

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

June 6-7, 2002

Hood River, Oregon

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS..... 4
EXPOSURE SCENARIOS TASK FORCE..... 5
DRAFT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ACCELERATED CLEANUP OF THE HANFORD SITE..... 10
LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP..... 15
SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD (SSAB) CHAIRS' LETTER TO ASSISTANT SECRETARY JESSIE ROBERSON..... 15
REVIEW OF AGENCY RESPONSES TO HAB ADVICE..... 16
FAREWELL COMMENTS FROM HARRY BOSTON, DOE-ORP 16
UPDATES AND COMMITTEE REPORTS..... 18
AGENCY UPDATES..... 20
BOARD BUSINESS..... 21
PUBLIC COMMENT..... 22
ATTENDEES 25

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BOARD ACTIONS

The Hanford Advisory Board (Board) adopted three pieces of advice at the June, 2002 meeting. A summary of each is included below.

Exposure Scenarios Task Force

Board members who have participated in the Exposure Scenarios Task Force developed advice about exposure scenarios in the 200 Area. The advice was adopted and included the following points:

- The Board acknowledges that some waste will remain in the core zone when the cleanup effort is complete, but the core zone should be as small as possible and should not include contaminated areas outside the 200 Area fences.
- There should be a continued human presence in the core zone.
- Beneficial use of the core zone should be maximized.
- Groundwater remediation should include source term remediation and aggressive technology development and implementation.
- A coalition of groups should be assembled to administer long-term stewardship of the site.
- The agencies should run a risk analysis of a range of potential human health and ecological risks.
- The values expressed by the Future Site Uses Working Group are still applicable.

The advice was adopted.

The task force will meet again in June to consider exposure scenarios on the Columbia River corridor. Several non-Board groups will participate.

Draft Performance Management Plan for the Cleanup of the Hanford Site

The Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) are currently writing a draft Performance Management Plan (PMP) for the Accelerated Cleanup of the Hanford Site. A draft of this plan endorsed by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is due on August 1, 2002. After reviewing the draft PMP through a Committee of the Whole, the Board adopted advice that offered suggestions and values to be included in the August 1 draft. Some of the main points in the advice are:

- Groundwater remediation efforts must include Source Term remediation and involve new technologies.
- The Board is concerned that the PMP sacrifices cleanup quality for speed; the Board relies on the regulators to prevent this.
- The Board supports accelerated cleanup that is safer, better, and faster but still in compliance with the relevant legal requirements.
- Cleanup priorities identified in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) should be followed, and highest risks reduced first.
- Assumptions in the PMP should be clarified.
- Funding for the PMP may be problematic.
- Public involvement is critical.

Long-Term Stewardship

DOE-RL plans to issue its Long-Term Stewardship Plan on September 30, 2002. The Board advised DOE-RL to delay issuance to allow adequate time to engage the public in workshops and include results from other strategic planning efforts and documents, such as the Cleanup Constraints and Challenges Team (C3T) process, Exposure Scenarios Task Force, TPA negotiations, and reviews of the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW-EIS) and the PMP. Advice to this effect was adopted.

OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

Site-Specific Advisory Board(SSAB) Chairs' Letter to Jessie Roberson

The chairs of the SSABs drafted a letter to Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management Jessie Roberson, encouraging her to utilize their expertise. The Board authorized Todd Martin to sign the letter without major revision.

Farewell Comments from Harry Boston, DOE-ORP

The Manager of DOE-ORP, Harry Boston, made farewell comments summarizing the progress that has been made on the waste treatment project. Construction is almost ready to begin. Some challenges for the future are the increased baseline cost for the facility and speeding the timeline for full operation.

Harry thanked the Board for all its work and support and Board members offered praise of his enthusiasm, openness, energy, and honesty. He will be greatly missed. The Board also expressed appreciation for DOE-ORP's willingness to provide information and support.

Cleanup Constraints and Challenges Team (C3T)

The next C3T meeting will be its last and will occur on June 27-28. The seven subgroups will present final reports and recommendations for future actions. The TPA agencies are working on a way to continue the dialogue and nature of the C3T process.

In response to a desire to participate with a more active role in C3T, the Board's Executive Issues Management Group will consider options for the Board committees to work more closely with the C3T subgroups.

Fast Flux Test Facility

The Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) contains 260,000 gallons of sodium at 400 degrees. Efforts are concentrated on initiation of fuel washing. DOE-RL plans to do a secondary sodium drain in Spring 2003 and a primary drain at the end of 2004 or beginning of 2005. The schedule is dependent on adequate funding.

DOE-RL submitted a TPA change package in March and negotiations are underway. The new milestones must be set by July 17, or the previous milestones will automatically be reinstated.

Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Copies of the Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW-EIS) have been mailed to interested parties. As this is a cross-cutting issue, issue managers from all committees are collaborating in the review of the document. The River and Plateau Committee has the lead, and Gariann Gelston is acting as the manager of all the issue managers. The SW-EIS will be discussed at the June River and Plateau Committee meeting.

Draft Meeting Summary

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD Draft Meeting Summary June 6-7, 2002 Hood River, OR

Todd Martin, Chair (Public -at-large), 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 at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Eight board seats were not represented: Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation (CTUIR), University of Washington, Washington State University, City of Kennewick, City of West Richland, Benton-Franklin Regional Council, Central Washington Building Trades Association, and Government Accountability Project.

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

One new member was introduced: Sky Bradley is the new alternate for the Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental Interests).

Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), introduced Tom Stoops, the new hydrogeologist for the Oregon Office of Energy.

On June 7, 2002, Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen) will participate in a Department of Energy stakeholder forum in Denver, Colorado on incineration alternatives. She offered to talk to anyone interested in having his or her views shared at the forum.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management (Hanford Work Force), shared that Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), will retire at the end of June, but hopefully will stay connected to the Board.

The deadline for reserving hotel rooms for the July 10-11, 2002 Board meeting is June 9, 2002.

Copies of the Board's 2001 Progress Report were available at the back table. Board members were encouraged to distribute copies to their constituencies. Additional copies can be requested from EnviroIssues.

Copies of the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) Training and Education Center's Environmental Assessment were also available. The 30-day comment period is coming up, though the final closing date is not yet known.

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, introduced staff members who do not normally attend Board meetings – Christina Richmond and Rodger Burns. She made several administrative announcements:

- The packets included an administrative calendar that should list all meetings and calls, although there were a few errors that will be corrected.
- For committee meeting summaries, EnviroIssues is returning to a format that summarizes discussion, rather than attributing individual comments to specific committee members.

- When EnviroIssues is asked to distribute information or documents to the full Board that are not Board-generated, EnviroIssues will send the contact information needed to acquire the documents directly to the full Board, so individuals may contact the authors.

Greg deBruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), thanked the Board for holding its meeting in Hood River for the first time since 1994. He urged the Board to think of itself as a single family, working collectively to clean up the Hanford site. He invited the Board to a Thursday night social hour at a nearby restaurant, with music and hors d'oeuvres sponsored by Columbia Riverkeeper. Greg played a piece of an audio tape called 500 Nations, featuring Johnny Johnson, a native chief on the Columbia, to remind Board members of the importance of their work.

The summary of the April Board meeting was approved with corrections.

