



## **Hanford Advisory Board Draft Meeting Summary December 4-5, 1996 Portland, Oregon**

---

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.

**Note:** Attachments are numbered according to the order they are mentioned in the summary. The attachments that were distributed at or before the Hanford Advisory Board meeting are not routinely distributed with this summary. If you need a copy of an attachment, please request it from Colette Casey or Donna Sterba at Technical Resources International, 509-943-1804 or Rosemary Guse at Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc., 509-376-8908.

### **FY'97 Budget Allocations**

Budget allocations from headquarters to DOE-RL were discussed. FY'97 funding shortfalls are anticipated at \$22.6 million for the Hanford site. Measures, such as workscope reductions and deferments, are being explored to meet the funding gap. Issues such as overhead charges and the Project Hanford Management Contract structure were discussed at length by the Board.

### **Institutional Controls**

The Board reviewed draft advice intended to provide guidance to DOE in its application of Institutional Controls at the Hanford site. Issues as to land transfer, end-state and anticipated changes to the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA), resulted in the advice being deferred until the February meeting. Interim actions included closer examination of the MTCA recommendations.

### **Public Comment**

A consortium of local citizens overwhelmingly expressed opposition to the restart of the FFTF and MOX fuel production. The local citizens spoke as individuals and as representatives of numerous organizations.

### **Columbia River Impact Assessment**

The Columbia River Impact Assessment and its role in accurately assessing risk to the river was discussed at length by the Board. The Board identified issues such as Phase II funding, the potential for this to be shared with others in the DOE complex, and potential funding sources for this activity, such as EM-50.

### **Reactors on the River**

Of the eight reactors along the river, one, 105-C was identified as the test model for reactor remediation. 105-C was selected because it posed the greatest safety concern due to a failing roof and its proximity to the river. It also had the lowest dose reading, thus making it a safer alternative for workers. Advice was issued in support of the proposed Interim Safe Storage measures. Support was also identified for funding

this activity out of the EM-50 program.

A second piece of advice was issued regarding the proposed alternatives for decontamination and decommissioning of the facilities in the 100 Area. The preferred alternative selected by the Board was for decontamination and decommissioning and disposal at the Environmental Restoration Disposal (ERDF) facility of the 105-C Reactor.

The N Springs Shoreline was identified as a crucial piece of the 100 Area cleanup. The contamination of strontium and cesium, the geographic location near the river and proximity to cribs discharging contaminants posed a complicated question of remediation. The Board decided to send this issue to the Environmental Restoration committee for further examination and the eventual development of consensus advice.

### **Historic Preservation**

The former system of classifying facilities for historic relevance at Hanford produced additional costs and delays. A new program to streamline the historic process was presented to the Board. The Board issued advice endorsing the new approach. The Board stressed the need for more public involvement throughout the historic process and during the determination of facilities to be included on the National Register.

### **Project Hanford Management Contract**

Baselines, incentive fees, economic diversification and overall savings were discussed regarding the Project Hanford Management Contract (PHMC). The advice from the Board was broken out into two separate pieces due to the importance of each issue.

The first advice addressed economic diversification. Outsourcing, local and regional definitions of contract placement and job creation were the topics of discussion. In addition, the Board requested to have the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Management Plan.

The second piece of advice addressed the need for an integrated baseline, the PHMC structure and issues and concerns over cost savings and efficiencies. The Board also requested attention be given to the rights of the "enterprise" company employees and any private marketing efforts of these companies, not being subsidized by cleanup funds.

### **Emerging Issues**

The Environmental Protection Agency, Washington State Ecology and the Department of Energy presented their reflections of progress and disappointments for 1996, as well as identified the emerging issues of 1997. The consistent theme referenced funding challenges versus the need to meet specific milestones, TWRS privatization and changes in the federal political arena.

### **FY'99 Process and Timeline**

The timeline for the FY'99 budget was outlined. Public Involvement opportunities to comment on the proposed budget will take place in the February to March timeframe. The draft Ten-Year Plan, project baseline summaries and Integrated Priority Lists schedule information was also provided.

### **Updates**

## **National Equity Dialogue**

The plan to establish the National Equity Dialogue is proceeding due to the action of concerned individuals meeting in November of 1996. The League of Women Voters took the action to compile notes and comments from the November meeting into the first draft of a working plan. A second meeting is scheduled for January in St. Louis, Missouri. The National Dialogue will have representation from stakeholders from across the United States. Concern was expressed over the slow progress being made on this project and the absence of representation from the southern states.

## **Tank Waste Remediation Systems**

Concern over budget impacts and privatization were addressed by the Board. Regarding privatization, two issues were consistently identified: (1) the contract structure of the privatization contracts; and, (2) the technologies being used for vitrification. It was identified that these issues will be addressed in the Committee forum.

## **Workforce Restructuring**

Work is currently being done to develop a workforce realignment plan. Potential layoffs could be around 500 or more in 1997. (check yellow book information)

## **TPA Community Relations Plan**

The Community Relations Plan has not yet been signed due to the need to clarify the issues. The M-33 change request is near completion. An updated list of FY'97 activities and an updated Board list will be provided in the January packet to the Board.

---

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.

## **Thursday, December 4, 1996**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Marilyn Reeves, Oregon League of Women Voters, (Public-at-Large Seat). The meeting was open to the public. Four specific public comment periods were provided, two at 11:45 a.m. and two at the end of each day.

Members present are listed in *Attachment 1*, as are members of the public and others attending. Board seats not represented were: Bill Riley, Grant and Franklin Counties (Local Government Interest Seat); Rick Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades Council (Hanford Work Force Seat); Gerald Sorenson, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories (Hanford Work Force Seat); [Add: Jim Cochran, Washington State University (Public-at-Large Seat); Shelly Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon Representative Seat); Rick Leumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental Interests Representative Seat); and Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Interests Representatives)].

## **Announcements Made Throughout the Meeting**

[Items are listed in chronological order, rather than in the order made. Announcements with no dates are listed last.]

Mark Hermanson invited the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) to a presentation on medical isotopes and noted that information on Hanford Tours was located in the blue section of the packet.

Tom Hern, (from where), stated NEPA manager for the Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement (HRA -EIS), stated that the last public comment meeting for HRA-EIS the Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement (HRA -EIS) will be conducted that Wednesday evening in same room as the Board is meeting. He reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Paige Knight, introduced students from the Open Meadow High School who were attending the Board meeting as part of school projects.

Merilyn Reeves stated there might be an eExecutive cCommittee meeting to determine the work load and plan how meetings will be scheduled.

Merilyn added that there is a vacancy on the Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG) for a HAB member. There are three voting member seats and there has not been a complete briefing on the group and their work. The opportunity exists to pull the STCG's decisions into the Board's decisions and discussions.

Dick Belsey said the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee will not be meeting in December and meetings will be changing changed to the second Thursday of the monthmeetings. An evening Environmental Executive Committee Restoration meeting was proposed following the an Environmental Restoration Committee meeting Executive Committee meeting on January 8, 1997.

Max Power, Ecology, will soon have information to the public about the two at-large seats.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1: INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), welcomed everyone to Portland and invited the Board members, alternates, and agency staff to a reception hosted by Oregon HAB representatives on Wednesday evening.

Changes to the agenda included switching the Project Hanford Management Contract (PHMC) (Agenda Item 7) and Historic Preservation (Agenda Item 8). Also, Elaine Hallmark, Confluence Northwest Hallmark Associates, will deliver the 1996 Hanford Advisory Board progress report at 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2: APPROVE SUMMARY FROM NOVEMBER 7-8, 1996 MEETING**

Paige Knight , Oregon Hanford Watch (Regional Citizens, Environmental, and Public Interest Groups), requested her affiliation be corrected to Oregon Hanford Watch as she does not represent the Oregon Waste Board. Mark Hermanson, Duke Engineering (Hanford Work Force), noted several wording changes, including changing the word "deeds" to "records" in the second paragraph on page 8 and changing the word "defined" to "endorsed on the top of page 12. and the principals listed on page 12 are John Wagoner's principals and are endorsed (not defined) by the HAB. Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Technical Council (Public-at-Large), highlighted typographical errors on page 2 where "analysis of" should be changed to "analyze", on page 19 where "lose" should be changed to "loss," and on page 10

where "steam" should be changed to "stern." s for correction as well as an incomplete sentence on page 18. In addition, it was noted that page 18 included an incomplete sentence at the bottom. Marilyn Reeves, Oregon League of Women Voters (Public-at-Large Seat) suggested that the replacement sentence for revisions to page 18 be included in the next packet (*Attachment 2X*) typed and distributed to members.

Madeleine Brown, Fluor Daniel Hanford (Hanford Work Force), noted several changes in name spellings, which include: Robert Caretlla changed to Robert Caretta on page 18, and Laurie Pebole changed to Laurel Piippo and Cathy Leonard changed to Kathy Leonard on page 19. In addition, Aaffiliations for Madeleine Brown and Mark Hermanson isare now PHMC contractors not rather than Westinghouse Hanford Company.

Merilyn requested Board members make the above changes and write the word "final" on their copies of the meeting summary. Revised copies will not be distributed, except in response to specific requests.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: FY'97 BUDGET ALLOCATIONS**

Alice Murphy, CFO, Chief Financial Officer, DOE, discussed presented the preliminary FY'97 budget allocations information (*Attachment 32*) and potential impacts to Hanford. summarized the changes to the FY'97 allocations and their relation to RL and shared specific allocation information. The preliminary allocation figures show Hanford receiving a shortfall in the area of non-defense programs. Funding for Regarding closure projects has not yetfunding, the \$15 million to accelerate cleanup have not been confirmed. for RL. The non-defense side of waste management was reduced \$15 million with RL receiving \$1 million. The non-defense nuclear materials and facilities stabilization program was reduced \$12 million with RL receiving \$7.8 million. Other areas which might receive a reduction in funding include TWRS privatization, spent nuclear fuel, policy and management, and program direction. The total uncostedreduction in allocation was is anticipated to be \$232.8 million. Reductions of \$6 million will potentially directly impact programs. The allocation request was \$1.319 billion and now appears to be \$1.296 billion. In addition, Ssitewide unfunded activities are \$37.5 million., including increases in Ttransition costs, conversions of Westinghouse Hanford Company systems, and uncosted reductions. were more than anticipated (an additional \$1.5 million) and Project Hanford Management Contract (PHMC) overhead impacts are still being analyzed. A proposal on managing overheads is due December 15 from the PHMC. Fluor Daniel Hanford. Specific budget details from the handout were discussed and it was noted that the original allocation was \$1.319 billion and is now \$1.296 billion. This translates to a \$22.6 million reduction of which \$15 million was taken off of privatization and program reductions, resulting in approximately \$6 million affecting programs.

