

Hanford Advisory Board
Final Meeting Summary
April 4-5, 2002
Red Lion Hotel, Richland, WA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	4
200 AREA DRAFT CHANGE PACKAGE.....	5
PRESENTATION.....	6
EXPOSURE SCENARIO TASK FORCE.....	9
UPDATES AND COMMITTEE REPORTS.....	11
TOP-TO-BOTTOM REVIEW.....	13
OVERVIEW OF RECENT GUIDANCE.....	14
DRAFT ADVICE ON TOP-TO-BOTTOM REVIEW.....	21
AGENCY UPDATES.....	22
BUDGET STATUS.....	23
DOE RECOVERY PLAN.....	26
HAB TRAVEL GUIDANCE.....	26
NEW VISITORS BADGE POLICY.....	27
ITEMS FOR JUNE BOARD MEETING.....	27
PUBLIC COMMENT.....	28
ATTENDEES.....	29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

200 AREA TPA DRAFT CHANGE PACKAGE

Pete Knollmeyer, Department of Energy-Richland (DOE-RL), gave a presentation and answered questions. Pete made the following points about the change package:

- Operable units have been consolidated from 22 to 12.
- Paperwork requirements have been reduced.
- Closure and post closure decisions for Treatment, Storage and Disposal (TSD) sites have been coordinated with cleanup decisions on past-practice units.
- The work plans for M-13 milestones will be done a year early, in 2004.
- A new milestone covers a plan to be submitted in 2003 for remedial action for source control in high-risk waste sites.
- M-15 milestones have been aligned with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) TSD closure plan submission.
- Groundwater is being addressed separately.

The committee's draft advice endorsed both the collaborative process among the agencies to create this change package and the goals of reducing risk, improving efficiency, and applying lessons learned. Four concerns addressed in the draft advice were:

- The package includes only non-tank farm operable units.
- The package claims to use a risk-based approach, but does not show any risk analysis.
- The package asserts a commitment to groundwater cleanup, but excludes it from the scope.
- Long-term management and future closure needs to be integrated with the remediation program.

EXPOSURE SCENARIO TASK FORCE

The agencies reported they got good information out of the March Task Force workshop. There will be further discussion on the 200 Area. When that discussion is completed, there will be advice coming to the Board. That should be expected in June.

Key points to be taken up at the May 7-8th Task Force workshop include:

- Assumptions on the time frames for Institutional Controls and Long-Term Stewardship.
- Institutional Controls such as signage.
- Native American exposure scenarios.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT -- UPDATE ON WEB SITE SECURITY AND SOLID WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (SW-EIS)

Web sites are being reviewed on a case-by-case basis though Marla Marvin's Public Affairs Office. Anyone who has questions about what is or is not available and why can contact her office. Because of the restricted access to documents, the Board adopted advice asking for an extension of the comment period on the SW-EIS through September.

TOP-TO-BOTTOM REVIEW

Wade Ballard, Department of Energy, Richland Operations (DOE-RL), gave an overview of the Review. He summarized four major findings:

- The need for performance based contracts
- A risk-based approach to cleanup
- Structuring business practices to allow for those two things and knowing how to manage to a baseline
- Minimize activities that do not directly support cleanup.

DRAFT ADVICE

An abbreviated form of the draft advice was adopted. It will be sent to the local agencies rather than to the national level. It was decided that the Board's input would be more effective at that level.

LETTER OF INTENT

Mike Wilson, Ecology, gave his view of the Letter of Intent signed by the Tri Party Agreement (TPA) Agencies. He assured the Board that the State has not relinquished any of its authority under the TPA. The Letter of Intent is a political tool to help Headquarters justify their budget request.

The Top-to-Bottom Review is an internal DOE document. The regulators have only agreed to look at new technologies. They will be evaluated on the same basis as they are now.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY-OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION (DOE-ORP) ACCELERATION STRATEGY

Harry Boston, DOE-ORP, gave an update of preparation for construction of the vitrification plant. He described their investigation of steam reforming as an alternative technology to handle low-level waste.

Pumping of waste is moving forward. By the end of this year, all pumpable liquid should be out of the single shell tanks (SST). DOE-ORP is working with the regulators toward interim closure of tank C-106. The funding for it would come from the acceleration fund.

RIVER CORRIDOR CONTRACT UPDATE

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, reported that the Request for Proposal (RFP) has gone out. There were some changes in the contractor fee structure, and the conditional-payment-of-fee clause was removed per the Headquarters legal department. TPA milestone dates have been added as a result of recent negotiations. A small business mentoring program has been added similar to what is in the Fluor contract, and the clause about foreign ownership was relaxed a bit.

Proposals are due back May 25th. Award will be made in late August if no negotiations are needed and in November if they are needed.

BUDGET STATUS

Bob Tibbatts, DOE-RL, reported that the draft work plan that will be submitted on May 1st will form the basis for the FY 2003 budget. The final form of the plan will be used for the five-year budget plan that will be developed as Congress considers moving to a Defense-type budget process for the Environmental Management (EM) complex. Congress is in the process of being briefed by Jessie Roberson on the budget request.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL PLAN

Susan Leckband said it is a good report. No Board action is needed. She advised the Board that their opportunity to comment will come when the Long-Term Stewardship plan comes out.

DOE RECOVERY PLAN

The comment period runs from March 18th through May 1st. The hot operations target date has not changed. Funding is on track, and the plan aligns with the Bechtel contract. These were key elements needed for this plan to be accepted.

NEW VISITOR BADGE POLICY

Dennis Sieracki, DOE-RL, Personnel Security Team Leader, said all site visits now require review from a security staff member prior to approval. The assumption is that anyone who needs access to the site will arrive when security staff is available to authorize entry.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Final Meeting Summary

April 4-5, 2002

Richland, Washington

Todd Martin, Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) 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. Board seats not represented were Central Washington Building Trades, the Government Accountability Project, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR).

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jim Hagar, City of Kennewick (Local Government), announced that Abe Greenberg, City of Kennewick (Local Government), has retired from the Hanford Advisory Board and will retire from work this summer. His replacement is Bob Parks, a councilman for the City of Kennewick who works with the tanks at Hanford.

Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government Interests), has a new alternate, Adam Fyal, an employee of Benton County.

Yvonne Sherman, Department of Energy-Richland Office (DOE-RL), has taken the position held by Gail McClure before she retired. She has worked for DOE for thirteen years and spent nine of those years as the Freedom of Information Officer. She is a supporter of the public involvement process and looks forward to promoting efficiency in her work with the Board. She views the Board as her customer, but asked members to refrain from calling her at home.

Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues (Contractor), announced the resignation of Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, who has been a facilitator for the Board for over three years. She affirmed EnviroIssues' solid commitment to their contract with the Board and announced that Penny Mabie will fill Ruth's position as lead project manager.

Lynn Lefkoff, who has recently joined the team, will help facilitate Board meetings, facilitate the Tank Waste and Budgets and Contracts Committees, and support the Exposure Scenario Task Force. Louise will continue to be the Senior Advisor. The rest of the facilitation team will remain in place. Louise thanked Ruth for her hard work on behalf of the Hanford Advisory Board. She will be missed.

