

## Hanford Advisory Board

### FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

September 6-7, 2001

Radisson Hotel, SeaTac, WA

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND BOARD BUSINESS .....	4
Vice chair selection.....	5
Meeting Summary Approval.....	5
CONVERSATION WITH ASSISTANT SECRETARY JESSIE ROBERSON.....	5
PERSPECTIVES FROM TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT AGENCY MANAGERS .....	6
U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office .....	6
U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection .....	8
Washington State Department of Ecology.....	9
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.....	10
CLEANUP CONSTRAINTS AND CHALLENGES TEAM (C3T).....	13
TPA RESPONSES TO BOARD ADVICE .....	20
Budget Advice (#120).....	20
B Reactor Advice (#119).....	21
Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education Center (HAMMER) Advice (#118).....	21
River Corridor Contract Advice (#115).....	21
HAB INVOLVEMENT IN DOE BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS .....	22
LETTER TO MARY LOU BLAZEK .....	23
TPA COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN ADVICE .....	23
PLUTONIUM FINISHING PLANT .....	25
COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ISSUE MANAGER UPDATES .....	28
Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting .....	28
Project Support Operations Center .....	28
24 Command Fire Follow Up .....	28
Public Information and Communication Committee.....	29
Groundwater Workshop.....	29
Institutional Control Plan.....	30
Tank Waste Committee.....	30
LETTER FROM TPA AGENCIES ON HIGH PRIORITY ISSUES .....	30
TPA Agency Priorities.....	31
Discussion.....	31
ITEMS FOR FUTURE HAB FOCUS: CENTRAL PLATEAU .....	33
PUBLIC COMMENT .....	36
ATTACHMENT 1 .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Vice chair selection**

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) agreed by consensus to reaffirm Shelley Cimon and Ken Bracken as vice chairs of the HAB for a second two-year term.

### **Conversation with Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson**

Assistant Secretary of Energy Jessie Roberson called in to the HAB meeting and reported on the top-to-bottom review. She encouraged the HAB to offer its recommendations.

Board members discussed the importance of advocating for credible cleanup budgets, long-term stewardship issues, concerns regarding the top-to-bottom review, and the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement.

### **Perspectives from Tri-Party Agreement Agency Managers**

The senior managers from the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies presented their thoughts on the past year. Keith Klein, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) emphasized that the key to credibility is delivering on cleanup commitments. Harry Boston, U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection, said DOE-ORP is on schedule and has controls in place to focus on retrieval and treatment of the waste in the tanks. Tom Fitzsimmons, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), commented on the recent Director's Determination, the work of the Cleanup Constraints and Challenges (C3T) team, and future challenges for the agencies, regulators, and HAB. He also introduced David Meers from the Washington State Attorney General's office who reported that if lack of funding means that DOE cannot keep its commitments, then litigation may be possible. Mike Gearheard, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), compared the HAB to the keel of a ship – the HAB provides the memory, drive, and direction for long-term cleanup.

Board members discussed the future of the 300 Area, the new River Corridor contract and the 2012 vision, cleanup budget credibility, alignment of cleanup contracts with Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones, the importance of defining end states, long-term stewardship, and public involvement.

### **Cleanup Constraints and Challenges Team (C3T)**

Todd Martin, Susan Leckband, and Doug Huston reported on their attendance at a meeting to discuss cleanup constraints. Mike Schlender, DOE-RL, made a presentation on the C3T effort, noting that there has been excellent participation from DOE-ORP, Ecology, and EPA. He indicated that participants in the C3T process would like input from the HAB.

Board members discussed the value of HAB participation in the C3T effort, concerns with the lack of understanding of the purposes of C3T activities, the importance of public involvement, links between the C3T effort and budget issues, defining end states, upcoming TPA negotiations, and the importance of building an alliance with DOE-Headquarters to support Hanford cleanup. The HAB adopted a letter to the TPA agencies communicating its concerns regarding the possible misconstruing of HAB participation as endorsement of the C3T process and its products.

### **HAB Involvement in DOE Budget Development Process**

The HAB endorsed a process developed collaboratively by its Budgets and Contracts Committee, DOE-RL, and DOE-ORP. EPA and Ecology had not participated extensively in its development. The process offers opportunities for earlier involvement, including participation in the development of budget scenarios.

### **Letter to Mary Lou Blazek**

The HAB adopted a letter to Mary Lou Blazek, longtime HAB member and Board supporter, who recently retired from the Oregon Office of Energy.

### **TPA Community Relations Plan Advice**

The HAB considered draft advice on revisions and improvements to the Community Relations Plan that outlines the public participation process implemented for the TPA. Board members discussed the importance of complying with a variety of legally-required public participation activities and including the HAB charter in the Plan. The advice was adopted by consensus with Gordon Rogers abstaining.

### **TPA Agency High-Priority Issues and Future HAB Work**

The TPA agencies shared a list of nine issues on which they would like advice. They expressed particular interest in the issues of identifying Central Plateau end states and cleanup in the river corridor. DOE-ORP is also very interested in tank waste treatment.

The Board agreed that work on Central Plateau end states was a priority. As a starting place, it decided to take advantage of part of the September River and Plateau Committee meeting to scope out the questions the Board wants to address. The River and Plateau Committee would not necessarily be the "home" of the issue. Board members also showed a willingness to set aside some of its other work in order to focus on the issue.

### **Updates**

The HAB received a number of updates on a number of topics, including the Plutonium Finishing Plant, a recent Site-Specific Advisory Board meeting, follow up to the 24 Command Fire, the Hanford institutional control plan, and the upcoming national SSAB groundwater workshop.

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

### **Hanford Advisory Board** Draft Meeting Summary September 6-7, 2001 Radisson Hotel, SeaTac, WA

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. One Board seat was not represented: Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Richard Berglund, primary member. This is the 3rd consecutive board meeting that this seat has been unrepresented.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND BOARD BUSINESS**

- Todd Martin announced that Assistant Secretary of Energy Jessie Roberson was scheduled to phone into the meeting at 8:45am. A letter from Jessie Roberson to the HAB dated September 5<sup>th</sup> was available on the back table.
- Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), is now the Administrator of the Nuclear Safety Division at the Oregon Office of Energy. He has replaced Mary Lou Blazek, who retired in August.
- Gail McClure, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), requested that HAB members submit travel vouchers promptly, before the end of the current fiscal year in September. Todd Martin reminded members to make travel reservations for hotels, rental cars, and airfare only through the designated travel agent.
- Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco (Local Government), announced that he is running for reelection for his position on the Pasco City Council. He campaigns door to door. He has visited 1,200 houses so far, and expects to go to 7,000 before he is reelected.
- Todd Martin announced that the Idaho National Environmental Engineering Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board would meet in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho on September 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>. It would like some HAB members to attend its meeting, although there is no specific agenda objective other than to meet each other. Gail McClure can assist with arrangements to attend the meeting.
- Joy Turner, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), announced that Ecology brought copies of its Annual Report for the Nuclear Waste Program to the meeting.

## **Vice chair selection**

Todd Martin announced that the two-year term was up for the vice chairs of the HAB. Since both Shelley Cimon and Ken Bracken are willing to continue to serve, Todd recommended their terms be renewed for another two years. Susan Leckband nominated Shelley Cimon and Ken Bracken for two years. The HAB agreed by consensus to reaffirm Shelley Cimon and Ken Bracken as vice chairs of the HAB.

## **Meeting Summary Approval**

The June meeting summary was approved with minor corrections from Ken Niles and Ken Bracken.

## **CONVERSATION WITH ASSISTANT SECRETARY JESSIE ROBERSON**

Before Assistant Secretary of Energy Jessie Roberson called in to the HAB meeting, Todd Martin reported on the meeting she had had with the HAB's chair, vice chairs, and committee chairs and vice chairs. The Statement of Principles shared with the Assistant Secretary was included in the September HAB packet.

When Jessie Roberson called in, Todd Martin requested a status update about the DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) top-to-bottom review. Jessie Roberson reported that scoping for the review continues. She had received letters from other advisory boards as well as the HAB and expressed interest in the HAB's recommendations. The top-to-bottom review will rely on existing channels for public review. She encouraged the HAB to proactively offer recommendations and to work through DOE-RL Site Manager Keith Klein and U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) Site Manager Harry Boston, although she is willing to receive advice directly as well.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), requested that the Assistant Secretary advocate for the cleanup budget. Paige was particularly concerned that Secretary of Energy would use the President's budget and asked Ms. Roberson to convey to the Secretary and the President that the budget needs to comply with legal agreements signed by DOE. Ms. Roberson responded that the Secretary is concerned that the cleanup program does not have the credibility to warrant the budget requested. She felt this was a fair view and noted that the Secretary does not control the final budget decisions.

Leon Swenson, Public at Large, asked what must to happen to achieve the credibility the Secretary desires for the budget request. He commented that to the HAB, the budget is credible because it is obvious what cleanup needs to occur, but for some reason DOE-HQ does not receive that message. Ms. Roberson responded that DOE-HQ receives the message, but a challenge for the top-to-bottom review is ensuring that the message and actions connect. She commented that DOE-HQ has a responsibility to make sure its actions match the message.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), thanked the Assistant Secretary for visiting Hanford and asked if she now has a better idea of the long-term problems (30-50 year horizon) faced by the site, including stewardship. Ms. Roberson responded she has not considered the issue specifically. She noted that this question is prevalent throughout the DOE complex and is not unique to Hanford.

Norma Jean Germond, Public at Large, expressed concern that the top-to-bottom review would slow cleanup, particularly with regard to the site not receiving adequate cleanup funding for the next two years. Ms. Roberson explained that one of her goals is to disconnect the top-to-bottom review from the budget. The top-to-bottom review is not linked to the budget process.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), commented on the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She appreciates the Assistant Secretary's attention to this issue in encouraging the site to proceed but noted that the site will need the Assistant Secretary's help to prevent DOE-HQ from slowing the process down. Ms. Roberson assured the HAB that she is taking action regarding the Solid Waste EIS and does not intend to let go of the issue. Pam also asked if the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) is involved with the top-to-bottom review, noting that the DNFSB becomes frustrated with slowdowns due to reviews and could probably help secure the requested funding. Ms. Roberson commented that she understands the role, responsibility and viewpoints of the DNFSB. As with HAB, she would like the insight and input of the DNFSB.