EXPOSURE SCENARIOS TASK FORCE

Doug Huston presented advice stemming from the May 7-8, 2002 meeting of the Exposure Scenarios Task Force. He first outlined the history of the task force. In Summer 2001, the TPA agencies requested a framework to assure that risk assessment was done uniformly among the different programs on the site. Moses Jarayssi, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., was assigned this task, and sought the input of the Board committees. During its September 2001 meeting, the Board decided to offer input through its existing committee structure. By November this evolved into the task force model, which was proposed to the Board by Gerry Pollet and Gariann Gelston at the December Board meeting. The Board decided to base the task force around a group for the 100 and 300 Areas and also form a smaller group to decide the proposal for the risk framework. The smaller group met in January 2002, reached consensus, and developed draft advice, which they brought to the Board in February 2002. In the proposal, a task force would be convened by the TPA agencies, open to Board members and non-Board participants. Over 60 people attended the first meeting in February 2002. The task force's second and third meetings, in March and May, respectively, resulted in the proposed advice. There are two remaining task force meetings. Final products will be distributed to as many people as possible for feedback.

Todd Martin pointed out that the advice followed Board process and worked well because many people helped develop it. He noted that the task force represents an important step because it follows the work of the Future Site Uses Working Group (FSUWG), something the TPA agencies have frequently requested.

The task force will produce a report for submission to the TPA agencies. The primary goal of the task force is to collect broad stakeholder values for the agencies; the advice is a secondary product from the Board members of the task force.

Greg deBruler clarified that the next meetings will look at the exposure scenarios on the Columbia River corridor. He stated many additional groups will be involved – National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (both from the Hanford area and from Portland), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Trout Unlimited, and the Steelheaders. Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), commented that since a goal of the task force was to involve more than just Board members, he is pleased to hear that so many non-Board groups will attend the next meeting.

Doug Huston described the primary themes of the advice:

- There is a core zone, which will be as small as possible.
- The best way to ensure that people know waste is in the core zone is through a continued human presence in the Central Plateau.

- Once cleanup is complete, there should be no importation of hazardous waste. Hanford is part of the Department of Energy (DOE) complex and it may make sense to send other waste to Hanford for the sake of the rest of the complex, but once cleanup is complete, no more importation should occur.
- Groundwater remediation efforts must include source term remediation, and must involve new remediation technology.
- It is necessary to think about and make decisions now about long-term stewardship (LTS). The task force proposes a coalition composed of stakeholders throughout the region to monitor LTS activities.
- It is important to understand temperature and geological effects on risk, and risk assessments should be dynamic.

Board Discussion

Betty Tabbutt, League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), expressed confusion on the groundwater remediation standards section of the advice. Doug Huston clarified that the intent was that groundwater should be cleaned up as completely as possible.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), stated that the task force's second meeting produced a remarkable end product, considering the hurdles during the agenda-development. The task force was not designed to produce Board advice but to collect views from stakeholders on the foreseeable maximum exposure scenarios, which will be used for decision-making. Gerry had the following concerns with the advice:

- The Board should not supplant other stakeholder advice on impacts, uses, and scenarios. He is concerned that other advice may be lost and suggested adding a phrase to the advice that other input should be recognized.
- The Board should not imply that it is acceptable for DOE to import waste until cleanup of the DOE complex is complete. It is uncertain when the DOE complex will close, if ever.
- To clarify the meaning about groundwater cleanup, he suggested stating that it is not acceptable to have contamination above drinking water standards throughout the core zone.
- The task force did not agree that the reasonable maximum exposure scenario in the core zone is to a worker for all time. Scenarios should be run for residents, Native Americans, and worker/day users in both the buffer zone and the core zone.
- The task force was very concerned about DOE's proposal to claim that the core zone is outside the 200 Area fence lines and includes Gable Mountain pond and the S ponds. The advice should say that the core zone should not be expanded to include contaminated areas outside the 200 Area fences; those areas must be considered part of the buffer zone, not the core zone. Future public and Native American exposure to those areas is reasonably foreseeable, and those areas are not part of an industrial zone. This is consistent with the recommendations of the Future Site Uses Working Group, which stated that the core zone is within the fence lines, or otherwise is defined as being as small an area as possible.

Ken Bracken, Benton County, disagreed with two of Gerry Pollet's suggested revisions to the advice. Ken believes that if it is in the greater good of the nation to consolidate waste, Hanford should accept other waste, although conditions should be established. He also felt it was unrealistic to expand the reasonable maximum exposure scenario in the core zone to include resident or Native American use.

Todd Martin pointed out that the Board is offering suggestions on running the assessments. When there are results from running the scenarios, then the Board can offer advice on what groups should be protected in the cleanup. In other words, at this stage the Board is just asking for potential scenarios on what assessments the agency runs, not actually making decisions on who should be protected.

Leon Swenson, Public at Large, agreed with Ken Bracken regarding import of offsite waste. He was impressed with the advice.

Gordon Rogers, Public at Large, listed a few points of serious concern:

- 1) Waste importation – it is unrealistic to assume that the DOE complex will ever completely shut down, as there will be continued waste generation and need for disposal from nuclear-generated electricity and other industrial uses of radioactive materials. It is a separate issue whether states should dispose of that waste or whether national facilities for waste disposal should exist. He cannot agree with a statement that no more waste should be imported to Hanford.
- 2) Groundwater – The land uses approved by the Comprehensive Land Use Planning document, which is in effect under a Record of Decision, as well the recommendations of the FSUWG do not suggest any future residential or irrigated agriculture in either the buffer zone or conservation/preservation zones. Unless the future uses are resolved, he has serious problems with the advice's recommendations on groundwater.
- 3) Scenarios – it is fine to run scenarios based on Native American use of land, but he questioned how groundwater is used other than by drilling wells and pumping it up. The influx of groundwater into the river is protected under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) and other regulations, which Gordon would like to see reinforced to protect the river.

Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), agreed waste importation should not be forbidden, since doing so does not build equity over the generations. She urged the agencies to begin to think about groundwater issues and work with the task force.

Susan Leckband agreed with Ken Bracken's statement. She also expressed concern about the continued human presence. There are several information sources to ensure knowledge about the site is passed on, but since those programs can fail, a continued human presence on the site is the best way to ensure information is passed on. If Hanford is seen as an asset by the country, it will be maintained in a safe configuration.

Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked about the suggestion to form a coalition to ensure long-term stewardship. What would be the timeframe? Who would organize it? Would doing so require authority beyond the TPA, such as congressional participation? Who would control the coalition? Doug Huston explained that the task force had been concerned that having only one agency in charge of long-term stewardship could be dangerous if that agency is given a new mission. Creating a new group with a vested interest in long-term stewardship could ensure that information on site conditions continues to exist. The task force did not have time to decide on the implementation details and there is no timeframe in place, except for the need to start now.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management, made several comments:

- He agreed with Gerry Pollet on the broad concept that specific Board advice and other products from the task force may disagree.
- The advice should clarify that groundwater needs to be cleaned up regardless of land use.
- Regarding use of the land – by definition, access to the core zone is limited to workers.
- There have been several discussions recently about “good science” ruling decisions. Too often, the principle is given lip service while decisions are based on politics. If good science says Hanford is the best location to store waste for the good of the nation, then the Board should follow that. Nobody wants waste at Hanford, but scientific judgment, not “Not in my backyard,” should be used to make decisions.

Greg deBruler agreed with the principle that good science should drive decisions, but commented that it rarely does. He then expressed concern about the future population living in the 200 Area. If no analysis is run, we will not understand risks or be able to tell future generations what the risk is for specific behaviors. The analyses need to be done to ensure that we know what may happen.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), commented that the Board should recommend the development of reasonable standards for packaging and disposal of the imported waste.

Keith Smith expressed appreciation for Jeff Luke's comments, which match his own perspective as a worker. He urged the Board to reflect reality, and thus retain credibility, regarding people on the site. He felt the best way to keep people from digging and playing in the 200 Area until it is safe is with a continued human presence.