Members expressed their appreciation and best wishes to Ruth. A celebration of cake and flowers took place during the break on Thursday afternoon.

A large vintage microphone was placed at the head table during the meeting in memory of Frank Rodgers who passed away last week. His long service to the Board is remembered by all who had the privilege of working with him.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), reminded Board members to sign up for the available spaces for the tour of the Hanford site next week. Any spaces unfilled by Board members will be given to other people wanting to take the tour.

Pam Brown said she attended the Energy Community Alliance meeting, where she asked Jessie Roberson if the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committees would be re-authorized. Pam said Jessie was stunned at the question and said, "Of course." The paperwork has not yet come to her from Martha Crossland (DOE-Headquarters), but there was no question of not renewing it.

Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), was congratulated by the Board for an award from Eastern Oregon University's President's Commission on the Status of Women honoring her for her work.

Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), announced he met with legislators and others about funding for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) facility. They established a tentative path forward to find stable funding for the facility. The importance of HAMMER is well understood.

Keith Smith will see that the Board gets an invitation to the Health and Safety Expo that is coming up.

MEETING SUMMARY

The summary of the February Board meeting was accepted with corrections.

200 AREA DRAFT CHANGE PACKAGE

Dan Simpson, Public-at-Large, told the Board that Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL, had a detailed discussion of the proposed change package with the River and Plateau Committee in February. The committee's draft advice endorsed both the collaborative process among the agencies to create this change package and the goals of reducing risk, improving efficiency, and applying lessons learned.

There were four concerns identified in the draft advice:

- The package includes only non-tank farm operable units.
- The package claims to use a risk-based approach, but does not show any risk analysis.
- The package asserts a commitment to groundwater cleanup, but excludes it from the scope.
- Long-term management and future closure needs to be integrated with the remediation program.

Presentation

Pete Knollmeyer gave a presentation to the Board on the change package and these additional questions:

- How does this package relate to the 100 and 300 Areas?
- How does it relate to the issues on the 200 Area that are excluded from its scope?
- How does it relate to the Top-to-Bottom review?
- How does it relate to the Exposure Scenario Task Force and the Constraints and Challenges to Cleanup Team (C3T) process?

This plan accelerates the planning process for the Central Plateau by a year. Operable units have been consolidated from 22 down to 12, which include some 700 waste sites. Fifteen or twenty sites are Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (RCRA TSD) units with specific related milestones. Those milestones have been aligned with the corresponding milestones for the operable units.

Paperwork requirements have been streamlined so more money can be spent on cleanup without sacrificing investigative work. Closure and post closure decisions for treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD) sites have been coordinated with cleanup decisions related to past-practice units.

The final cleanup schedule has been moved from 2018 to 2024 to align cleanup of waste sites adjacent to tank farms with the single-shell tank (SST) closure milestone, M-45-00.

The negotiations cover four milestone series: M-13, -15, -16, and -20. M-13 covers writing the work plans for the feasibility study. Eight or nine of these have been completed. The rest will be done by 2004, a year early.

The M-15 milestone covers doing the investigation and feasibility study that result in a proposed plan. This has been revised to be consistent with the streamlined remedial investigation and feasibility study planning process. The timetable is unchanged: 2008.

A new milestone has been added. A proposed plan will be submitted in 2003 to perform a remedial action for source control at high-risk waste sites with the potential to continue adding contaminants to the vadose zone. DOE hopes to develop a new modified RCRA

C-type surface instrument to gather data to help determine which sites need to be remediated and which are eligible for a surface barrier.

Once the M-15 milestone is completed, a Record of Decision (ROD) is issued; then remediation begins. M-16 milestones control when that begins, so those are not usually set until M-15 is complete. The only M-16 milestone on the books now is the final M-16-00 because there are no RODs yet for the 200 Area operable units. Milestones have been realigned to that so that when the M-15 plan is submitted, the RCRA TSD closure plan will be submitted at the same time.

Groundwater was excluded from these negotiations, not because it is unimportant, but because it needs to have full attention at another time. Groundwater discussions are ongoing under the C3T process where there has been a lot of input. The results of those discussions can be integrated with the rest of the plans at the appropriate time.

Pete said the tank waste management program falls under a different series of milestones. Those sites are predominantly RCRA past-practice sites. There is a milestone that says that cleanup must be integrated between RCRA and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA).

Waste from the operable units will go to the Environmental Remediation Disposal Facility (ERDF). Some facilities in the units are not waste management units; some facilities adjacent to the units are. There are approximately 150 waste sites adjacent to one of the five canyons. There is flexibility in how and when those sites are addressed. For now, they are with the operable units.

These negotiations are going on in parallel with the Top-to-Bottom review.

The change package includes a commitment to address groundwater next. Right now, there are three different sets of requirements for groundwater monitoring: CERCLA, RCRA, and the DOE Atomic Energy Act. Jane Hedges, Department of Ecology, is heading a subgroup of the C3T process to come up with an integrated monitoring program. Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, is leading another group that is looking at an overall strategy and exit strategy for the Central Plateau, the decisions that are needed to achieve it, and the regulatory questions.

The first ROD for a 200-Area operable unit will be for the CW-1 operable unit. That ROD process was addressed by the task force Moses Juryassi, Bechtel Hanford (BHI), led. The risk scenarios developed in that process were presented to the Exposure Scenario Task Force. The scenario sets out a time frame showing periods of institutional controls and long-term stewardship and when institutional controls will fail. The scenarios range from a one-time intruder to residential use. Conservation mining has been identified as a scenario, but there is no risk scenario for it. The exposure scenarios identified by the Exposure Scenario Task Force will determine how much soil contamination has to be cleaned up to meet that scenario.

Board Discussion

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management (Hanford Work Force), asked what conservation mining is. Pete said it is things like nature preserves, trails, bird sanctuaries, and gravel mining. Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental, & Public Interest Organizations), stated that Columbia River Keeper disagrees with the conservation mining approach. Mining, any kind of digging, is the last activity that should occur on the site.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said one of the values EPA put into these negotiations was that work in the Central Plateau was not to be delayed. One of the things that came out of this process was that they now know what is going on with groundwater. The other major victory was aligning the M-20 and M-15 milestones so that those plans come in at the same time. DOE has fulfilled its commitment to groundwater on four units in the Central Plateau. Dennis said moving the date to 2024 allows an integrated approach. This plan can be used as a template to integrate other baselines.

Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon) asked the status of the talks on groundwater monitoring. Dennis said the C3T process is working well on this issue. Some Atomic Energy Act requirements have been aligned with CERCLA. They are working on RCRA. They plan to look at the remediation component.

Dennis said groundwater has been given more attention than people realize. The agencies need to do a better job of communicating what they are doing. Changing the date from 2018 to 2024 allows better integration with the tank wastes, the highest priority.