Jessie Roberson reiterated that the top-to-bottom review is a way to capture recommendations that have been made in the past while simultaneously gaining a fresh perspective.

## **PERSPECTIVES FROM TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT AGENCY MANAGERS**

The senior managers from the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies presented their thoughts on the past year and provided the HAB with focus on important policy issues for the next six months.

### **U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office**

Keith Klein, DOE-RL, commented that the key to credibility is delivering on cleanup commitments. In the River Corridor, up to 22 Multi-Canister Overpacks (MCO) of spent nuclear fuel have been removed from the basin. That is only 5% of all the fuel to move, but DOE-RL is now moving into an operational mode and optimizing operations. Recently the project moved to 24-hour shifts, four days a week, and will increase to seven days week in February. Additional processing tables will be installed in the basins to increase throughput. Keith Klein anticipates a 4- to 5-fold increase in productivity and emptying close to a basin's worth of fuel over the next year.

In addition, DOE-RL is making important progress on B Cell. In the 300 Area (close to the City of Richland and the Columbia River), DOE-RL had an unpermitted Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) mess and has since succeeded in moving one million or so curies. DOE-RL has also shipped surplus uranium off site and is making progress on cocooning reactors.

On the Central Plateau, DOE-RL has put stabilized plutonium into storage containers. The plutonium is now less expensive to maintain, in a stable form, and triple packaged in stainless steel. DOE-RL has sent shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP), and moved about 3 million tons of contaminated soil to the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF).

Regarding Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) commitments, DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are not aligned with only three milestones and another that was renegotiated. An important milestone missed was that construction of the vitrification plant did not begin on schedule. Keith Klein feels DOE-RL is on schedule to meet its commitments and will exceed the schedule in some cases. Regarding another missed milestone, DOE-RL could not get a permit to ship all of its uranium billets, but is on track to dispose of the rest on site.

Regarding the new administration, Keith Klein feels the perceived lack of credibility for the DOE budget is part of a natural calibration process; it is inevitable that a new administration would want to review operations. Field office and contractor managers have been briefing Jessie Roberson about strategy, approach to closure, and other issues.

Two years ago, DOE-RL began working on issues that the administration is reacting to now, such as the charges that cleanup is too slow and costs too much. Some DOE-RL solutions to these problems include breaking work up into the River, the Plateau, and the future; realigning contracts, and performance incentives (PIs); and other strategies. He pointed out that the HAB is most useful at finding areas of consensus and pointing out major disconnects. Keith Klein has asked the Assistant Secretary for early feedback on DOE-RL's strategy and current direction of work. He anticipates reaching closure in November regarding alignment on a path forward, timeframes, and a funding profile between the heads of the TPA agencies: Harry Boston (DOE-ORP), Tom Fitzsimmons (Ecology), Mike Gearheard (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), and himself. He emphasized that delivering on commitments and achieving better credibility requires a plan.

Regarding DOE-RL's approach to closure, Keith Klein believes that a key measure of success for cleaning up the River Corridor is removal from the National Priority List (NPL). To achieve this requires review by the EPA, Ecology, and the public.

The Central Plateau is more complex and thus requires more aggressive planning. To petition for deletion from NPL, DOE-RL will need a robust Long-Term Stewardship plan and final remedies in place. These are all predicated on groundwater protection strategies, remediating waste, removing buildings and material within the buildings, and

dealing with the tanks, the Plutonium Finishing Plant, Spent Nuclear Fuel, and other programs.

In summary, Keith Klein feels DOE-RL is working to protect the Columbia River, respecting treaty rights, staying mindful of the TPA and its commitments, working on fostering independent economic strength on the site, reducing the footprint, and protecting workers.

### **U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection**

Harry Boston, DOE-ORP, gave an overview of the status of work and his thoughts for the future at DOE-ORP. He is proud of the progress DOE-ORP has made. It is on schedule, removing liquids from tanks, closed the Wyden Watchlist, and has controls in place to focus on retrieval and treatment of the waste in the tanks. DOE-ORP is instituting controls for the interim tank stabilization and stopping leaks in single shell tanks.

The infrastructure for the vitrification facility is in place, completed ahead of schedule and \$9 million (out of \$40 million) under cost. DOE-ORP will mobilize for construction in the next 30 days and formally start construction by December 2002, hopefully earlier. DOE-ORP is also continuing its subsurface investigations. Harry Boston emphasized that he and Keith Klein work together to ensure their two offices function as one DOE for Hanford.

Regarding the new administration, Harry Boston thinks there are good people with new ideas and perspectives. In summary, although he perceives DOE-ORP's progress as very good, DOE-ORP will not rest until the tank waste has been treated, and the tanks are closed.

Harry Boston expressed confidence in his contractors and their baselines. He is advocating for the new administration to fund the tank waste treatment facility as one well-defined project to secure multi-year funding. DOE-ORP still plans to begin hot operations in 2007.

Harry Boston expressed high confidence in the near term at building facilities efficiently and providing good value to taxpayers. However, he would like a credible, farther-reaching plan to help the project and to make progress in the near term. For example, the current plan assumes the construction of larger vitrification facilities (costing \$3 billion or more) over the next few years, but right now it is difficult to even secure \$1 billion. Thus, DOE-ORP needs a plan to treat waste with a level funding profile that is still consistent with regulatory requirements.

Using proven processes, the initial facilities could treat 50% of the waste in their design life. DOE-ORP is working to revise the design for the initial facilities to treat all the waste. He emphasized that there is no change to near term plans. He also emphasized that public involvement is vital to help DOE-ORP treat the waste smarter, sooner, and less expensively. DOE-ORP would like to get more out of initial facilities, tie waste



treatment technology to treatment of material, recognize that some tanks are nearly empty and could be closed in the near term, ensuring alignment with the future stewardship plan, and stay consistent with the plan for the Central Plateau.

An inventory of radioactivity in tanks revealed that several tanks hold the bulk of the inventory while some are almost empty. The size of the vitrification facility is dependent on the amount of sodium in the waste. It may be possible to empty the tanks sooner if the sodium could be separated – possibly by 2028 instead of 2047.

DOE-ORP is working to understand subsurface contamination and protect public health and the environment now and in future. On this topic it is essential to hear from stakeholders and tie to end points on the Central Plateau.

### **Washington State Department of Ecology**

Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology, drew an analogy between mountain climbing and Hanford cleanup. Like a mountain climbing expedition, Hanford cleanup makes progress in tiny little steps. There are many little monotonous activities, interrupted by moments of sheer terror. He feels that this stage of the cleanup is a moment of terror. He focused his comments on: 1) the recent Director's Determination 2) explaining the work of the Cleanup Constraints and Challenges (C3T) team as a way of understanding Ecology's apparent disjointed actions, and 3) future challenges for the agencies, regulators, and HAB.

Tom Fitzsimmons complimented Harry Boston, Keith Klein, their staffs, and the contractors and workers on the site for their achievements, ideas, and leadership. Over the last year the reactors have been cocooned and much progress has been made at K Basins. He also applauded the HAB and Chair Todd Martin for the transition to new leadership and providing discipline and focus.

**1. Director's Determination.** DOE-ORP asked for a change on the start date of construction of the vitrification plant, which was supposed to begin by July 31<sup>st</sup>. Ecology did not grant the change request and is issuing the maximum daily penalty under the TPA for failure to meet that date. If DOE-ORP can present a recovery plan in October that would still ensure the beginning of hot operations by December 2007, then Ecology may reconsider the fine. Ecology's action reserved its ability to make a decision through the current budget schedule whether the TPA is working or not. If not, Ecology will consider an approach to tank waste cleanup through other means, including lawsuits.

**2. C3T work.** Ecology is engaged in the C3T effort. Tom Fitzsimmons is supportive, involved, and committed to the process. He feels that if Hanford survives this budget cycle and develops a clear path forward, then cleanup has an opportunity to be more focused than it has been in the last five years.

**3. Future challenges.** Tom Fitzsimmons observed that this is the first time he has heard DOE officials at a HAB meeting devote 90% of their time talking about the future,

instead of defending why past events were not accomplished. He commented that realignment needs to happen, but the Tri-Parties must decide whether to align the TPA with activities or align activities with the TPA. Ecology aligns activities with the TPA. Tom Fitzsimmons was pleased to hear that DOE's top-to-bottom review includes DOE-HQ, not just the sites. Another challenge is the expectation that DOE-ORP will be able to produce a credible plan to recover the vitrification plant's schedule; he requested the HAB help evaluate such a plan and whether it would require future rebaselining. He also asked for the HAB to help with research and development investments to consider other alternatives to stabilizing and treating the waste instead of expecting the construction of other plants from funding requests that may be unachievable. He would also like the HAB to help define end states, particularly in the short term for the River Corridor. He encouraged a more pragmatic approach to Long-Term Stewardship.

Tom Fitzsimmons introduced David Meers, the head of the Ecology division of the Washington State Attorney General's office. David Meers reported that the Attorney General's office supports Ecology's decisions. The Attorney General's office is interested in solving problems, but if lack of funding means that DOE cannot keep its commitments, particularly with regard to the vitrification plant, then litigation may be the only choice remaining.

### **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

Mike Gearheard, EPA, commented EPA Region 10's Acting Regional Administrator Chuck Findley is retiring at the end of September. He compared the HAB to the keel of a ship – the HAB provides the memory, drive, and direction for long-term cleanup. EPA thinks the direction for cleanup is to do it in small pieces, as set forth in TPA. Cleanup on the Columbia River is going well but must continue at the same pace, which depends on the budget. This means completing interim safe storage for the reactors, continuing with 100 Area cleanup, beginning remedial action in the 300 Area, continuing the cleanup of groundwater in the 200 Area, and speeding the removal rate of MCOs in the Spent Nuclear Fuel project.