Gerry Pollet reiterated a few points he felt had been forgotten:

- 1) The task force was very concerned with DOE's proposal to restrict groundwater in the core zone and buffer zone for 150 years because if groundwater is contaminated to shoreline, then the shoreline cannot be used, which violates treaty rights.
- 2) Projection of the population on the site – there is a projection of 2 million people within a specific number of miles of the site. Since there are already prohibitions on taking water from the Columbia River, the groundwater of Hanford is an immense public resource (groundwater belongs to the State of Washington, not the federal government). It is reasonably foreseeable that this valuable resource will be used in the future. Therefore, it is not acceptable to say that any area outside the point of compliance at the edge of a waste unit is going to have a restriction if groundwater cleanup is "complete."
- 3) Resources within the core zone – the area between 200 East and 200 West includes valuable habitat. The task force felt that some people have reasonable uses of resources and exposures for areas outside a shrunken core zone (now called the core zone).
- 4) On waste importation, he disagreed with the modifications to the suggested language. He was concerned that the Board would approve waste importation without reviewing the SW-EIS. The task force's intent was to convey that when cleanup under the TPA is complete, beneficial reuse does not include adding more waste to the soil.

Sky Bradley commented that the task force had not intended agricultural use in the core zone.

Jim Curdy, Grant & Franklin Counties (Local Government), commented that contamination affects everyone, and single groups – such as residents or Native Americans – should not be singled out. He asked the Board to consider the Columbia River Treaty with Canada, which includes the total Columbia River Basin and several other states.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, clarified that the ecological analysis will include both plants and animals, and covers native plant/treaty use.

Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, questioned the meaning of the phrase "freed up for reuse." Doug Huston explained that the land should be freed from government control and made attractive to ensure continued human presence.

Greg deBruler suggested risk assessments address the vadose zone as well, and that groundwater should be considered as a whole, not separated into operable units.

Mark Beck, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen), pointed out that the problem with exposure scenarios is that looking 200 years into the future is not very helpful. There

will be a continued human presence for the next 50 years and workers are still digging up surprises. Scenarios have to plan for surprises. He supported running the exposure scenario; although it may not be useful, it will still produce information.

Shelley Cimon suggested decoupling intruders and Native Americans, since natives are not intruders. Dennis Faulk, EPA, said the intruder scenario would include native activity and there is not a separate scenario for tribes.

Robin Klein, Hanford Watch, expressed concern about reducing the core zone. She would like to see a more proactive recommendation to launch a plan for technology development. She was also concerned that the Board acknowledges that some waste will remain in the core zone when cleanup is complete. Doug Huston explained that the language in the advice was actually suggested by the tribes and acknowledges the laws of physics that say it is not possible to have 100% cleanup. Todd Martin pointed out that this was a central issue for the task force.

John Stanfill, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), clarified that the tribes have not suggested that the core zone be used for a waste zone, but they have acknowledged that it may have to be used for that purpose.

A working group met on Thursday night to revise the advice, based on proposed language from Gerry Pollet, the discussion of the Board, and the consensus principles from the task force meeting. On Friday, Doug Huston presented the revised advice to the full Board. The main substantive changes were: removal of the suggestion that waste importation is acceptable (an idea that was not a product of the task force); clarification of the extent of groundwater remediation envisioned; and removal of the “beneficial reuse” part of the advice.

The advice was adopted by consensus. It will be sent to local and regional TPA agency officials.

Agency Perspectives

Dennis Faulk, EPA, commented that the TPA agencies have learned a lot through the task force, especially about how to establish a task force. He noted that the small groups in the task force workshops produced very useful cross-fertilization of ideas. He urged the Board to send a copy of the advice to Doug Sherwood, who had been advocating for exactly such a group for many years. Dennis emphasized that, from a technical perspective, the second to last paragraph is the most important idea in the advice. He added that when the effort first started, the agencies were not sure of the framework in the Central Plateau. This process helps integrate the tank program with the rest of cleanup, accelerate ideas, and provide grounding so that cleanup quality is not compromised. He thinks all the staff and TPA agencies are committed to quality cleanup of the Central Plateau, and that there are good ideas on what the Central Plateau will ultimately look like. There is no final answer yet, but the task force work is a good step.

John Price, Ecology, made three major points about the task force:

- Based on task force feedback, Ecology has now changed how it thinks about risk assessments on the Central Plateau.
- The workshops have been very valuable, and even the informal products like flipchart notes have been helpful.
- The advice being discussed will be very valuable for the start of the risk analysis and public involvement.

Bryan Foley, DOE-RL, thanked the Board and task force for its involvement in developing risk assessments. DOE-RL is currently working on the Gable Mountain and B Pond feasibility studies, which will be employed next year, so the advice is very timely.

Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, commented that the timing of the task force is excellent because it will help integrate efforts between DOE-RL and DOE-ORP.

Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, noted that the task force's efforts have helped the agencies think of ways to accelerate cleanup without compromising quality. Most importantly, it has provided context for the Central Plateau. Although there is no final answer yet, this is a good step, there is a lot of energy and it is a good grounding process.

DRAFT PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ACCELERATED CLEANUP OF THE HANFORD SITE

Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, provided an overview of the PMP. The PMP is the result of a series of yearlong events, starting with the C3T process. C3T was developed as a proactive internal review of Hanford cleanup, in response to the announcement that the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management, Jessie Roberson, planned to conduct a Top-to-Bottom review of the entire Environmental Management program. After the Top-to-Bottom Review, the TPA agencies signed a Letter of Intent to continue the review process, request funding through the Cleanup Reform Account, and develop a Hanford work plan. The final response is the PMP, which was due in draft form by May 1, 2002. Currently the PMP exists as a DOE document. A version endorsed by the regulators is due on August 1, 2002. The purpose is to reduce risk, reduce cleanup costs, maintain quality, and integrate strategies between DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. There are specific goals for progress by 2007 and 2012.

The strategy focuses resources on activities that accelerate cleanup and reduce risk, which includes removing/stabilizing high-risk materials, deactivating and decommissioning excess facilities, and minimizing long-term risks related to materials that will remain on site. DOE-RL and DOE-ORP will work closely with the regulators and will deploy comprehensive business approaches. The PMP is not designed to supplant any existing agreements, such as the TPA, but to function as a roadmap for key decisions. The TPA still guides all cleanup at Hanford.

The PMP includes five strategic initiatives, which will accelerate:

- 1) cleanup on the River Corridor
- 2) tank waste treatment – by increasing throughput, demonstrating retrieval and closure of the high-level waste tanks, and evaluating alternative technology for low-level waste
- 3) the stabilization and deinventory of nuclear materials
- 4) waste disposal and source-term remediation
- 5) deactivation and decommissioning of the Central Plateau facilities and waste sites

Overall, according to Wade, the PMP will streamline business on the site. It addresses removing unnecessary nuclear facility requirements as nuclear waste is removed. To remove the constraints of moving money around, there will be only two budget control points – the waste treatment plant and operations. The PMP also asks for longer contracts to increase stability.

The PMP summarizes the internal strategy for Hanford. DOE would like input from the Board. The document is available on the Hanford website at www.hanford.gov/docs/hpmp/index.html. Comments should be submitted by July 1.

