

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY BOARD

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 4-5, 2003

Tukwila, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary	1
Welcome and Introductions	3
Announcements	3
June Meeting Summary.....	3
Review of 2003 Board Work and Discussion with TPA Senior Management on Board Priorities for the Upcoming Year	3
TPA Look Back/Look Ahead: Perspectives from TPA Senior Management.....	4
Public Involvement Dialogue	9
Natural Resources Trustees Council (NRTC).....	13
TPA Agency Updates	15
Supplemental Technologies	17
Draft Advice: TRU Waste in the Tanks	18
Draft Advice: Supplemental Technologies	18
Retrieval, Treatment and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of Single-Shell Tanks EIS comment period extension request	19
Board Business.....	20
Committee Updates	21
FY2004 Priorities.....	22
United Kingdom Visitors.....	22
Public Comment	23

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

Executive Summary

Board Actions

The Hanford Advisory Board (Board) adopted two pieces of advice; one addressing supplemental technology issues and one addressing TRU waste retrieval. The Board also adopted a letter requesting an extension of the Tank Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) comment period.

Review of 2003 Board Work and Discussion of Board Priorities for the Upcoming Year

The Board reviewed adherence to the outcomes of the 2002 leadership retreat. Several changes were made as a result of these outcomes. The Board adopted fourteen pieces of advice and issued six letters in the last year. The Board's priorities in the coming year were chosen based on the Tri-Party Agency (TPA) agencies' 2004 priorities letter and the Board's identified priorities. It is unclear at this time how many of these issues are firm and will actually be addressed in the coming year. Each agency gave its view on the Board's work for fiscal year (FY) 2003 and what the most important issues in FY2004 are.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Look Back/Look Ahead

Each TPA agency provided feedback on the Board's work in FY2003. Suggestions were provided to the Board on ways to improve the work that is being done as well as priority issues for FY2004. Each agency also provided an update on the work it did in the last year.

Public Involvement Dialogue

The Public Involvement Committee developed this dialogue to address the TPA agencies' perspectives on public involvement. A history of the Board's development was also provided to help educate the site managers about the environment the Board grew out of. Each agency head was asked to give their perspectives on public involvement as well as to provide tangible public involvement commitments for the coming year.

Natural Resources Trustees Council (NRTC)

The NRTC provided a brief presentation to the Board about their role at Hanford. The NRTC works with the Tri-Parties to ensure the protection of existing natural resources, minimize injury to natural resources during cleanup, and the restoration of existing resources.

United Kingdom Visitors

A team from County Cambria in the United Kingdom (U.K.) attended this meeting and has spoken to many Board members. The team is visiting a variety of U.S. Department of Energy sites U.S. to observe how the cleanup process functions. In the United Kingdom, the largest nuclear plant is slated for closure and the team wants to learn how to involve the public in the decisions to be made regarding this closure.

Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)

DOE-ORP believes the transuranic (TRU) waste retrieval process will help remove the waste from Hanford more quickly. DOE-ORP has appreciated the Board's input on tank closure.

Department of Energy-Richland Office (DOE-RL)

DOE-RL has finished the long-term stewardship plan. This will be used as a framework to identify the relationship between the cleanup mission and long-term stewardship. This document identifies the actions and decisions required to prepare for long-term stewardship.

An agreement was reached to end the use of unlined trenches at Hanford. This decision is contingent upon obtaining the proper permits from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS) not being challenged in court.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

The Cleanup Constraints and Challenges Team (C3T) process was a good opportunity for the agencies to learn to work together. The C3T process has resulted in tangible progress and many issues have been discussed, though new ones continue to arise. Because of this success, the C3T process has been transitioned into everyday workgroups through the Interagency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) process. These groups will identify issues and work to develop solutions for these issues. There are several IMIAT teams focusing on a variety of issues. The teams welcome Board involvement.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Draft Meeting Summary
June 5-6, 2003
Richland, Washington

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered three public comment periods, two on Thursday and one on Friday.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Five Board seats were not represented: Benton County (Local Government), Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Washington State University (University), and the Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environmental).

Welcome and Introductions

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, opened the meeting and welcomed all the participants. He introduced several new Hanford Advisory Board (Board) members: Patrick Conley, West Richland (Local Government Interests); Richard Smith, alternate for City of Kennewick (Local Government Interests); and Nanci Peterson, Yakama Nation (Tribal Governments).

Announcements

Todd announced that Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), will be getting married on October 18th in Sunnyside and everyone is invited to attend. For those interested in attending please let Dennis know.

CH2M Hill and the Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) are presenting a supplemental technologies road show in the next room.

June Meeting Summary

The Board approved the June meeting summary with the addition of comments from Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government Interests); Nancy Myers, Bechtel Hanford Inc.; and Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations). The two committee of the whole summaries from May were also adopted.

Review of 2003 Board Work and Discussion with TPA Senior Management on Board Priorities for the Upcoming Year

Todd discussed the Board's adherence to the 2002 leadership retreat outcomes. The Board made a visible commitment to reduce the wordsmithing process and to work toward consensus in committee meetings. The Board focused a great deal of attention on acceleration and the result was a large amount of advice. The Board also increased communication with the TPA agency heads, in particular Keith Klein and Roy Schepens. There was an evident commitment on the part of committee members to maintain personal responsibility for getting the needed work done. The committee chairs in particular have done an excellent job focusing on the Board's timeline and not addressing extraneous issues. The Board also began enforcing the "three meetings missed unexcused and you are out" rule.

The Board adopted fourteen pieces of advice in the last year. The major issues for consideration resulted from the agencies' FY 2003 priorities letter to the Board. The Board also issued six letters, the Exposure Scenarios Task Force Report, and two national site-specific advisory board (SSAB) letters. Of the issues

the Board had planned on addressing in FY 2003, most have associated products and all the issues with the exception of one were addressed in committee or Board meetings.

Todd reviewed the agencies' FY2004 priorities letter and compared this to the Board's identified priorities. Last year the Board and agencies were able to agree on the work the Board would do; however, the identified priorities for FY 2004 do not appear firm. It is unclear at this time how some of these issues will grow and mature in the coming year. He added that having a specific focus for each Board meeting last year worked well, so that model will be used again.

TPA Look Back/Look Ahead: Perspectives from TPA Senior Management

DOE-RL

Keith Klein, Manager of the Department of Energy-Richland Operations (DOE-RL), discussed the progress at the site, provided feedback on the issues the Board addressed in the last year, and identified issues for the coming year. He noted that the job is only gratifying if the work is done correctly and safely. Keith briefly reviewed some of the work that has been done in the last year.

- o 875 metric tons of spent fuels have been completed. More than two-thirds, 159 of 258 multi-canister overpacks, of all the fuel has been moved and the task is on track to be completed in spring 2004.
- o Plutonium residue stabilization was completed and shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP) have begun. Achieving plutonium stabilization in 2004 will not be an insurmountable goal.
- o F reactor is currently in the final stages of the sealing process.
- o More than 1000 drums of TRU have been shipped to WIPP. This is up to eight shipments a month with 42 drums in each shipment. The total number of drums moved is now more than 1500. Twice as many shipments were made in FY 2003 as in the previous three years total.
- o 120,565 metric tons of soils were moved in the last year. The total amount moved is 389,3130 metric tons.
- o 237 of 1600 waste sites have now been cleaned up, which is good progress.

One area where progress has fallen behind schedule is the sludge project in K Basins. The team is currently taking an opportunity to consider a new approach. Additional thought is being given to developing a method to directly dispose of the material at WIPP instead of handling it twice.

Keith provided feedback on the last year as well as suggestions for the Board's work in the coming year. The Board's advice over the last year has been helpful. The site especially appreciated the letters of support for tangible accomplishments.

The issues that will need focus in the coming year are:

Solid Waste – M-91 milestone discussions are still not complete. Congressional funding is contingent upon DOE having a good working relationship with EPA, Ecology and other organizations. The C3T process was very positive in helping to develop a better relationship amongst all the agencies. The issues of waste importation and authority over that touch on ideologies and principles but the participants are working hard to reach a compromise. There are a multitude of technical issues and the groundwork must be laid out correctly from the start. The HSW-EIS will also need attention.