EPA is concerned that there is a failure to reach agreement to engage in serious negotiations about TPA milestones that are about to or have already slipped. The TPA agencies have not been able to negotiate those milestones because of the transition to the new administration. Overall the EPA would like to negotiate the milestones, commit to baselines, and align these with the TPA.

Mike Gearheard would like the HAB to participate in the process to achieve a long-term vision for the Central Plateau.

Tim Takaro commented that the 2012 Vision calls for the leveling of the 300 Area and asked about the current schedule. Keith Klein clarified that the entire 300 Area would not be leveled. DOE-RL is considering keeping a few buildings for the Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL). Work will involve identifying a place to store waste, determining requirements for packaging, dealing with aging infrastructure, and

identifying methods of worker protection. He further commented that the River Corridor contract is dependent partly on the budget situation and the new administration's goals for improving DOE's approach to contracting. He indicated that Bob Card and Jessie Roberson have been very supportive of proceeding with cleaning up the River Corridor. He summarized that the 300 Area will be razed except for a few areas; the 2012 vision is still possible; and everything depends on the budget.

Tim Takaro also asked for clarification of Jessie Roberson's comment that the budget submission lacked credibility. Keith Klein answered that Ms. Roberson had referred to the DOE's Environmental Management (EM) budget submission, not that of DOE-RL. The criticism was not whether the DOE-EM budget was for worthwhile work but questioning the price tag. Credibility comes from confirmation that the budget describes a reasonable amount of work and cost. Harry Boston added that the DOE-EM budget is a target because it has not always been clear that progress was being made for the billions of dollars invested.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked whether the four TPA agencies confer with each other to present the same message to Congress. Keith Klein explained that the C3T team represents one cross cutting effort for such collaboration. He does not perceive any communication constraints; he suggested that any problems would be due to his own lack of foresight to consult with the regulatory agencies before taking action. He reemphasized that he would like the HAB to help achieve realignment in the Central Plateau and a groundwater protection strategy. Between DOE-ORP and DOE-RL, the current baseline for the total cost of cleanup is on the order of \$90 billion, but it may be possible to lower the total cost to \$45-50 billion without increasing the site's risk profile. However, much depends on decisions regarding the Central Plateau. Mike Gearheard offered a comparison. The entire EPA Superfund budget is \$1.3 billion. The entire Department of Defense cleanup budget is also in the range of \$1.3. In contrast, the DOE-EM budget is \$6 billion. He thought new policy makers would understandably be wary of such high DOE budgets.

Ken Niles commented that it is useful to hear from the heads of the four agencies. He observed, since in the past, EPA and Ecology have been willing to change milestones, alignment has meant changing the TPA to match existing contracts. He asked whether DOE is willing to renegotiate contracts with contractors. Keith Klein answered absolutely. Harry Boston commented that DOE-ORP only has a few milestones out of alignment because they are not achievable from a technical perspective.

Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), commented that defining the Central Plateau end states is paramount; he would like the agencies to focus on it even more. He also personally challenged and encouraged the agencies to keep their differences at a professional level.

Paige Knight offered another metaphor: a final vision for the site is the Holy Grail for the region. She was particularly concerned with the possible early closure of tanks. Harry Boston responded that the closure only referred to single shell tanks not in use. In May,

Harry Boston requested that CH2M Hill (CHG) take immediate actions to ensure safety; corrective action is now in place to address those issues. He commented that CHG has an excellent safety record and is making tremendous progress in cleanup although it had been sloppy on some fundamental safety and quality issues. Overall the safety is good, but Harry Boston has raised the standard.

Paige Knight commented that on a recent two-day tour of Hanford she noticed an overly large crowd from CHG present and thought that would explain how the public would think the cleanup budget is unnecessarily large.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), voiced a concern that, with regard to Long-Term Stewardship, the Assistant Secretary failed to mention two unique qualities of the Hanford site: 1) the treaties with the Native American tribes and 2) Washington State's Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). Betty Tabbutt encouraged the agency heads to educate DOE-HQ about these legal commitments. The treaties have much to say about end states, and the federal government should be held to the same standards as industries and other polluters. Keith Klein responded that DOE made a deliberate effort to introduce the Assistant Secretary to the tribes during her visit.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), commented that Ecology should invest more effort to alert the public if there are legal problems about the TPA commitments not being met. He also asked whether Congress is legally obligated to fund Hanford cleanup because of the TPA. Tom Fitzsimmons answered that the cornerstone to any legal argument is to what degree the federal government is obligated to fund cleanup, although there are other legal requirements as well that Ecology is very seriously considering. Regarding the public, he commented that not all citizens in the region are as interested in Hanford cleanup as the members of the HAB. Penetrating beyond a surface level to understand the broader public will is an important but difficult task. He asked for suggestions on how to improve this effort.

John Erickson, Washington Department of Health (Ex-Officio), built on the mountain climbing metaphor: moments of terror are always followed by moments of absolute beauty.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization) thanked DOE-ORP and Harry Boston for a formal commitment to openness. He also pointed out that if the agencies had heeded previous HAB advice about having the HAB review contracts, budgets, and overhead cost cutting, then DOE might not have a budget credibility problem. He further reminded the agencies that the HAB has issued advice on contracts, contract reform, and cost savings.

Gerry Pollet next asked about the commitment to make the Hanford Reach National Monument safe, clean, and useful. He was concerned because in 1994, the four agencies signed a commitment in which the River Corridor would be cleaned by 2011 and all the work plans would be complete by December 2001. These dates will be missed. He

pointed out that the public continually asks for those commitments to be honored, but instead the current baselines for cleaning groundwater along the Columbia River do not even align with the 2018 date. He specifically asked for each of the agency heads to respond to the following three questions:

- 1) Have you read or at least reviewed the full set of comments from the annual budget cleanup priority hearings each year?
- 2) Will you commit to personally attend the annual set of budget public hearings (four meetings around region in the spring)?
- 3) Are Ecology and EPA going to enforce through compliance orders deadlines forgotten earlier that DOE will not even negotiate?

Tom Fitzsimmons responded that in the interest of time, he would not answer all three questions. He referred to the C3T process, which can involve both the public and the HAB and will hopefully lead to powerful and coordinated visions. Gerry Pollet responded that the public has been giving input at hearings for years and since the C3T process began with a small group, it appears to the public that its visions have been left out of the process. Gerry pressed for a commitment from the agency heads to attend public meetings, and said it was shameful that they do not attend.

Norm Dyer, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), thanked the agency heads for attending the HAB meeting. He thought it was clear that Congress should provide an adequate cleanup budget, but thought DOE-HQ had a management and legal obligation to report to Congress if funding is not adequate. He noted that the Clinton Administration did not choose to make that statement to Congress and asked whether there has been any indication that the present administration will do so. Harry Boston said DOE does not know how the process will end this year.

Jim Curdy, Grant and Franklin Counties (Local Government), commented on how the loss of credibility affects funding for Hanford cleanup. The region borrowed over \$2 billion to build the Grand Coulee Dam, and although farmers have paid off some of the debt, \$1 billion is still owed to the federal government. Setting aside land as a national monument removes earnings from the area to pay off that debt. The next payments are due in 2003. The relevant treaty says the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project will have adequate water, but that is not the case. He emphasized that these agreements, which have been passed by Congress and signed by Presidents, are international agreements critical for the water supply for the whole nation. Credibility means fulfilling our country's treaty obligations.

### **CLEANUP CONSTRAINTS AND CHALLENGES TEAM (C3T)**

At the June HAB meeting, Todd Martin had announced that the HAB had been invited to a meeting to discuss cleanup constraints and determine how all parties involved could work together to eliminate those constraints. Todd Martin, Susan Leckband, and Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), attended the meeting as representatives from the HAB. Todd stressed the importance of transparency in the process and noted the risks for the HAB to participate – including co-optation – but he

felt it was necessary for the agencies to discuss this effort and to specify how the HAB could be involved. Susan Leckband added that she receives meeting minutes for this process, all of which are clearly marked for distribution to anyone interested. She expressed appreciation of the agencies' effort to establish cleanup goals. Doug Huston added that four subgroups were developed, and he has participated in one of them.

Mike Schlender, DOE-RL, made a presentation on the C3T effort, noting that there has been excellent participation from DOE-ORP, Ecology, and EPA. He indicated that participants in the C3T process would like input from the HAB in the near term on TPA milestones and the River Corridor contract procurement. The four C3T subgroups need timely and substantive input from the HAB as well as continued participation on the leadership team subgroup in C3T workshops.

The C3T process is being conducted at this time because there is a need for a common vision, reflecting budget challenges and strategies for 2012. The C3T effort has similar targets as the DOE-HQ top-to-bottom review. It provides an objective forum to discuss issues. Participants hope it will resolve issues more quickly than the normal TPA process.

The C3T process began in May. The four agencies conducted many interviews and identified and grouped over 100 constraints. At a workshop held at the end of June, the leadership group identified the top constraints and agreed to four initiatives:

- 1) Develop a collective end state for Hanford.
- 2) Renew the commitment to the TPA as the guiding cleanup document.
- 3) Reduce unnecessary layers of requirements applied to cleanup activities (looking at DOE and contractors to streamline work).
- 4) Develop an investment strategy to ensure national support for Hanford.

The C3T group is developing a partnering approach that includes other stakeholders and the tribal governments. The path forward involves three primary tracks: 1) preparing for the FY03 budget, 2) strategies to resolve TPA and commitment issues, and 3) preparing for the River Corridor contract. The C3T process would like HAB feedback, especially since there is a meeting in Washington, DC in November between Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson and the heads of the four agencies about alignment. There are multiple insertion points for HAB input, participation, and advice, but there is near term urgency to influence the FY03 and FY04 budgets, near-term TPA milestones, and River Corridor contract procurement. In the long term, the goal is to have an understanding of alignment by June 2002.