Todd Martin asked if the streamlined approach puts CERCLA and TSD requirements together or are they separate? Dennis said they could go together. Now that the closure plan and the CERCLA proposed plan will be done together, the state will put the closure requirements in the permit and issue a CERCLA ROD. Todd asked if the paperwork for each would be the same. Dennis said it is up to Ecology whether DOE can submit one plan.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), asked about the more detailed elements of the plan for risk analyses to help drive the comprehensive risk assessment that was promised. John Price, WA Department of Ecology (Ecology), said after the decision documents are in place by 2008, the remedial work can be scheduled, and higher risk sites can be cleaned up first to protect groundwater.

Dennis Faulk (EPA) said that some of the highest risk sites are in the Central Plateau, and they were started years ago. Risk assessments will be done in conjunction with work plans. The same approach is being used as in the 100/300 Areas. Because only a sampling of sites were investigated, doing a comprehensive risk assessment is difficult. There is currently good information on the most risky sites.

Tim said you tend to work on the things that you have the most information about. Once all the information is available in 2008, the priorities may have to be reevaluated. John Price referred to the new milestone in 2003 to do remedial action for source control at high-risk sites.

Pete Knollmeyer said there is a lot of characterization data on a number of waste sites because data has been collected anytime a hole has been dug for any reason. The U Plant cribs will be looked at as part of the accelerated plan for 2003. Technetium and uranium are among the most mobile contaminants. Those are a priority, and they have tried to make sure they know where those releases are.

A concern was raised about long-term management versus remediation. At some point, waste management can become a source. Dennis Faulk said that under Superfund, they try to close the whole facility. If waste is still going into the ground after remediation, more work has to be done. C3T is working on the key question of baselines.

There was some discussion of the Department's commitment to integrate groundwater remediation given that it is a separate milestone. The committee felt that the commitment is there, but the Board should keep track of the integration process.

Todd Martin asked Pete Knollmeyer whether DOE would respond to this advice by saying the plan they are submitting to Headquarters on May 1st complies with the integration issue. Pete didn't think the May 1st document would address this issue. The August 1st version of the document may.

Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, asked if the advice recommendation that a comprehensive risk assessment include a quantitative analysis wasn't already current practice. Dennis Faulk responded that the analysis currently is qualitative. Dan Simpson added that some issues are the result of a lack of supporting documentation or misunderstandings that could be cleared up with more information.

The advice was adopted and will be sent to Keith Klein, DOE-RL, the regulators, and Harry Boston, DOE-ORP.

EXPOSURE SCENARIO TASK FORCE

Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), gave an update on the task force meeting in March. About 62 people representing diverse groups attended. A basic course in Hanford history took most of the first day. The group took some time to find its focus, but some good value and principle statements came out of it. The next meeting will be May 7th and 8th. Everyone is encouraged to participate.

The advice that was expected to come out of the March meeting was not forthcoming. The task force did not finish their discussion of the 200 Area, and the advice content may

change based on the rest of that discussion. Doug anticipates having that piece of advice for the June Board meeting.

Dennis Faulk said from the agency perspective, this process is working. Although it got off to a difficult start, the values and principles that came out of it are valuable to the agencies. The things that the agencies took away from that meeting included:

- Concerns about the buffer zone
- The values identified validate the values set forth by the Future Site Uses Working Group and the Tank Waste Task Force
- Diverse short- and long-term values were set forth
- Stored waste should be retrievable
- Groundwater is a very high priority concern

Dennis felt the task force was close to reaching consensus on the future use of the buffer zone. Although only a couple of the people present had been involved with the Future Site Uses Working Group (FSUWG) or the Tank Waste Task Force (TWTF), the values expressed were very similar. The issue of protecting future generations came out strongly.

Dennis asked people to attend the task force meeting in May and "nail this down." Todd asked if by that term Dennis meant getting closure on those issues. Dennis said he does not expect closure on each issue, but hopes that by the end of May everyone feels they can "live with where we are going."

John Price, Ecology, said groundwater and tank wastes are the biggest issues to the Board. There wasn't any discussion at the task force workshop on how to do risk assessment for tank waste, and the plan for groundwater was fuzzy. The agencies are working on articulating what they are doing more clearly. They plan to present that in May and get good input from the task force.

Pete Knollmeyer agreed that the agencies have not done a good job of communicating what they have done in terms of groundwater composite analysis, performance assessments that look at all contamination and its mobility, whether it will be protective into the future, or what characterization data exists. Pete is working on a good presentation for radionuclides.

Pete was intrigued with the Native American risk scenario that came up at the task force meeting. The task force pointed out that the assumptions being used about the buffer zone are not consistent with the FSUWG's report. He learned that people want DOE to get on with groundwater cleanup earlier rather than later.

Pete assumed from lack of input on the time frames in the agencies' assumptions that people were satisfied with them. Board members who were at the task force meeting quickly corrected Pete. They said there would be further discussion of that at the May meeting and input would be forthcoming.

Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, said he is interested to see what kind of consensus advice can come out of the task force. It will be important to have a document that they can refer to and work with.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, & Public Interest Organizations), pointed out the need to understand the difference between a zoning determination and an exposure scenario. He thought the task force made great progress toward defining the treaty rights and cultural usage scenario as a reasonable maximum foreseeable site use that should drive cleanup. He saw a close relationship between the change package before the Board, other pending decisions, and the advice that will come out of the task force. The delay in the advice concerns him.

Gerry said the change package espouses no delay of cleanup, yet pushes soil and groundwater cleanup from 2018 to 2024. The statement by the Secretary that cleanup will be done 35 years sooner does not jibe with the actual dates. Gerry stressed that the groundwater will not be cleaned up for 150 years. No mention is made in agency documents that the river shoreline will be restricted for 150 years.

Susan Leckband reminded people that the Long-Term Stewardship workshop included managed retrievable storage. Waste will be stored in the Central Plateau perhaps forever. The Task Force needs to discuss this at the workshop in May.

UPDATES AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

SSAB Chairs Meeting

Ken Bracken and Todd Martin will attend the meeting at Fernald this week. They will take the list of questions that came out of the Budgets and Contract Committee at the last Board meeting and input on the budget and Top-to-Bottom Review from other committees as it appears in their meeting minutes. Pam Brown asked Todd to take her concern about the lack of input from the public on the budget and possible modification of Tri-Party Agreements.

The Board gave Todd authority to sign a letter at the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs' meeting that included a statement about groundwater. Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health) asked how that statement differs from previous statements about groundwater. Ken Bracken said the difference is that other Boards are making the statement this time.

Budgets and Contracts

The Committee has given a lot of its attention to the Top-to-Bottom Review and the Letter of Intent that was signed. There has been virtually no information on the budget for the Committee to work with. They have been told that by May 15th there will be information on both the 2003 budget allocations and the proposed 2004 budget.

There will be public meetings held on the budget in the next weeks in Seattle, Hood River, the Tri-Cities, and Portland. The Committee will meet as soon as information is available. They will get as much information from the agencies as they can and then develop advice on the budgets for both years in time for the June meeting. Headquarters has indicated they will consider comments into mid June. The Committee meeting will be moved to sometime after mid-May.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection

There will be a Committee meeting next Thursday. The primary focus continues to be assessing the effectiveness of the safety monitoring system.