Importation of Waste – this continues to be an issue of contention for all the parties. There is a Rocky Flats waste stream that is to come to Hanford. However; a commitment was made to complete certain projects before any waste was brought here.

River Corridor – the contract award has been delayed at this time.

K Basins - Sludge removal from K Basins is behind on the milestone.

End-States – there is a lot of room for constructive input into this discussion.

In closing, Keith stated that the purpose of cleanup is to restore the river corridor and to transform the central plateau. However, it must be recognized that there will be a great deal of waste left on the site, as it is not possible to remove all of the contamination from the groundwater.

DOE-ORP

Roy Schepens, Manager, DOE-ORP, stated that DOE-ORP takes the job seriously and to that end, the best people continue to be brought to Hanford. The team is serious about cleaning up the site and this could not be done without the contractors. The priorities of DOE-ORP are:

Safe operations: Accelerated cleanup activities must be accomplished safely. DOE and the contractors monitor the safety performance. Negative safety trends are corrected before they become significant problems. As a result, the lost workday and conduct of operations indicators are improving and DOE-ORP wants to see those trends continue. The tank farm vapor issue is a good example of this. Local and national experts were brought to the site to meet with workers and to assess the vapor issues. The most recent review by Dupont, the industry leader in chemical safety, indicates that the workers have not been exposed to vapor levels above regulatory limits. Two of the recommendations resulting from this review were:

- o Better education of employees on safety issues
- o Engineer upgrades to reduce nuisance odors that cause employees nausea

The focus for the coming year will be continuous improvement in the safety trends.

Waste Treatment Plant: The original completion date of 2056 has been accelerated via the new baseline to 2032. It is the responsibility of DOE-ORP to prove this can be done. Vitrification will now be completed in 2028. Supplemental technologies will be developed to assist the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) in completing the high-level waste mission. The single shell tank farm will be closed in 2024 and there is a TPA milestone to meet requiring that single-shell retrieval be completed by 2018. The first single shell tank farm will be completed by 2014; aiding in the meeting of this deadline is having a good TPA that identifies how clean is clean.

Accelerated Cleanup: There are several accelerated cleanup activities in progress. One of these activities is the interim stabilization of single-shell tank (SST) liquids, which will be completed in 2004. This allows the focus of critical resources to shift to other important activities including installing and upgrading of infrastructure to support full operation of vitrification facilities in 2011. The first demonstration of single shell tank waste retrieval is nearing completion and the first closure demonstration is planned for 2004.

Single Shell Tanks: The single shell tank retrieval and closure programs are being developed in coordination with Ecology and the EPA. Key commitments in this process are included in the TPA. A significant amount of review and monitoring of the progress will be conducted by Ecology and the EPA. Retrieval actions employ a TPA commitment to complex retrieval from 149 single shell tanks by 2018. The first demonstration of tank retrieval is nearing completion and six additional actions are expected to start between now and December. Up to 40 retrievals could be completed by 2006. The retrieval sequence considers: risk reduction, WTP needs, and double shell tank space waste compatibility. There is a TPA commitment to close 149 SSTs by 2024. The first demonstration is planned for 2004 and will use tank

C108. The tank closure EIS will evaluate the impacts of various closure alternatives for the final closure of all SSTs. The record of decision (ROD) for this EIS will be issued in April of 2004. Up to 40 SSTs could be completed by 2006.

Supplemental Technology: The treatment technology development program is underway. On October 1, 2003, DOE-ORP will make a decision on which low-activity waste (LAW) treatment technology to choose for further investment. The permitting and pilot-testing phase of this project will occur between January 2004 and January 2005. The final technology path forward will be recommended by DOE-ORP to the TPA agencies on January 30, 2005. There have been vendor forums and information sharing sessions with Ecology, CH2MHill, DOE-ORP, and the vendors to learn more about bulk vitrification, cast stone, and steam reforming.

Roy added that DOE-ORP provides public involvement and outreach through a variety of ways including:

- National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)/EIS process
- Public reading rooms
- TPA change process
- State of the site meetings
- Hanford Advisory Board
- Tank Forums
- Media
- Websites
- Quarterly Project Review

In summary, DOE-ORP is working towards finishing what was started and towards understanding the work that needs to be done. This means delivering the WTP, treating the waste, and closing tanks. The government must be provided with items and service in a timely manner and the workforce will be aligned to accomplish this. Changes will be made as required including eliminating barriers and reducing requirements, and aligning with the regulatory and stakeholder community. Decisions will be made in a timely, open, and honest fashion and these decisions will achieve the desired end result. There will continue to be a relentless drive to find safer, cleaner, quicker, and cheaper solutions to the cleanup problems. Both DOE and the contractors must be accountable to do what is right morally, ethically, and technically.

Ecology

Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology, commented for this meeting by looking back over the last year and then forward to the challenges in the coming year. He also provided general comments about public involvement and specific feedback to the Board.

The past year was an interesting one and next year will be even more so. A tremendous amount of progress was made on the site, more than in any previous year. Each time progress is celebrated; more successes on the site are taken for granted. A lot of work has been done in the last year and the biggest success was the tank waste vitrification strategy. The year began with a lack of trust and confusion surrounding what constitutes accelerated cleanup and the strategies for this. A set of milestones was negotiated for tank closure and vitrification that puts the project on track for completion in 2028 with greater confidence than before. In 2005 it will become apparent if supplemental technology will or will not work. This was a powerfully successful year in a number of ways and everyone should be proud of all the work that was accomplished.

In the future, a lot is uncertain because Washington State Governor Gary Locke is not seeking re-election. Due to this, he has been focusing on what he most wants to spend his energy on for the next 16 to eighteen months. In the coming year, Ecology has choices to make with DOE to influence or to reject a number of critical issues that will develop a framework for the long-term future.

A demonstration project is underway for tank waste retrieval. The current policy for determining incidental waste processing is the focus of a lawsuit. This revolves around the decision of how clean each individual

tank needs to be. The coming year will provide an opportunity to discuss that issue and to give advice. The Board needs to no longer give general advice but rather needs to help make decisions.

Several state attorney generals have written the Secretary of Energy to indicate that they will fight any proposed legislation to overturn what the DOE lost in the court case. The attorney generals are “deeply troubled.” This is a call for very strong political action and this item needs to be closely watched. All stakeholders must ensure that this legislation does not take effect. However, there are TPA requirements in place regarding this issue and he believes that DOE-ORP will comply with these. There is no excuse for failing to meet TPA requirements.

Part of the challenge in the coming year will be the tradeoffs between perfection of information, timeliness and absoluteness of commitments, openness of participation and consultation, and the actual achievement of something to send to Congress in order to obtain funding. A full appreciation must be had for the power of being able to tell Congress that Hanford has closed a tank. This will only aid in the appropriation of funds.

The biggest challenge for FY 2004 will be the continued progress on the vitrification plant construction. Tom suggested that Board members attend the TPA quarterly update meetings. The selection of an alternate technology will also be an issue of great importance. The public involvement question is how the public can make those decisions openly with involvement. DOE-ORP should not make those decisions and then hold the public meetings. Early public involvement and input are imperative to the process. This is an important discussion because it will lay the future framework for the possibility of doing the job in the timeframe discussed.

There is a huge choice to make in the HSW-EIS, hopefully in open court and supported by great thought and commitment so a good future is laid. The question with the HSW-EIS is the perfection of information and exposure to big picture thinking. Everyone will have to wait to see what information the HSW-EIS brings to light. Hopefully all the comments and ideas can be absorbed into the document. There needs to be a sufficient plan and strategy so that all parties feel comfortable moving forward. One important question in this is, how much information is available now versus needed permits or when future questions will be addressed? Some of the parties would like to require all the information now, but this is a dilemma that still needs to be solved. The preference is to have all the information now but the process may be allowed to proceed on a permit-by-permit basis as the information becomes available.

The M-91 negotiations, which address buried waste, have been to some degree a failure. At issue is which party has jurisdiction of TRU waste. Ecology would like a judge to make the decision so this could be used as a frame for where the process goes from here. A choice will be made through the court and the framework will be consistent with that. The new M-91 agreement would remove the TRU waste portion and lay out the groundwork for the rest of the waste. The debate over the appeal of the TRU waste decision would then be removed from these negotiations. The importation of waste issue has still not been resolved, although Hanford has a role in the national complex cleanup. If issues at Hanford are to be handled consistent with the TPA, then the site must step up to the challenge of imported waste.