Agency Perspectives

Mike Gearheard, EPA, commented that, in general, EPA is supportive of the PMP and the efforts like C3T that have led to the development of the PMP. EPA has been working on TPA change packages – those for the 100 and 300 Areas are signed, the 200 Area change package will be signed soon. Thus,

many of the initiatives in the PMP are already embodied in TPA milestone adjustments. Throughout the C3T and PMP development process, there have been concerns that the TPA would be weakened. EPA shared this nervousness, but Mike emphasized that the TPA remains the controlling document for cleanup. EPA will remain vigilant about the PMP. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 budget is not yet firmly in place, which is an area of concern. Overall, EPA is supportive, nervous, and watching the budget.

Mike Wilson, Ecology, clarified that by signing the Letter of Intent, Ecology is not giving up or giving away anything. The TPA still rules Hanford cleanup. All budgets will be evaluated on the basis of whether the funding is sufficient to meet TPA milestones. The C3T process was designed to support the TPA. Regarding tanks, the TPA still rules, regardless of new technology. Proven technologies will be included in the TPA, but if the new technologies do not work, remediation will still be handled according to the TPA. The milestones are still in place, although Ecology supports beating the milestones. Regarding offsite waste, Ecology is still evaluating the SW-EIS and considering cumulative risk issues. Mike would like Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology's Director, to review the PMP carefully before it is final. Ecology has no official comments on the PMP yet.

Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, commented on three elements of the PMP:

- Developing technology for vitrification is good.
- Closing tanks on the acceleration schedule is more difficult because an agreement with the regulators is needed.
- New technology will make cleanup faster and less expensive.

Although he does not know about agency support from the top, Steve will soon meet with incoming DOE-ORP Manager Roy Schepens. Steve noted that tank support is the greatest issue. The PMP is based on outyear budget submittals, so there are currently no concrete estimates.

Additional Viewpoints

Al Conklin, Washington Department of Health (DOH), said DOH is pleased to see an accelerated cleanup plan. He expressed concern that past mistakes are not repeated, such as when DOE signed a contract to design 30% of the waste treatment plant and then started to build it, which was not consistent with regulator processes. He wants to be sure the authors of the PMP understand the licensing requirements for the waste treatment plant. For example, the PMP calls for a tenfold increase in vitrification and improvements to the melters. DOH will likely finalize the permit soon, but the licensing process requires a specific design and specific throughput; decisions for control technologies are based on those designs and throughput. The acceleration goals are worthy, but DOH is concerned that the footprint of the plant will change, which would not support the additional controls that would be necessary for a tenfold increase in throughput. DOH has to make tough decisions on what controls are necessary to protect the public from airborne radionuclides.

Gerry Pollet presented slides he had prepared about the PMP. The President's FY 2003 budget request was \$390 million less than the baseline level to meet TPA and other legal requirements. Gerry asserted that the \$433 million exists only in press releases from Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ), which has stated that funding beyond level funding depends on the results of the Top-to-Bottom review. He questioned whether the \$433 million really is that amount and whether DOE will actually request it from Congress.

According to Gerry, the new strategies in the PMP call for spending \$50 million on alternatives to vitrification, \$20 million on demonstrating single-shell tank closure, \$50 million on increased vitrification capacity, and over \$500 million on increased base capital costs for the vitrification plant (not a capacity increase). The PMP also calls for increased imported waste and does not address pre-1970 transuranic

waste. Prior Board advice about offsite mixed waste calls for short-term storage and treatment, not disposal; this PMP calls for more import and disposal of mixed waste.

Heart of America Northwest concluded that there was not enough money to pay for compliance with the TPA as well as the proposals in the PMP. For high-level nuclear wastes, the highest priority should be to retrieve the wastes from tanks and vitrify the waste. A good thing about this PMP is that it acknowledges that it can increase vitrification by better than 10% by 2018; the problem is funding and timeline problems for the permits.

The PMP proposal for closing tanks has no basis in any legal standard. If a tank is authorized for long-term storage or disposal, then Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensing is needed, which requires compliance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and requires that high-level wastes be permanently isolated from the environment. Without a RCRA landfill, no policies exist for regulation. The PMP assumes that unlined landfills will be used for low-level waste, and that the mixed-waste disposal unit is permitted for offsite waste, which is wrong.

Gerry suggested modifying the advice by stating that the Board's priority for the proposed additional DOE-ORP funding is increased retrieval and throughput for vitrification (to exceed 10% by 2018), rather than spending on technology alternatives and controversial tank closure proposals.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), responded to Gerry's assertion that the \$433 million is missing. She recently attended a House Appropriations subcommittee meeting and was informed that the request is in the House budget. Pam said that the Secretary of Energy testified that congress requested \$433 million over the Presidents request. It will still have to be approved by the Senate, but she believes it exists.

Discussion

Susan Leckband explained the advice development process. She condensed eight pages of comments from the Committee of the Whole and 1-2 pages of comments contributed by the other committees. Participants held a conference call to go over the advice, Gerry Pollet provided discussion of the PMP's five Strategic Initiatives, and Susan pulled all the pieces together. The advice focuses on work plans rather than funding issues.

Keith Smith voiced support for the high-level nature of the advice. He offered several comments:

- He is hopeful that the regulators will support the PMP and that the PMP meets the points from the Top-to-Bottom review so funding can be secured.
- He felt management should consult with the workers before starting this kind of plan; many are spooked to hear that cleanup will be "accelerated" when they already are working fast and have equipment problems. The faster pace strains credibility.
- There are communication problems between the workers and management, because management does not involve workers in the procedure review process.
- Regarding offsite waste, the workers find it easier to accept innocuous waste like broken-up buildings rather than high-level waste.
- He agreed with the principle suggested by Gerry Pollet that funding should be concentrated on working on what is known rather than spending too much on alternative technologies.
- He noted that for the Spent Nuclear Fuel project, management is lacking. The effects of the Project Management Center have not yet trickled down, apparently due to lack of people for the positions.
- The Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) is the foundation of site activities and must be the underlying principle of the PMP. Keith was concerned because activity on the site is currently so labor-intensive that without good implementation of ISMS, there could be problems. He did not

think the PMP places enough emphasis on ISMS and that the language in the PMP actually claims victory on ISMS, which is not justified.

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, asked Keith to help DOE-RL figure out what specifically should be said in the PMP to elevate ISMS. They will work together offline.

Leon Swenson agreed with the need to involve workers in reviews of procedures; he encouraged DOE to get worker input. He also suggested the task force approach as a way for DOE to collect broader input on what risk assessment needs to be done.

Ken Bracken framed his comments by stating that he is an advocate of tanks. He offered a series of opinions on the PMP:

- Focus must be placed on completing construction of the waste treatment plant. Improving throughput is important, but not at the cost of delaying the waste treatment plant.
- He has endorsed tank closure for years and would like to see it finished. He endorses closure under the M-45 milestone, which outlines the process for closure and timelines. He is pleased that DOE and the regulators are working with vitrification, but noted that any process needs to be in accordance with laws. Technologies can be considered, but not endorsed without more information.
- He was encouraged by DOE's willingness to look at the whole process. For example, the change from operating as a nuclear site to operating as a cleanup site is important.
- He is concerned on issues not covered in the PMP, such as pre-1970 transuranic waste (TRU). The logic to split TRU at that year should be explained rationally.
- He is also concerned about groundwater remediation in the future.
- The explanation of assumptions in the PMP was not evident.
- There should be a national effort to integrate the acceleration activities of the individual DOE sites.

Ken noted that the PMP is the first step toward risk reduction and will hopefully compel DOE and the regulators to extend the plan. He appreciated the willingness of DOE and the regulators to enter in a dialogue on the PMP, rather than wait for Board complaints later. He hopes DOE-HQ takes these values as well.