Public Involvement and Communications

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, & Public Interest Organizations), reported that at the Public Involvement meeting yesterday there were several presentations on access to information on Hanford and the impact of the limited access to web sites. Anyone with questions can contact the committee. They have a list of web sites that have been pulled and vague criteria for why, but Headquarters is still developing this. A security team at DOE, working with Marla Marvin's public affairs office is evaluating all web sites for Hanford and contractors. It seems to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. If Board members have questions about why a site has been removed, they can ask Marla about it.

The Committee has been working on the budget meetings in Seattle, Hood River, the Tri-Cities, and Portland to insure that they are effective. They hope to get the public involved in commenting on the new work plan being submitted in May. They will be using the Public Involvement White Paper as a tool to evaluate specific public involvement meetings and comment periods.

The comment period for the solid waste environmental impact statement (EIS) is coming up closely on the budget meetings. Having this comment period during the summer and so close to the budget meetings may not allow for proper public involvement. The committee would like the EIS meetings moved to September. Another concern is that the information needed to evaluate the EIS has been pulled from the Internet. Hard copies are usually still available, but not as easily accessible to people from other areas.

Amber reported there hasn't been a big change in the Freedom of Information Act requests.

Public tours of the site have been cancelled for the summer. Only VIP and mission-related tours will be given.

Susan Leckband supported the idea of requesting an extension on the EIS meetings to September. The fact that this information has been taken off the web sites indicates the

importance of the EIS information. The Board needs clarification on what information will be available and to fully evaluate it. This EIS will lead to a very important ROD.

A discussion was held about asking for an extension. The agencies are reluctant to have such a protracted comment period given the pressure they have been under to get this EIS out to the public. However, some Board members said that given how long it has taken to get this draft EIS, a couple extra months shouldn't matter. The opportunity to look at it carefully takes precedence. Pam Brown said the River and Plateau Committee would need time to draft advice. Mike Wilson, Ecology, said he would defer to the Board as to how much time they need to evaluate it.

Pete Knollmeyer said some of the detailed maps of the location of waste would be available on hard copy rather than electronically. The hazard analysis is sensitive information that could be misused in the wrong hands. DOE does not want that kept secret from the local people that need to know. They would appreciate advice on how to find the balance between openness and diligence.

Todd pointed out that Board input and public input are two different issues. With back-to-back Board meetings in June and July, the Board has a better opportunity to complete their review and advice process.

Amber pointed out the delay of the budget meetings to May or June is the cause of this dilemma. It took a long time to get information they requested through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). That would preclude using that process to get the information needed for the EIS evaluation in a timely way.

Amber and Susan put together a short letter asking for an extension, which was approved by the Board. Todd recommended it be sent as advice so the agencies would respond. The Board agreed.

Betty Tabbutt, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental, & Public Interest Organizations), asked about the relationship of this EIS to the whole complex. Pete Knollmeyer said that the comprehensive EIS dealt with transportation of solid waste. Only receiving sites need this type of EIS. Betty said we have always wanted a national dialog on a programmatic EIS, but this is only for the Hanford site.

Tank Waste Committee

The focus of the Committee for the last couple of months has been to support the Exposure Scenario Task Force. Pam Brown said a meeting in May will be necessary to discuss committee leadership in advance of the June Board meeting.

Chair

Todd reported that his trip to the Paducah Board meeting retreat went well. He gave two seminars at the University of Washington last week. One was a basic Hanford primer. The other was a graduate seminar focussed on canyon disposition.

TOP-TO-BOTTOM REVIEW

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Interests), said the Top-to-Bottom Review changed the budgeting process this year. No detail has been available on the 2003 budget before its submission to Headquarters and then to Congress. As a result, the Letter of Intent has been signed, the C3T process is ongoing, and the Top-to-Bottom Review has come out all without much explanatory information. The questions collected by the committee about the budget were distilled into the advice before the Board.

Gerry Pollet presented slides framing the Top-to-Bottom Review from the Committee's review of it. The Top-to-Bottom Review is driving the budget request. He asked Board members to listen to the presentations of the agencies to discern the different assumptions on whether there is any linkage between funding and changes to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). He pointed to the use of the word "stabilization" in the Review as meaning leaving waste in tanks. The privatization baseline continues to be an issue.

The Review asserts that tank waste can be left in soil, but there is no supporting risk assessment. The Review says that vitrification has negligible public health or environmental benefit. Gerry pointed out that even ignoring the radioactivity, the chemical content of the waste would require removal of the waste under federal and state law.

Gerry asked the Board to pay attention to the different interpretations of "tank closure" by the State and DOE. The State requires that the tanks be considered as a system.

A letter has been received that indicates other sites are planning on shipping transuranic, remote-handled transuranic, and mixed waste to Hanford burial grounds this calendar year as a result of the Top-to-Bottom Review.

Overview of Recent Guidance

Top-to-Bottom Review

Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, gave an overview of recent DOE guidance and an update on the Top-to-Bottom Review, the Letter of Intent, and C3T. He recommended that everyone read the Top-to-Bottom Review because there are good things in it. It highlights issues DOE needs to fix.

Wade said there are four major findings in the review:

- The need for performance based contracts
- A risk-based approach to cleanup

- Structuring business practices to allow for those two things and knowing how to manage to a baseline
- Minimize activities that don't directly support cleanup.

The report points out that only one-third of the money at the sites is being spent on cleanup. The other two-thirds is going to security and maintenance. Waste needs to be stabilized as quickly as possible to reduce risk and security costs.

The report pointed out the need to get a long-term stewardship plan in place quickly. It recommends getting small sites cleaned up as quickly as possible and closing them.

The report recommends making sure that the scientific program is designed to meet the specific needs of the site, not just be generic.

C3T

Wade said there are 42 targets of opportunity that have been identified within the baseline. These have been consolidated under seven headings and there are focus groups working on those to develop an overall strategy that integrates all of them. These groups are looking at cesium and strontium capsule disposition, groundwater monitoring assessment and protection, tank closure demonstrations, the Central Plateau strategy and vision, timing of waste disposal, and DOE-ORP and DOE-RL baseline integration. These groups have been meeting every other week since the last C3T meeting and have put out status reports.

The expectation is that these teams will frame the issues and try to reach some tentative ideas about how to approach the problems. If the ideas are promising, they will put together an implementation plan. The results will be a plan for a plan. Final plans are due the 1st of July. Those plans will be assembled into a final report on the process.

Letter of Intent

The Letter of Intent calls for a work plan to be issued in draft form May 1st. The plan is designed to address initiatives that DOE believes it can pursue in the near term to speed things up such as stabilizing plutonium. The goal is to put waste in a form that costs less to maintain and safeguard. For example, they are looking at moving cesium and strontium storage from wet to dry. They are looking at things that they feel comfortable are effective.

The work plan is derived from the C3T process. A team from Headquarters will come next week to assess progress on the plan. The final plan is due August 1st. That will allow time to include the results of the C3T process and work with the regulators and contractors.

Paragraph 8 of the Letter of Intent defines the relationship between Headquarters and DOE locally in terms of funding for work to be done.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, & Public Interest Organizations), raised a concern over the references to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in the Letter of Intent. Wade said the Letter covers other sites, and he believes that is an issue at sites other than Hanford.