C3T is led by the four senior managers of the TPA agencies (the "Gang of Four"). They are supported by the Hanford Leadership Team (i.e., workshop participants and now including tribal participants) and the Hanford leadership workgroup. Subgroup 1 is dedicated to visioning. Subgroup 2, led by Doug Sherwood, EPA, is creating a database that compares cleanup contracts and TPA milestones. Subgroup 3 is working to eliminate unnecessary requirements. Subgroup 4 will use the products from the first three groups to present a business case strategy to officials in Washington, DC.

Todd Martin clarified his participation in the C3T process. He wanted to ensure the C3T group understood that to receive feedback from the HAB, C3T would need to work through the HAB's issue managers, committees, and normal HAB processes. He had hoped the C3T group would be able to present a few broad questions that it is addressing to the HAB at this meeting. He also noted that this process would require broader public involvement than just the HAB.

Denny Newland, Benton County (Local Government), questioned to what degree DOE could be held accountable for cleanup commitments, an issue that has influenced DOE engagement in TPA negotiations.

Charles Kilbury did not think the HAB should enter into a partnership with the C3T process. Instead the HAB should critically analyze products of the process and make recommendations.

Gerry Pollet expressed dismay that this is the first time the HAB has heard anything significant about the C3T process. He pointed out that no members of the public interest community or those who fought for MTCA were consulted. He alleged that the process violated MTCA's requirement that the public be notified of any resource restrictions, proposed changes to unrestricted use, interim institutional controls, and changes to default assumptions. He suggested that if the C3T process hopes to define end states with public support, it should have started with the public. He urged the HAB not to participate because the HAB does not represent the full spectrum of the public.

Mike Schlender responded that so far, the C3T process has been limited to gathering data from public hearing records information, reviewing HAB advice, collecting information from project managers about TPA commitments, and understanding alignment issues. Once the data have been collected, he would like the HAB to participate and contribute to the visioning part of the process.

Mike Gearheard commented that the end states discussion has been limited to the 200 Area, where there are still uncertainties; end states for the River Corridor will not differ from those previously defined. He also commented that Doug Sherwood is very concerned about the public involvement process associated with any change to the TPA.

Tom Fitzsimmons urged the HAB to focus on the four C3T workshop initiatives. C3T participants will make decisions based on those initiatives and have the public participate in a meaningful way.

Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business), expressed concern that no representatives from the local government or business community were involved in C3T. He also expressed doubt about the success of the process, and pointed out that since the agency heads plan to meet with DOE-HQ in November, the process has precluded the involvement of any parties other than those already involved.

Keith Klein responded that when cleanup levels are precisely defined, there would be Record of Decision (RODs) and related public processes. DOE-RL and DOE-ORP have an opportunity to influence DOE-HQ to help ensure Hanford receives the resources needed to maintain progress on the cleanup. He indicated that ideas on alignment, not necessarily consensus, could contribute to an investment strategy.

Mike Schlender offered some strategic perspective on the C3T process. In the near term, DOE-RL and DOE-ORP have an opportunity to influence the FY03 and FY04 site budgets, the impending procurement for the River Corridor contract, and milestones for the 100 and 300 Areas. In the long term, the process could continue iteratively. He noted that the Assistant Secretary had suggested the November meeting as an opportunity to influence the budget.

Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), commented that the mission has already failed since it has not consulted other constituencies.

Paige Knight compared the C3T process to the 2012 visioning process, in which people were upset at not being included at the outset. She noted that if the C3T process does not necessarily want consensus, it could run into problems getting input from the HAB, since the Board operates by consensus. In general, Paige thinks it sounds like a good idea to undergo this process since it must start somewhere, but asked if there is a way to get wider participation. Keith Klein responded that he would like as much consensus as possible. He emphasized that the agencies are trying to make C3T as transparent as possible and commended the HAB for at least observing.

Tom Fitzsimmons admitted that the agencies should have included more parties for participation initially, but pointed out that the immediate concern is to convince the administration that Hanford is conducting its own top-to-bottom review. If Hanford can present a strategy in the November meeting with Jessie Roberson, it may be able to convince DOE-HQ to invest in the strategy.

Greg de Bruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization) commented that until end states have been agreed upon for the 100 and 300 Areas, it is impossible to define end states for the 200 Area by November. There should be a wide-reaching public discussion on these end states. He felt the HAB was being used but not involved in the process. He expressed appreciation for the work of the four agency heads, but urged them to consider total life cycle costs and long-term forecasts.

Betty Tabbutt questioned the need for the C3T process, since the obvious constraint is whether the federal government is accountable for cleanup agreements. Until that question is answered she warned that C3T might be just another visioning effort. She noted that Hanford chose to follow the TPA for cleanup because it is legally binding.

Tom Fitzsimmons responded that getting the highest level of the federal government, The Secretary of Energy Secretary, to invest in a Hanford cleanup strategy is the best way to



ensure cleanup. This could also lead to more deeply tying cleanup to the TPA. An investment strategy may be a creative way to get the federal government to invest longer term in Hanford, like a capital improvement project. Mike Gearheard concurred; the effort is to provide long-term vision for Hanford cleanup to help avoid the ups and downs of the annual budget cycle.

Keith Klein said that Hanford representatives would like to be able to convince the budget decision-makers that following the TPA is not only the right thing to do, but also makes sense technically, fiscally, socially, and with respect to risk. Ideally Hanford would build on the Rocky Flats model, a DOE site that was unharmed by budget cuts this year, because it had generated support that it was on the right path to closure.

Gerry Pollet asked whether DOE-RL would negotiate milestones for the 200 Area by December 2001. Mike Schlender answered that it would. Gerry blamed the budget problems on the administration and DOE-HQ. He noted that for only one year (1995) out of the last 12, Congress did not provide more money to Hanford than the administration's requested budget.

Pam Brown commented that she appreciates the C3T effort. She thinks the HAB should have an opportunity to participate. She requested the C3T leaders define a process to decide end states. She also requested the four subgroups involve HAB issue managers and committee leadership.

Ken Bracken commented that C3T represents a step to solving issues that have daunted the site. He voiced concern about the process; to address issues of this magnitude before individuals at the DOE-HQ level is troubling because the C3T process could be misconstrued or given more credibility than it has. He hoped the HAB could provide guidance on involving citizens.

Dan Simpson, Public-at-Large, urged the HAB and C3T group to consider managing the entire site as a large, unified project.

Victor Moore, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), asked whether people would have access to areas of the site that have been cleaned up. He suggested that cleanup areas be redesignated. He suggested changing meaningless names, such as 100 Area and 200 Area, to the date of the expected cleanup date, such as Area 2007 – this would provide clues about end states. He also felt the fences should be changed as cleanup progresses so the whole site is not kept as a reservation.

Leon Swenson advocated convincing budget-allocators that year-to-year funding is not adequate. The key to that approach is treating the whole project like a single entity rather than looking at parts and pieces. He supports the direction of the C3T but hopes the HAB can be involved. He noted that initial discussions should be coupled with TPA milestones and budget implications.

Mike Schlender clarified that originally the C3T process was to start gathering information to develop a long-term view for the site with input from many parties about the larger end state question. The effort is still in its infancy. He noted that DOE-RL needs approval from DOE-HQ on strategy as it enters into formal negotiations for change packages to the TPA. He emphasized that this process is to learn what gaps exist. DOE-RL would not miss milestones or commitments. In addition, it provides an early opportunity to match commitments with contracts. Keith Klein clarified that this process began with the purpose of identifying barriers to cleanup, one of which is that end uses have not been defined.

Mike Schlender also explained that the November meeting is an opportunity for the agencies to meet with Jessie Roberson. The intention was to complete the staff work regarding 100 and 300 Area milestones, with a long-term view showing disconnects on an overall strategy for Hanford. The 100 and 300 Area negotiations have to be resolved before December, and DOE-RL needs to talk about those negotiations in advance. DOE-RL thought the HAB could provide insight before the formal change package process. The longer term issues could hopefully be resolved by June 2002. DOE-RL hoped to get an agreement-in-principle before beginning formal negotiations.

Keith Klein further explained that they would take this information to the new administration to convince DOE-HQ to be Hanford's biggest advocate. He would like the result of that meeting to be that Jessie Roberson thinks Hanford is doing a good job and that the 3CT process is addressing the kind of questions that will be asked in the top-to-bottom review.

Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, emphasized that this process is collecting data and identifying disconnects between the TPA, contracts, the multiple site baselines, and assembling a database of all this information. The November meeting is a touchstone with the new leadership at DOE-HQ and an opportunity for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP officials to demonstrate that Hanford has everything all thought out, including shortcomings. He asked for the HAB to help define the public involvement needs.

Mike Gearheard commented that many different "ornaments" have been hung on the November meeting. One that would be useful is a decision from DOE that the C3T process could serve in lieu of a top-to-bottom review. He felt that accomplishing other things, including review of the tank waste milestone would be difficult to accomplish in that meeting. The November meeting does not replace discussion of the 100 Area milestones.

Todd Martin offered three options for action from the HAB: 1) not formally comment at this time, 2) encourage but not endorse the C3T effort due to process problems, or 3) let HAB committees and issue managers work on the issue. Todd noted that the agencies want feedback on end states, but the HAB has discomfort about the process. The HAB is glad the agencies are talking but does not want to be abused or formally linked to the C3T process.

Doug Huston reported that the Oregon Office of Energy feels it is an important, useful process, and Oregon will continue to be involved. He suggested that issue managers work with each of the subgroups.

Susan Leckband pointed out that the HAB has encouraged the agencies to talk to each other, and they are doing so in this process. She encouraged support from an issue manager perspective.