### **Board Discussion**

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest,, (Regional Citizens, Environmental, and Public Interest Groups), expressed concern over potential unfunded activities, such as the HAB, Washington and Oregon Ooversight and the Openness Panel. Alice responded that these activities were budgeted at Headquarters last year, but are now to be funded through the responsibility of Richland Office the Department of Energy - Richland Operations(DOE-RL) to be funded through the programs funds. Richland has committed to funding \$970,000 for the HAB.She referred to items listed in the handout, such as the HAB, as being funded.

Discussion took place regarding the comparison between the old Westinghouse contract versus the PHMC and fee awards. Gerry also expressed concern that given the potential for reduction in funds, the PHMC award fees were not being reduced accordingly. Alice stated that contract negotiations with

Fluor Daniel Hanford have already taken place and scope of work changes are not anticipated.

Paige Knight, Oregon Hanford Watch (Regional Citizens, Environmental, and Public Interest Organizations), expressed concern that the PHMC is not different from the WHC contract because it does not appear that fee awards are based on performance. Alice explained that the contract is 100% performance-based fee and that work being done is cost reimbursable. Gerry asked whether performance measurements are based on TPA milestones the performance measures are not in the TPA milestones. Alice explained responded that the performance-based workplans measurements weare incorporated into the multi-year workplans of in which Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones are included. . George Kyriazis, City of Kennewick (Local Government Interests), expressed his concern that the cost reimbursable and award fees are not being reduced as budget allocations are reduced. Alice stated that if there are significant changes in the amount of work being done, then DOE would renegotiate the amount of fee Fluor Daniel Hanford could earn. It was also noted that if the contractor meets expectations on an item, they receive no fee. However, if they exceed performance measurements, such as schedule, they will get a fee award. If they fall below the performance measurements, then they face losing fee awards.

Gerry reported that the Dollars and Sense Committee had been presented with information which estimated that programs such as TWRS will be impacted by shortfalls in funding and TPA milestones will be impacted. added that there are two parts of the PHMC: a cost reimbursable and the award fee portion. Alice explained that the contract is 100% performance-based fee and that work being done is cost reimbursable. Specific accomplishments, including quality of work, have been identified and costs will be controlled through validated baselines.

Alice responded that Hanford and its contractors are still discussing Nimpacts to programs and milestones. The regulators have been included in these discussions and have been receiving the draft impact statements. The final impact statements will be provided to the Committee,egotiations on baselines are taking place with the contractor and the the Board will have the opportunity to comment on proposed program cuts and allocations before before DOE makes the final decisions are madeon specific TPA milestones. and workscope. It was noted that the practice of holdbacks was eliminated at the request of the field offices. This includes congressional mandated activities which already have been allocated.

Doug Sherwood, Environmental Protection Agency, stated that the agency has not received a formal letter from Headquarters on the final allocation for FY'97. The regulators are interestested in minimizing the impacts to TPA milestones, but will not be making decisions until the final announcement is made. Mike Wilson, Washington Department of Ecology, emphasized that the information being presented on impacts to programs and milestones, such as TWRS, are those being presented by the contractor to make up for additional workscope and budget shortfalls and have not been agreed to by either DOE or the regulators. In response to questions, Alice noted that the practice of holdbacks was eliminated at the request of the field offices. This includes congressionally mandated activities.

Chuck Potter mentioned several performance measures were up for re-negotiation and some TPA milestones may be impacted. He added that the Dollars and Sense Committee would be receiving a copy of Class 1 change on budget. Alice replied that she will look into this matter. Tom Engel, University of Washington (Public-at-Large), said stated it would be in the Board's best interest to develop a strategy to make programs such as TWRS focus on the long-range issues and the "big picture." . This would allow programs to understand the objective of each program and handle budget shortfalls and other issues with that objective in mind. He cited the TWRS program on tank leaks and core sampling as an example.

Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), commented that everything that is happening on the budget is facing a value-based decision. He added that this is not an

engineering decision as there are health and safety indications with these decisions. He noted that it will help the difficulty in making decisions regarding budget impacts if the Board provides advice which states where public values can be applied in setting priorities. It is important for the Board to provide advice when things are uncertain and when the public values can be applied to helping set priorities. The Board discussed the need to see proposals at the earliest time.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS**

Dick Belsey explained that the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee has been working on understanding and preparing draft advice on Institutional Controls since May, 1996 and the draft is considered a "work-in-progress." Ben Floyd has been instrumental in bringing the draft advice forward. The proposed advice contains principles that the TPA agencies should use when developing and implementing cleanup decisions and making land available for other uses, focusing on how institutional controls should be used in those processes. Dick was introduced as the issue manager who provided a conceptual breakthrough by reformatting the information so that the issues are brought out and incorporated into the document. The Board is being asked to provide guidance to the Committee as to whether this advice is complete. Dick anticipates that it will be brought to the Board for final consensus at its February meeting. Dick is missing information and if there are any substantial changes. The Board will come to consensus at the February Board meeting.

#### **Board Discussion**

Barbara Wise, Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL), shared comments from Patrick Willison's, Chief Council for DOE, comment that at this point in time, institutional controls are the planned end state for the 200 Area, contradicting the first point in the draft advice. Dick Belsey commented and responded that the first point is a strong statement that which relates to values and should be included in remain in the advice. It was recommended that there were compatible activities with the Future Site Uses Working Group (FSUWG) that they thought might be cited in the 200 Area. Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Technical Council (Public-At-Large), suggested that it could be acknowledged that the 200 Area is a unique situation.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizens, Environmental, and Public Interest Groups), suggested that the role of institutional controls in interim cleanup decisions should be included in the advice. Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Citizens, Environmental, and Public Interest Groups), reminded the Board that the Yakama Indian Nation states there should be no institutional controls in effect 100 years past closure. Mark Hermanson said he strongly endorses the concept of local governments maintaining property records and would like to integrate the DOE's published codes into information usable by local governments. Dick Belsey noted that it is his understanding that there already is a state law requiring local government to keep property records, however the federal government is exempt from such requirements.

Tom Engel suggested that the third point takes into consideration unique situations, such as the 200 Area, and thus the first point should not be changed. Discussion ensued regarding the 200 Area and the use of institutional controls. Todd Martin recommended adding an exception in the advice for the 200 Area. The similarities to landfill management and the 200 Area were cited. Mary Lou Blazek commented that when administrative or institutional controls are used, it should be in the context of an interim cleanup or work-in-progress and not maintenance and monitoring. Doug Sherwood recommended adding a statement regarding interim cleanup solutions and who would have control over release of the land. He noted that when cleanup is complete, institutional controls may not be needed, but to get there, they could be used in the interim. The final goal is protection of resources.

Greg deBruler added that the Yakama Nation said there should not be any institutional controls 100 years past closure, and as such, identifies "timing." Marilyn Reeves added that at the last meeting, the discussion focused on what can be done now through local governments and records, and also noted that the issue of timing is important.

Mark Hermanson said he strongly endorses the concept in regards to records and laws and would like to integrate the use of, and take advantage of, DOE's charter to publish codes that could integrate the concept into law. Dick noted that it is his understanding that there already is a state law.

Gerry Pollet expressed his concern that he finds the draft advice is inconsistent with the statewide general principles and applications. law in the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). He suggested a statement be added to the advice which states that wherever unrestricted land use is recommended by the Future Site Uses Working Group (FSUWG) or required by state law, DOE should not rely on institutional controls beyond the year 2011. Colette - Louise thinks it is 2011 - can you check the tapes? for areas along the River and 2018 for all other areas. stated: "For no area where FSUWG recommended or state law requires unrestricted use, should DOE seek to rely upon, or regulators approve, institutional controls after the year 2000 on areas along the river and 2018 for the remaining areas." When the remedy is complete, institutional controls are not to be relied upon. Reliable institutional controls are for a limited set of circumstances. In addition, Gerry stated that he does not support providing funds to local government for systems to track property information because no land will be transferred to them in the near future. Gerry also suggested strengthening the advice by adding an additional point which recommends that areas which are transferred to public use with institutional controls in place, should be required to notify public users of potential risks.

Gordon Rogers questioned if regulators have the responsibility for determining when, where, and how institutional controls are used, whether there is a need to change the advice as suggested by Gerry.

Doug Sherwood added responded that cleanup decisions often define what and where institutional controls are necessary. However, how they are applied are usually the decision of the land owner. Randy Smith, Environmental Protection Agency, noted that this advice will provide guidance to the regulators if institutional controls are proposed for interim cleanup actions.

and the local and state governments. Dan Silver agreed to the role of the regulators. Randy Smith noted that care must be given regarding how the contamination is kept in place and said this advice will provide guidance if institutional controls are proposed then or for the interim. Max Power, Washington Department of Ecology, stated that Ecology sees that there can be improvements to how property records are kept track of and that there is a need for local government to be involved. noted that when Ecology did their study on land transfer four or five years ago, they found in federal statute provisions for long-term leases in lieu of transfer. He noted that while land may not be transferred, there is an interim period during which there needs to be a way of tracking and local government may be involved. Ecology is looking at how institutional controls are imposed and tracked. Dick added that tracking information should be made generic and transferable. Dick suggested that the point regarding local governments use of systems to track property records might be eliminated from the advice because it is focusing on details of how policy is implemented, while the rest of the advice focused on what the policy should be.

Marilyn moved that the advice go back to Committee thus eliminating the 9:30 a.m. item from the December 5 agenda.

#### **Action on Institutional Controls:**



Dick will provide Gerry's comments in document form to Ben.

The Board decided this was a "work-in-progress" and sent it back to the Committee for revision.

#### **Action on Agenda Item 4 - Institutional Controls**

Ben Floyd, Benton County Commission (Local Government), provided an overview of changes to the draft advice which incorporates Gerry's concerns: (1) MTCA requirements as they relate to institutional controls have been identified, (2) recognizing the recommendations of the MTCA Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), (3) recognizing the need for local governments to deal with institutional controls and property records, and (4) identifying the 1100 Area as an opportunity to test and implement the principles included in the advice. With these changes, Ben believes that the Board can adopt the advice at this meeting.

Several Board members expressed concern about endorsing the MTCA PAC's recommendations without seeing it first and knowing if they will be implemented. Gerry responded that Ecology has committed to implementing the PAC recommendations. Dan Silver, Washington Department of Ecology, stated that the MTCA PAC has spent a great deal of time over the past 18 months discussing institutional controls, and that the Board should review the recommendations before it adopts its own advice.

After discussion regarding timing of the advice, it was agreed that the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee will review the advice and the MTCA PAC's recommendations and will bring a revised version to the Board for adoption at its February meeting. Gerry Pollet stated that he will be incorporating some of the points presented in the draft advice into a letter from Heart of America Northwest commenting on the HRA-EIS.