Paige asked when public input would be accepted. Marla Marvin said input would be sought right after the plan comes out on May 1st. There will be an opportunity for the public to discuss it at the upcoming budget meetings. The Board could have a briefing at the June meeting.

Wade said that there has not been any guidance on the '04 budget, but they are being asked to develop a five-year budget plan. The idea is to go to a Defense-type budget process. The content of the work plans will become part of the '04 budget process. DOE hopes to come to a conclusion on the plan in the next couple of weeks. That plan will become part of the budget meetings in May.

Paige expressed further concern about having to change TPA agreements in order to get budget money. Wade said budget is not tied to making TPA changes.

Ken Bracken asked for clarification about why the final plan is being sent to Headquarters on August 1st. Wade said it is not going to Headquarters for approval. It is a tool for Headquarters to use with Congress and the Administration to demonstrate that the sites have a plan that justifies the budget request and that the regulators and stakeholders are in agreement with the plan.

Tim Takaro asked if the word "transform" has any meaning beyond acceleration. Wade said no. Tim asked if there are any documents to support the portions of the Review that talk about risk numbers associated with a risk-based approach. Wade was not aware of any documentation, but believed some must exist. He has asked that question and has not been given anything. He said the risk-based approach is conceptual and the concept makes sense.

Betty Tabbutt, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations) asked for further clarification about the portion of the Letter of Intent that talks about making changes to agreements after August 1st. Wade said that the plan is looking at doing better than the TPA milestones, which does not require any changes to the TPA. However, if any changes were to be made, a formal process would need to take place.

Betty asked if this Letter commits people to things for which funding is not guaranteed at this point. If that is the case, there will be a compliance gap. Wade said the budget process would go on with hearings. He has no answer for what might happen if the money is not allocated.

Agency Response

Mike Wilson, Ecology, stepped in to correct some misapprehensions and rumors about what the Letter of Intent means. To him, this agreement came out of the C3T process, and it is a commitment to continue that process. The agencies were already far along in the process of addressing acceleration and changing agreements before the Top-to-Bottom Review called for it.

The State has not agreed to give up anything. They have agreed to talk to DOE about innovation and efficiency in a number of areas. The Top-to-Bottom Review is an internal DOE dialog about how to make improvements in their operation. Ecology will measure the operation of any new technologies DOE is considering against the same standards they always have. Any attempt at early closure will be looked at through the TPA and RCRA processes as a system.

Any linkage between the review and the Letter of Intent that might possibly exist in the mind of DOE, may not exist in the mind of the State. For instance, the State is still adhering to the dates in the TPA regardless of any changes DOE is considering in terms of acceleration changes. If DOE is thinking in terms of leaving waste, the State is not. Ecology is maintaining its authority under the TPA.

There was never any money tied to the Letter of Intent. The letter was agreed to with the idea that Hanford would be in a position to qualify for funds. But if no funding is forthcoming, the plan will remain the TPA as it exists today.

The \$433 million figure that came out the week the letter was signed was a DOE figure and was as much a surprise to Ecology as to everyone else. Ecology still does not know where that figure came from. They are still in the process of deciding where the allocation will be applied.

Mike said that he was in Washington, D.C. during the time the announcement came out about the \$800 million fund that sites would compete for. Everyone in Washington, D.C. instantly dismissed the idea. The Secretary needed to have agreements in hand with the States about what would be done with the \$800 million. That was the political expediency surrounding the Letter of Intent.

One concern after the announcement that Hanford would get a large part of the \$800 million was that other states also have an interest in that money. Other states are submitting plans as well so that they can be used to support budget requests.

Our TPA changes are in place. The August work plan will reflect the TPA, not the other way around.

Pam Brown said she shares the concern of many that this whole process lacks transparency. She said that the '03 and '04 budgets are being developed without input. She asked if Wade could tell us what assumptions are being used in that process. Wade

said they are really focussing on '03. Once the budget comes out, decisions will have to be made on how to split the funding between ORP and RL. Headquarters will be involved in that decision. The split in '03 will be the basis of the split in '04. They are looking at acceleration savings information so that they will be able to use that information when they get the budget.

Pam said that from her conversations, it appears Congress is assuming flat funding from '02 to '03 with a \$300 million incentive fund.

Doug Huston asked what definition of risk is being used to look at cost reduction. Wade said they are looking at it from a lay perspective. They know that stabilization of plutonium and spent fuel reduces costs. It also reduces risk to workers who are doing retrieval.

Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental Interests), did not feel the Letter of Intent goes far enough to assure him that DOE is committed to protecting fish, wildlife, and native plants during cleanup. It calls into question "How clean is clean?"

Tim asked what the State's level of participation in the Top-to-Bottom Review was because Tom Fitzsimmons said the State was involved. Mike Wilson said they had a 45-minute to an hour interview with the panel doing the review. Tim asked about the State's input into the reduction of vitrification or the baseline assumptions. Mike stressed that figures that are driving DOE proposals are not necessarily drivers for Ecology. The Top-to-Bottom Review is not a driver for Ecology.

Susan Leckband said she appreciated hearing that the August 1st plan would reflect the TPA. She warned the Board not to be distracted from the reason the Board is here by proposals being put forth.

Todd said the purpose of this presentation is to clarify where the Board's input is needed.

DOE-ORP ACCELERATION STRATEGY

Harry Boston, DOE-ORP, spoke about ORP activities. They are in the midst of installing a mock facility to cold test equipment that will be put into tanks to monitor the liquid in them. The double-shell tanks (DSTs) are aging, and they have to last until all the waste is removed. In the last year and a half the tanks have come up to specifications for reducing the corrosive environment in those tanks.

In 1999 half a million gallons of waste was pumped out of single-shell tanks (SSTs). In 2001, 300,000 gallons were pumped. This year 2 million gallons needs to be pumped. A lot of the pumping equipment is old and breaking. CH2M-Hill is working diligently to do the pumping and do it safely. We have already pumped more this year than last year. After this year, there will be no more pumpable liquid in the SSTs.

The Office of Safety Regulation has said we have an adequate safety authorization process, we understand the nuclear safety environment and have the proper requirements and plans in place to allow us to start pouring to base mass in these facilities in July. They still need environmental permits.

An independent panel of contractors looked to see if we could pour the foundation of the vitrification (vit) plant. We are likely to do it this summer. Structures should start coming out of the ground in September, not December of this year. Everyone is working together to get the permits in place so that this can go ahead. The permits cover the design of the equipment to ensure the plant can operate safely.

The schedules look good. The current contractor works directly for DOE, and they have to learn how to work that way. The project is experiencing some cost overruns because DOE has changed some requirements, but today it is on cost schedule. It is not unusual for a large project to have cost overruns. The contractor is lowering the fee structure to cover some of that. The contractor is considering the operating costs for the facility as they are building it.

Harry showed pictures of the vit plant site and the work that is already underway. He said they are taking steps to address problems with the melter and noble metals such as chromium, silver, and sulfur.

Harry said that not all things have to be cleaned the same to be fully protective of public health and safety. He talked about getting cleanup done faster and \$20 million cheaper. That figure reflects removing the privatization baseline.