Pam Brown asked if the Board wanted to question its willingness to trust the TPA process and regulators. She expressed confidence that if proposals are not adequate, the regulators will not approve them. She did, however, have a concern that Hanford should not accept offsite waste without money to deal with it. Otherwise, offsite waste will fill the trenches and take money away from other projects. She also agreed with Gerry Pollet's points about pre-1970 TRU and that DOE-ORP and DOE-RL should not be returned to a single organization.

The Board agreed to reiterate in the advice that it trusts the regulators to evaluate the PMP.

Bill Kinsella commented that the update of public values is an important part of the process of drafting the PMP, so the Board should explicitly state that commitment and get a statement from DOE that it intends to go beyond the requirement. Although there is an unprecedented level of trust established between DOE and the regulators right now, that same level of trust does not necessarily exist between the public and DOE.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), commented that it is unethical to obligate the waste treatment plant to take waste without offering funding. In the future, DOE may have to ask how much one site can accept, but it may not be dealing with this well now. He supports having Ecology and EPA act as watchdogs through the development of the PMP. He made a final

observation on how public awareness of terrorism has freed money for defense and speculated that if nuclear cleanup is considered homeland security, then the normal funding level could double.

Leon Swenson expressed concern that risk reduction seems to be primarily programmatic, with less emphasis on reduced risk to the environment, workers and public. He would like to see a quantified comparison of the tradeoffs for the public, worker, and environmental risk between the existing plan and the PMP. Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, explained that programmatic risk is part of the initiative; responsible project management includes looking at the risk in a schedule. Risk reduction is for the workers and the public, although DOE will need to emphasize and publicize that more. Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, added that to make decisions on Central Plateau closure, there must be better quantification of risk. Leon proposed including language specifying that the risk assessment of worker and public safety concerns include the relative weight of perceived risk. The risk assessment must occur quickly.

Greg deBruler pointed out that a problem with the draft advice is that it does not address uncertainty. Some front-end work is needed to assess the exposure and contamination on site, waste inventory, regulatory requirements, and technology needs. He asked the Board to remove the advice's endorsement of acceleration, since it ignores the tried, proven work done in the past. By accepting acceleration, the Board is saying it accepts the idea to use new technologies, not proven technologies that the budget has spent money on over the last few years.

Gerry Pollet pointed out several sections in the PMP that refer to the funding of FFTF. Harold Heacock said he did not recall that DOE intended to fund FFTF. Wade Ballard explained that FFTF is not part of the PMP because DOE had not yet made the decision to shut it down when the plan started. When DOE shuts FFTF down, the funds for FFTF have to transfer from Nuclear Energy to Environmental Management, and Nuclear Energy will have to take FFTF out of its budget request.

Harold Heacock asked for a written record of the funding commitment.

Betty Tabbutt suggested adding a reference in the advice to the Public Involvement White Paper; Todd Martin pointed out that doing so would violate Board process by suggesting the white paper was Board-adopted advice when, in fact, it is not.

Norm Dyer responded to Gerry Pollet's statement on reclassification of waste. Norm wondered if the emphasis on legalistic concerns neglects operation realities. If there is value in risk reduction to reclassify the waste, Norm feels that may be acceptable.

There was a brief discussion of the funding requirements for the plan. Dennis Faulk, EPA, explained that the intent is to invest in front-end funding to reduce outyear cost.

Max Power, Ecology, suggested the advice needed some context-setting in the beginning, perhaps by saying at the outset that the Board would like to highlight particular things in the PMP to address. Max added that Ecology is not comfortable with the PMP as it is, either.

Norm Dyer suggested including a paragraph in the advice that asks DOE to include in the PMP the three commitments made in the June 6, 2002 DOE Response to Board advice #129. The commitments are: 1) all decisions to accelerate cleanup and reduce cost will be supported by credible risk assessments; 2) discussion of risk will continue to be included in environmental review documents for cleanup activities; 3) risk assessments will consider hazardous risk as well as radiological risk. The Board agreed.

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, urged the Board to define what the PMP should contain to meet stakeholder approval. She estimated that 70% – 90% of the initiatives are supported. She also suggested the Board state what it likes about the PMP.

Marla suggested the Board clarify whether it recommends that DOE-RL needs a backup plan for high-level waste in case Yucca Mountain does not become a waste repository. Susan Leckband explained that the Board is very skeptical that Yucca Mountain will ever be open and, even if it is, space for Hanford waste may not be available. Ken Bracken added that the intent of the advice was to be apolitical regarding Yucca Mountain.

Gerry Pollet commented that the advice represents a spectacular job pulling together specific things to be addressed in the PMP. DOE-ORP needs to know that there is no way the Board could endorse a plan that leaves waste in tanks. On the other hand, the advice also lists activities – such as groundwater remediation and accepting offsite mixed waste – that are not in the PMP but should be addressed. The advice very explicitly describes how an acceptable plan can be created and what values the Board holds. Gerry emphasized that this advice is a critical piece of work for the Board and reflects months of effort.

The advice was adopted by consensus. It will be sent to the TPA agencies. Todd Martin suggested the Board also consider sending the advice to Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management Jessie Roberson in September.

LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP

Susan Leckband presented advice on long-term stewardship. She noted that the draft distributed in the Board meeting had been updated from the version in the packet. The reason for the advice is that Jim Daily – the DOE-RL staff member responsible for the long-term stewardship document – is planning another workshop to collect stakeholder input on long-term stewardship. There is no critical issuance date for the plan, but since it is being changed, it should incorporate comments from other efforts like C3T, TPA negotiations, and the PMP. The Board is requesting an extension of time to include information from other documents, as well as input from another workshop, if one is held.

Gerry Pollet suggested adding the Exposure Scenarios Task Force document to the list.

Jim Trombold inquired whether this request should be framed as advice or a letter. Susan Leckband said it should be advice, since DOE will engage the public yet again and delay issuing the plan. Issuing advice also means the Board will receive a response.

The advice was adopted by consensus. It will be sent to Keith Klein, DOE-RL.

SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD (SSAB) CHAIRS' LETTER TO ASSISTANT SECRETARY JESSIE ROBERSON

Todd Martin reported that recently there was a meeting of the SSAB chairs in Cincinnati, OH. Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management Jessie Roberson was invited, but did not attend. The meeting involved extensive discussion about Assistant Secretary Roberson's absence. Other SSABs were concerned because they have not been very involved with their sites in the Top-To-Bottom Review. The chairs of the SSABs drafted a letter to encourage DOE-HQ to utilize their expertise. The general consensus among SSAB chairs was confusion on how the SSABs are supposed to work with DOE-HQ when DOE-HQ does not share information.

Ken Bracken urged the Board to authorize Todd to sign the letter. He noted that within DOE, the institutional memory is actually shifting to the SSABs, since many DOE staff are retiring.

Shelley Cimon asked if there had been any discussion of a specific format to propose to Assistant Secretary Roberson. Todd Martin reported that there was not. There was, however, significant discussion of tone, and the common ground was to convey that the SSABs are available to offer assistance.

Jim Trombold speculated that Assistant Secretary Roberson might be leery of working with the SSABs. Todd Martin noted that the letter does not suggest specific tools of how to do so, but calls attention to the SSABs as a body of expertise that is not being used.

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland, asked how Assistant Secretary Roberson contacts the SSABs. Todd Martin explained that she contacts the SSABs through Martha Crosland at DOE-HQ. He suggested that a positive outcome from the letter would be Assistant Secretary Roberson's attendance at the next SSAB meeting in Oak Ridge, TN.