Gerry Pollet noted that the 100 Area milestones are supposed to be part of the C3T process. Under the TPA, renegotiating 100 Area milestones requires public comment and notice, which has not happened and will not be possible before December 2001. He noted that EPA, Ecology, and the Washington State Department of Health (WDOH) have been working on end states, but DOE has not participated. He suggested the HAB write a letter saying it will not have anything to do with the C3T process. Gerry Pollet further suggested that the HAB and agencies engage in a facilitated process to collect public values on end states, have the HAB help evaluate those values, distribute them for public comment, and use that feedback as a basis for further negotiations. He also suggested the agencies review past HAB advice on this topic.

Gerry Pollet expressed doubt that the HAB committees, meeting once a month, would be able to make much progress on end states. Tim Takaro commented on the reduction in the number of times the HAB meets per year; it is reaching a dangerously low level.

The HAB developed a letter to the agencies on the C3T process and asked its committees to begin work on end states. Pam Brown thought the HAB committees should work with the four subgroups. Todd Martin explained that although that was not stated in the letter, the HAB has requested to be apprised of C3T effort's progress. Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, requested that the letter reflect that the HAB was invited to participate and that three members were invited even though they do not represent whole HAB. Todd emphasized that the HAB did not want to be formal members of the subgroups, although issue managers may observe.

Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force) said he understands the sensitivity of the HAB, but the Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council will continue to be a part of the C3T effort and will be able to report back to the HAB.

Denny Newland felt the HAB should be part of the four subgroups. He also suggested changing the letter to reflect that the HAB requests DOE not suggest HAB concurrence prior to formal HAB consideration and action on this process. Doug Huston and Harold Heacock commented that individuals participating need not be identified as HAB members. Todd Martin explained that issue managers could provide information to the subgroups about how the HAB functions, but not offer endorsement or approval. Harold Heacock noted that there have been past incidents in which HAB members participated in groups that later improperly claimed HAB endorsement.

Todd Martin expressed concern that the HAB's C3T letter might not travel with all C3T documents. He warned that work products with HAB members' names on them could give the impression of HAB endorsement outside of the proper Board process.

Leon Swenson felt that HAB members are members of the public regardless of their affiliation with the HAB, so it makes sense that the C3T group use the HAB as a ready pool of concerned, informed citizens. Doug Huston noted that HAB members are still useful participants for their insight into HAB processes and could essentially function as issue managers. Dave Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), expressed concern that HAB members would be listed with no affiliation and questioned how to refer to them.

Russell Jim, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), said that at the end of the process for the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group, there was consensus that 200 Area Central Plateau would be used for waste storage. The Yakama Nation could not agree with that since it was not in compliance with treaty rights. The same situation could arise with the C3T process.

The HAB adopted the letter as revised to clarify Board concerns regarding the possible misconstruing of HAB participation as endorsement of the C3T process and its products. The letter will be sent to Mike Schlender, DOE-RL, with copies to Mike Wilson, Ecology; Doug Sherwood, EPA; Wade Ballard, DOE-RL; Martha Crosland, DOE-HQ; and Jessie Roberson, DOE-HQ.

## **TPA RESPONSES TO BOARD ADVICE**

### **Budget Advice (#120)**

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government), summarized that the advice had conveyed the message that the President's budget was not acceptable and violated seven of nine HAB principles. In addition, the advice said that the HAB did not want the top-to-bottom review to hinder cleanup progress, and insisted that regulators take enforcement action. The overarching problem with the budget was that it did not meet TPA commitments. Maynard did not perceive from the responses that any of the agencies took issue with the HAB's advice. The DOE-RL response pointed out that this was not a normal process and not a normal year. Next year there will be a more iterative budget review process with the HAB.

Gerry Pollet added that the responses from EPA and Ecology addressed the failure of DOE to provide information in accordance with TPA processes. He questioned DOE-RL's response that Hanford was able to meet minimum requirements in terms of providing information to the regulators.

Wade Ballard commented that DOE-RL believes it met TPA requirements. Dennis Faulk, EPA, commented that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP did good job meeting their DOE-

HQ requirements. Even though they did not meet the TPA requirements, they should be commended given the limitations imposed upon them.

The HAB decided to take no further action related to this advice.

### **B Reactor Advice (#119)**

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), reported that the responses reflected the HAB's concerns through the planning process that will be initiated to outline the path forward. Todd Martin noted that the response format from DOE-RL had very specifically addressed the concerns in the advice point-by-point.

Wade Riggsbee noted that the EPA response was only half a page long, and he had hoped for more detail. Wade Ballard reported that DOE-RL has had internal deliberations about how to be more responsive to advice and came up with a format for point-by-point responses. The format in the future will be a cover letter and a point-by-point response.

### **Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education Center (HAMMER) Advice (#118)**

Keith Smith thanked the HAB for supporting the employees at Hanford. The Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education Center (HAMMER) advice was issued to DOE-RL, and the HAB received a brief response from Keith Klein. Keith Smith read the letter to the HAB and added that union workers had toured the HAMMER facility and agreed that it deserved more support. Congressional Representative Norm Dicks has assured Keith Smith that funding would be restored. Keith Smith believes Congress is supportive of HAMMER; its proposed funding allocation has returned to close to \$5.9 million.

### **River Corridor Contract Advice (#115)**

Gerry Pollet summarized that the advice's basic principle was that the River Corridor contract should reflect the TPA. The HAB had expressed concerns about the nature and scope of the contract. A closure contract is not appropriate if there is not adequate characterization information. The committee was worried that the target price of the contract would be inflated in direct proportion to the uncertainty involved. The response from DOE-RL stated that it intended to comply with the relevant portions of the TPA. Gerry Pollet noted that it was unclear whether the contract would reflect the TPA or the Hanford 2012 plan. DOE-RL's response agreed that the impacts of milestones and regulatory requirements on the contract are vital, but did not address the HAB's specific request of a matrix of those milestones in comparison to the contract.

Gerry Pollet added that the Budgets and Contracts Committee compared the River Corridor contract cost with an independent cost estimate from the Army Corps of Engineers. Many uncertainties were plucked out of thin air, for example to increase the

cost estimate by 156% because it is unknown what is in the burial grounds. He noted the HAB's fundamental disagreement with a closure contract.

Greg de Bruler pointed out that the response did not address Item b in the advice. Also, number 5 in DOE-RL's response states that disclosure will be an essential element. He asked when disclosure will occur and hopes it will be before the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) is issued. He gave the letter a C-.

## **HAB INVOLVEMENT IN DOE BUDGET DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

Denny Newland explained that the HAB and the four agencies have jointly developed a draft process for HAB involvement in DOE budget development. Both DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are now managing by baselines, so an evaluation of baseline funding scenarios will provide more and better information than in the past. This will show how decisions for the immediate year affect later years.

The HAB can be part of developing budget scenarios. This process will also allow earlier participation in the budget development process. In October or November, the Budgets and Contracts Committee will be briefed on the previous year's performance and how well TPA milestones were met. This will be the HAB's first glimpse of how successful DOE's new contracting approach was and whether it sufficiently addressed the management of indirects and overheads. There will be at least two budget scenarios evaluated – one is the target case and the other is the compliance scenario. Other scenarios may also be considered.

In December, the committee will present the information to the HAB, take input from the whole HAB, and then work with DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to evaluate those scenarios, which should be available by January. In February, a scenario reflecting the President's budget will be developed. In March/April/May, the committee's work will support the Public Involvement and Communication Committee and the public budget meetings. The Budgets and Contracts Committee will prepare draft advice and evaluate outyear budget submittals.

The Budgets and Contracts Committee requested HAB endorsement of the draft process.

Dan Simpson commented that the process looks like a step toward greater participation in the management of the projects and less in the direction of policies and goals. He would like to know alternatives with respect to hazards and risk, which are not necessarily covered by regulatory requirements. Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, agreed. Denny Newland emphasized that the Committee is not trying to manage the budgets.

Harold Heacock thanked DOE-RL and DOE-ORP for their cooperation, noting that the impetus for the process came from DOE-RL. He emphasized that the draft process is a general framework and is subject to future revisions as the process develops.

Wade Ballard clarified that stretch and superstretch work can only be achieved by the contractor's cost savings; workscope remains constant. Wade thought it was a good process and more accurately reflects how DOE-RL makes decisions. By comparing baseline scenarios, it will be easier to see the impacts on other projects. Under the old Integrated Priority List (IPL) system, there was more arbitrary division. He cautioned that if the FY02 budget begins with a continuing resolution, some important schedule items could slip.

Steve Wiegman commented that DOE-ORP also feels the process is valuable and will show how specific amounts of money are saved on specific items. He asked the HAB to help DOE-ORP present the baseline and budget information to the public.

Dennis Faulk said EPA has not been engaged in this process much, by its own choice. He thought it sounded like a positive step. EPA is still focused on the TPA and getting milestones set that will drive baselines. Joy Turner, Ecology, said Ecology is supportive of the process, although it has not participated fully.

Susan Leckband cautioned the BCC committee to avoid a perception of collaboration in DOE's decision making. She emphasized that the HAB must stay impartial. Todd Martin also cautioned the committee. He expressed concern that there might be the temptation of a small group of issue managers to conduct work the full HAB should do. The committee leadership will work with the DOE public involvement staff and EnviroIssues to safeguard the process.

Maynard Plahuta responded that the committee does see intend to be involved in DOE's management. He thought the process would allow the BCC committee to provide meaningful advice that is consistent with TPA requirements. Wade Ballard explained that he expects no difference between the baselines and TPA.

The HAB endorsed the process by consensus.

## **LETTER TO MARY LOU BLAZEK**

The HAB considered a draft letter to Mary Lou Blazek who recently retired from the Oregon Office of Energy. Doug Huston commented that Oregon likes the tone of the letter but would like to augment it with details of her past history. The HAB approved the letter with those additions.

## **TPA COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN ADVICE**

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest ((Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), introduced the draft advice on the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP). The CRP outlines the public participation process implemented for the TPA. The TPA agencies are currently revising the 1997 version of the document. This includes updates like website addresses, but the Public Involvement and Communication Committee also wanted to offer advice on policy issues and other

substantive changes. Individuals can submit more detailed comments during the official public comment period, which lasts until October 10. The TPA agencies have issued a new draft of the CRP, but the committee's draft advice was on the existing CRP and provided guidelines as the agencies continue to work on revising the CRP.