#### **FAST FLUX TEST FACILITY (Brief Update) UPDATE**

Lloyd Piper, DOE Acting Deputy Site Manager, provided an update on the FFTF situation the consideration of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) as an option for tritium production. The Secretary is expected to make a decision in December 1998 as to whether the FFTF should be kept as an option. If it is selected as an option, an environmental impact statement will be written and a final decision made in December 1998. , on the option to consider the FFTF for tritium production. In the meantime, there will be an EIS and other opportunities for public comment. A DOE fact sheet on the history and information of on the facility was made available to the Board. (*Attachment 3*) Mike Grainey highlighted called attention to the a position paper from Oregon and a letter from the Governor of Oregon to the Secretary O'Leary opposing the restart of the FFTF.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Merilyn Reeves provided a brief overview of explained to the participants of the public comment period the Board's intent and purpose and emphasized that it does not consider every issue affecting the Hanford site. e. She added that the Board has not received detailed briefings on the FFTF have not taken place and and there are not anyno committees currently addressing the issue.

Lynn Sims, Don't Waste Oregon Council, read testimony in opposition to the restart of the FFTF and said in support of decommissioning of the facility. was overdue. She noted that her organization's goal is to protect the citizens of Oregon from radioactive waste and disasters from nuclear explosions.

Adam Rich inquired asked for information on as to the the air quality around in West Richland and if

hazardous waste will affect the local communities, including Portland. Mark Hermanson responded that the air quality in the Tri-Cities is considered pristine, and as such, adheres to tougher air quality standards. Mike Grainey stated that the State of Oregon is a member of the Board and ensures that Hanford does not cause impacts by air or water on Portland and other parts of Oregon.

Jim Lockhard, a cable access producer in Portland, expressed concern about the ability of the FFTF to safely produce tritium and that restarting the facility would affect the mission of cleaning up the area and returning it to public use. restart, the cleanup of Hanford and returning it to the use of the people. He noted that it is possible that the medical isotopes will only be 30% of the production and the restart is meant for bomb production. The age of the facility is also of concern in making the FFTF safe. He expressed a lack of faith that the leaks and safety can be assured.

Chuck Johnson, Public Education Director for the Columbia Basin Institute, commented that citizen, spoke against the restarting restart of the FFTF and the use of MOX fuel to stabilize plutonium. is not necessary and cited various reasons in opposition of the restart. He didn't think it would stand the scrutiny of Congress, nor get consensus within the region. He formally requested the Board oppose the restart of FFTF and MOX fuel. He noted that it would raise non-proliferation issues.

Skip Mayhock, identified himself as an indigenous person. a Native American, stated his belief that the Hanford site should be cleaned up for future generations, not continued use by the government. He doesn't believe there is any way of cleaning up or protecting something that is already created. He noted in the past there have been discussions about restoration of the land, yet every treaty has been broken. He does not believe the government can do what it is saying and emphasized the need to learn how to clean up for the future generations. It is important to work together to correct these problems.

Russ Farrell, Eastside Democratic Club, spoke against the restart of the FFTF and production of tritium for use in war. explained his personal history. He referred to past and present treatment of whistleblowers. It was promised that Hanford would not hurt the region, but there were releases. Today, the same people saying that FFTF will be safe could be lying.

Raynor Ward, citizen, spoke against the restart of the FFTF and asked that the accident at Chernobyl be remembered when making decisions concerning restarting production at Hanford. commented that there has been a lot of good things said about FFTF and brought up a comparison between the Hanford and Chernobyl. There are a lot of facts that have come out since the accident. The life expectancy has shrunk since the explosion, cancer rates have increased, and general harm to the region has taken place. He believes that at Hanford, we would be using an old reactor which could be an accident waiting to happen.

Mark Brown, Director of Greenpeace in Oregon, spoke against the restart of the FFTF based on the public's desire to see Hanford returned to public use, and not used for weapons production purposes. discussed the following public perception and concerns: (1) the focus needs to be on the cleanup and not starting a new reactor; (2) Hanford being cleaned up to a restricted level when unrestricted is the only standard acceptable; (3) the 45 day comment period on the EIS needs to be extended; (4) there is no safe nuclear production; and, (5) there is not a need for nuclear power in the country today. Medical isotopes are a misnomer for starting up the reactor.

Bill Beiers, citizen, spoke against the restart of the FFTF and the production of tritium. expressed concern about the consideration of restarting FFTF. He noted that we don't have an adequate method of handling the waste that has been created, much less handle the waste that will be created by the FFTF. He inquired as to the example we would be setting for the rest of the world in our efforts to reduce the

amount of this material.

Michael Hunkey, a documentary producer on film producer, Hanford and downwinder issues, stated that unbiased information must be given to the public about the restart of the FFTF before an educated decision can be made. he was not opposed to nuclear technologies, but opposed to the nuclear industry as it has been practiced in the past. Before the FFTF can be restarted, past practices need to be addressed to ensure that the same legacy/practices are not committed again. He expressed concerns over the nuclear industry and government treatment and labeling of whistleblowers and their influencing of information released about itself. No future productions can be tolerated due to these lies, cleanup must be continued. Economic benefits cannot be used to justify the decision.

Everett Antilla, citizen, spoke against the restart of the FFTF and the production of tritium. commented that we "already have enough bombs." He questioned the policy of going after other countries who produce nuclear weapons material, when we are producing tritium. Producing tritium has no rationale world-wide. His conclusion is that a few hundred workers, political figures and corporations are the only ones who will benefit.

Cherri Hostenstein, citizen, spoke for the protection of the environment and against creating more waste for future generations to clean up. the health and safety of the people. She stated that there is a mistaken belief that technology will solve everything and that corporations and leaders do not lie to us when profits are at stake. She reviewed a poster that addressed past beliefs that chemicals such as DDT were safe and its relation to perceptions of safety in the nuclear industry. She expressed concern over creating more waste when we haven't dealt with what exists. She said we need to make a better future for our young.

Bill Mead, Director of Oregon Public Safety Resources Agency, spoke against the restart of the FFTF due to the lack of need for additional sources of tritium noted that his findings (gathered from O'Leary's documents) support that we don't need the MOX facility, should not use FFTF, and should dispose of plutonium by vitrification of waste. He commented that the real issue is one of employment for the Tri-City work force and that is not a reason to start the FFTF..

Paul McAdams, citizen, spoke in favor of continuing the cleanup mission at Hanford and against creating additional waste with the restart of the FFTF. told the Board he has been working with Hanford for many years and protested the startup of the plutonium plant. He expressed concern over creating more waste because they will never be able to clean up the existing contamination. The cleanup should occur so that people can live on the land. If there is an accident at Hanford, the results are dangerous to the entire region. He noted the need to prevent additional deaths.

Lynn Sims, citizen, spoke against the restart of the FFTF and the creation of more hazardous waste. shared her personal comments on the need for employment and the contribution of isotopes to medicine as legitimate concerns, but the hazardous waste generation and danger outweigh the benefits. She opposed the restart of the FFTF and MOX fuel. She added the TPA should not be rewritten for the sake of military production.

## **PROGRESS REPORT**

Elaine Hallmark, Confluence Northwest Hallmark Associates, presented the 1996 Hanford Advisory Board progress report (*Attachment 4*) and introduced the past facilitation team members who were in attendance, Sarah Cloud, Debbie Kauffman and Busse Nutley. and presented the 1996 Hanford Advisory Board progress report. (*Attachment 4*) She noted that while the Board is keeping the focus on

the cleanup at Hanford, they are also participating in an experiment of public participation. Marilyn Reeves thanked the past facilitation team for commented that it was a privilege to work with the team and appreciate their efforts in assistance and services to the Board.

pulling the Board together and creating systems to work out the issues.

#### **AGENDA ITEM # 5: COLUMBIA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Ralph Patt, Oregon Water Resource Department (State of Oregon), presented draft advice prepared by the Environmental Restoration Committee on the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA). This is following up on the presentation made to the Board at its November meeting by the CRCIA steering panel. Thdiscussed the status report presented by the CRCIA Steering Panel. He reviewed the following recommendations in the draft advice includes the following recommendations: (1) coordination with other programsis needed on groundwater strategy and TWRS;, (2) Phase II needs should be fundedfunding;, and, (3) the project should be needs to be elevated to a higher management level within DOE.

Specifics of the Phase II study will include: (1) writing the ROD Record of Decision for pipes in the river; and contaminated river (2)islands with contamination;, and, (3) review the PNNL study looking atbeing done by PNNL that looks at ecological consequences impacts. In addition, upstream plumes need to be included in the study in order to make it more comprehensive. Phase II will also include wWhile the Phase I study looked at immediate dangers and writing the ROD, more needed to be done regarding the plumes upstream in order to have a more comprehensive study. Writing a very detailed methodology on the future risks needs to better understand what needs to be cleaned up and how. to continue because there is an important data gap and a good risk assessment will help understand what needs to be done. The anticipated budget is \$1 million for the next two yearsfirst year. Ralph explained that Phase I work is focused on a Record of Decision for pipes and contaminated islands in the River and a PNNL study of ecological impacts from these current sources. Phase II will also include future impacts from upstream plumes that have not reached the River yet. It will include defining requirements for a risk assessment methodology that looks comprehensively at both current and future risks to better understand what needs to be cleaned up and how. Ralph estimated that Phase II would require \$1 million for the first year.

#### **Board Discussion**

Doug Sherwood commented that he EPA would like to see this study applied beyond environmental restoration. would like a more comprehensive scope. The nNational dDefense Nuclear Facilities Safety bBoard recommended that DOE improve its site-wide assessments, which the CRCIA could help accomplish. The tools needed for this should be well-coordinated among all the different programs. An example of the deficiencies include the current content and inventories of the vadose zone above the groundwater. Twenty out of 700 sites have been characterized in the 200 Area cleanup, so an assessment cannot be completed. There could be a culmination of many different efforts and the CRCIA can be a part of it. Marilyn Reeves questioned what the cost would be of applying a study similar to the CRCIA complex-wide. Doug responded

Funding of the program was discussed and it was noted that some of the activities are covered in existing ER programs. Doug said that some activities are already being funded, but the final cost would have to wait until the CRCIA is finalized. he would have to review the recommendations and understand what portions need to be done to see what the additional costs might be. The possibility of obtaining funding through EM-50, due to the potential complex-wide relevance, was also discussed. Board

members believed this could be a viable option.

Gordon Rogers questioned whether funding for the CRCIA could be obtained from programs such as EM-50. Ralph Patt responded that a representative from PNNL had said that it has funding from EM-50 for some of its studies.