As this is a letter from all the SSAB chairs, no significant wordsmithing was possible. The Board agreed by consensus to have Todd sign the letter without major revision.

REVIEW OF AGENCY RESPONSES TO HAB ADVICE

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, noted that at its last meeting (April 2002), the Board issued three pieces of advice and has since received responses to all three. For advice #127, (SW-EIS) the response letter stated that the comment period was extended to late August. On advice #128, (200 Area Change Package) the response was that the agencies received comments and will include a comments summary. The response to advice #129 (Top to Bottom Review) was submitted on June 6th, so it was not included in the packet but was available at the back table.

FAREWELL COMMENTS FROM HARRY BOSTON, DOE-ORP

Harry Boston, DOE-ORP, reflected on the past 22 months of his tenure as manager of DOE-ORP and what the future holds. When he started at DOE-ORP, the BNFL contract had just been cancelled and the future of the vitrification plant was uncertain. Now, the foundation has been dug and only one item from the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board is holding up the beginning of construction. There are also a few items in the public comment process that DOE-ORP expects to go well.

There are some challenges. One is that the updated baseline for vitrification facilities is more expensive, at \$4.4 billion instead of \$3.965 billion. When fee and contingency are added, that is a 10% - 15% increase (these numbers are not official, as DOE-ORP has not completed its review with the contractor yet). It may be possible to double the process for waste treatment by 2018, and treat the worst waste first. The higher cost does not mean all the costs are spiraling upward; this is close to a Title 2 design and uncertainty is very low now. The contractor is very close to building and is already buying materials. The current baseline calls for full operation in 2009, instead of the original baseline date of 2010.

DOE-ORP will comply with regulations, but it is still a long way from making final decisions on how much waste to treat in the tanks. It is important to start the dialogue now, and that in conjunction with environmental data and technology information will produce answers.

Harry Boston is honored to have served as Manager of DOE-ORP, and thanked the Board for listening, giving him the benefit of the doubt and being civil. He feels strongly that DOE-ORP has a wonderful team made up of Bechtel National, Inc., CH2MHill Hanford Group, and the DOE employees. Success of the project requires a strong technical foundation and the support of the constituency. He asked the Board to continue its support of the DOE-ORP team.

Discussion

Greg deBruler thanked Harry for attending the Board meeting. Greg then asked, with regard to accelerating cleanup, whether the next DOE-ORP Manager would drive cleanup forward, keep it in the same place, or let it slip back. Harry feels that his successor, Roy Schepens, is a good, honest man. Although there was a change in administration, the Top-to-Bottom review teams conveyed to DOE-HQ that DOE-ORP is facing a tough project but moving forward. To meet the challenge of starting construction, it is necessary to dialogue and think ahead.

Keith Smith commended Harry's success, and then questioned the vitrification plant construction contractor's commitment to the ISMS, since there seem to be some problems with follow-through. Harry thanked Keith for having the confidence to bring the issue to the table.

Al Conklin, DOH, commented that Harry is an honorable man and has set the tone for the vitrification project. He will be missed. The permit for Phase I of the vitrification plant will be signed on Friday, June 7th. Harry responded by commenting that the facility has four permits in public comments, but none have major concerns, which is incredible for a new facility with no predecessor. DOE-ORP is meeting all regulations, most likely because Ecology and EPA discussed issues with Bechtel National, Inc. beforehand.

Susan Leckband expressed hope that Roy Schepens will have Harry's level of enthusiasm and communicativeness. She then asked him where he is going and whether he had any advice for the Board on how to educate his successor on enthusiasm for the vitrification plant. He answered that he is joining a private firm in Washington, D.C. He advised the Board to educate Roy Schepens gently, by meeting privately, in small groups, and to give him some time to ease in to the new position.

Leon Swenson commented that it is good to see that there has finally been groundbreaking with the vitrification plant.

Bill Kinsella expressed appreciation to Harry on behalf of Paige Knight, who could not attend the meeting but who has appreciated his work with stakeholders and his frankness and energy. Bill recognizes that Harry inherited a program in trouble and has had success turning it around.

Ken Bracken echoed the statements of other Board member. He commended Harry's leadership and said that even though the stakeholders have not always agreed with everything, Harry has been an honest broker, rare and valued.

Todd Martin expressed appreciation for Harry for taking the time to talk to the Board. Further, the legal documentation for the Board is for DOE-RL, so it would have been possible for DOE-ORP to ignore the Board. Instead, DOE-ORP has provided support on every level – with budget information, briefings at committee meetings and with issue managers, staff support, etc. The Board greatly appreciates those efforts.

On behalf of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board, Norm Dyer expressed appreciation for how responsive and forthcoming Harry has always been in his involvement with the group.

UPDATES AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Next SSAB Meeting

Todd Martin asked for volunteers to attend the next SSAB meeting tentatively scheduled for January 29 – February 1, 2003 in Carlsbad, NM. The topic will probably be transuranic (TRU) waste and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Wade Riggsbee, (Yakama Nation), Leon Swenson, and Harold Heacock all indicated interest in representing the Board at the meeting. Todd will provide more details as they become available.

SSAB Videoconference

Todd Martin reported on the SSAB videoconference with Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson. The SSABs were given short notice for an 8 a.m. meeting. From the Board, Todd Martin, Harold Heacock, and Pam Brown participated. After the initial introductions, the videoconferencing equipment malfunctioned, so the meeting was conducted by teleconference. The primary concerns of the sites were lack of public involvement, especially regarding budget information. Assistant Secretary Roberson had been surprised to learn about the budget disconnects. Harold Heacock added that the discussion was not very satisfactory, since it was so broad and not all the sites actively participated.

C3T Update

Todd Martin announced that the next C3T meeting would be June 27-28. The Board's general default attendees – Todd Martin, Gerry Pollet, and Susan Leckband – have offered to attend. An agenda is available. Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, commented that the next C3T meeting would be the last. All seven subgroups will have final reports and recommendations to proceed. The meeting will also extract and address the policy issues that may be possible to institutionalize. Several questions remain on how to continue the process and ensure that good ideas are developed and incorporated into the PMP. Assistant Secretary Roberson has been invited to the meeting, and even if she is not able to attend, several DOE-HQ staff will be present. On the 27th from 5 – 7 p.m. there will be an open house.

Ken Bracken urged the agencies to continue the dialogue in whatever structure follows C3T.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, said the TPA agencies intend to reinstate senior management meetings and continue the C3T subgroups to support meeting the August 1st endorsement deadline for the PMP.

Gariann Gelston, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, asked the Board to reconsider its decision to only observe in the C3T process. She would like the Board to take a more active role in the process. Leon Swenson shared an affinity for the idea of increased Board participation, but pointed out that one individual speaking for the Board is a major obstacle. Todd Martin suggested participation could be increased at the committee level by more actively engaging with the C3T subgroups. Mike Wilson, Ecology, suggested having committee representatives attend the C3T subgroup meetings and then report back to their committee.

Todd Martin asked if a calendar of C3T activities exists. Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, explained that there are biweekly meetings of all the teams, and then each team also holds 1-2 meetings per two-week period. C3T will consider how to institutionalize continuation of the teams and senior management communication. The agencies are open to Board suggestions on how C3T proceeds. Dennis Faulk, EPA, added that the team meetings are somewhat impromptu, but people are welcome to attend or listen by phone when available. Todd suggested the Executive Issues Management Group decide Board participation with C3T during its next call.

Committee Leadership

Committee leaders were all selected through consensus. The following leaders will serve until June 2003.