Tom addressed the issue of public involvement. What may have been appropriate in the past for public involvement is not necessarily the best method at this time. Some time needs to be taken to discuss public involvement in the context of what will be happening in the next year. At this time it is not useful to talk about what did, didn't, or should have happened. Ecology asked the Board last year to become more focused and disciplined and the Board did that well by focusing on a couple of really critical areas. The advice issued was helpful and Ecology thanks the Board for providing that. He stressed that the state of Washington fully supports and believes in a strong and active Board. In the future the preference is again for the Board to be focused and disciplined. If any changes are made in the future with the Board, Ecology will give their full support, including office space to maintain staff and processes. The Board's effectiveness has been greatly appreciated over the last year.

Environmental Protection Agency

Mike Gearhard, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), commented his one observation over the last year or two was that scarce resources have been diverted from cleaning up the site to struggling over matters of authority. This does not add to the momentum of cleanup. He is proud of the State of the Site meetings and thanked the key staff people who suggested these. It is important to maintain a dialogue with the public and he is looking forward with commitment to doing those again.

Great benefits have been reaped from the C3T process. There has been continuing movement of massive amounts of waste from the river. Parts of the 300 Area are ready for backfill, and pump and treat systems have been approved. Success has been seen in getting the groundwater strategy off the ground. Work will continue to need to be done relating to the difficult groundwater questions. The U plant regional closure strategy is moving forward, as are the vitrification plant, the removal of fuel from K basins, and the grant funding to the regional government for redevelopment.

One of the ongoing challenges will be the progress at K basins. The slowdown is very worrisome and this issue still has not been resolved. Other issues still open are the M-91 Milestone negotiations and other TRU issues, potential delays associated with the new river corridor contract, issues with DOE's emerging end-states policy, and the federal budget. The hope is that even though this is a very expensive and large project, the budget will be able to preserve momentum.

Five areas that will need continuing attention are:

- End-States
- Risk Assessments
- Waste Management
- Groundwater
- Continuing stakeholder involvement

All of these issues are highly charged and linked. These cannot be resolved without effective involvement from the Board.

Questions

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), stated the last year has been incredible and is very encouraging. One of the things the Board was asked to do over the last year was to provide documentation for the work it did. However, there was a great deal of interaction in committees that was constructive but did not lead to advice. Would it be helpful for the Board to provide something on paper about these discussions?

She also noted that a good job has been done in the tank farms. She is concerned about the supplemental technologies because the best, not the cheapest, needs to be chosen. She commended Bechtel for contesting the River Corridor Contract and for not accepting inaccuracies or making a commitment they knew they could not keep. She is concerned about contractors' work scope being under funded; DOE needs to be sensitive to a contractor taking on \$800 million of un-funded work scope. She sincerely appreciates the support local government is getting from EPA, Ecology, and DOE. However, while the site managers take the TPA seriously, DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) does not. She complimented the four agencies on the C3T process but noted that the site is at risk of DOE-HQ not wanting to follow the letter of the law.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked Tom if he could be more specific in how the Board should become involved in decision-making. Tom stated it is the difference between thinking about what could or might happen and providing advice on that versus this year when there is emerging data and real time issues where the turnaround time to actual choices may be a better focus. How will the Board and public involvement influence those decisions? Advice has been

provided on the HSW-EIS and guiding policies and principles for the Board are set, so the question now is how do these apply to the data and the choices being made.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), commented that input is needed early in the process because it is not possible to go back in time and do things differently. He asserted that no additional waste should be added until the waste currently at Hanford is cleaned up. Both DOE and the contractors have admitted they are unsure of the impacts from the tanks on the groundwater, nor are the impacts of releases in unlined burial grounds fully understood. The state of Washington and the EPA have noted that the risk in the burial grounds is unknown. If there is to be a TPA change package, then there should be a full investigation of the burial grounds including an opportunity for public involvement. Additionally, the laws regarding disposal in trenches should be followed. He stated that he would like to see a commitment that the HSW-EIS will be released for further review of burial ground information that was added before a Record of Decision (ROD) is issued. Keith Klein replied that no matter how good a job he believes is being done there are people who will find the HSW-EIS inadequate. However, he has come to accept that the team has bent over backwards to add more information to the HSW-EIS in response to public comments. He asked that people look at the final HSW-EIS and the response document before drawing conclusions.

Public Involvement Dialogue

Todd introduced the public involvement dialogue. The purpose of the dialogue is not to “beat up” the TPA agency heads about public involvement but rather to educate them so they can better communicate the public’s needs to DOE-HQ.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Health), presented a brief overview of public involvement. He stated that it helps morale to celebrate the successes and that there can be a tendency to become submerged in the negative. There should be respect for the participation of each person in the room. These issues are complicated and demand teamwork. Effective public involvement is disseminating information with effective feedback to the agencies. Effective public involvement is based on the idea that “communication always improves involvement.” It is of concern that there is a lack of public interest in relation to issues at Hanford. This is a great disadvantage to the public involvement process. Especially of concern is the lack of younger participants in the Board or related organizations.

Another issue that creates difficulty at Hanford is the transient nature of DOE management positions. A remedy to this would be the development of a commissioner position. This person would be in a permanent position to promote long-term stability at Hanford.

There are many valuable benefits of public involvement. The many years of experience on the part of Board members can be very helpful if it is tapped in a positive way. Effective public involvement can decrease litigation, negative feelings, and suspicion. It also provides valuable feedback to aid decision makers in cleanup choices.

Todd briefly outlined the Board’s history. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, information related to Hanford would be made available to the public only after stakeholders had engaged in a long fight to obtain that information. There would then be a series of meetings around the state to discuss decisions that had already been made. This method angered the public and the process was extremely conflict ridden. The proliferation of resource intensive, repetitive and unsatisfying meetings were not proving to be beneficial to the process.

The Future Site Uses Working Group and the Tank Waste Task Force of the mid 1990s broke the cycle of poor public meetings by taking advantage of core public involvement principles. This included access for the public to pre-decision information, providing an avenue for public input, and responses to that input. In addition, there was an acknowledgement that it was important to balance the information provided by DOE with information from independent sources. The knowledge and expertise of the most interested stakeholders is of great importance to this process. The agencies made a commitment to consider input and in turn, the stakeholders made a commitment to participate in good faith. In the past the organizations had

done best by issuing press releases from conflict ridden meetings. Independent facilitation was imperative in this process.

The Hanford Advisory Board was developed in parallel with two keystone dialogues, which recommended that site-specific advisory boards be created. The Board resulted in a dramatically improved relationship between stakeholders and agencies. There was also a dramatic reduction in the resources needed for regional public meetings. For example, in September of 1995 before the Board was developed, twenty-five regional public meetings were held. In this process it was the stakeholders' responsibility to determine consensus on issues. In the current process, the Board takes the variety of opinions, combines these, and achieves consensus. The Board provides a continuity of input and has a shelf life for future referrals. It is a one-stop shop for intangibles such as sounding boards, committee discussion, etc. It is hard to determine what these are worth dollar-wise, but these do provide a valuable service.

What led to today's discussion was that many respondents were concerned the result of the DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM) top-to-bottom review had jeopardized the progress made in building an effective working relationship between the stakeholders and DOE at Hanford. The Board must make every effort to assure that public involvement is adequately represented when the site managers are at meetings in Washington D.C. It is apparent that something is changing in DOE's tone and approach to public involvement.

Greg deBruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), briefly discussed the DOE public involvement plan. While DOE has a public involvement plan, there is an apparent shift away from the partnerships of the past. This shift is apparent in the disconnect between the current draft of the public involvement plan and the draft issued in 1994. While the content of these two drafts is essentially the same, many of the items that were removed from the 1994 draft address the benefit of collaborative effort between agencies and stakeholders. There needs to be a sense that the public is a partner throughout the process, not just after the decisions have been made.