Greg deBruler said stated that over the next two months, the group CRCIA steering panel will be prioritizing the items in the worksopeworkscope items and completing a budget. When that is finalized, the steering panel will be prepared to discuss the full scope of the study with upper managementThe requirements section of the report is comprehensive. Phase II will be refined to address workscope and budget. At that time, the team will brief the upper management. .

Dick Belsey noted that the CRCIA is a good example of a project being started funded and its first step has produceingd something worthwhile in its first phase. However, the full return on of the investment won't will not be realized until additional funding and phases steps are taken completed.

Merilyn Reeves recommended suggested that the advice reference the National Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's recommendation, the applicability of Phase II work to other sites, and include something thea potential for funding from about sources other than HanfordEM-50 funding. Greg commented that they would prefer not to attach it to EM-50.

#### Action on Agenda Item 5 - Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA)

On Thursday, Louise Dressen outlined changes made to the advice based on the Board's discussion. After further discussion on specific wording, the advice, as revised, as was adopted. It is Consensus Advice #?61.

#### **Board Action:**

Ralph took the lead to write the advice with assistance from Doug.

#### **AGENDA ITEM # 6: REACTORS ON THE RIVER**

Ralph Patt distributed a background paper on the the Iinterim Ssafe Sstorage (ISS) of the reactors ofn the rRiver background paper ((*Attachment 5*) on the history . of As presented to the Board in November, the TPA agencies are beginning negotiations on this issue. The background paper includes four major issues discussed by the Environmental Restoration Committee, including interim safe storage concerns, schedule for final disposition, method of final disposition, and inclusion of N Reactor in the negotiations. Based on the Committee's concerns, draft advice has been prepared for consideration by the Board.

the EIS. Items included: (1) deactivation of the eight reactors at the site; (2) the ROD; (3) the five actions considered; (4) the preferred alternative; (5)current proposal; (6) current TPA discussions; and, (7) the committee member issues that have come up on ISS.

Roger Stanley, Washington Department of Ecology, provided an update on the status of the negotiations. The TPA agencies have been updating cost, exposure risks, environmental risk, and other types of information. In addition, the Environmental Restoration Committee has been reviewing the Agreement in Principle (AIP), which is included referenced in the advice being presented today. Once that advice is adopted by the Board, the AIP will be finalized within the next few weeks. and added

work being done in light of the ROD includes: (1) updated cost information; (2) current state of knowledge of exposure and overall environmental risk; (3) ER program baseline; and, (4) disposition of EM budgets. He said they have been working with ER on the Agreement-In-Principle that will be finalized next week and will then begin negotiations. Roger eHe expressed an interest in accelerating the work on the actual negotiations before the end of the year.

Ralph Patt clarified that the first piece of draft advice being presented is on the interim safe storage of the 105-C Reactor only ISS. The A second related piece of draft advice being presented on this subject is endorsing is endorsing the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the 100 Area's preferred alternative of for the decontamination and , demolition of facilities , and disposal of facilities at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).

Ralph Patt also presented an update on the N Springs which are contaminated due to cobalt and strontium strontium leaking from two cribs (1301-N and 1325-N) in close proximity to the river (*Attachment 6*). Strontium was entering the river at levels above drinking water standards,. however pPump and treat methods, which were implemented and which have been successful, are not removing the contamination quickly enough. Thus, the TPA agencies are looking at alternative technologies. The present situation is that the strontium is being stopped and is no longer entering the river. The combined need for combination of groundwater groundwater and surface cleanup causes make choosing an alternative remediation technology difficult. Ralph said the Environmental Restoration Committee will consider this further at the January meeting.

Doug Sherwood added the fact that strontium is highly sorbed on the soils presents a unique risk situation at the Hanford site. Dick Belsey stated that the creeks cribs in the area are constantly recharging the plume so cleanup efforts have had to focus on source control.

## **Board Discussion**

Gordon Rogers reviewed the advice with the Board. Marilyn Reeves questioned whether the draft advice on the interim safe storage of the 105-C Reactor is addressing an emergency situation. It was discussed noted that the 105-C Reactor is the first reactor to be addressed due to the fact that of all the reactors, it has the lowest radioactive dose associated with it, of all the reactors and and it is the least costly to test new methods of storage. Marilyn also questioned whether there were available Environmental Restoration (ER) program funds available for this work. Doug Sherwood responded that there is approximately \$11 million from EM-50 in addition to some ER funding. safety issues and it is the least costly to do testing. In addition, remediated waste has already been taken out of the B/C areas and this fits in with work being done now. The C Reactor budget is approximately \$11 million from EM-50 plus additional ER funding. Getting the work accomplished in 1997, is a concern, not availability of funds, is the concern. The only concern is getting the work done this year.

## **100 AREA DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING**

Marilyn asked whether the decontamination and decommissioning activities in the 100 Area will take place in 1997. Doug responded that the majority of the work is scheduled for 1997, but some activities may carrying into 1999.

Marilyn asked whether there was funding available for FY'97 activities at the N Springs. Doug stated that the FY'97 work is to get through the decision-making process and look for funding in FY'98 to move into the remediation process. Ralph Patt added that he now understands that there is no funding available in FY'97 to do vadose zone characterization beyond spectragamma gamma spectros, contrary

to the Board's advice from the November meeting which recommended additional characterization be carried out. Lloyd Piper added that the vadose zone characterization work is still being discussed with Fluor Daniel Hanford and there has not been a final decision has not been made.

Norma Jean Germond, Oregon League of Women Voters (Public-at-Large), questioned how many cribs along all of the reactors remain to be cleaned up. Doug Sherwood responded that he believes there are 37 liquid waste sites. EPA will be issuing an ROD addendum which will raise that number to 71. The addendum maintains the same cleanup standards as previously written, but applies them to a wider number of sites. It will cover all the liquid disposal sites except the N Reactor.

### **Action on Agenda Item 6 - Reactors on the River**

Changes to the 105-C Reactor interim safe storage advice, include including subheadings for clarification and the addition of acronyms in the titles, were described. After further discussion on specific wording, the advice, as revised, was adopted. It is Consensus Advice #58.

There were no changes to the 100 Area decontamination and decommissioning program advice since the Board's discussion. The advice was adopted. It is Consensus Advice #60

### **AGENDA ITEM 7: PROJECT HANFORD MANAGEMENT CONTRACT**

Mark Hermanson introduced two pieces of draft advice concerning the Project Hanford Management Contract (PPHMC). One focuses on the effectiveness of the PHMC in accomplishing its goals for the site and the other on the PHMC commitment to economic diversity and increased outsourcing within the local and regional areas. The two pieces of draft advice expound expand on the Board's advice adopted in November which listed issues and concerns the Board had with the PHMC. Specific issues addressed in the first piece of advice include: (1) cost saving incentives based on updated and independently validated baselines, (2) establishment of stable baselines, (3) incentive fees based on overall cost savings, (4) review of performance objectives to ensure that regulatory requirements are being included, (5) appropriateness of transition costs, and (6) protection of workers as they move to enterprise companies.

At this time, the Board was presented with a response from DOE to its Consensus Advice #55 adopted at its November meeting which addressed the Board's issues and concerns on the PHMC.

### **Board Discussion**

George Kyriazis expressed concern over the length of the draft advice concerning the PHMC. The significant issue for him is the presence of some incentive for reduced costs at Hanford, above and beyond the award fee. Marilyn Reeves suggested comparing the proposed advice to Consensus Advice #55 and the response received from DOE to ensure that no duplication is occurring. Mark Hermanson stated that the Committee had discussed the potential for duplication of advice, but had decided that there is some benefit to reiterating the Board's position.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), raised a concern regarding the lack of time Board members have to discuss this piece of advice with the constituents they represent. She would like to request that advice coming from all committees be circulated among Board members in with enough time for them to properly review and comment. Gordon Rogers expressed concern that portions of the advice, such as requesting validation of baselines, are examples of micromanagement and is something the Board has tried to avoid. Alice Murphy added that there are project baselines which are in the

process of being validated.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), expressed concern that the advice is suggesting changes to the PHMC which, to his understanding, has already been signed. Chuck Potter, Benton Franklin Regional Governmental Agency (Local Citizen and Governmental Interests), acknowledged Pam's earlier concern and stressed the importance of the Board's involvement in issues such as the PHMC. It serves to underline the Board's continued interest in the contract, even after it has been signed. Gerry Pollet noted this advice could also serve as an educational piece for the public and media, who are asking if anyone is looking at this new type of contract. It will show the public that someone has critically evaluated the PHMC. Gerry also acknowledged Pam's earlier concern.

Norma Jean Germond suggested that adequate training and safety for employees in the privatized and enterprise companies should be stressed in the advice. Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Citizens, Environmental, and Public Interest Groups), suggested adding a concern about the increased transition costs which could arise from prime subcontractors being changed in two years, when their contracts with Fluor Daniel Hanford are renewed. George responded to Harold's earlier statement by saying that Board advice which suggests changes to an already signed PHMC should not be stopped; DOE should be open to the possibility of having to change parts of the contract.

Alice Murphy added that DOE is trying to move towards fixed price contracting which requires a specific workscope. Two new items in this contract which assists in monitoring costs include invoice reviews for reasonable costs and DCAA audits of all contractors. Doug Sherwood noted that it is his understanding that costs are going up and thus DOE needs to watch the baselines closely and ensure that workscope is achieving cleanup goals. Alice also added, in reference to the draft advice addressing economic diversity, DOE does have an agreement with Fluor Daniel Hanford that jobs being transitioned to enterprise companies do not count towards the creation of 3000 new jobs for the area.

Pam ask Alice how specific DOE has been with Fluor Daniel Hanford in regard to the types of jobs which will be counted towards the creation of 3000 new jobs in the area. Alice responded that the definitions are still in the process of being finalized. Mark added that he understood that the 60% manufacturing jobs requirement had been changed to say that Fluor Daniel Hanford must demonstrate that the jobs are tied to the Tri-Cities area. Chuck stated that in the past efforts to commit to regional and local preferences for economic development have failed because it was in conflict with federal procurement laws. Alice responded that last year was the first year Hanford was able to get a local preference policy from Headquarters.

### **Action on Agenda Item 7 - Project Hanford Management Contract**

Mark Hermanson reviewed the two pieces of advice on PHMC which incorporated the comments and suggested changes from the Board's discussion. After further discussion on specific wording, the advice, as revised, was adopted. It is Consensus Advice #62.

The Board reviewed the advice concerning economic diversity. After further discussion on specific wording, the advice, as revised, was adopted. It is Consensus Advice #59.