Budgets and Contracts Committee

Harold Heacock, Chair

Gerry Pollet, Vice-chair

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee

Keith Smith, Chair

Tim Takaro, Vice-chair

Public Involvement and Communication Committee

Amber Waldref, Chair

Bill Kinsella, Vice-chair

River and Plateau Committee

Pam Brown, Chair

Susan Leckband, Vice-chair

Tank Waste Committee

Doug Huston, Chair

Leon Swenson, Vice-chair

Public Involvement Committee Update

Bill Kinsella reported that the committee is working with DOE on the public involvement aspect of the PMP. There are two public involvement timeframes: the formative period and the action period (the indefinite future). The committee is also trying to apply the Public Involvement White Paper principles to the PMP. The committee hopes to apply the white paper principles to other issues.

The committee is also looking at the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) public involvement process, especially as it applies to the SW-EIS. The committee is interested in providing input on the SW-EIS public meetings. A continuing issue is the quality of input; the committee views itself as watchdogs in this sense.

Jim Trombold encouraged Board members to submit comments on the PMP before July 1.

Todd Martin said that for DOE Order 413-3 (Project Management Order), the person responsible for drafting the public involvement section contacted Todd and asked for permission to include the Public Involvement White Paper as an attachment.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, announced that the Mariners are playing at 3:35 pm on September 4th, the Wednesday before the Board meeting in Seattle. He suggested, if one is scheduled, holding the Public Involvement Committee meeting before the game and organizing a trip to attend the game.

Tank Waste Committee Update

Doug Huston reported on the issues from the committee meeting last month:

- Review of alternate technologies for tank waste treatment
- Review of the PMP
- Committee leadership selection
- Mechanism to ascertain status of the vitrification plant, need to get tool for review.

The committee will not meet in June. A half-day meeting is planned for July, during which the committee will continue looking at alternate technologies and the new Bechtel baseline.

Budgets and Contracts Committee Update

Harold Heacock said the committee is still waiting for the FY 2003 and FY 2004 budget information to be released. There is another DOE-HQ freeze on release of information.

Wade Ballard, DOE-RL, said that for FY 2003, he understands that unofficially, the \$433 million is additional to the President's earmark. It is not yet known how exactly to split that amount between DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. DOE-RL is still working with the contractors on the numbers for 2004 to 2008, so DOE-HQ will not allow that information to be released yet.

The next committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 25th, when more budget information may be available. The next committee call placeholder is June 18th. Wade Ballard said DOE-RL must submit budget information to DOE-HQ by June 10th. He committed to telling the committee the following week when it could expect to see updated budget information.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee Update

Keith Smith reported that the committee has a conference call on June 19th to discuss potential advice related to health and safety, especially on the PMP. He encouraged attendance on the conference calls to meet a quorum. Advice would be ready for either the July or September Board meeting.

River and Plateau Committee Update

Susan Leckband reported that at its most recent meeting, the committee had talked about:

- Advice on the SW-EIS
- Advice on the LTS plan, including holding another workshop to provide input to the LTS plan and how the Institutional Controls Plan folds into the LTS plan
- Draft PMP
- Exposure Scenarios Task Force, how incorporation would fold in with the LTS plan
- PFP Change package – Dirk Dunning is the issue manager; he is reviewing the change package and will report to the Board if there are any issues of concern
- Committee leadership: the committee selected the same officers

Gariann Gekston commented that the committee is using a new strategy in reviewing the SW-EIS. Many issue managers, including several from other committees, will participate and Gariann will be the "Issue Manager Manager." The goal is to produce meaningful advice by the July Board meeting. The next committee meeting will include a morning discussion of the SW-EIS among the issue managers and an afternoon session with DOE-RL.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, thanked the River and Plateau Committee for sponsoring a site tour in April. It was the best tour he has ever been on.

AGENCY UPDATES

Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) status update

Al Farabee, DOE-RL, explained that FFTF still contains 260,000 gallons of sodium at 400 degrees. Concentration is on three efforts to get fuel washing initiated: fixing the solid waste cask, upgrades of the closed-loop ex-vessel machine, and a sodium removal system. In terms of sodium drain, DOE-RL is looking at a secondary sodium drain in Spring 2003 and a primary drain in the end of 2004 or beginning of 2005. TPA negotiations are underway; DOE-RL submitted a change package in March in accordance with the last change package. There must be closure on the new milestones by July 17th, or the old milestones are automatically reinstated.

Leon Swenson asked if there are any problems with the July 17th deadline. Al Farabee answered that the schedule is going well.

Robin Klein asked how much of the drain timeline is dependent on getting funds in the next year. Al Farabee explained that the schedule is dependent on \$39 million this year, \$36 million in FY 2003, and level funding of \$46 million starting in 2004. The problem is purchasing interim storage casks in which to place the washed spent fuel. If they don't get \$46 million, they can a) wash the fuel and have no place to put it, or b) lay off people, buy the cask, but have no one to wash the fuel.

Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW-EIS)

Mike Collins, DOE-RL, reported that DOE mailed 300 copies of the SW-EIS. More will be mailed as requests come in. DOE-RL will work with the Board to get copy requests, advertisements in newspapers, and other materials.

BOARD BUSINESS

Board Leadership Retreat

Todd Martin announced that there would be a Board leadership retreat, with the goal of team-building, making the leadership group more effective and efficient, and building ownership so the leaders take more responsibility for the goals and process of the Board. Anything that comes out of the retreat will be brought back to the Board; no unilateral decisions will be made.

The chosen location for the retreat is Sleeping Lady near Leavenworth, which will meet the federal government per diem. The retreat will be run by an independent facilitator and will not include EnviroIssues or the TPA agencies. However, since Sleeping Lady is a rather fancy resort, Todd wanted to hear feedback on whether Board members approved of the location, and what suggestions people had for mechanisms to get feedback from other Board members, the agencies, and the facilitation team on what the Board leadership is doing well or can improve.

Madeline Brown questioned whether the retreat is funded with Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) money and qualifies as a public meeting. Todd Martin assured the Board that the funding for the retreat is "squeaky clean" and consistent with regulations.

Ken Bracken expressed support for the retreat on the condition that all leaders could attend. Todd Martin explained the rationale for the urgency of the meeting: 1) to report to the Board in July, then solidify findings for the September Board meeting, and 2) the facilitator will be biking across China in August. The goal of the retreat is for committee leaders to understand their responsibilities.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, voiced support for not inviting the agency representatives.

Jim Trombold expressed support for both the retreat location and goals.

Greg deBruler also supported holding a leadership retreat. However, he was concerned that if people not part of the leadership group are not invited to the retreat, then there should be adequate time before the retreat for them to offer ideas.

On Friday, after a morning meeting of the leadership group, there was still no final date for the leadership retreat; the preferred dates are June 24th – 25th if the facilitator is available. A process to gather input had been established: anyone (Board members, agency representatives, non-Board members) who wants to provide input will be interviewed prior to the retreat.

Topics for July Board meeting

- Exposure Scenarios Task Force update from June meeting
- Two potential pieces of advice from the River and Plateau Committee – the SW-EIS and the PFP change package
- Potential advice from the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee on ISMS and consistency issues
- Potential advice from the Budgets and Contracts Committee on the FY 2004 budget
- Groundwater update as an informal Tuesday evening session
- C3T update
- An introduction to Roy Schepens, and discussion of the relationship and role he will play with the Board
- Report on the leadership retreat
- Potential informal reception for Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL, on Wednesday evening

Administration

Since the regularly scheduled Executive Issues Management Group (EIMG) call on June 20th conflicts with the annual Hanford emergency drill, it was rescheduled for Friday, June 21st. This is a DOE day off, but the agencies will support the call.