Some of the specific disconnects are as follows:

- o Lack of adequate budget information
- o Lack of adequate time to address issues such as the supplemental technology
- o There is not an opportunity for public or Board involvement during the downselect process
- o Lack of participation by DOE-ORP in the annual TPA budget meetings
- o Less available information as well as longer response times.
- o Pressure to limit the meetings of the Board.

Greg encouraged Board members to give thought to where public involvement has been, is, and where it will be in the future.

Agency Perspective

DOE-ORP

Roy Schepens stated that DOE-ORP provides a great deal of public involvement already, but it can always be improved. Discussions on supplemental technology have been taking place for over a year. A workshop was held in June, and an offer was made to bring the workshop to the communities, but this was discouraged. The public's feedback is valuable, but it is important to remember that there may be disagreement. Hopefully the differences of opinion are not too far apart. An efficient way to utilize the public involvement processes needs to be determined.

Roy commented that he uses many informal processes to communicate with the public. He encourages his staff to engage with the community. The team visits the tribes at their locations and talk to them informally about what is happening at the site. Some of the tribes have also come to the site to receive a tour. Many other activities are used as well, although more can always be done.

Ecology

Mike Wilson, Ecology, stated that a knowledge base like that of the Board is very valuable to the regulatory agencies. However, it is important to engage in succession planning, bringing new people in and educating them so they can take over for the more experienced people. One of the concerns of the EPA with public involvement is how to reach new faces and voices. However, it is not beneficial to have new faces parroting old voices. Ecology's view of public involvement is that the legal requirements of the TPA are the base to work from, not the ceiling to work to. Ecology supports a strong Board and continues to respect and appreciate the work done by the Board. Ecology would appreciate any advice on areas where the public involvement efforts are not effective. Ecology will continue its current public involvement process as well as to go the extra mile. If Board members or other members of the public have any suggestions, those are welcomed.

EPA

Mike Gearheard stated the EPA is firmly committed to the important role of the Board and public involvement. Difficult decisions will not be made without community involvement and consensus. EPA staff is always available to speak to. EPA shares the concern that some of the signals are towards a lessened degree of support for advisory boards around the DOE complex. Public involvement is an important piece that should accompany focusing on the long-term work. There are times when public input will oppose decisions that have been locked in long discussions. Cleanup will go forward despite the opposition. While agency officials will at times make decisions that are unpopular, that does not mean public input is not critical to the process.

The EPA is also concerned that the normal budget dialogue has not occurred over the last few years. This has been a glitch in the working relationship. The agencies are committed to trying to put these discussions on a predictable and public path.

DOE-RL

Keith Klein stated that he read the recent public involvement policy draft as a reaffirmation of the policies already in place. The TPA Community Relations Plan guides DOE's activities. He stated the department goes above and beyond what is minimally required. One of the issues is that even when meetings are held outside of Richland it is still the same group of people attending. This group reflects the diversity of views and is appropriately weighted, but there is probably more support for what DOE is doing than what is heard from the Board. No one disputes that public participation, scrutiny, and openness are important.

Tangible commitments from DOE-RL include releasing a decision summary so that the public can see what decisions will be made in the near future. The risk-based end states policy was released and Hanford was one of three sites whose comments helped to change this document. The draft is a pre-decisional document and is open for comment. Public involvement dialogue is beneficial because sometimes those working on the project may be too close and will miss something that others see. Public involvement affects the way DOE views, approaches, and addresses issues. DOE-RL fully believes in and supports the Board. DOE-RL will continue participating in the state of the site meetings and will hold regional risk-based end states workshops. In FY 2004, DOE-RL would like the Board to address the issues of: public involvement opportunities, encouraging decision makers to attend smaller meetings, reviewing both the decision summary document and the public involvement decision calendar on the web, and ensuring that senior managers obtain a sense of what happened at the Board meetings.

Questions

Jeff Luke suggested that if DOE and the regulatory authorities desire timely input, it could be that the TPA needs to be adjusted to encompass public input. The Board should be funded at a level that allows and encourages timely input and dialogue.

Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), observed that the supplemental technology road shows are public education, not public involvement. The Board would like an opportunity to provide input on the downselect decision

Paige Knight commented that while the same people attend the meetings every time, they continue to come no matter how frustrating or boring the meetings are because they care very deeply about this issue. The HSW-EIS meeting had a small turnout because people were extremely frustrated with the process and felt their opinions were not valued. There are many issues for people to be involved with and each person can only be involved with so many. That does not mean they do not care. Additionally, it is not necessarily beneficial to have new faces at each meeting. That would mean that people are not continuing to be involved. As for young people, an effort needs to be made to reach out to them and bring them into the process. Hanford is a very complex and heavy issue. It takes a great deal of time and education to understand the issues fully. DOE should note how much time Board members give to the multitude of meetings each year, while at the same time considering how many public meetings the DOE site managers must attend.

Paige noted that a handwritten comment letter is the equivalent of ten thousand people commenting. She asked how many comments a comment in person is worth. Board members are chosen to speak for the members of many other organizations. Board members do not only represent themselves.

Greg deBruler asked why funding for Boards has been reduced if DOE says they are important. Considering accelerated cleanup and the need for public dialogue, what is the rationale for this reduction? Roy replied that DOE has not made a final funding decision. He stated that he focuses on the work that needs to be done rather than the funding. The Board should cost out the work that needs to be done. He commented that he has reduced his contractor support services while increasing productivity. It is imperative to clearly identify the work that needs to be done. Money is being removed from some areas such as administration and being used for cleanup. A determination of how much Board involvement is really needed must be made.

Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), asked why advisory boards are being disbanded when this is supposed to be an integral part of policy. Keith replied that there are budget constraints on everyone and the amount of funding does not demonstrate a level of commitment or value.

Greg noted that while the overall project budget has increased, the Board's budget has continued to decrease.

Jim stated that he would hold up the cost effectiveness of the quantity and quality of advice to any of the other aspects of the budget. The lack of public involvement is a theme throughout this administration. He believes the site managers would be happy to have adequate funding for the Board and to work in an open manner as well.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), commented he is concerned about the signals from DOE regarding the public involvement process. The Board has been very conscious of the erosion that is occurring to the process and has taken steps to be more cost effective. He asked what Keith and Roy could do to help the Board avoid further erosion. Keith commented that the Board should provide an honest and open assessment detailing how advice has helped the site managers. Judgments must be made to determine how much money to provide for certain activities. He assured the Board that the site managers would do their best to be as honest and open as possible.

Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business Interests), asserted that the current administration has a different philosophy and style of management. In the public involvement discussion, he has heard generalities from the agencies but has not heard how the agencies intend to address public involvement issues. The Board should be discussing how to generate more public interest on these issues. The TPA requirement for public involvement is being met and now is the time to make positive suggestions for how to improve involvement.

Leon Swenson (Public At Large) stated there should be a commitment to negotiate TPA milestones in a way to allow for meaningful public involvement in some of the decisions. The supplemental technologies decision is such an example. DOE has provided a great deal of education to the public on this issue but has not provided an opportunity for participation.

Shelley Cimon commented that many issues are coming to a head. One of the biggest concerns is that in the coming year, important decisions will be made very quickly. This is a fundamental change in the way decisions are made and the Board will need to adapt to this change. The agencies will also need to think about changes to the way they do business. In this new approach, term limits on Board seats do not make sense. The decisions that will need to be made will require a broad base of knowledge from a group of people. The meetings, which started in August, have been informative and important, but participation needs to increase. At the state of the site meeting in Portland, it was stunning to see the number of people attending and the sophistication and education of the audience. Roy Schepens replied that term limits are healthy. The only way to get more people involved is to drag them in. It takes people who have the energy and desire to do this, but it is only possible to have that energy for so long. He is a firm believer that if an effort is made to advertise for new Board members, everyone will be pleasantly surprised.

Mike Wilson stated that he is not in favor of term limits for term limits sake. It is up to the Board to determine the best way to bring new people to the Board, not the agencies. It does not do any good to bring people in off the streets.

Keith Klein stated the agencies are looking for quality decision-making. The success of meetings is not judged solely on how many new faces are present. The more public meetings and people there are to manage, the more time that is spent away from cleanup. The question to ask is if the decision-making is prudent.