Ralph Patt reviewed the draft advice and shared the ER Committee recommendation to use Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDEF) for the F Area facilities. The work is scheduled for FY'97 with the possibility for carry-over into 1998 with one reactor (Louise?) possibly being carried over into 1999. Uncertainty exists for funding of one of the facilities, as there might be a delay with 108 F, but the rest are all on schedule. The Board agreed to discuss this advice further and any comments



may be given to Ralph.

## **UPDATE ON N SPRINGS**

Ralph Patt explained that the N Springs are a result of contamination coming out of two cribs (1301-N and 1325-N). (*Attachment 6*) The TPA is considering approaches to deal with the cobalt and strontium (Sr-90) contamination. Sr-90 was getting into the river at levels above drinking water standards. Pump and treat was implemented and has been successful in keeping the strontium from going into the river. However, it will be a long time before pump and treat will completely remove the strontium thus the TPA is looking at alternate technologies. A variety of options are being considered, but due to the proximity to the surface, there is a combination of groundwater and surface cleanup resulting in some difficulty in choosing what alternatives will be considered.

## **Board Discussion**

Doug Sherwood stated that the N Springs is unique on this site and noted that the usual environmental concern is contamination getting into the river. In this instance, cobalt is highly absorbed in the soils where Sr-90 seeps out of groundwater discharges. There are concentrations in the soil that represent risk. Other alternatives need to be looked at for remediation. Ralph added that this is a major issue concerning cleanup along the shoreline and cribs and recommended bringing draft advice back in the spring.

Dick Belsey commented that the cribs are part of the system that are continually recharging and need to be dealt with as a whole. The Corrective Measures Study will be coming out this month which will lead to the preferred alternative in the spring. Also, a proposed plan for N Springs will be available this year.

Merilyn Reeves inquired as to the funding for FY'97. Doug explained that they hope to get through the decision-making process this year and any remaining money will be used for remediation next year. The goal is to deactivate the N Reactor plant, as it was supposed to be finished this year. The Board recommended characterization, drilling, and looking at techniques for the vadose zone. Lloyd Piper explained that this is one of the workscope items being discussed with FDH and a final determination has not been made.

## **AGENDA ITEM # 8: HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

Pam Brown explained a decision was made in the Health, Safety, and Waste Management cCommittee to develop two separate pieces of advice, with the first focusing on preservation of the historic structures, while archeological issues will be discussed at a later date. She commented that DOE has been very innovative on this project. She explained that the The entire Hanford site with 2,200 buildings, was previously considered a historic place worthy of preservation, which was a costly effort and slowing cleanupbut with 2,200 buildings. , DOE and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) have reached an agreement for streamlining this process. Three facilities (B Reactor, T Plant and the 313 building) which are representative have been designated as representative of the facilities around the site. have been designated as historic sites. it became costly and slows cleanup. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has commented that the unique arrangement reached with DOE is receiving national attention and getting a favorable reaction. Three facilities (B Reactor, T Plant and the 313 building) which are representative of the facilities around the site and have been designated as historic sites. These facilities will receive a full review and their relation to the Manhattan project will be identified. She explained the different types of reviews and noted this was much more succinct. In this The draft advice, DOE is being congratulateds DOE on its innovative work with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and National Historic Agency (NHA)Preservation Act. She reiterated that

they don't want to see a lot of money spent or a slow down of the cleanup.

Jim Rasmussen, DOE, Director of Environmental Insurance and Permits, provided the background information regarding the on the streamlined process created to ensure that Native American, cultural, and historical resources on the Hanford site are being properly preserved and cared for (*Attachment 7*). The National Historic Preservation Act, which requires a review of the projects that have an effect on Native American, cultural, and historical resources, added to cost and time of projects. Tom Marceau, Bechtel, who works with the historic district created on the Hanford site, said that. organized the streamlined strategy for historic buildings, explained the history of the Hanford buildings and the past and current historic process. In contrast to a project-by-project, building-by-building study of the entire site, He noted that the new process focuses on representative buildings of an historic district that which take into account contributed to a historic event. Tom's The established task group negotiated with the SHPO to exclude temporary structures and focus only on the Manhattan Project and Cold War era related facilities. It is estimated that this approach will save over \$20 million due to a smaller area being included in an historic district, less paperwork, and better coordination with cleanup activities so that cleanup is not slowed down. The Historic District was outlined and sites were selected by going through a building-by-building review.

### **Board Discussion**

Pam and Madeleine Brown expressed concern that more people wanted be involved in the process. This advice stated that the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee was concerned about the lack of public involvement in the process of selecting sites. This potentially left out expertise and information that members of the public who worked on the site at its inception could bring to the process. addresses that need so the public can add their expertise. Pam inquired as to how the historic determinations will be made. Jim stated that there will be an evaluation panel which will be looking for public involvement in deciding what buildings are appropriate to preserve. Madeleine Brown suggested that remedial public involvement take place whitto enablech historians in the community to provide their expertise. a curation strategy in which a public involvement opportunity exists: what should stay; sitewide mitigation plan; and, developing community-based strategies for using the buildings. The final report will include recommendations to DOE for adaptive and future use of these properties. Madeleine also recommended the SHPO should be receive the Board's on advice distribution.

Betty Tabbutt suggested that the tribes should also be involved in the selection of historic buildings. Tribal relations with relation to lack of early involvement were discussed. Tom explained noted that the tribes wearere involved in a parallel effort going on for the traditional preservation of cultural properties and facilities.

Charlesuck Potter and Harold Heacock questioned suggested that whether or not the tremendous volume of available record and non-record historic material will should be identified, cataloged, and placed in locations which are accessible by the public. was taken into consideration. Charles noted that Michelle Gerber, FDH, has produced a lot of documentary material. Tom stated that she is a member of the project team and her work is considered complementary to their efforts.

George Kyriazis asked what type of work the \$2 million cost estimate will fund. Tom Marceau responded that it will cover participation of documentation and also cover mitigation costs. Cost reductions with reference to reduced paperwork and actual mitigation was discussed. Each individual program will determine how much their the facilities (including documentation) will cost. The focus for mitigation will be on 180 buildings, for mitigation, but the final number how many will be used will depend on the public involvement comments. Jim stated that there is \$450,000 to start this process in FY'97.

### **Action on Agenda Item 8 - Historic Preservation**

Pam Brown summarized the changes made to the draft advice and reiterated that advice on cultural and archeological issues will be deferred until a later date. George Kyriazis expressed concern about the cost of this effort as this advice which supports listing buildings on the national registry, but does not address the cost of preparing the facilities. Pam responded that this effort is not preserving the facilities, but instead, is documenting the historic significance of the facility.

After further discussion on specific wording, the advice, as revised, was adopted. It is Consensus Advice #57.

Merilyn stated that this advice will be discussed tomorrow.

### **AGENDA ITEM # 7 PROJECT HANFORD MANAGEMENT CONTRACT**

Mark Hermanson described the development process behind the two draft PHMC consensus advice that include: (1) characterizing the concerns published at the last Board meeting; (2) cost saving incentives; (3) establishment of the baseline; (4) the incentive fees guaranteed to the contractor; and, (5) validity of assessing the proposed savings as they are volatile and still moving. Concern was expressed that the majority of the PHMC is subcontracted which could result in higher than expected transition costs.

Discussion ensued regarding the previous contract and fee structure, streamlining the advice language, and the potential for redundancy with advice #55. Merilyn Reeves suggested checking to see if this could be in addition to advice #55. It was explained that the advice is a reiteration of the Board position.

Various comments from the Board included procedural concerns over receiving this information at a meeting and then being asked for a response. Concerns were also raised regarding the validation methods of the baselines and Alice Murphy noted that validation is going on in the project and there are project baselines but not an integrated baseline.

Harold Heacock expressed concern over several comments relating to changes to the FDH contract which is signed and in place. He posed the question as to if there were any provisions or suggestions to change the actual structure of the contract.

Gerry noted this advice could serve an educational purpose and noted this is valuable information to the public and media. He explained that this will let people know that someone has looked at the PHMC and its pluses and minuses. He noted that it would be news that the PHMC does not include an overall cost saving initiative and did not commit to reducing costs by \$1 billion over the next five years.

Discussion took place regarding health monitoring at Hanford. Norma Jean Germond expressed concern over adequate training and safety for employees in the privatized and enterprise companies. Many members of the Board agreed that health and safety monitoring is the most important portion of the advice.

Concern was expressed over transition costs associated with turnover of subcontractors in two to three years and overall competition was discussed by various Board members. Jerry Peltier noted that Hanford has been in transition for eight years because of the WHC extensions and expressed concern that there are similar problems between Rocky Flats and Hanford due to the number of contractors. He noted that a letter from John Wagoner identifies cost and schedule baseline as a problem and added that the planning process is fluid making it difficult for contractor accountability. Todd Martin added that one of the

reasons there is not a firm baseline is because contractors change frequently which also makes the evaluation process difficult.

Doug Sherwood described the earlier contractor transition in the ER program. In reference to the PHMC, he noted that it is his understanding that costs are going up and the contractor is having to comment on baseline changes. He added that DOE needs to watch the baselines closely, and make sure work scope is moving closer to the goals.

Mark Hermanson summarized the comments of the advice: (1) the issue under cost savings needs to be more objective; (2) streamline the second paragraph; (3) formal controls need to be used on baseline changes; (4) address safety and health training and bring health monitoring into perspective; and, (5) stabilization of the baseline throughout all contractors.

Merilyn noted that there is national interest in what the Board is saying with this advice and to the extent possible, repeat the sentences from advice #55.

### **Advice on Economic Transition**

Alice Murphy commented that three things are being done with regards to the baseline: (1) DC8 (Louise?) auditors will review the baseline; (2) there are invoice reviews in which costs are examined; and, (3) there is an agreement with FDH that states jobs being transitioned to the enterprise companies do not count against the 3,000 new jobs. Pam Brown and others discussed manufacturing jobs and the need to identify jobs that have a tie to the Tri-Cities. Alice noted that the goals associated with outsourcing for the PHMC include 50% of the budget will be outsourced by 2001 and of that a large portion of what is outsourced will go to local, regional and Native American businesses. She added that job definitions are being discussed.

### **Action on PHMC:**

Incorporate comments into the two pieces of advice for review tomorrow.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ken Ferguson, Greenpeace, expressed support for the shutdown of the FFTF for safety-related issues and spoke against restocking the nation's tritium supply because he feels that it is not safe. He added that funding this program will divert funds away from the cleanup. The main priority should be to make the site as safe as possible and not the re-supply of the national weapon stockpile.

Lynn Sims expressed concern over the information being provided to potential manipulation of the public the public and media by the FFTF supporters. She added we are moving into the international market of plutonium production and worried about privatization of the FFTF. She noted this needs to be discussed on a nationwide basis not just by the lobbyists. She added that MOX fuel production is the worst of all possible technologies as it is the most expensive, hazardous, and dangerous. George Kyriazis commented on risk versus benefit and noted the overall benefit of isotopes is to save lives. She also expressed concern about MOX fuel production.