Betty Tabbutt added that it is important to reference specific laws because there are laws with public involvement requirements. If the CRP is implemented properly, it satisfies those legal requirements. MTCA specifies that a public participation plan should be developed at every cleanup site, so referencing MTCA would enable the CRP to meet MTCA requirements.

Joy Turner commented that Ecology would like the CRP to meet all state and federal requirements for public participation.

Susan Leckband expressed concern about whether the applicable cleanup laws referenced in the advice have the same time requirements for a public participation plan. Betty Tabbutt responded that the committee considered that point, specifically regarding the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and MTCA. Susan also asked if the CRP is a MTCA public involvement plan. Gerry Pollet explained that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and MTCA both require a public involvement plan. Max Power, Ecology, explained that Ecology would like the CRP to serve as the basic plan to meet MTCA requirements.

Charles Kilbury questioned why the state of Oregon is mentioned specifically three times, prompting the HAB to agree that all references should include the states of both Washington and Oregon.

Ken Bracken asked why the committee chose to highlight MTCA, a particular state law, and not other applicable laws. Betty Tabbutt answered that MTCA is Washington State's Superfund law. Under the federal Superfund law there is a requirement that all applicable state and federal laws must be applied. MTCA is the only one at Hanford that requires that a specific plan be written. If the CRP does not qualify under MTCA, Ecology would be tasked with writing a separate standalone document.

Dennis Faulk explained that MTCA is one of the main cleanup laws and it applies to Superfund cleanups. The new requirement is that the TPA agencies would have full disclosure in ads and fact sheets, which he acknowledged has not been done well in the past. He supported adding that language into the CRP.

Gordon Rogers questioned the need for this advice, since the agencies are undoubtedly aware of the law. Joy Turner commented that Ecology follows MTCA, no matter what the CRP ends up saying, although Ecology hoped the CRP could cover the public participation plan requirement.



Amber noted that the most recent draft of the CRP omitted the HAB charter. The committee felt the HAB charter should be included. Betty Tabbutt commented that five years ago the CRP did not include the HAB charter and including it in the CRP was a way to secure HAB funding. Dennis Faulk added that including the HAB charter gives the CRP more muscle and helps Ecology and EPA. The HAB discussed whether it was redundant to include, since Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSAB) are federally chartered. Betty Tabbutt said the advice is an attempt to preserve DOE funding of HAB activities.

Jim Trombold suggested changing the name of the CRP to the Public Participation Plan, to remove any connotations of putting a spin on information. Dennis Faulk suggested the Hanford Cleanup Public Involvement Plan; there were no objections and this was incorporated into the advice.

Ken Bracken was reluctant to include the number 10 as the minimum number of people needed to request a public meeting. Dennis Faulk said EPA would likely respond that it does not like the number 10 being included. The TPA is structured so EPA and Ecology can decide to hold public meetings as needed. HAB members engaged in lengthy discussion about the use of the number 10 as the minimum number of people needed to request a public meeting. Dennis Faulk commented that including a definite number would cause the agencies problems. Gerry Pollet pointed out that the existing CRP uses the number ten. He added that MTCAs now says ten to provide certainty.

The advice was adopted by consensus with Gordon Rogers abstaining. It was sent to each of the TPA agencies.

## **PLUTONIUM FINISHING PLANT**

Pam Brown introduced Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL, to make a presentation on the progress at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). Hanford was the first site to package Plutonium in 3013 cans. The project team is now meeting milestones for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) and the TPA. It has also achieved over two million safe work hours.

PFP was built in the late 1940s. The first plutonium buttons were produced in 1949. While production ceased in 1990, the plant was not officially shut down until 1996 after which the mission focused on plutonium stabilization.

The project baseline indicates that the plant will transition to its end state by 2016. In 1999, DOE developed a project management plan for this work. The mission is to stabilize the plutonium, safely store it, and remove it. While work has been slow in some areas, they are ahead in stabilizing residues and oxides. Residues are being packaged to send to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The use of 3013 cans comes from DOE Standard 3013, which instructs how to stabilize and package plutonium so it can be safely stored for 50 years.

DOE is looking forward to negotiating the transition of the plant under the TPA. It plans to ship the plutonium to the Savannah River Site. However, the governor of South Carolina will not allow shipments to the state unless there is resolution on cleanup issues at Savannah River. DOE-RL is trying to operate independently of the disagreements in South Carolina.

DOE has met the TPA milestone to repackage Rocky Flats ash and is trying to get on with TPA negotiations. However, given the activities at Hanford, including spent nuclear fuel and tank farms issues, there have not been enough resources to undertake negotiations yet. Negotiations have been delayed from June to November 2001.

The PFP baseline is fully outlined in the integrated project management plan which was delivered to DOE-RL two days ago before the HAB meeting. Copies are available. Comments will be accepted from regulators and public within the next 30 days. The first six years of the project management plan contain good cost estimates, but those beyond that time are speculative. Pete Knollmeyer thinks the costs will not go up.

In the baseline, the activities begin with getting rid of the nuclear materials, then cleaning everything out of the pipes and ducts. Equipment will then be stabilized. The main PFP facility will be the last to go. Deactivation is the best way to achieve risk reduction. The work is being done by CERCLA with EPA as the regulator.

There are a number of plutonium hazards at PFP, including the risk of a criticality. DOE has to control what happens where. It is a complicated system. There are many layers of controls, sometimes 2-4 layers of defense.

There are a number of types of materials at PFP, including metal buttons, sand/slag/crucible, polycubes, and mixed oxide fuel pellets. DOE will reduce risk by getting rid of nuclear material, then try to decrease costs by installing more engineered barriers and relying less on human barriers.

Stabilization of plutonium metals is nearly complete, as is work on alloys packaged in 3013 cans. Work with the Hanford ash is ahead of schedule. In the area of solution precipitation, the schedule has been delayed seven months to July 2002. Fortunately, DNFSB is pleased with the progress and the resolution of the problems. Progress is being made safely at PFP.

Pete Knollmeyer asked for input from the HAB: How should the TPA Agencies provide public information on PFP and get public input on its activities?

Mike Wilson noted that PFP is very dangerous facility, especially from a worker exposure standpoint. He observed that that danger has been reduced. Ecology is anxious to begin TPA negotiations, as discussions have remained the same over the past five years. Ecology has not pushed for TPA negotiations over last three years because of DNFSB oversight, the lack of agency resources for negotiations, and an uncertain scope and schedule for the project. Ecology has also been involved in discussions about nuclear materials and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) issues. The

question is differentiation between valuable material stuff and RCRA waste. As witnessed by the Plutonium Reclamation Facility explosion, Ecology believes some of the highest risks are chemical. The emphasis DOE puts on plutonium may be overstated, and the chemical risks may be understated. Cleaning out PFP will generate some waste that will go to the Central Waste Complex and some that will go to WIPP in New Mexico. We also need to consider how the PFP project fits into the rest of the Central Plateau.

Gerry Pollet expressed concern regarding the mismanagement of chemicals at PFP and its relationship to the explosion. He also noted that the soils around the facility are contaminated. Tribal use laws are also a concern. He said that it is important for the HAB to look at the issue of compliance with hazardous waste laws and emergency planning right-to-know laws. There are still explosive chemicals stored at PFP.

Pete Knollmeyer acknowledged that DOE did respond to a notice of violation with a response that it would go into TPA negotiations. These have been deferred from 1996 until now. Many chemicals have been removed, but there was never a promise to remove all the chemicals. Since the facility was built in the 1940s, it is not in compliance with RCRA, enacted in the 1980s.

Ken Bracken asked if the current life cycle cost estimates take advantage of Rocky Flats' lessons learned, since it has similar activities. Pete Knollmeyer responded that lessons learned from Rocky Flats and Savannah River are being considered, including specific information on glove boxes. Ken also asked who funds DOE's activities with special nuclear materials. Pete explained that Environmental Management funds it because DOE-EM will ultimately take ownership of the material and fund all remaining work. Ken expressed his unhappiness that the defense programs under DOE and the Department of Defense are eating in onto the DOE-EM cleanup budget.

Tim Takaro asked about the disposition options for metals, alloys, ash, solutions, oxides, and other materials. Pete Knollmeyer answered that all material under Defense Board commitment will be addressed by May 2004, hopefully earlier. The performance incentive date for the contractor is December 2003.

Keith Smith agreed with Mike Wilson about hazards to the workers at PFP.

Pam Brown noted that it is important to keep in mind that the speed of the progress for work done at PFP is a factor of money. She asked what the HAB would be willing to give up to give it more funding. She was impressed that they are processing five times more plutonium now. While there is a long way to go, things are looking good.

Todd Martin asked how much of DOE's success could be attributed to using simple, robust technologies as opposed to going for something more high tech. Pete Knollmeyer responded that buying small, modular robust machines was the reason for the successful progress at PFP.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ISSUE MANAGER UPDATES**

### **Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting**

Todd Martin reported that he, Gail McClure, and Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon) attended the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs meeting in Santa Fe. They engaged in extensive discussion with other SSAB chairs. The Pantex Board is in dispute with DOE over the scope of its activities and may lose its charter. Todd felt the HAB's work on its charter in 1993 and 1995 will hopefully prevent a similar dispute at Hanford. The Pantex site has both cleanup and production work. Its Board has focused on production activities because they affect cleanup, but DOE disagrees. There is significant confusion about whether the Pantex board had a charter and where it resided. Todd invited other HAB members to attend future SSAB meetings.

Tim Takaro asked about the status of the joint stewardship letter to DOE-HQ from the SSABs. Todd Martin explained that DOE's response to the letter had been included in the HAB packet. DOE is trying to figure out how to fund stewardship given concerns regarding off-budget funding. The sites have been directed to come up with a plan by 2004. The SSAB chairs did not respond to DOE's stewardship letter because the bulk of the meeting was dedicated to budget issues.