Patrick Conley, City of West Richland (Local Government Interests), commented that he is a member of the West Richland City Council and he attends these meetings as a representative for those who have to work during the day to make ends meet. Therefore for the next three years of his term, every time he attends a meeting, it is the same as if he has brought a thousand people with him. It is a shame that the public involvement document has been issued as final. As a member of the city council, it is imperative that everything done is done with transparency. As soon as the council starts to ignore the needs of the stakeholders, democracy ceases to exist. It is dismaying that input is not actively sought. The people who live within sight of Hanford are earnestly interested in what happens.

Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), noted that the Board cannot impose term limits but rather that is the responsibility of each organization.

Natural Resources Trustees Council (NRTC)

Larry Goldstein, Washington State Department of Ecology Nuclear Waste Program, gave a brief presentation on the Natural Resources Trustees Council (NRTC). Larry is the trustee for Washington State and does not speak for the council but rather represents the council. It has been more than four years since the council has made a presentation to the Board. In his presentation, he discussed the makeup of the council, the council structure, and the regulatory requirements. He added that in addition to the information on his handout, the following website is a good source of information related to the NRTC:
www.hanford.gov/boards.nrtc

The NRTC is made up of eight entities: DOE, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Nez Pearce Tribe, the Yakama Tribe, the Umatilla Tribe, the State of Oregon, and the State of Washington. DOE organized the Council in 1993 and in 1995 a memorandum of agreement was approved. The goal of the NRTC is to protect and restore the natural resources of the Hanford site. The NRTC would not be effective without the participation of the EPA. Authority for the NRTC is assigned through Comprehensive Environmental Restoration Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA), the Treaties of 1855, and the Natural Resources Defense Act (NRDA).

The Hanford NRTC works with the Tri-Parties to proactively address the protection of existing natural resources, minimize injury to natural resources during cleanup, the restoration of natural resources, and the conducting of activities in a holistic manner. The objectives of the Hanford NRTC are:

- o To ensure natural resources are considered when decisions are made.
- o To integrate natural resource restoration into cleanup actions.
- o To minimize additional injury to resources.
- o To encourage site-wide natural resource planning.
- o To provide information to the agencies to achieve the objectives outlined in the Tri-Party Agreement.

The trustees are responsible for responding to natural resource injury, defined as a measurable adverse change, by assessing the extent of the injuries and restoring the natural processes injured or services lost. These responsibilities are met by working with all parties to minimize the cost of claims against the DOE. As a part of this process, DOE has several responsibilities including: notification when there is a release or a threat of release, providing site evaluation results, participating in site planning and negotiations, and addressing the impacts of remedial actions.

The NRTC coordinates with other trustees to perform preliminary assessments; provide an opportunity to comment on work plans, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) reports etc.; encourage participation in ecological risk assessments; and develop a close out report. The current priorities for the Hanford NRTC include: remedial action projects; 100 B/C pilot risk assessment; 100 Area remedial design report and remedial action work plan; the 200 Area ecological risk assessment; and hazard, dose response, and toxicity assessments.

In the future, the NRTC will focus on remedial actions including the coordination of various cleanup activities, the compilation of existing information, the assessment of potential injuries and damages, the HSW-EIS, groundwater issues, and ecological impacts. It is the job of the Board and the NRTC to ensure that the site is cleaned up for future generations.

Questions

Paige asked if it is difficult to have DOE as both a libel party and a trustee. Larry replied that it is a challenge. From the perspective of federal and state requirements, everything seems straightforward. However, attention must be paid to the budget. It is a continuing struggle to address the needs of all involved parties. Paige asked if the NRTC has been involved in planning for the pre-decisional draft of the risk-based end states implementation plan. Larry commented that individual trustees have weighed in and the NRTC has provided a list of target end points for Ecology to submit to DOE.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), noted the presentation states the NRTC would support the assessment of possible damages and injury. If some of the habitat is not recoverable prior to the injury, what forms of compensation are available? Larry stated that the experience so far is that the ratio is negotiable. That ratio translates into available dollars. If it is not possible to replace a resource, then every attempt is made to acquire similar land elsewhere. As part of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) construction for example, the purchase of seeds and seedlings, and the re-establishment of shrub steppe were required.

Susan also asked what the NRTC's interface is with the Board. Larry stated the hope is that this relationship will be improved. Very often the activities of the NRTC boil down to the available resources. It would be helpful if the council were made aware of the Board's priorities and activities. By being more aware, it is possible the council could help with the Board's ambitious agenda. The NRTC is still trying to fully understand its role.

Todd asked if the NRTC produces any products, and if so whether a distribution list existed that the Board members could be added to. Larry stated the NRTC issues many products and it would be helpful to have the Board members aware of the products generated.

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), asked how the NRTC is funded. Larry stated it is dependent upon each agency involved. His participation is funded in part by a CERCLA grant. The hope is year-end funding will be made available to the NRTC which would allow them to work more closely with the Tri-Parties.

TPA Agency Updates

DOE-ORP

Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, commented that DOE would like to see the TRU waste advice approved. DOE believes this process will allow for the waste to be removed from the tanks and Hanford more quickly. This advice has a number of caveats and DOE appreciates the input on tank closure.

EPA

Nick Ceto, EPA, discussed the transition from the C3T process to the IAMIT work groups. The C3T process was a great experience and one of the outcomes was that the agencies took the opportunity to determine how to work better together. There were several good discussions on the groundwater strategy that resulted in the decision to move many of the drums from Central Waste Complex (CWC) to ERDF, a large percentage of which will be treated. This will open up a great amount of storage space. During this process, progress has been made in tangible ways and most issues have been discussed though new ones continue to come up. Because of the progress made, the agencies concluded that the principles of C3T should be integrated into everyday business. The group decided that work groups, developed through the IAMIT process, could be used to identify the issues that are being struggled with and pick the most important of those for the work groups to discuss. The work groups would then develop solutions and ideas for addressing these issues and bring those to the management teams.

The IAMIT teams are:

- End States
- Closure of Central Plateau
- Risk Assessment
- Waste Management

One of the major questions has been how to involve the Board and the public in this process. So far, one suggestion is to invite other people to participate or to have people identify that they would like to be included in this. The goal is to have an open process but to not slow down the work. Any other suggestions for how to do this are welcome. The teams will focus on hot issues and develop possible solutions. The teams will then disband if the issue was addressed. If a new issue arises, a new team will be created.

Questions

Paige commented she hopes the NRTC will be invited. Nick stated that Larry Gadbois is the chair of one of the groups and therefore, NRTC has been invited.

Shelley asked how often the teams meet. Nick replied that they develop their own schedules.

Leon commented this is a major move in the right direction. He had the opportunity to attend one of the meetings and he applauds the work being done. There needs to be a discussion on how Board members can participate in a meaningful way without speaking for the whole Board.

Max Power, Ecology, commented that the Headquarters project teams, the National Government Association, and the Federal Facilities Task Force have been working on a tight time frame and have not been operating on a principle of openness. In three or four cases, sub-groups were created to enable the group to stay in touch more effectively. The DOE reports to those groups on a regular basis. He suggested it might be beneficial if the chairs of the teams provided an update at each committee meeting.

Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), commented that from what Nick said, it sounds as if priorities and timing are being determined, which is different from what Pam had described. He asked if Nick agrees with Pam's interpretation. Tom stated he would like to be aware of what was discussed so he can have input into the discussion. Nick replied that for major decisions, there must be a public process. For day-to-day decision-making, the intention was to give the groups the task of identifying issues and then ferreting out the decisions that would need to be made. Those decisions would then be presented at larger meetings. Everyday decisions would address how to deal with the site. While public participation is valuable, at the lower levels it can also slow forward progress. Tom noted he is leery of what DOE considers a major decision. He stated he hopes EPA and Ecology are more aware of this.

Todd stated what concerns him is that the work the agencies and the Board are doing will mature. However, it is unknown which issues will mature and which will flounder. It is important that there is a formal mechanism for public involvement. To this end, there should be an update from each team chair at the River and Plateau Committee meetings. Nick noted the team is trying to get the summaries and meeting schedules posted on the website along with the work products. Todd countered that the Board needs to ensure it is responsible for identifying the big issues. The difficulty is all the issues are big and the Board must decide where to spend its resources.