Harry talked about building the plant with two melters instead of the original plan to start with one and add another at a later date. This will allow the waste to be processed sooner. One hundred percent of the high-level waste can be processed by 2028.

The low-level waste picture is not as good. By 2025, 40 percent of it can be done. They are looking at other options for treating the other 60 percent. Harry pointed out that the waste problem at Hanford is chemical as well as radioactive. They are taking a serious look at steam reforming as a way to deal with the sulfur and organic components of the low-level waste. This process eliminates nitrates. Sulfur in tank waste doubles the glass volume. Steam reforming is a simple process that can handle higher volumes of waste and cuts down significantly on the effluents that have to be recycled to pretreatment.

Harry showed some slides of how steam reforming works. Some initial scoping work has been done on this, and it looks promising. If it looks like a possibility, they will move to bench testing with real waste, and if that is successful, on to a pilot program. It would be possible to include a steam reformer in the vit plant design.

They are looking at blending waste to blend away chromium. That could reduce the waste volume.

They are working with the agencies toward interim closure of tanks that have little waste left in them per the TPA and RCRA. Tank closure means, in part, to get the waste out and fill the tank with grout or possibly sand and gravel. The important thing is to keep water out of the tank. They are also looking at alternatives to treatment, such as grout, for liquids that don't have a lot of activity in them.

Harry stressed that we have a good plan now, but would like to do better. The regulators have agreed to look at these ideas. He said getting funding is contingent on showing progress, no matter how small.

Gerry Pollet asked how the difference in the contract requirements would be made up over the actual funding. Harry said CH2M-Hill signed a contract that said they would find a way to do work that wasn't funded. They have been doing a good job of getting those things done.

Gerry said the Board has asked ORP to make a priority list because choices will have to be made. He asked what the cost would be of characterizing the waste that will remain in and under tank C-106 and doing an EIS and where the money would come from for doing interim closure. Harry said the money for interim closure of C-106 is part of the acceleration pool of money. We got all of the money needed to do the regulatorily required work and get waste out of tanks last year. We are on track to do it this year.

Gerry asked what testing the steam reforming technology and redesigning the plant to include it would cost. Harry said they are just getting into that now and they will not redesign the plant unless it turns out to be warranted.

Pam Brown said this Administration has changed the approach to science and technology. They are directing science and technology towards tank closure and dealing with the really challenging tank waste. She asked if Harry is working with the EM 50 people to help supplement our ongoing budgets and contracts to do the science needed.

Harry said that he is relying on work that the EM 50 people have done in the last few years for melter design and operation of vitrification facilities. He said that the new Chief Scientist, Jim Owendoff, head of EM 50, is doing a good job and wants to fund the things we are looking at. Joe Cruz, DOE-ORP, said that the things we are looking at fit in well with the current priorities and have a good chance of getting funding if money is available.

Keith Smith said the biggest concern of the workers in closing tanks is the chemical component. Radioactivity can be determined by measurement. Chemicals aren't always well characterized, and exposure can produce long-term effects. Harry said they think they have a good idea what chemicals are in what tanks. They don't know all the chemicals. They have industrial hygiene-type monitoring. Harry said they take it very seriously when workers say they smell something. He urged workers to let them know if they are not doing something that they should regarding chemicals.

Paige Knight asked if adding a second melter changes the permitting requirement. Ron Naventi, BNI, said the permitting deals with things like emissions quality. The second melter doesn't affect that.

Paige asked about staffing at DOE. Harry said he has eliminated two senior management positions. They currently have 129 employees, and they may be asked to reduce that to 109. Harry said he would be discussing that with Headquarters.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, asked what makes grouting, which has been rejected in the past, a good thing now. Harry said he is not recommending grouting large amounts of waste, but there may be small amounts of low-level waste that could be grouted in place. The regulators would be fully involved in that decision.

Leon asked if any lessons learned at Savannah River could be applied here. Harry said that they frequently have teams from Savannah River and West Valley come here to discuss ideas we are considering here, and their input is valuable.

Tim Takaro mentioned the current concerns about BNI's opting out of the site safety-monitoring program and asked what the transition will be like as we move from pure construction to vit plant operation. Harry said they would come back in the future to address that specifically.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management (Hanford Work Force), said he has an interest in treating waste in place if it is feasible because it reduces risk to workers who have to move the waste to treatment facilities.

Doug Huston asked if moving a larger volume of waste through the treatment facility affects the risk analysis. Harry said the plant size remains the same, so you can never have more than the plant can hold. The storage capacity has not changed.

Dave Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, & Public Interest Organizations), asked about byproducts of the steam reforming process. Harry said the bench testing would answer some of those questions.

DRAFT ADVICE ON THE TOP-TO-BOTTOM REVIEW

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), presented the draft advice on the Top-to-Bottom Review. It was a lengthy piece with an attachment of supporting information. Concerns addressed were the threat that the TPA would have to be changed to get funding, that there was no supporting data for the risk analysis portion, and the lack of public input into the review. The authorship of the review is not apparent.

Gerry added that the purpose of the attachment is for use by Congressional members who rely on such data to support their positions. The review only addresses radiological risks and not chemical. The review says the budget decisions will be based on the criteria in

the review. The review suggests supplanting RCRA and CERCLA, which removes the EPA's capacity to use court enforcement. It eliminates the EIS requirements.

Some members wouldn't support something so long. Some wanted to stick to policy issues and trends. Others questioned the need to respond to the Top-to-Bottom Review at all. Some thought this would just be picking a fight with Headquarters. Gordon Rogers thought we should direct our response to the regulators supporting their good judgement in enforcing the TPA. Many people thought the points in this advice had already been given in advice over the years. Others thought that silence could be construed as approval.

Todd Martin read a generic response letter from Headquarters written by an assistant to Jessie Roberson that reiterated what we already know. Since we had a detailed response to a previous letter from Jessie Roberson, Todd thought this indicated that Headquarters is done talking to us. However, we should go on record, and we should do it through the May through August process of producing a work plan. He suggested that an abbreviated form of this advice be produced with or without the attachment. Gerry did not think a diluted form would do the job that needs to be done. Gerry felt that Congress and the Administration are hearing only the Top-to-Bottom Review version of things and need to hear the contrary view from us.

After extensively reworking the advice, the consensus was to address it to the local parties. The agencies said that this is an important piece of advice for the Board to offer them.

Tim Takaro asked about waste streams coming from off site. Gerry said it is difficult to get that information. He said cleaning up some sites faster means shipping their waste to Hanford. There is no permit for such an action, and no EIS has been done.

After adopting this advice, there was some discussion of developing some boilerplate language to avoid having the same discussions on each advice. Another idea, which has been mentioned before, is to have a word-smithing committee that takes the advice at the end of the meeting on Thursday and polishes it. No decision was made.

AGENCY UPDATES

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, gave an update of the River Corridor contract. One change is that if the funding rises or falls rapidly, there will be a review of the contractor's fee, recognizing this is an inefficient way to fund a contract. There is a provision for teaming partners. There is a minimum fee, because contractors deciding whether or not to bid look at the worst case scenario, and they wanted to make sure people would not fail to bid based on something that will not happen.