Ken Bracken asked if there had been any discussion of thinking strategically from all the SSABs. Todd Martin indicated that a request would be made to keep the SSAB chairs informed on the top-to-bottom review. Another issue was the planning for the next two SSAB workshops on groundwater and on disposition.

### **Project Support Operations Center**

Keith Smith explained that the Budgets and Contracts Committee had had a concern about the Fluor Hanford Project Support Operations Center (PSOC). The committee received a briefing from Larry Olguin, Fluor Hanford, on this issue at its last meeting. The PSOC operates at Hanford similarly to how it works at other sites by assembling specialized engineers and managers to manage projects. A big concern was the costs associated with the PSOC. However, the engineers and managers are not idling and waiting to be assigned; they are on-site performing work. Ultimately, this approach should save money.

Wade Ballard further explained that the PSOC is a project organization established to better utilize the people and ensure proper training. The intent was that it would not increase costs, but help Fluor Hanford be more cost effective. DOE will audit and validate the cost savings.

### **24 Command Fire Follow Up**

Pam Brown reported that she and Doug Huston have continued to follow the aftermath of the Hanford fire in the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee. They

were concerned about the lessons learned. At the last committee meeting, local fire officials, WDOH, and other emergency operations staff discussed the issues. Pam indicated that the committee came away with the sense that lessons learned were being addressed. Doug Huston added that the Oregon Hanford Waste Board is also following the issue.

Debra McBaugh, WDOH (Ex-Officio), offered information on sampling activities related to the emergency response, intermediate sampling, longer term air sampling, and sampling during a dust storm. WDOH will issue a full report by the end of the year containing all the data. Debra said that she was also given the opportunity to be on the national fire commission. As a part of that, DOE established a large audit team. She observed the audit at Hanford recently and found it very interesting.

Pam Brown asked if the sampling found any dangerous levels of contamination. Debra McBaugh said they had not. Routine WDOH monitoring is continuing.

Russell Jim noted that a Burn Assessment Emergency Response team came to Hanford to study the fire's effects on cultural and natural resources. The team was funded with money from the Department of the Interior. The Yakama Nation was assured it would be able to participate, but it was not provided with any funds to participate. Plutonium in the soil will affect food and plants which could mean traditional foods and medicines are gone. Russell wanted to know what is in the soil and in the vegetation because the health of the Yakama people depends on the health of the environment.

### **Public Information and Communication Committee**

Amber Waldref reported that the committee will continue looking at the draft of the revised TPA Community Relations Plan and will keep the Board updated. The committee is also talking a lot about site tours. Betty Tabbutt has developed a draft questionnaire for people to complete after tours. She asked HAB members to look at the survey and give the committee feedback.

### **Groundwater Workshop**

Gordon Rogers described plans for the SSAB groundwater workshop scheduled for November 8-10 in Augusta, GA. It is being organized by the Savannah River Site. The goal of the workshop is to improve stakeholder understanding and provide joint recommendations toward resolution of concerns. Attendees will include a variety of responsible agencies, site remediation contractors, regulators, and SSAB members.

Several core topics will be covered, including remediation technology, monitoring, characterization, regulations, public involvement, and funding. The draft agenda calls for a tour of the Savannah River Site on November 8. Opening remarks will be made by a DOE-HQ representative, followed by a panel discussion composed of one site representative, one contractor representative, one federal regulator, one state regulator,

and one SSAB member. Gordon is concerned about how these representatives will be selected.

Each site will provide a display and a briefing book describing its unique groundwater issues. There will be discussions between sites about common issues. Workshop participants are expected to draft statements regarding issues of importance to stakeholders which will hopefully lead to recommendations with joint SSAB endorsement.

Gordon Rogers indicated that a number of people from Hanford have expressed interest in attending the workshop, including John Morse, DOE-RL; Michael Graham; Doug Sherwood; and Dib Goswami, Ecology. Gordon also thought that the State of Oregon might want to send a representative. Shelley Cimon has expressed interest, and Gordon thought that Todd Martin should attend. He also hoped that the Tri-Cities would send some participants. Nancy Myers, Bechtel Hanford, has registration forms, which must be completed and submitted by October 1. Gordon asked to know within one week who wants to be considered.

### **Institutional Control Plan**

Susan Leckband reported that DOE's institutional control plan has been submitted to EPA. It is available to anyone else interested in looking at it. Susan has been working with Jim Daily, DOE-RL. Now that the institutional control plan has been developed, his team is working on the long-term stewardship plan. The Idaho National Environmental Engineering Laboratory is now the clearinghouse for long-term stewardship for the entire DOE complex. Wade Ballard added that DOE's long-term stewardship plan is due in 2004, but DOE-RL will complete its plan sooner. Dennis Faulk indicated that the institutional control plan should be out for public comment in November.

### **Tank Waste Committee**

Leon Swenson announced that the Tank Waste Committee was not meeting in September, but will probably meet in October for a full day, including discussion about how effective the issue manager system is working. Todd Martin added that the HAB leadership group met in August and identified the need to work towards further clarification of the issue manager system. Harold Heacock indicated that the Budgets and Contracts Committee might want to talk to the Tank Waste Committee about joint activities in October.

### **LETTER FROM TPA AGENCIES ON HIGH PRIORITY ISSUES**

Wade Ballard explained that to more effectively communicate their concerns, the TPA agencies prepared a list of nine issues on which they would like advice over the next six months. Many of the issues are related, and they were not listed in any priority order.

Ken Bracken commended the agencies for working together to produce the list.

Greg de Bruler asked that the list be more specific about what feedback the agencies would like about end states. He urged the agencies to achieve clarity on the River Corridor before tackling the Central Plateau.

Susan Leckband commended the list as a great communication tool. She added that DOE asked contractors to support the participation of site employees on the HAB, and the contractors have once again written letters of support for employee representatives to the Board.

### **TPA Agency Priorities**

Todd Martin requested that each of the TPA agencies give its view of the most important items in the letter needing Board attention in the near term. Dennis Faulk commented that EPA's priorities are Central Plateau End States, River Corridor/Hanford 2012 Negotiations, and Ecological and Baseline Risk Requirements. He elaborated that identifying End States and defining ecological risks are processes that have already started and will likely take a long time. EPA would like to negotiate 2012 issues before the River Corridor contract is let.

Max Power explained that Ecology would like the TPA agencies to have a definite path forward for the Central Plateau End States and River Corridor/Hanford 2012 Negotiations outlined by Christmas.

Wade Ballard commented that groundwater issues are critical, but the top issues for DOE-RL in the near term are Central Plateau End States and River Corridor/Hanford 2012 Negotiations.

Steve Wiegman said that DOE-ORP thinks Central Plateau End States is an important issue as it relates to the tank farms, but between now and December, DOE-ORP is more interested in tank waste treatment. DOE-ORP would like policy level input on how it can invest in technology development and equipment upgrades for the tank waste treatment project.

### **Discussion**

Charles Kilbury supported adoption of the list. Doug Huston suggested assigning Issue Managers to all the issues on the list.

Russell Jim hoped that the HAB would continue to consider tribal treaty rights and understand the government-to-government consultation process. He hoped long-term stewardship is not sacrificed, noting that covering up the site and leaving it is not compliant with the treaty of 1855.

Gerry Pollet emphasized that a cleanup plan cannot be formulated without an ecological risk assessment because baseline characterizations are necessary. The agencies need to

commit to follow the public participation process under Washington State law instead of just using the HAB to meet public participation requirements. He also thinks the agencies need a primer on the new MTCA requirements.

Dennis Faulk responded that the Central Plateau End States discussion is partly driven by the Canyon Disposition Initiative, for which a decision will be issued in spring. Max Power commented that Ecology is training its staff on the revised MTCA requirements. Dennis Faulk added that EPA, DOE, and contractor staff are also getting trained on MTCA.

Tim Takaro asked whether DOE-HQ understands that DOE-ORP has a difficult time seeing past the first half of the waste in the tanks, noting that that might influence the credibility of budget submissions. Steve Wiegman responded that DOE-HQ is starting to understand that DOE-ORP cannot produce a crisp baseline for the next 30-40 years. The baseline is solid through the construction of the vitrification plant, but from an audit perspective, the baseline beyond 2011 does not look credible. The current baseline is still based on privatizing facilities beyond 2011. DOE-ORP cannot define end states or closure since it has not performed the demonstrations of what it can actually retrieve out of the tanks.

Paige Knight commended the agencies for creating the list, noting that it brings a sense of balance to the discussions. She urged the HAB to have the difficult discussion about how clean is clean. She noted the energy in the room and expressed hope that these discussions happen promptly so the HAB can influence Congress and DOE-HQ.

Ken Bracken expressed appreciation for Russell Jim's comments and asked for clarification on how the conflict about long-term stewardship requirements between the Yakama Nation and the United States is being resolved.

Russell Jim explained that the Yakama Nation must preserve its land and resources for future generations and to follow the treaty between the Yakama and the U.S. government. The Yakama realize that it may be impossible to clean the site up completely. There is an underlying fear that under CERCLA and RCRA, DOE could walk away from the site in 30 years. Since DOE-RL is a federal agency, it has an obligation to uphold the treaty, a fact that has been ignored in the past. Very few people understand treaty rights and issues. The Yakama hope to work through the process, but so far there has not been true government-to-government cooperation. He emphasized that the Yakama have the most vested interest at Hanford; the signatories of that treaty would not have signed unless it was clear that the land would be available for food and other cultural uses. The Yakama would like to see an agreement about how clean is clean on technical basis and a cultural basis. He feels it is important to find the best cleanup technology that exists. He also commented that he observes a lot of money spent but no clean up and that the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) is misnamed because waste is merely being moved from one place to another. The Yakama are also concerned that the ERDF liner is only designed to last 30 years.



Todd Martin observed that the major issues highlighted by the agencies are all committee cross cutters. He urged members to consider what path of action to take and noted that the HAB should be schooled on the new MTCA requirements and receive an update on the treaties.