DOE-RL

Susan Leckband briefly reviewed the status of the long-term stewardship plan. She noted that Jim Daily, DOE-RL, was supportive early on of including and working with the public. This was a wonderful experience for everyone involved. Many members of the Board, along with USFWS staff, participated in these discussions. The plan has now been issued and is a living document. There are particular statements in the document that identify it as a living document. This should be used as a framework to identify the relationship between the cleanup mission and long-term stewardship. This document identifies the actions required to prepare for long-term stewardship such as expanded post cleanup monitoring. Cleanup decisions will be made with long-term stewardship in mind. There will be benchmarks for long-term activities and these will be monitored. This process has been a success story for early public involvement helping to produce an excellent document.

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, announced that last night, Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management, the Chairman of the House of Representatives Energy Committee, Representative Insley, and Representative Hastings discussed unlined trenches. Agreement was reached that the use of unlined trenches would end as soon as the ROD is signed. Two contingencies for this are that permits from Ecology and EPA will be needed and that the HSW-EIS is not challenged in court. The HSW-EIS will be finalized as early as next week. The ROD will not be issued any sooner than thirty days after that.

She added that all four agencies will be holding workshops on Risk-Based End-States and plan on working closely with the Board.

Marla also announced that she will be on maternity leave from September 10 through December 3. While she is gone, Yvonne will be the contact for day-to-day matters, Beth Bilson will act as the Designated Federal Official (DFO), and Colleen Clark in Marla's department is available for questions as well.

Supplemental Technologies

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, stated the reasoning behind supplemental technologies is if the second high-level melter is installed now then the deadline could be met more quickly. If additional low-level treatment was available in the 2011 timeframe, then the high-level melters could be used specifically for the high-level waste.

After privatization, the path towards treatment was still able to continue and be maintained. A series of negotiations took place to move the decision time of 2014 to 2005. A determination had to be made of what the process would look like in this new timeframe. The result is that in 2011 the WTP is functioning at full capacity, as is supplemental technology.

Part of this process included establishing two new milestones. The first is that DOE must submit a supplemental technologies report in January 2005. At this time, there will be negotiations to decide what technology will augment the WTP. The baselines would then be changed to reflect the decisions from these negotiations. At this point in the process, public input would be solicited.

For a supplemental technology to be acceptable it will need to:

- Produce a waste form that performs as good as WTP glass
- Be protective of human health and the environment
- Be possible in terms of cost, construction, and other factors.

The caveat that any new form is “as good as glass” is essential because Ecology agreed to a five-year delay that turned into ten years for tank waste treatment, in exchange for a better Low-Activity waste form.

Billie Mauss, CH2MHill, gave a brief update on the status of the supplemental technologies. One of the common issues identified by the public is that there is value to having the new technology be as good as glass, as is high quality cleanup. Many expert review panels have been developed to review the possible technologies. These panels have helped to identify the selection criteria for the technology. The team has been very open in giving progress reports to the tanks committee.

The timeline for the selection is as follows:

- 10-1-03 – downselect investment strategy
- 12-1-03 – contracts awarded to vendors
- 5-31-04 – demolish and decommission (D&D) permits are issued
- 8/2004 – hot tests are initiated
- 1/2005 – recommendation on supplemental technology and path forward to achieve the 2028 (M-62-08) deadline. The determination of which path to take will be made at this time.

At this time, safety, schedule, cost, operability, and system impacts are not discriminations for selection. The issue of secondary waste will need to be resolved for all thermal waste forms, including the WTP. She noted that the grout waste form performance is not comparable to WTP glass. Bulk vitrification and steam reforming are potentially comparable in performance to WTP glass, but steam reforming must resolve the issue of intruder performance and bulk vitrification must resolve the issue of Technetium-99 (tc-99) salts in the sand.

Questions

Paige commented that there is no why or how. She does not feel comfortable agreeing to any decision without having data to back it up. Billie replied that a large amount of backup information is available. The committee needs to decide what information it needs.

Paige commented that she wants to hear all of the information at once. Suzanne responded that they debated what to present and were limited by the five minutes. There is more data but they were trying to fit into the mandates of what the Board requested. Todd noted the difficulty is not the willingness to share information but rather the timing of when the information is available.

Leon commented the real issue is when the data is available to the Board. Additionally, it is a Board process issue. The Board processes must be able to work and it is the DOE timeline that drove the advice. He would like to see cost and performance data.

Keith Smith asked if the team had looked at the data from previous steam reforming trials. Rick Raymond, CH2MHill, commented the information from previous attempts was validated but the steam reforming currently being used is very different from what was used in Portsmouth.

Harold noted that on one hand, Washington State has agreed to supplemental technologies; however, they are party to the lawsuit. He asked if these are compatible. Suzanne clarified that the state has agreed to explore the options. It is the position of the state that the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) lawsuit is in greater relation to tank residuals than it is to leaving immobilized waste at the site.

Draft Advice: TRU Waste in the Tanks

Doug thanked Al Boldt, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), for providing a great deal of information and help for the advice. He also thanked Jeff, Pam, and the entire Tank Waste Committee. The advice states that the Board is generally supportive of this process for eight specifically mentioned tanks. The committee is skeptical that this would be successful for any of the other tanks. Caution needs to be exercised because the determination of whether or not the tanks contain TRU is an intricate process.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), relayed that Heart of America Northwest cannot support any advice that is generally supportive of this effort out of concern for their approval potentially being taken out of context. The advice was revised to address this concern.

Tim asked DOE to clarify how it will talk to the parties in New Mexico and how this process might evolve. Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, stated he did not have that information but added that John Kristofski, DOE-ORP, has met with the parties in New Mexico.

Suzanne Dahl stated that there has not been much contact with the state of New Mexico. DOE-ORP has been in contact with WIPP trying to determine what will be needed in the data packages. The Hanford staff will be going to the quarterly meeting in New Mexico to speak with the regulators there.

This advice was adopted.

Draft Advice: Supplemental Technologies

Leon commented that the new draft was reviewed by the Public Involvement committee during yesterday's meeting and subsequently, several changes were made. These changes expanded the public involvement section of the advice, in particular addressing the timing of decisions. It was the consensus of both the Public Involvement (PIC) and Tank Waste (TWC) committees to request a two-month extension of both the decision date for DOE and the M62-08 milestone so DOE can accommodate public involvement in this process without missing a TPA milestone. The issue of how the involvement process has and has not worked is closely tied to the morning's discussion regarding effective public involvement as a direct response to the very aggressive schedule that has been put forth by DOE-ORP. DOE-ORP has been very forthcoming in terms of attending meetings with the committees, and providing information in a timely manner. However, there are still critical pieces missing such as cost, schedule, and performance information, and the public feedback process.

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government Interests), noted the timing issue is serious. However, the draft advice clearly avoids providing any support for the use of supplemental technologies. Leon responded that committee consensus was that the WTP process must be completed. It may not be the best process available, but it will allow for some of the high-level waste to be treated. A better technology may present itself during the supplemental technologies process but the project needs to continue to move forward with what is available.

Supplemental technologies should be used as a supplement, not as a replacement. Doug added the first criterion in the advice is a reiteration of what the Board has consistently required. The second is that the most highly contaminated material should be sent to Yucca Mountain. What remains on site should be the most benign material. Wanda noted that if the supplemental technology is as good as glass, it should not matter what remains at Hanford because the risk would be the same. Doug noted there would not be the same isolation as at Yucca Mountain.

Richard Smith commented that if the supplemental treatment process performs the same as glass, then this should not be an issue. Additionally, it should not be difficult to have Yucca Mountain accept a waste form other than glass. Tom Carpenter stated that the Tank Waste EIS indicated that even vitrified tank waste stored at Hanford would fail. The reason for the material to go to Yucca Mountain is that this site is in itself considered a storage vessel. The glass will break down, which is why it should be stored at Yucca Mountain. The law requires the material be isolated for 10,000 years. It is not right that any high-level material could remain at Hanford, in a shallow burial ground close to the river.

Susan noted the Board would be asking for a delay in the schedule. Generally delays cause ripple effects. She asked if the committee knows or has considered what the effects may be. Doug responded that that is why Ecology is also being requested to extend the related milestone. Suzanne added that Ecology would ultimately be okay with this extension.