The conditional-payment-of-fee clause was modified because if the safety of the organization is such that there is a major issue, fee is at risk. They were trying to be innovative in that clause, but the legal department at Headquarters would not agree to it.

The statement of work was modified in accordance with good comments from all parties. TPA milestone dates have been added. The provision to take down some buildings in Zone A early was added from the TPA negotiations.

The Department worked with EPA and Ecology to focus on the burial grounds outside the fence in the 300 Area, but they moved a burial ground in D into Phase 2. It will still be done by 2012.

A small business mentoring program was added that requires the contractor to choose small businesses in the area to mentor for two-year periods with a penalty for failing to fulfill it.

The clause about foreign ownership was modified to allow contractors with some foreign ownership to bid.

There is a community commitment component that says the contractor has to be a good citizen and participate in the community. There is no dollar amount attached. The Fluor contract has a similar provision.

The Request for Proposal was issued on March 6th. Proposals are due back May 25th. The Department will hold oral interviews with everyone. These are not negotiations. If they receive a bid they like without having to negotiate, the award will be made toward the end of August. If negotiations are required, the award will be sometime in November. There will be a three-month lag between award and transfer of the existing contract.

Greg deBruler asked what would happen if the contract is not funded. Beth said they need \$40 million over where they currently are in the budget. If that money didn't come through for any reason, they would go to Headquarters and ask them how they intend to fulfill their commitment because this is part of the objective up to the Secretary level at Headquarters.

Tim Takaro asked if the innovative safety language that Beth said Headquarters did not approve was left in the contract or whether there was strong safety language. Beth said she would have to check the contract and get back to Tim. She thought it was still there. Tim asked what Headquarters did not like about it. Beth said that conditional payment of fee is a very nebulous part of the contract. You could only invoke it in the case of a dramatic occurrence. Headquarters was concerned that they did not know the thought behind it to make such a change so quickly. They want to make that kind of change site-wide. At this time, the clause doesn't reflect the philosophy at Headquarters.

Tim asked if including the area outside the fence of the 300 Area includes the riparian zone in the contract. Beth said it is all in the contract, some in Phase 1 and some in Phase 2. Much of the area outside the fence was moved from Phase 2 to Phase 1. If anyone has

questions about the contract, you can submit the questions at the web site and those will be answered until the 1st of May.

BUDGET STATUS

Bob Tibbatts, DOE-RL, gave an update on the DOE cleanup budget status for 2003 and 2004. As discussed earlier, DOE is working on the draft plan for May 1st for FY 2003. The 2003 funding is based on that plan.

The House Appropriations and House Armed Services, National Security Committees have had a briefing by EM-1 on budget, and the Senate Armed Services Committee will have a briefing from Jessie Roberson on April 10th. The Senate Appropriations Committee will be briefed on April 18th. We may have feedback in the June/July time frame as to how this is received and how things continue to evolve.

Written guidance on the FY 2004 budget is due out next week. That will be given to the Board as soon as it is received. The verbal guidance from EM has been that we will not receive specific targets for the out years. What is new this year is that we will submit a five-year plan for 2004 to 2008. The targets for that will not be provided. The request we submit will be based on the May 1st plan as it develops. The funding profile will be the request as of now.

The budget request is due to Headquarters by May 20th. A letter came from Jim Fiori, DOE-HQ, saying they would accept comments that come in after the submittal. This is not a precedent for future years, but just until we get back on track for the normal budget procedure.

Leon Swenson asked if the five-year budget plan assumes funding increases in the out years. Beth said it does, but not large ones. The funding will accommodate acceleration activities.

Maynard Plahuta asked if there is any indication that Congress and the Administration will accept a five-year funding plan. Bob Tibbatts did not know what discussions have taken place. Pam Brown said that they had been given an overview in January, and they were told that they had bought into this and were very excited about it. They said Jessie Roberson is different for them to work with than any other EM-1. They had received better information from the sites for budgeting decisions than ever before.

Beth Bilson said when you look at this initiative, it could be perceived that DOE is taking over the role that Congress has held in the past -- deciding which state gets money -- so this has been difficult. Pam Brown said Congress is not going to give DOE a pool of money. The powerful members of the Senate Appropriations Committee are not going to let their states down. It is up to the Department to put forward their plans to Congress.

Todd Martin was interested in knowing to what extent the May 1st plan is a baseline. Beth said it is a work plan, not a baseline. It can not be broken down in terms of units.

The August plan will be more detailed. Todd was satisfied that the plan was a move toward a baseline that the committees could use.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL PLAN

Susan Leckband read the Institutional Control Plan and found it very interesting. She recommended it to people who want to be educated about what requirements the RODs list in conjunction with what is in the Control Plan. She said the Board did not need to specifically address this plan at this time. She suggested the Board comment when the Long-Term Stewardship plan comes along. This plan may be modified or changed as things change with RCRA, and DOE-RL will provide an annual report on the effectiveness of these institutional controls. Anyone wanting a copy of the plan can sign up for it at the back table, and EnviroIssues will see that they get a copy.

Gerry Pollet brought up a promise made a year ago to increase signage along the river to warn people of the hazards. There is one sign. The riverbed all the way to the high water mark is owned by the State of Washington, a fact that has not been acknowledged or dealt with. The Exposure Scenario Task Force should take up the signage issue when they discuss the 100 and 300 Areas. Gerry was concerned about the Board's ability to comment on this given that the underlying documents have been withdrawn from the Internet. Dennis said he would look into that. The documents should be available. Marla Marvin said she would follow up on it. They welcome these comments. Gerry said there should be an extension of the comment period in light of the lack of access to documents.

Dennis Faulk appreciated the input. This is a discussion that needs to take place. He has been involved with signage for the last couple of years. He was in favor of one large sign in English and Spanish. There will be a meeting next Monday to discuss the wording for the signs. DOE has met what has been put into the RODs. They would like input from organizations other than the Board.

Michael Goldstein, EPA, said this is the start of a process to see if these controls are in place and whether they are effective and meet the ROD requirements. They will have an evaluation in about a year.

Betty Tabbutt warned of letting institutional controls become the permanent remediation. She reminded that under state law, we have a priority system of remediation, and institutional controls is the least favored option. Tim Takaro pointed out that just because the institutional control period ends in 2150 and long-term stewardship comes in, there will still be institutional controls in place. The public is sensitive to this because of the Administration's sacrifice zone proposal for the 200 Area.

Gordon Rogers recently read a report from the State Department of Health and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). Water was sampled in the river at the low-water stage and no conditions were found that would imperil the health of the public, fish, and so forth even in the N Area.

Jim Curdy, Grant & Franklin Counties (Grant & Franklin Counties), reminded everyone that there are other laws governing the river such as the Navaho River Act. DOE cannot put restrictions on the river that violates the other laws governing it.

Dennis Faulk said the Institutional Controls Plan is a work in progress. It will be enhanced as we get smarter on the issue.