#### **ITEMS FOR FUTURE HAB FOCUS: CENTRAL PLATEAU**

Ruth Siguenza reminded the HAB that the TPA agencies would like input on Central Plateau end states, which is an issue that cross cuts all five committees.

Greg de Bruler commented that end states are critical to the success of cleanup and must be discussed. He suggested creating a focus group to be run by an independent facilitation team to determine end states over the course of several months. He advocated beginning with the 100 and 300 Areas first before tackling the 200 Area. He feels it is premature to determine 200 Area end states because of its magnitude and multiple waste sites. He suggested that a core group should immediately begin a facilitated discussion, and there should be a series of meetings throughout the Northwest to involve the public.

Wade Ballard said the proposal to work on Central Plateau end states is a good approach, although its structure could be addressed. Steve Wiegman commented that the idea sounded like Subgroup 1 of the C3T process. He noted that within the TPA agencies many people are talking about end states on the Central Plateau. However the dialogue starts with the HAB, it needs to begin. Dennis Faulk agreed with Steve Wiegman. He also agreed with Greg de Bruler that it might be time to use an independent facilitation team. He suggested the River and Plateau Committee would be a good place to start the discussion. Mike Wilson thought it was a good idea and emphasized that end states must be discussed through a consolidated approach.

Susan Leckband commented that the River and Plateau Committee had already decided to discuss Central Plateau end states. She agreed that eventually an independent facilitator might be necessary, but she would like to see discussions start in committees.

Dan Simpson pointed out that he is an issue manager for Central Plateau end states for the River and Plateau Committee. He supported forming an ad hoc committee devoted to Central Plateau end states.

Paige Knight supported Greg de Bruler's plan, noting that the Tank Waste Task Force's concentrated effort was good. She also suggested the inclusion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the effort to define end states for the 100 and 300 Areas. She cautioned against progressing too far without consulting the public.

Ken Bracken advocated for an approach similar to the Tank Waste Task Force and endorsed Greg de Bruler's plan. He noted that end states decisions are far more contentious than anything related to tanks and beyond the HAB committee structure. A serious discussion requires a focused effort not easily accommodated within the HAB structure. Doug Huston agreed with all of Ken's points.

Wade Ballard reminded the HAB that Subgroup One of the C3T effort is designed to focus on this issue, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He suggested the HAB focus on the topic as a parallel and linked process to C3T since the Central Plateau end states discussion cuts across all the HAB committees. He also emphasized that C3T is not defining end states, since characterization data is still lacking. C3T is focused on understanding the process to define end states.

Gordon Rogers commented that Central Plateau end states is a problem two orders of magnitude greater than Tank Waste Task Force or the Hanford Future Site Uses Workgroup efforts. He thought it was impractical to have another focus group in parallel to C3T.

Mike Wilson supported a process similar to the Tank Waste Task Force. Max Power reminded the HAB that in 1996, it attempted to respond to a DOE strategic planning effort and attempted to go through a separate process. He urged people to study where this previous work fell short.

Norma Jean Germond felt the HAB committees should continue to work on Central Plateau end states, but that eventually an independent facilitator would be necessary.

Todd Martin noted that there is a limited amount of energy in the stakeholder community. The HAB is a Federal Advisory Committee Act chartered body with a budget. He said that if the group did something independent of the HAB, then he believed the HAB was not doing its job. However, he also noted that if the HAB did not make this work a priority, it would not do the work well. He proposed moving toward obtaining technical assistance to help the HAB establish a level knowledge playing field. Since the Central Plateau end states work sounded like a high priority, he suggested creating an ad hoc committee to meet in place of regular committee meetings in October. He did not believe it was appropriate to take this work outside the Board.

Greg de Bruler said that many people on the Board have projects that deserve time and attention of the committees to continue the work that needs to be done. He thought a focus group should be created with a mediator who can find common ground and bring resolution to the issues. He cautioned that they must look seriously at how much this effort would cost, and indicated that he did not believe that this should be paid for out of the HAB budget. He said that DOE should provide additional funding for technical expertise, a mediator, and many in-depth meetings.

Susan Leckband indicated that she liked Todd Martin's suggestion. She said that if this work is a Board function, then it should stay within the Board and its committee structure. She noted that the HAB may need to prioritize some of its efforts.

Gerry Pollet said that the HAB was not going to define end states. He observed that the HAB is a good sounding board when its members are all together, but it does not work well with keeping to a single committee. Each seat has a different perspective on end

states. He advocated for an ad hoc committee process within the Board and cautioned that there was still a need to go out to the public for input.

Ken Bracken asked what the goal of this effort was. He did not think that the HAB could define end states, but that it could identify the values by which they are defined. He noted that there were key people not seated at the HAB table. He asked how this process would work.

Wade Ballard said that there is a coupling between end states and a cleanup vision. The first thing needed is a vision. He believed that we will not identify end states in the next six months, but rather how we are going to get there. The agencies want to know how to best get feedback from the HAB on the C3T process and what the HAB values are in defining end states.

Dennis Faulk said that EPA has wanted to reach this point for a while. He emphasized the need to define the process. EPA does not want to set TPA milestones without this discussion.

Mike Wilson explained that Ecology will not determine end states for cleanup property; it sets cleanup levels. Ecology will not tell DOE how property will be used 10, 50, or 100 years from now.

Max Power observed that there has been a lot of work done over last 10-11 years. The Board has as much institutional knowledge as any other entity. Given that, the HAB can help structure and define values into concrete dilemmas that the agencies will face in the near term. The public needs to weigh in on these issues. The HAB can help design a process for public input and can define issues and choices to help the public respond meaningfully.

Doug Huston suggested that the HAB provide values around developing end states. This is an issue that can be handled at the committee level. He suggested making the River and Plateau Committee the lead and identifying issue managers on each of the other committees who could work to develop a statement of values in a reasonable amount of time.

Gerry Pollet said he thought it needed to be an ad hoc committee effort.

Todd Martin recapped that the Board saw the Central Plateau end states discussion as a priority. He suggested that the Board take advantage of the three-hour morning session on the Central Plateau previously scheduled for the September River and Plateau Committee meeting to scope out the kind of questions the Board would like to address. He tasked the facilitation team with developing the agenda for such a session. He also agreed to work with Gail McClure, DOE-RL, to ensure that interested Board members would be able to travel to the meeting.

Greg de Bruler expressed concern that the group had gone back to committee process, which he considered flawed.

Todd Martin clarified that the morning session in place of part of the River and Plateau Committee meeting was only a starting place. The River and Plateau Committee would not necessarily be the "home" of the issue. The session would be intended to scope out the work and the questions on the Central Plateau end states that the Board wants to work on. He noted that if the Board is going to focus more attention on this issue, he wanted its commitment to a willingness to set aside some of its other work in order to focus on the issue.

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, suggested that the scoping effort could consist of four elements: identification of the substantive questions to work on, how the process will work, public involvement elements, and how to tie in to TPA agency needs.

Todd Martin then asked if the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee still wanted to have a September committee meeting or did it want to focus its efforts into the scoping session for work on Central Plateau end states.. Dan Simpson indicated that the committee still wished to meet.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ruth Yarrow, Physicians for Social Responsibility, commented that she is appalled that the public was not informed about C3T visioning progress. She pointed out that DOE needs public input and public support to make it happen. The public must be informed to be involved.

## ATTACHMENT 1 – ATTENDEES

### HAB Members and Alternates

Mark Beck, member	Kristie Baptiste-Eke, alternate	
Ken Bracken, member	Norm Dyer, alternate	
Pam Brown, member	Jim Hagar, alternate	
Tom Carpenter, member	Doug Huston, alternate	
James Cochran, member	David Johnson, alternate	
Jim Curdy, member	Todd Martin, alternate	
Greg deBruler, member	Debra McBaugh, alternate	
John Erickson, member	Dennis Newland, alternate	
Norma Jean Germond, member	Maynard Plahuta, alternate	
Abe Greenberg, member	Joseph Richards, alternate	
Harold Heacock, member	Wade Riggsbee, alternate	
Russell Jim, member	Daniel Simpson, alternate	
Charles Kilbury, member	Keith Smith, alternate	
Paige Knight, member	John Stanfill, alternate	
Robert Larson, member	Stan Stave, alternate	
Susan Leckband, member	Amber Waldref, alternate	
Jeff Luke, member	Charles Weems, alternate	
Victor Moore, member		
Ken Niles, member		
Gerald Pollet, member		
Gordon Rogers, member		
Thomas Schaffer, member		
Leon Swenson, member		
Margery Swint, member		
Betty Tabbutt, member		
Tim Takaro, member		
Jim Trombold, member		

### Agency, Contractor, and Support Staff

Harry Boston, DOE-ORP	Rick Bond, Ecology	M.C. Hughes, BHI
Walt Pasciak, DOE-ORP	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Wade Ballard, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
Keith Klein, DOE-RL	Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology	W.G. Poulson, BNI
Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Laura Shikeshio, CAG
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Roger Stanley, Ecology	Carolyn Haass, CHG
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Joy Turner, Ecology	Mike Payne, CITG
Bob Rosselli, DOE-RL	Nancy Uziemblo, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique, Inc.
Janis Ward, DOE-RL	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Steve Wiegman, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
	Mike Gearheard, EPA	Susan Wright, EnviroIssues
		Jesse Ziebart, EnviroIssues

**Agency, Contractor, and Support Staff**

		Jeff Hertzell, FH
		Barb Wise, FH
		Mike Goddy, GHJ
		Walt Apley, PNNL
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
		Ann Lesperancy, PNNL
		Susan May, WDOH

**Members of the Public**

Joan Abbotts, University of Washington	David Meers, WA Attorney General	Lynn Waishwell, CRESP
Christie Drew, CRESP/UW	Adam Niermann, HPA	Ruth Yarrow, WPSR
Bill Griffith, University of Washington	Greg Thomas, USPHS – ATSDR	