Leon noted that the feeling of both PIC and TWC is this decision will have a far-reaching impact. The committees would like to be a part of the decision instead of picking up the pieces in the future. Based on the information from the open house, he is unsure that he could disregard any of the technologies. The available data is very limited. It is important that the Board has an opportunity to weigh in.

Martin Yanez, Public-at-Large, asserted it is not sensitive for the Board to say send all the waste to Yucca Mountain. The Board must be sensitive to the public when speaking with the agencies. The waste needs to be studied more closely to determine if there are other ways of dealing with it besides sending it out of state.

Susan stated she likes this advice. There is great concern that no matter how much money is allocated to the vitrification plant, no glass will ever come out.

Max asserted that in 2005 when the information on the technology is available, Ecology will have a benchmark that requires this technology to be as good as glass.

Wanda stated it is the secondary waste stream that should be minimized to ensure the impacts on all living things are also minimized. Pam clarified that a secondary waste stream could be off gas from the WTP. It is the impacts of the waste stream that should be minimized in that case, not the stream itself.

This advice was adopted.

Retrieval, Treatment and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of Single-Shell Tanks EIS comment period extension request

The comment period for the EIS ends on November 4th, which is before the Board meeting. The Board would like to request a 55-day extension so it may provide advice. The Board is open to other alternatives that would allow Board comment such as a committee of the whole, or receiving the document earlier.

Paige stated this extension is not only important for the Board but for the public as well. The public was greatly involved with the scoping process and it is important for them to have an opportunity to comment.

Susan noted that the fact that there are two pieces of advice requesting delays due to the Board's schedule is either a reflection of too few meetings or these documents not being in sync with what the Board needs to do.

The letter was approved.

Board Business

Todd provided a brief update on the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) issues. The Idaho Board has run out of money for this fiscal year and will have to see if funding is available for fiscal year 2004. Seven members of the Paducah Board (about half the membership) resigned in protest of DOE's apparent lack of respect for the board. Several other boards are making news in their local newspapers based on changes to their contracting situations. Several chair calls have been held to discuss these issues. There is growing concern about DOE's commitment to the advisory boards.

The issue for Hanford comes from a letter issued by Jessie Roberson stating that prime contractors should not be a contractor for the board. This is because of conflict of interest and accountability reasons. This was a major issue for Savannah River because Westinghouse runs the board there. However, at Hanford the board is contracted through EnviroIssues. A change may be seen with the support personnel from Bechtel and Fluor such as Nancy Myers and Barb Wise. DOE would also like the Board to become more independent. One way for this to happen would be for the Board to operate as a 501-3(c), under which the Board would be given a grant by DOE for operations. Rocky Flats operates under this model. A formal proposal has not been received for this and the executive committee has had a lukewarm response to this idea.

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, briefed the Board on changes to the facilitation contract. EnviroIssues has a fixed price contract for one year with four possible one-year extensions. For fiscal year 2004, EnviroIssues was asked for budget cuts as well as a six-month contract extension instead of a one-year. There is an optional six-month extension for the rest of the year. The proposed contract price will allow for five Board meetings and forty committee meetings for the fiscal year. This includes committee of the wholes, task forces and other special meetings. A senior advisor will no longer be on the staff for this contract. A proposal outlining these changes has been submitted to DOE but it has not yet been approved.

Marla stated she appreciates the executive committee's willingness to discuss this issue. DOE is very interested in the boards becoming more independent, partly because it will then be easier to see the costs of the boards pulled out.

Max clarified that committee summaries will not be cut as part of these changes. Penny stated that as a result of the discussion at the June Board meeting, committee summaries will still be provided.

Paige asked what the benefits and possible pitfalls are of the Board becoming a 501-3(c). Todd stated the Board would be very independent and could direct resources to the areas the Board deems necessary. However, many of the issues Marla currently handles would become the Board's responsibility. The majority of the administrative responsibilities would fall to the Board's chair.

Leon expressed concern that reorganization would divert a substantial amount of effort away from the real issues. Greg deBruler added that if DOE can divert the Board's attention now, a number of key decisions would be made without input.

Shelley urged the agencies to be clear on what the decision points are for the upcoming year. The timelines need to be more finely tuned and the Board meetings will need to be carefully prepared.

Committee Updates

Tank Waste Committee (TWC): The committee discussed the supplemental technologies downselect and the tank waste EIS that resulted in the two pieces of advice at this meeting. At the last committee meeting, the committee also received a tour of the WTP. There is no plan to have a meeting for October but this may change if a supplemental technology workshop is scheduled for the November Board Meeting. The committee has chosen Doug Huston to continue as chair and Leon Swenson to continue as vice-chair.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP): Pam reported that the committee has looked at the issues for the upcoming year in relation to the priorities report Todd gave earlier. She has met with DOE-RL to get a sense of when various documents will be available for review. An aggressive schedule has been put together through January in preparation for the February Board meeting. At the committee meeting next week, there will be a tour of several of the sites at Hanford including the B/C cribs, Gable Mountain, and the burial grounds among others. Pam and Dan had an opportunity to meet with the IAMIT group and were very encouraged with the interaction between that group and the agencies and regulators. Dennis added that the End-States group will be asking for significant time at the October committee meeting in preparation for the November Board meeting. The committee has chosen Pam to continue as chair and Susan Leckband to continue as vice-chair.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection (HSEP): Keith Smith stated that the results from the inhalation incident should be ready by next month's committee week so HSEP may need its own meeting to discuss that and to receive an update on tank vapor issues. HSEP may also request a report from DOE-RL on the tag violations and how those will be mitigated. The committee has chosen Keith Smith as its chair and Tim Takaro as its vice-chair.

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC): Harold stated that both DOE-ORP and DOE-RL have changed their baselines to improve efficiency. The contractors are now given a sum of money and are expected to work within that. This new method reduces the amount of committee involvement in the budget process. The baselines are currently undergoing a series of reviews and both agencies have stated they will be able to discuss these in October. The River Corridor contract is still in a holding pattern due to the continuing dispute process. There will be a need for an October meeting to discuss the baselines. Committee leadership has not yet been determined.

Public Involvement Committee (PIC): Amber stated that PIC has been busy developing the public involvement dialogue over the last few months. At yesterday's committee meeting, there was a good discussion about the Official Use Only Policy with representatives from the DOE-RL security office. The committee will continue to monitor this item to see how it evolves and affects public involvement needs. PIC will be working with Ecology to find a way to integrate the State of the Site and annual budget meetings. Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), is exploring the possibility of a Board forum, like the one held in Spokane, at Lewis and Clark College during the November Board meeting. Dennis Faulk also alerted the committee that there are still a number of loose ends from the Exposure Scenarios Task force. The committee has chosen Amber as the chair and Susan Hughes, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), as the vice-chair.

Questions

Paige asked if Amber is alluding to the product from the Exposure Scenarios Task Force being used in the end-states discussion. She would be happy to see this because the workshops were of great value. Dennis replied that while good work was done, the final product was not disseminated to the broader public. One of the issues was that it is difficult to structure this discussion for the broader public.

Tom announced that on September 29, 2003, the Government Accountability Project (GAP) will be sponsoring a function to honor John Brock, who was the founder of the Hanford Joint Council (HJC). It is

an opportunity to recognize his effort. The event will be held at GAP's downtown office and State Attorney General Christine Gregoire will be speaking. This event is open to the broader public. Also, GAP has engaged several Russian scientists with extensive environmental sampling at similar sites in Siberia to do extensive sampling of the Columbia River. Anyone interested in meeting them should speak to Tom.

Dennis announced that Columbia Riverkeeper has applied for an EPA technical group grant. He encouraged any other groups that would be interested in such a grant to speak to Columbia Riverkeepers or himself for more information.

Max announced that Laura Breu, lead investigator for the Hanford site-wide permit, will be leaving at the end of the month.

Pam announced that the Hanford Communities have completed a video about accelerated cleanup. This video uses the DOE video on the same subject and the question and answer period from the state of the site meetings. This video will be aired on public and cable television.