DOE RECOVERY PLAN

Greg Jones talked about the DOE-ORP Recovery Plan. The comment period for the recovery plan runs from March 18th to May 1st. A document is available that tells how to submit comments. Roger Stanley and Mary Beth Behrant can provide technical comments and feedback.

The regulators called for this plan when DOE failed to meet the milestone to begin construction on the vitrification plant last summer when the privatization contract was terminated. The 2007 date for commencement of hot operations is unchanged. The funding for 2002 has been achieved. The date and the funding were key elements for having this plan accepted. The plan aligns with the Bechtel contract. The accelerated plan to move hot operations up to 2006 is not part of this plan. Some dates have been defined. People can look at the plan to see the specific changes in milestones if they like.

HAB TRAVEL GUIDANCE

Yvonne Sherman handed out the following summary of the HAB travel policy. New policies are marked with an asterisk.

TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT FOR HAB MEETINGS

- Two members for each seat can be reimbursed for each HAB meeting.
- Only designated committee members, including the Public Involvement Committee, will be reimbursed for travel to a committee meeting unless specifically invited.
- For travel purposes, each member may belong to no more than two committees.
- The HAB chair, vice-chair(s), and committee chairs may be reimbursed for travel when attending a meeting of any committee.
- The HAB chair will work with the DOE Public Involvement Manager to determine how many members may attend and be reimbursed for travel to a meeting other than a HAB meeting.

DO's AND DON'T's OF GOVERNMENT TRAVEL

- HAB travelers will be reimbursed only when traveling on HAB business.
- Travelers must have a travel authorization in place **before** travel begins.
- Travelers will be reimbursed for actual costs incurred or at government rates, whichever is less.
- Travelers are responsible for canceling any reservations made, either personally or through the designated travel agency. If charges are incurred due to the traveler's failure to cancel, the traveler must pay the charges.

- Travelers will not be reimbursed for rental cars when a HAB or other authorized meeting is held in the hotel where the traveler stays or within walking distance. For all committee meetings that are held at the Federal Building, the Hanford House in Richland is the designated hotel.
- When a rental car is authorized, travelers will only be reimbursed for a small or midsize car.
- If travelers choose not to use a designated hotel, they will be reimbursed only for the expenses they would have incurred at the designated hotel. Additional expenses, such as parking, accrued at a hotel other than the designated hotel will not be reimbursed.
- Travelers will not be reimbursed for meals when travel and meeting time does not exceed 12 hours.
- Travelers should submit travel vouchers to DOE within 10 days of travel completion.
- Travelers should let the HAB travel coordinator (509-376-7502) know if they have not received reimbursement within 2 weeks of voucher submission.
- Travelers must attend the entire meeting to receive reimbursement from the HAB travel budget.

Yvonne said the last bullet is a HAB rule, not a federal one, and she wants the Board to enforce this themselves. People whose presence is only required for a portion of the meeting may attend only that part.

If Board members are not currently notified when the travel reimbursement is credited to their account, they can contact Kristy Collins. She will request that a notification email be sent.

The Board is having problems with some hotels refusing to grant room blocks because Board members do not use the room block. The hotels cannot fill unused rooms at the last minute. Please use the recommended hotel and make your reservations through the travel coordinator. Some people are not identifying themselves as HAB members when they make their reservations.

NEW VISITOR BADGE POLICY

Dennis Sieracki, DOE-RL, the Personnel Security Team Leader, said all site visits now require review from a security staff member before they are approved. HAB members must identify a need before a badge will be issued. The assumption is that HAB members will be on site when authorized staff is on duty.

Doug Huston said he is an emergency responder and is on site weekly, but his expired badge was not renewed. Dennis said the presumption is that someone in authority would be on site in the event of an emergency at any time.

Pam Brown said this policy is very offensive. DOE-HQ and National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) were surprised to hear about this policy. They felt that local government should have access to the site. Dennis said this is a local determination and each site makes the decision based on their own circumstances and past experience.

Todd Martin asked for copies of the policy.

ITEMS FOR JUNE BOARD MEETING

Budget

The May 1st plan
Results of task force (advice)
Committee leadership
Solid Waste EIS
PFP Change Package
ISMS advice

Todd said the committees should try to select their leadership by consensus in their May meetings. If that can't be achieved, they should take a vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

John Tate, a disabled worker from the Hanford site, appreciated the comments he heard on behalf of the work force. He wanted to know who will keep track of the things the Board said they would do today and who will report back to the workforce. Todd assured him the minutes of the meetings are open and available to the public.

HAB Members and Alternates

Ken Bracken, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Debra McBaugh, Alternate
Pam Brown, Member	Gordon Rogers, Member	Jay McConnaughey, Alternate
Shelley Cimon, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate
James Cochran, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate
Jim Curdy, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Daniel Simpson, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Kristy Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Keith Smith, Alternate
Charles Kilbury, Member	Martin Bensky, Alternate	John Stanfill, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Madeleine Brown, Alternate	Stan Stave, Alternate
Robert Larson, Member	Norm Dyer, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Gariann Gelston, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Jim Hagar, Alternate	David Watrous, Alternate
Todd Martin, Member	David Johnson, Alternate	
Bob Parks, Member	Richard Leaumont, Alternate	

Agency and Contractors

Wade Ballard, DOE	Dave Einen, EPA	Nancy Myers, Bechtel
Beth Bilson, DOE	Mike Gearheard, EPA	Ron Naventi, Bechtel
Harry Boston, DOE	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Judith Connell, Fluor
Mary Burandt, DOE	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Gloria Cummins, Fluor
Jim Daily, DOE	Max Power, Ecology	Keith Thomson, Fluor
Bryan Foley, DOE	John Price, Ecology	Barbara Wise, Fluor
Gergory Jones, DOE	Ron Skinnerland, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique, Inc.
Pete Knollmeyer, DOE	Joy Turner, Ecology	Peter Bengston, ORP/PNNL
Marla Marvin, DOE	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, ORP/Nuvotec
John Morse, DOE	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Chris Chamberlain, Nuvotec
Jim Rasmussen, DOE	Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues	Pat Hickerson, CH2M Hill
Yvonne Sherman, DOE	Linda Grotefendt, EnviroIssues	Bryan Kidder, CHG
Dennis Sieracki, DOE	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues	Felix Miera, CH2M Hill
Bob Tibbatts, DOE	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues	Sandi Murebel, WTP
Janis Ward, DOE	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues	Janice Parthree, Battelle
Steve Wiegman, DOE	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues	Mike Goddu, GHJ
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Suzanne Heaston, Bechtel	

Public

John Becker, J. Becker Assocs.		Jan Morzvell, Information MATTERS
Meg Blzchsm Self	Jeff Holloway, FH	Robert, FW
Gabriel Bohnel, Nez Perce ERWM	Jeff Johnson, C&E News	Steve Sautter, CRESP
Allyn Boldt, Self	Sanara Lilligren, Nez Perce Tribe	John Stand, TCH

Caree Call, East Oregonian	David Losay, Self	John Tate, Public
Don Clar, DEC Enterprises	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Anne Williamson, Public
Les Davenport	Barry Monvek, Information MATTERS	Joan Young, Self