Susan Leckband requested that the facilitation team email a list of all conference calls, meetings, and activities. Penny Mabie thanked her for the suggestion and said EnviroIssues is working on a new system for reminders and will need feedback on how well it works. At Harold Heacock's suggestion, Penny will also see whether such an update can be posted on the HAB website.

Greg deBruler expressed concern that meeting summaries should reflect the diversity and 'hot issues' that come up. Summarizing can minimize the views of the community that may have heartburn on an issue. Penny Mabie clarified that Board meeting summaries will remain unchanged – comments will still be attributed. Greg responded that in the past, the committee meeting summaries do not always show all the important issues. For example, about a year ago he had concerns about the 300 Area that were not captured well in the meeting summary. Todd Martin suggested Greg work with EnviroIssues offline. Keith Smith suggested that if an individual wishes their comments to be attributed, that could be arranged. Penny Mabie reiterated that Board members can always offer concerns to EnviroIssues or the facilitator; that is why the meeting summaries are always offered in draft form until approved by the committee at the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Roney, Columbia Riverkeeper, thanked the Board for meeting in Hood River. Steve retired to Hood River from a career in naval intelligence and air defense construction. He became involved with Columbia River Keeper out of concern for the health of the Columbia River. He is encouraged by the draft Project Management Plan and its five strategic initiatives. He thinks it would be phenomenal if the TPA agencies can agree on the plan by August 1st. He urged the Board and agencies to make decisions with consideration of the general public, especially those around the Columbia River. A major issue of concern to him is that the 300 Area be completely cleaned up, not delayed any longer, and that it would be idiotic to bring in more waste. On behalf of Columbia Riverkeeper, he appreciates the work of the Board and hopes that the river remains clean.

Catherine Zangar offered public comment as a citizen, but noted that she is affiliated with Columbia Riverkeeper. She grew up in Richland and is concerned that the plan does not treat the river or desert as a

resource. She primarily hears about making cleanup faster and cheaper, not better. She wants the 300 Area to be usable by people, not just animals. It should not be left contaminated, with open trenches or grouting, or tanks left with waste still in them. She recognizes that such cleanup is not cheap, and emphasized that she does not want cleanup that is practical, she wants what is possible. She observed that the plan sounds like a used car sale – a deal only available today. She does not want cleanup to be done half as well to get twice as fast. The desert is not a wasteland and needs to be treated as valuable land. Further, she is amazed that the federal government is held to different standards than citizens regarding disposal of waste. She summarized by saying that the quality of cleanup should not be sacrificed for lower cost.

Yellow Thunder, representing herself and her cat, commented that she is a resident of the Columbia Gorge. She is very worried about reclassification of dangerous waste as low-level waste, which is a violation of public trust. DOE still needs to cleanup dangerous HLW in cesspools, which is getting into insects that go offsite. It is irresponsible and dangerous not to complete the cleanup of the tanks. Yellow Feather and her friends have asked DOE for years about how to protect people and the environment. The cleanup is a good effort, and she applauds, but it must be finished: the vitrification plant is not yet completed; the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) has not been drained. After studying the history of the nuclear industry, she is concerned about cover-ups and that too much revolves around getting contracts. Yellow Feather grew up next to an experimental reactor and has observed a high rate of many types of diseases in her family and neighbors – breast cancer, thyroid diseases, Grave’s disease, etc. She has chosen not to have children because of the fear of passing along diseases or contaminants that are in her body. She encouraged fast movement forward on cleanup, and the immediate draining of FFTF, to apply those maintenance funds to cleanup.

Molly See submitted public comment via a letter dated June 5, 2002. The text is below:

“Hello, my name is Molly See. My family and I live in White Salmon, Washington. I was born and raised in Hood River, Oregon, and still visit my old family home there. A good many of my relatives live on one or the other side of the Columbia River.

I’m a mother, grandmother, and part of a family business. I’m a writer and former teacher, and have been concerned about Hanford for a very long time. I feel that what the DOE does at Hanford could well have an impact on our lives, our peace of mind, our health, our business concerns, our futures, on down through the years.

I was dismayed to hear that this beautiful and popular part of the world is being proposed to be designated as a Nuclear Sacrifice Zone! I’m glad that hearings and meetings allow people to learn and speak freely about these things. I appreciate your group. I have also appreciated Greg deBruler through the years of many hearings. We are lucky to have him.

I would like to see these things happen:

- 1) That attempts to designate Hanford as a Nuclear Sacrifice Zone be dropped and never brought up again, anywhere.*
- 2) That standards for allowable nuclear contamination not be changed to allow for increased levels of radiation.*
- 3) That no more radioactive waste of any level be transported in any way to Hanford, and that the present contamination be cleaned up.*
- 4) That no changes be made to the full and unencumbered funding of the legal Tri-Party Agreement, a hard-won symbol for many people of the ability and willingness of our politicians and officials to listen to and care for the people, and to set an example, for everyone, of the importance of following the law.”*

Steve White, Columbia Riverkeeper, thanked the Board for coming to Hood River and for all its work. He has worked with Columbia Riverkeeper for a long time. He lives in White Salmon. His involvement with environmental activities is an extension of his spiritual beliefs. He believes the creator gave people the responsibility to protect the air, water, and rocks. He also believes in Margaret Mead's credo that it only takes one or two people to change the face of world. He feels a personal responsibility to be involved in issues that affect the earth. He is concerned that DOE has appeared to back off of a total vitrification process. It is incomprehensible to him that cleanup standards would be lessened to commercial use rather than any use. He is part Native American and believes in seven generations, but the decisions made for Hanford cleanup go far beyond seven generations. The Hanford site is an example of something humans have created where the science got ahead of thinking the whole thing through. He encouraged DOE to return to the earlier cleanup plan and do total cleanup. He thinks everyone, especially Tri-Cities residents, would want the entire Columbia River for any use.

ATTENDEES

HAB Members and Alternates

Mark Beck, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Garianne Gelston, Alternate
Ken Bracken, Member	Gordon Rogers, Member	Dave Johnson, Alternate
Pam Brown, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Bill Kinsella, Alternate
Shelley Cimon, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Robin Klein, Alternate
Jim Curdy, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Member	Richard Leaumont, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Todd Martin, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Kristy Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Sky Bradley, Alternate	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Charles Kilbury, Member	Madeleine Brown, Alternate	Keith Smith, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Al Conklin, Alternate	John Stanfill
Jeff Luke, Member	Norm Dyer, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Wade Ballard, DOE	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Harry Boston, DOE	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
Bryan Foley, DOE	Max Power, Ecology	Nancy Myers, Bechtel
Marla Marvin, DOE	John Price, Ecology	Barbara Wise, Fluor
Yvonne Sherman, DOE	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Peter Bengtson, ORP/PNNL
Steve Wiegman, DOE	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Chris Chamberlain, Nuvotec
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Rodger Burns, EnviroIssues	Bryan Kidder, CH2M Hill
Mike Gearheard, EPA	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues	Mike Goddu, GHJ
Melinda Brown, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Allyn Boldt, Public	Steve Sauter, CRESP	Steve Roney, Columbia Riverkeeper
Les Davenport, Public	John Stang, Tri-City Herald	Yellow Thunder, Public
Wayne Kinney, Sen. Ron Wyden	Ray Smith, Smith Farms	Steve White, Columbia Riverkeeper
Kathleen Luke, Public	Steve Riggs, HIN	Catherine Zanger, Public