### **FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1996 - AGENDA ITEM #9: EMERGING ISSUES IN FY'97**

### **Ecology Perspective**

Dan Silver, Assistant Director of Waste Management, Washington Department of Ecology, talked about the progress and accomplishments the accomplishments and progress made in of 1996, both for the Board and the Hanford site. He stated that relations have improved greatly between Ecology and, especially with DOE and its contractors and noted that confidence is higher than it has ever been, but it can still be improved. He has also been pleased that Headquarters and other players in Washington, D.C, have been much more attentive to the sites. The Board has emerged to at the national level and has become to become a powerful force and an actual institution.

He commended the site ongoing ER work, the "de-listing" of the 1100 Area from the National Priorities List superfund, and progress on budget and cost savings. He also listed specific examples of progress at Hanford. The Board, Randy Smith, and Doug Sherwood were commended for their work on budgets. Accomplishments include: (1) resolution of safety concerns over ferrocyanide; (2) start of the cross-site pipeline; (3) signed privatization contracts; and, (4) characterization of waste in 40 tanks.

Dan went on to express extreme concern about characterization for FY'97 hoped the Board will become involved in characterization. He noted expressed his opinion that the Board missed an opportunity in 1996 to work with the new PHMC when to determine it was instigated to determine how the new contract system could be made to work when it was instigated. Dan has asked Ecology staff to focus on the TWRS privatization program and within that effort, the agency wrote six success measures for the program and shared them with DOE. DOE and its contractors agreed to the success measures, however, not all have been met. Ecology remains concerned about characterization being unfunded in 1997. He was dissatisfied that some of the six success measures written and agreed to by DOE and WHC, haven't happened yet. Additional Other concerns included the failure to retrieve waste from C-106 and the failure to reach that an agreement has not been reached on on the critical path for integration of cost and schedule of the TWRS program. Ecology will remain skeptical about the overall TWRS privatization and involved in the process as technologies are tested it continues.

Dan He discussed the privatization program and commented that the technologies are high risk. He committed to making privatization work from a regulatory point of view, but remains concerned about the finances for the project. He has no confidence in the procurement of privatization and doubts whether resources can pay for the expensive vitrification.

He went on to discuss emerging issues. He noted that four enforcement actions, two of which resulted in fines, were issued by Ecology in 1996. due to the number of fines, Ecology does not see DOE and its contractors performing are not performing waste management activities in an excellent manner. He stated that the new New contractors will be held accountable to the laws of this state or they will pay the penalty. He expressed concern over the scrutiny of the Hanford budget by Congress and recommended that there needs to be a political strategy to deal with it. Another issue is the fear that the Board is successful only when they the it and the regulating agencies work together. work together. Dan He discussed geographic divisions and issues and said there needs to be debate, but cautioned against that some issues differences could polarizing the Board, but it should remain focused and united on issues directly related to resulting in danger to the the cleanup of the site.

Randy Smith, Director of Hazardous Waste, EPA, noted that 1996 was an excellent year in the area of environmental restoration. Topics for FY'97 include: (1) determining what areas of budget development can be most effectively used to impact priorities, (2) negotiations on reactor disposition, (3) land use planning, (4) spent fuel negotiations, have remaining technical questions, and the tension between focusing on managing the fuel and managing the waste in the basins, and (5) the Ten-Year Plan.

Randy summarized the big picture issue for the Hanford site is a cost savings and efficiency. Progress has been made in ER with reductions in the estimated cost of cleanup. However, he noted that while

there have been ER budget cuts that with which EPA has not been happy with, they saw DOE and the contractors work together to complete tasks. The Board can help in the area of cost by determining how progress can be measured and applying comparison logic between what is going on at Hanford and at other sites. He observed that the challenge of the Board is balancing the "big picture" role versus a more micromanagement role.

Lloyd Piper summarized the major tasks for FY'97 as including: (1) budget planning and workscope and the impact on the Ten Year Plan TYP and FY'98, (2) TYP Ten Year Plan and the National Dialogue, (3) the possibility of FFTF being included in the options for tritium production, (4) beginning the openness panel in a reasonable time, budget, and approach, (5) determining the scope, cost and priority of the CRCIA versus cleanup activities, (6) the reuse of canyons and correct disposal of waste at ERDF, (7) re-competition of occupational health medicine contract, (8) determining where reasonable risks can be taken in the area of technology deployment, and (9) simplification of planning and baseline approaches.

Lloyd also reviewed 1996 activities. These included publishing a first draft of the Safety Analysis Report for TWRS, curtailment of radiological activities at the N Reactor, and halting slowing of other activities to ensure that all safety concerns are being met. He also stated that with the PHMC contract team, DOE taking a new look at how things are done. He commented that although the PHMC transition is a challenge, it can be beneficial as more efficient methods of doing cleanup are implemented.

### **Board Discussion**

George Kyriazis thanked Dan Silver for his continued honest appraisal of the Board's activities and the situation at Hanford. However, the Board's involvement in the PHMC was what it should have been. stated that he did not agree with Dan's perception on the PHMC comment opportunity . Dan reiterated that he didn't does not think the Board went far enough to support DOE in its drive for change. Pam Brown commented that the need to stay focused on the budget is an important issue for the Board as well as developing an overall as the political political strategy to ensure that cleanup programs continue to be funded.

. Gordon Rogers stated that, in relation to discussions on the potential restart of the FFTF, that on a the national level there is no competition between the on overall budget budget for the cleanup mission and the budget for with regards to tritium production. The Board and public discussing the issue should remember that it won't take money directly away from Hanford. It may affect cleanup dollars on a nationwide level, but won't directly take away money from Hanford.

Dan suggested that Tthe FFTF was discussed as the latest issue where there are Board differences. Comments wereis an example of an issue where made that there needs to be a scheme on there needs to be an plan for how the Board the Board that leaves emotions out of the debate and addresses only areas where agreement can be reached. common area.

Tom Engel expressed concern about how the Board we gives advice, the level of effort that at which the Board operates, and whether the major players can respond appropriately to the suggestions from the Board. He cited examples of advice given and the rate of associated progress. He recommended a major focus of the Board should be to determine how to see how these programs fit into the strategic planning thinking and if it is reflected they are reflected in the budget.

Dan concurred that progress has not been good enough on the site. However, he is impressed by some of the things with the new contractors. He added that there is a lot of room for improvement and acknowledged managers who are pushing for accountability.

## **EPA Perspective**

Randy Smith described EPA's perspective on issues from the previous year, primarily in ER, and said 1996 was a banner year. He cited examples of the "soils on the river" and "contamination placement" activities that came into being this year. New topics for FY'97 include: (1) the budget. He highlighted that the group review with RL on budgets has been innovative; (2) Reactor disposition. This difficult issue will involve negotiations with updates from the agencies regarding where the Board has a choice to comment. (3) HRA-EIS and CLUP. In terms of the EIS, DOE clarifications during the last several weeks helped EPA to open up the public process. The Board should be involved in the coming year. (4) Spent fuel negotiations (K Basin). Negotiations have been suspended until FY'97. In addition to technical questions, there is a tension between focusing on managing the fuel, waste in the basins and contamination. EPA is not comfortable with this issue. (5) Ten-Year Plan (TYP) This is separate from the budget and the Board will be addressing this issue.

He noted that the big picture is the cost and efficiency issue. Much progress has been made in ER with reductions in the estimated cost of cleanup. He noted that while there have been ER budget cuts that EPA was not happy with, they saw DOE and the contractors work together to complete the tasks. He discussed the new contract structure and said it may or may not produce the incentives. The Board can help by applying comparison logic between what is going on at the site and in other places, and if the Board is doing all that they can do. He observed that the challenge to the Board is balancing the "big picture" role versus the micromanagement and influencing role.

## **Board Discussion**

General comments from the Board were in agreement with EPA and Ecology's presentation. Responses were consistent in the need for a "big picture" strategic approach and staying focused on issues were mentioned.

Jerry Peltier discussed contractor changes, manager employee ratio's and commented that the new contractors are trying to reevaluate the goal and ensure the process will most effectively reach that goal. He noted that several reviews are being conducted and there is priority on the development of baselines and staffing plans. He asked the Board for patience until it is resolved and added that he doesn't see the contractors moving forward until they know what the baseline is developed.

Dick Belsey stated that while many of the issues facing the Board are complex, the Board needs to continue translating technical information into that which can be understood by the public. The other important role the Board plays is commented that this Board is "applied democracy" and that issues faced by the Board are complex. Most important is mortgage reduction which remains a complicated technical area, but the Board needs to translate the information to make it understandable. He stated that the Board needs to avoid failure and helping DOE understand the risks, as they it did with the tanks and M&I contract.

Mark Hermanson expressed appreciation for Dan and Randy's comments and the comments provided by the agencies and suggested the minutes reflect the lists of emerging issues. Those lists can be used by the Board in the development of its workplan for 1997. and possibly break out the information and give to the Board for the development of their workplan.

DOE Perspective In addition, with regard to the PHMC, the Board did try to influence the Request for Proposals, but became frustrated in trying to persuade DOE to take the Board's view into account.

George questioned whether there is a process in place for having technologies transferred to Hanford for use by the site. Lloyd Piper responded to Tom Engel's comments and stated that the cost of TWRS is another form of mortgage reduction and does not believe that the manager ratio discussed was accurate. He noted that DOE is looking at what will be happening in light of the current elections. He commended Dan Silver's excellent contribution to the Board and DOE.

The major tasks for FY'97 include: (1) budget planning and workscope and the impact on FY'98 and FY'99; (2) TYP and National Dialogue; (3) the possibility of FFTF being included in the options for tritium production; (4) position the openness panel in a reasonable fashion, time, budget and approach; (5) the scope, cost and priority of the CRCIA versus cleanup; (6) the reuse of canyons and the correct disposal of waste at ERDF; (7) re-competition of the occupational health medicine contract; (8) technology deployment into the projects - the Board may be needed to identify where reasonable risks can be taken; and, (9) simplification of planning and baseline approaches.

He reviewed 1996 activities and noted that the first draft of the Safety Analysis Report is complete. They are trying to get through 1996 operational curtailments in FY'97. Safety related issues in ER, spent fuel and PFP resulted in curtailments. Essentially, it is really project oriented and they are trying to get DOE and contractors committed to optimistic schedules. However, he personally prefers an aggressive schedule but recognizes issues need to be addressed as they are identified. He commented that the new contractor brought in new contractors which has resulted in DOE taking a new look at how things are done. He commented that although the PHMC transition is a challenge, it should be beneficial. He also added that just because the subs can be re-bid it doesn't mean it will happen, but it provides incentive to the contractors.

### **Board Discussion**

Board members discussed the processes for technology transfer. Lloyd commented responded that they DOE and its contractors are trying to identify given technologies that many be needed in conjunction with project baselines so they will be ready to bid on a project at the proper time with the most current information.

Merilyn Reeves challenged the group to think about emerging issues with reference to the Board and noted that the Board has not been successful in the past in developing a work plans. She highlighted Dan Silver's measures of success indicators and asked the Board to think of some indicators of success that can be revisited by the Board a year from now. at the end of the year.

### **AGENDA ITEM #10: FY'99 BUDGET PROCESS AND TIMELINE**

Alice Murphy distributed Hanford's Strategic Plan to the Board (*Attachment 8 10*). She stated that it is discussed the strategic plan as a top level planning document that identifies Hanford initiatives, vision, and provides a planning basis for making decisions at the site. (*Attachment 10*) She also explained that it addresses the science and technology goals, environmental management strategies, how the establishes mission and mission and technical guidance, provides a life cycle view of the Ten Year Plan, updates the decisions decisions made under CERCLA and NEPA, and provides technical guidance for baseline development. and what needs to be done at Hanford. The strategic plan will be used to establish mission and technical guidance. The strategic plan provides a life cycle view that frames the ten year planning window, updates of the formal decisions made under CERCLA/NEPA, and provides technical guidance for baseline development. The TYP accelerates progress within the ten-year window, enhances integration across the DOE site, and aims to maintain a stable funding level. Discussions are ongoing on the development of the FY'99 budget and the TYP.



Alice reviewed the timeline distributed to the Board which outlines the anticipated dates for the FY'99 budget process. She reviewed the timeline for the FY'99 budget process and discussed items such as budget targets and priority lists. (*Attachment 9*).

### **Board Discussion**

Dick Belsey asked if there were uncertainties in the budget process due to a new Secretary being appointed. Alice responded that there will be some changes in the timeline. Gerry Pollet questioned when the deadline was for the Board to prepare advice on the FY'99 budget. Alice agreed that the Board should plan on giving advice after the beginning of March, and Alice clarified the dates for the public comment period and stated that by February 14th there should be a draft TYP and Integrated Priority List (IPL). The best time for stakeholder input will be in late February or early March.

Gerry noted that the Board has issued three pieces of advice objecting to the issuance of the strategic plan without awaiting the for an EIS for the new assumptions, as required by NEPA. He inquired as to the Board's comments and asked if DOE will admit to issuing a ROD issue a ROD on the EIS which says the plan and mission document will be revised in accordance with NEPA and public comment. Lloyd Piper responded that the strategic plan is a planning document, not a decision document, thus it is not required to comply with NEPA, and it is consistent with NEPA. Discussion took place on specific documents and their relevance to the NEPA process and budgeting.

Discussion ensued regarding concern that the advice submitted on the strategic plan was not incorporated. Lloyd commented that previous advice recommended to proceed with the strategic plan and produce it and not and not go through another hold another public process. It was agreed that the production of the strategic plan should not be seen as an endorsement by the Board of the document. Gerry clarified that the advice was to subject the plan to the NEPA process and did not want the printing of the document portrayed as an endorsement.

### **AGENDA ITEM #11: BOARD ACTIONS**

#### **Institutional Controls**

Ben Floyd acknowledged the comments from yesterday and noted that he and Gerry discussed the advice. He provided an overview of the new changes: (1) MTCA requirements as they relate to institutional controls have been identified; (2) recognizing the advice needs to be considered with the MTCA PAC; (3) National Dialogue report in relation to the advice, as it talks about the need for the capacity of local governments to deal with institutional controls and property records; and, (4) principles where appropriate to use institutional controls. He cited the 1100 Area as being cleaned up said there is a good chance the land will be transferred.

#### **Board Discussion**

Board members expressed concern over including the MTCA PAC recommendations in the advice without first seeing it. The recommendations are only advice and not law. Gerry noted that he has the assurance from Ecology that the PAC recommendations will be incorporated into policy. He also stated that MTCA is a cleanup program and referenced the Maximum Reasonable Exposure scenario that guides cleanup. He added that it is important to discuss institutional controls in the advice so that all three agencies will work from a consistent standpoint for uniformity purposes.

Jerry Peltier raised the issue of zoning criteria and inquired as to how restrictions are maintained. Gerry stated that issues such as deed restrictions and zoning have been discussed by the PAC and various scenarios have been examined. Dan Silver reiterated that the PAC has made a huge contribution on this issue and that he was comfortable with the advice.

Board members suggested keeping the advice focused on the maximum reasonable exposure limits (big picture) and away from micromanagement. Discussion ensued on the HRA-EIS and the fact that it does not reflect MTCA. Gerry referenced issues in the HRA-EIS and noted that one of the best reasons for issuing this advice is the HRAEIS and its failure to acknowledge the exposure scenarios. Lloyd Piper acknowledged that DOE does follow the law and if the HRA-EIS needs revision to clarify certain positions, they will do this. Lloyd said this particular draft was sent back to Patrick Willison earlier in the day. He added that it is appropriate to wait for PAC recommendations and said work can begin on some of the items in the draft advice.

Dick acknowledged that work on institutional controls began in May. He said they are prepared to take it back to the committee with a caveat that the specific reference to the PAC be taken out and reference to maximum exposure limits be referenced. He stated that it is time to put the advice out as guidance.

Merilyn and other members concurred, recommending a statement be made that the PAC report will be reviewed when it comes out. Ben Floyd noted that he will take the advice back to committee, but asked for a commitment that it be adopted in February. Ben requested regulator written response to the draft advice.

#### **Action on Institutional Controls:**

Comments and suggestions should be given to Ben prior to the February meeting.

Comments regarding the HRAEIS are to be made individually.

Institutional Controls will be on the February agenda.

#### **Columbia River Impact Assessment (CRCIA)**

Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues, outlined the changes to the advice. These changes include Phase II funding, applicability to other sites, the impact to other parts of the cleanup program and the elevation of the reporting level. The applicability to other sites and value to risk assessments was discussed. Merilyn directed the changes to be made and a final review be completed.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Barry Sutton commented on stewardship at Hanford and the importance of returning the land to a healthy environment for the public to use.

He stated that those involved use a lot of facts and figures to make important decisions which, in turn, makes those not directly involved feel powerless. He encouraged everyone to put forth every bit of effort to try and thoroughly clean up Hanford. He expressed concern that carbon tetrachloride would not be tracked. He supported excavation to remove contaminates as he feels the land is important and is a disgrace to leave it as it is.

#### **REACTORS ON THE RIVER**

Changes to the advice include subheadings for clarification and the addition of acronyms in the titles. There were no objections and the advice, advice #58, was approved.

## **DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING ADVICE**

There were no changes to the advice since yesterday's discussion. Marilyn Reeves noted this is an FY'97 program and the lab might not get funding. There were no objections and the advice, advice #60, was approved.

## **PROJECT HANFORD MANAGEMENT CONTRACT**

Mark Hermanson explained that there are two pieces of advice. Changes to the first piece included: (1) statements more pronounced and the introduction streamlined; (2) reference to previous advice where appropriate; (3) added health and safety training to make sure DOE is aware of health trends and ensure that employees in sub, sub-contractors are covered; (4) strengthen the emphasis on the contract budget risks associated with cost-reimbursable contracts; and, (5) clarified and strengthen concerns on transition costs and contractor changes.

### **Board Discussion**

Various Board members said they were pleased with the changes and offered additional changes to the wording. George Kyriazis expressed concern over the performance cost efficiency of the reimbursable portion of the contract and the award fee incentives. Discussion ensued on incentive fee and the contract. Changes were made to the advice to reflect concern on overall cost savings. The advice, advice #62, was approved with the changes.

### **economic diversity**

Mark Hermanson responded to questions that the intent of this contract is to give the contractor the initiative to create new jobs for the Tri-Cities area because of the short-term of the sub, sub-contractors. It is possible to take work being done elsewhere, bring it to the Tri-Cities, and still not provide any new economic growth.

Comments on the advice include an emphasis on 3,000 new jobs in the "Tri-Cities" and lasting economic diversification. Dan Carlson, Director of Economic Transition, FDH, commented that in the PHMC, section H.2 Promises and Commitments, describes Fluor's economic contractual commitments. He added that the job growth of the enterprise companies, which are newly relocated or created, represent a minority of the job creation in proportion to the 3,000. A separate program, The Industrial Recruitment program, will assist in creating 3,000 new non-Hanford jobs.

The Board approved the advice, advice #59, with the recommendations.

## **HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

Pam Brown summarized the changes including an expeditious and cost effective manner to implement and more public involvement. She reiterated that cultural and archeological advice will be deferred until a later date.

### **Board Discussion**

George Kyriazis expressed concern over the budget and commented that the TYP has not identified funding for these facilities to make them ready for preservation. This advice identifies getting on national registry but does not address the cost of preparation. Pam responded that they are not preserving the facilities, but instead, are documenting the historic significance of the facility. By entering into this agreement, DOE has established an understanding with the SHPO and National Historic Preservation Society.

Madeleine Brown noted that there are a number of historians in the Tri-Cities that have expertise that can be used. Merilyn confirmed there were no other changes and the advice, advice #57, was adopted.

## **AGENDA ITEM #12: NATIONAL EQUITY DIALOGUE**

Jeff Breckel, Washington Department of Ecology, told the Board that the National Dialogue has taken an important step forward. A meeting was held in November to begin write a the basic pproposal that will establish the goals, scope, critical guiding principles, products, approaches, processes and schedule of the National Dialogue (*Attachment 10*). The League of Women Voters staff hasve taken prepared a the action to prepare the first draft of this plan and it is currently being reviewed by the planning committee members (*Attachment 10*). . A steering committee will be established to deal with the administrative issues, facilitation team and background materials. The plan needs to be reviewed by the planning committee members to make sure it accurately reflects their thoughts.

Merilyn Reeves noted that the planning committee has not completely agreed on some of the issuesissues, but a path forward can be seen. Once there is fundingfunding is assured, there will be a series of three field meetings will be held. She noted that tThe purpose of the field meeting is to obtain clarification of issues, their broad implications and how they affect each side of the dialogue. Merilyn anticipated that the field meetings would be held in the springtime of 1997. The principle issue that caused the most discussion at the November meeting was determining what is the decision of what decisionsissues are going to will be part of the dialogue process and how much DOE will delay decisions so that the National Dialogue process will have a chance to impact them. Jeff noted that after much discussion, DOE added that DOE is stated that if it makes a decision, it will come to the National Dialogue, explain the decision, and solicit immediate feedback on that decision.

Another important note is that the National Dialogue process will not focus on commercial waste, including spent fuel. Merilyn noted that there have been few representatives from the committed to the National Dialogue process.Southeast portion of the country, including Savannah River and Oak Ridge, which may influence the successfulness of the project. However, other states have been very active in the process. Jeff and Merilyn asked the Board to review the draft plan for the National Dialogue and provide comments.

## **Board Discussion**

Betty Tabbutt questioned whether DOE is attempting to control agenda-setting, how decisions are made, and the overall freedom of the National Dialogue group. Merilyn responded that she has not seen that to be the case and that the staff supporting the National Dialogue have been working hard to ensure that DOE will be supportive of the project. Dick Belsey asked if there are resources available so the National Dialogue can ensure that the complex information which will be presented to the public in the field meetings will be understandable. Jeff responded that the group is currently looking at what types of information are available and what can be used so that the scope of the issues can be fully understood.

Pam Brown expressed her opinion that it is essential to the success of the National Dialogue project to

have sites such as Savannah River present throughout the process. She questioned how commercial spent fuel decision-making will be made if it is not part of the National Dialogue. Paige Knight stated her support for including spent fuel on the National Dialogue agenda. Gordon Rogers questioned what is meant by "equity." Jeff responded that an overall concept of "equity" is that the communities at a site feel that the decisions made in regards to disposition of material are fair and adequately address the issues and concerns of the region.

Gerry Pollet expressed his support and assistance in holding regional meetings in 1997 to generate regional values based on public input. He suggested that a second set of meetings be held so that the public can review the values after they have been consolidated with the rest of the country and within the National Dialogue process. Jeff added that the need for feedback has been recognized and is being discussed within the planning group.

Paige questioned where letters of support should be sent. Jeff responded that the appropriate person is Tom Brunway at Headquarters.

Discussion ensued on national participation and it was noted that the southeast participation is very important. Marilyn said she is pleased with the level of discussion by participants. She added that the National Dialogue will create an integrated process and the DOE community has been a very valuable member.

Board members discussed the commercial and government spent fuel issue and expressed an interest in seeing this topic on the agenda. Gordon Rogers asked about DOE's interpretation of the word "equity" and Jeff noted that there has been discussion regarding the meaning of the word at Headquarters. Marilyn added that this issue keeps coming up and the purpose is to foster implementable decisions in a fair manner. It was noted that there will be regional meetings next year. Jeff commented that there is a need for the feedback loop and, once the values and principles are adopted there will be another round of discussion. He also noted that the need to involve the broader public was discussed. Comments on the draft can be made to Tom Brunway, Under Secretary at DOE.

Jon Yerxa, DOE, commented that he was impressed with how well this group worked over the two day period and how well the League of Women Voters facilitated the process. He added that other sites are becoming aware of these types of issues that the Board has and he is has been talking to other committeessite-specific advisory boards about creating an inter-board dialogue. He noted that he talked to Cindy Kelly and she recommended talking "board-to-board" about these issues.

### **AGENDA ITEM #13: TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEMS**

Gerry Pollet reported that the Dollars and Sense Committee is in the initial stage of looking at the TWRS program. He anticipates that the Committee will design a presentation to be made to the Board and will then consider advice about the privatization contracts. A remaining issue that will be looked at by the Committee relates to the TWRS privatization reserve. The initial impressions have been that the Lockheed Martin Advanced Environmental Systems (LMAES) contract allows for open-ended negotiating, which can result in termination by DOE if a price for the technology is not agreed upon. This would require DOE to pay for the technology without receiving a viable method of remediation.

Pam Brown reported that the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee received presentations from both BNFL and LMAES. There remain many unresolved questions about the viability of the LMAES technology. She anticipates that this issue will be a major challenge for the Board in the upcoming year. will look at privatization contracts and the TWRS privatization reserve. He commented

that the biggest concern is LMAES which allows for an open ended negotiation of the price with no cap. Another concern is the nature of the negotiation of potential price increases. An additional concern is if funding is not available to meet potential increases, LMAES can call it termination by DOE and use the privatization reserve to be reimbursed for work completed.

Pam Brown shared with the Board that BNFL and LMAES made a presentation to the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee. She said BNFL had a great presentation and a solid technology, but there are still unresolved questions. The LMAES presentation did not provide any information that made her more comfortable about the technology. She stated that this is one of the biggest challenges this Board is going to face and added that the scientists have no confidence in the technologies. Harold Heacock inquired if they were running a risk with only two contracts, of which, one is tenuous.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 14: UPDATES**

##### **Environmental Health and Safety Council (EH&S)**

Alice Murphy stated that while there have been newspaper articles regarding the workforce realignment, DOE is still waiting for a draft plan from Fluor Daniel Hanford in December. There is a potential for 500 layoffs within Fluor Daniel Hanford.

Mike Grainey reported that in August of 1996, Oregon signed an interagency agreement with Washington to reflect a long-standing relationship the two states have had. Gordon Rogers noted his concern that DOE is providing grants to employees of the state of Oregon to focus on Hanford issues, while the same support is not being provided to agencies within the Tri-Cities. Mike Wilson clarified that the memorandum of understanding is not granting special status or regulatory authority of any kind to Oregon. Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency, noted that EPA does have technical assistance grants available and encouraged citizens from the Tri-Cities to apply.

Dennis Faulk reported that the TPA Community Relations Plan has not been signed because the M-33 change request will require a change to the Community Relations Plan. It is anticipated that the signed plan will be available in January.

Margery Swint described reported on the Fluor Daniel Hanford Environmental Safety & Health (ES&H) Council of which she has recently become a member. She said the vice president in charge of ES&H is joined by the major subcontractors, DOE and other representatives on a monthly basis. The purpose of the council is to actively involve middle managers and employees in ES&H activities, including establishing site-wide procedures, resolving issues, monitoring compliance to standards, integrating and coordinating ES&H issues for sitewide continuity, elevating problems to the executive council as needed, and developing and distributing lessons learned. She cited the development of a new lock and tag program that eliminated multiple training programs. They are looking to consolidate other safety committees on site.

Discussion took place regarding the details of the training program and the responsibility of supervisors and workers with regards to occurrence reporting. Margery explained that any safety issues will be brought to this group so issues can be shared sitewide. Dick Belsey expressed concern that the lessons learned are out of date.

##### **TPA Negotiations on Spent Fuel**

Roger Stanley said TPA negotiations on the K Basins are suspended until January 14. John Wagoner

requested the suspension and EPA and Ecology have agreed. Once resumed, the negotiations should be completed by the middle of March.

### **PHMC Workforce Realignment and Rebaselining**

Alice Murphy distributed articles (*Attachment 11*) published in the paper regarding the workforce realignment and rebaselining. She stated they are still waiting for a draft plan which could identify 500 layoffs, in December from FDH. After discussion with Board members, Alice stated that the final plan will be made available, but couldn't comment on the draft because she did not know what the contents would be.

### **Interagency Agreements**

Mike Grainey said Oregon signed an interagency agreement in August. He noted that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been working very well and he appreciated Washington help and assistance. Conversation ensued as to those on the HAB who are supported financially and those who are not. Gordon Rogers thought the activities of the Board suffer because the Tri-Cities is at a disadvantage at not being able to fund or be treated equally by DOE in terms of ability to hire technical consultants to "bird dog" for their representatives. Mike Wilson stated that he didn't think this MOU gave Oregon any special status, but rather formalized a relationship. Dennis Faulk said EPA has a technical assistance grant which is designed to meet the needs that have been raised and encouraged Tri-Cities people to apply. Gordon noted that he did apply and had a grant approved, but could not manage to get the people involved to carry out the work involved.

### **TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP)**

Dennis Faulk reported that the CRP is still not signed due to issues not being understood. The M-33 change request is almost ready for signature and there is a need to have a Class 1 change to the CRP. He remarked that they will be able to put an updated list of FY'97 activities and an updated Board list in January's mailing.

## **AGENDA #15: : BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

### **Meeting Schedule and Locations**

Merilyn Reeves discussed having a meeting in March in lieu of April; alternatively, she suggested adding the budget workshop in March instead of a Board meeting with a March meeting or in April. Mary Mary Lou Blazek commented that the Board meeting locations need to be more balanced geographically and Merilyn concurred.

### **New Member Orientation**

Merilyn also reported that New member orientation information should be available in January.

### **FY'97 Board Budget**

The Executive Committee will review the Board's year end financial report. Merilyn stated that the Board did not overspend its budget and they will look ahead of what else should be done in the future.

### **Board Membership**

Enterprise employees were discussed in relation to membership criteria. Max Power said it was important to have the input of the people who are working on the site and it was recognized that the union workers could be represented; the problem is people with profound knowledge of the site that were not represented. He referred to the language in the beginning of the report/charter that described non-union/non-management employees were represented from as representative from the cleanup and health and safety contract. He explained that when they went to fill the initial position, it was broken into two groups - M&O and other (PNNL, HEHF, etc.) Merilyn inquired as to site employees who are represented by different seats reserved for the non-union/non-management. The recommendation developed by Dick Belsey, Margery Swint, and Bob Larson was discussed. Max described the recommendation to limit the seat to DOE and its direct contractors (ER, HEHF, and FDH and its prime onsite contractors). Many of the people in the enterprise companies are working onsite, but in the future, fewer and fewer of these will be doing so. Max added that The recommendation leaves it to the TPA representatives will to decide whether it is profitable to have the incumbents continue and put up one seat for filling at this point and then rotate them out.

Jon Yerxa said he will check with the other TPA liaisons and get back to Merilyn about the actual response to this issue. Merilyn noted that this issue will be discussed in Executive Committee.

Additional copies of the HAB progress report are available by contacting TRI at (509) 943-1804.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lynn Sims thanked the Board for working so hard on all issues.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Attendance
2. Change to November Board Summary FY 1997 EM Budget Allocations
3. Hanford Advisory Board Progress ReportFFTF and DOE's Tritium Production Mission
4. Hanford Advisory Board Progress Report
5. Background Paper on Interim Safe Storage (ISS) of Reactor Blocks
6. Update on N Springs Shoreline
7. The Hanford Site Manhattan Project and Cold War Era
8. Hanford Strategic Plan
9. FY 1999 EM Budget Development Process
10. National Dialogue
11. Workforce Realignment Articles

---

**Hanford Home Page | HAB | Summary List**

*For questions or comments, please send [email](mailto:Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov) to the Hanford\_Advisory\_Board@rl.gov*

*URL: <http://www.hanford.gov/boards/hab/execsum/dec.htm>*

*Last Updated: 01/26/2001 10:35:38*