FY2004 Priorities

The Board reviewed the fiscal year 2004 priorities. The Board is not limited to what the agencies have suggested, although it is worth paying attention to. It is important for members to note the planned schedule and associated issues.

The priorities for fiscal year 2004 were adopted.

United Kingdom Visitors

Several visitors from the United Kingdom were in attendance. They are in the process of developing an environmental management program to clean up a nuclear site in the United Kingdom. Rex Toft stated he and the other members of his group had a good exchange of ideas and views some of the Board members. The nuclear site they are starting the cleanup process on is a reprocessing plant in County Cambria. The British government has advised that the energy policy is changing to give more emphasis to wind power. The result will be the decommissioning of the Celophile nuclear plant in six or seven years. The workforce during this time will be reduced from 9,000 employees to 4,000. This reduction will have a very large impact on the local economy, compounded by the remote location of the facility. There are very few alternatives for employment in this area. Another issue is that the majority of Britain's nuclear waste is in above ground storage at this site.

A bill was passed by parliament that requires consultation with the local community in regard to what they would like to happen with the facility. The view is that the government would tell the community what they want to hear, not what they need to know. To this end, the British policy will be modeled after the American policy. The communities thought it would be wise to send a team to view the American model firsthand. The team has learned many valuable lessons, including the importance of speaking with one voice, submitting requests for provisions in legislation early in the process, and talking with the government about Celophile in terms of site closure. It is important to have national groups involved with the cleanup process, so the team has been observing the US-DOE boards to see how they function. The team has also recognized the need to look after the interests of the workers and local community.

Questions and Discussion

Susan commented that she is employed at Hanford and is lucky the government allows non-union, non-management employees to participate in the Board. She asked if the workers at Celophile would be engaged in some way. Rex replied they are in the fact finding stage but feel it is important to have worker participation.

Tim asked how this became the sole storage facility. Rex replied because it is the biggest nuclear site in the UK. The region is so heavily dependent upon the jobs provided by the facility, it is one of the few areas in the country that is pro-nuclear and willing to take waste. After a long series of meetings, consultants were brought to the site to explore its geology. It was discovered that the ground will not be suitable for long-term storage.

Becky asked how long the plant has been in operation. Rex explained that it started generating for electricity and weapons production during the early 1950's. Currently, many of the power stations are being shut down and replaced with wind-generated power.

Jim asked what percentage of the waste is commercial versus military and if there will be a continuing waste stream from elsewhere in the UK. Tim stated the vast majority of the waste is commercial, with some military waste as well. There will continue to be a waste stream because some of the power stations will continue to operate. The plant is used to process not only waste from the UK but from Germany and Japan as well. Low-level waste is also brought to this site, including medical waste.

Max suggested that there are several people in the community who would have valuable information to share about spin-off businesses and worker transition programs that have been successful.

Shelley asked what the size of the population is in Cambria. Rex replied there are 12,000 employees and the nearest town has 25,000 people. The county as a whole has 25 million residents but most of those live East of the mountains that separate the plant from the rest of the county.

Public Comment

John Perreault stated the reason more people are not attending this meeting is that it takes a deep commitment to understand the subject. The people at this meeting have been chosen to learn the information necessary to have an intelligent conversation regarding Hanford. Additionally, attendance is low because the meeting is in the middle of the day and while it is advertised as a Seattle meeting, it is actually twenty miles away. If increased public participation is desired, then the meeting should be held in the evening or on a weekend so the rest of the public, who have jobs, can attend. He addressed Keith and Roy noting that while it is nice that groups such as the rotary have been given tours of the site, public tours are still unavailable.

Shauna Larson thanked the tribal people to whom the land originally belonged. She represents the Federal Facilities Working Group. The job of this group is to interview communities such as this about their level of participation in site decisions. The team is interested in talking to anyone who wants to share their stories and thoughts about Hanford. A report from these interviews will be given to DOE for review.

Nanci Peters attended the meeting as the unofficial representative of the Yakama Nation. She commented if these were truly public meetings, the name of the Board would be the Hanford Public Advisory Board. The public should be allowed to speak before the Board members so they feel welcomed and heard. This meeting has not been conducted with dignity and respect. She stated she has observed carelessness, grandstanding, and a lack of respect to everyone around the table. She urged that participants keep in mind dignity and respect.

Doris Bradshaw commented she started with the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) and is now working with the Federal Facilities Working Group. They are asking each person from the community to provide input on public involvement issues at the site. She noted one gentleman stated this is a diverse group but it doesn't appear so. The Federal Facilities Working Group wants to do whatever they can to help the Board do its job better. They want to ensure the community has real involvement.

Shauna Larson stated she worked with the tribes in Alaska as an environmental justice coordinator. She stated she has learned so much about Hanford it is incredible and is still resonating. It has been quite a journey and she finds it difficult to believe people live next to this site. As she looks around the room she

very much feels in the minority. A credible and effective communication process includes active community outreach for public involvement. She encouraged the Board and DOE to increase outreach, to bring the information to the churches and the tribes, and other places that are uncomfortable for non-ethnics. The Board meeting was not set up for the general public. The Board needs to think about who the public is such as working mothers and other working individuals. She stated she has heard some participants say it is not beneficial to get angry. If you are not angry, then you are not paying attention. The land is not being returned to its native state, this is a reason to be angry. She added that risk assessments do not apply to most ethnic people because radiation is not the only issue. There is also the issue of organic pollutants that combine with the contamination from Hanford. It is important to think about Hanford cleanup in context of everything else around the site.

Doris Bradshaw stated that about eight years ago, she began looking at what the Department of Defense had done to her community. At the time, she did not realize there were other communities like hers. While visiting Hanford, she became frightened to be so close to something so dangerous. The workers spoke as if this material was harmless. They stated that the radiation was present but is not harmful. She noted that from the beginning of time people have said certain things are not harmful which then turn out differently. These are not friendly chemicals; they were developed to be destructive. She asked why someone would create something so toxic and so harmful. The U.S. needs to look at the effects not only to the targeted country but, to U.S. citizens living near the manufacture of these materials. She commented one gentleman presented an outline of work for the next ten years. To her this does not allow for the input of citizens. No one will be listening to the community. Her advice to the government is that there needs to be a platform to talk about health issues. Radiation may not be found in the fish but other contaminants may. In closing she stated that the Board is important but needs greater diversity. The board in Tennessee is the same. The government and board there continued to say they did not know how to reach the black community. The government needs to do a better job of educating the public. The Board needs to do a better job of educating the public. She is the only African American in the room and she feels self-conscious. Education helps people to understand. Everyone has the right and deserves to know the full scope of the issue.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Pam Brown, Member	Bob Parks, Member	Rebecca Holland, Alternate
Tom Carpenter, Member	Gerry Pollet, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate
Shelley Cimon, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate
Patrick Conley, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Jeanie Sedgely, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Dan Simpson, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond	Elizabeth Tabutt, Member	Richard Smith, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Martin Yanez, Member	Charles Weems, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Gabriel Bohnee, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-officio
Jeff Luke, Member	Allyn Boldt, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-officio
Todd Martin, Member		

--	--	--

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Keith Klein, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Michael Cowen, Thor Treatment Tech
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Suzanne Heaston, BNI	Diane Schmoker, Thor Treatment Tech.
Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL	Jim Henschel, BNI	
Rick Stutiheit, DOE-RL	Nancy B. Myers, BHI	
Greg Jones, DOE-ORP	Dale Allen, CH2MHill	
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Dan Butler, CH2MHill	
Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP	Bryan Kidder, CH2MHill	
Randy Smart, DOE-ORP	John Kristofski, CH2MHill	
David Garcia, DOE	Billie Mauss, CH2MHill	
Nick Ceto, EPA	Rick Raymond, CH2MHill	
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Don Moak, Duratec	
Mike Gearheard, EPA	Liana Herron, EnviroIssues	
Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues	
Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues	
Larry Goldstein, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues	
Jane Hedges, Ecology	Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues	
Joy Turner, Ecology	Jeff Hertzfel, Fluor	
Max Power, Ecology	Dick Wilde, Fluor	
Ron Skinnard, Ecology	Barb Wise, Fluor	
Mike Wilson, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Doris Bradshaw, DDMTC	Tim Knowles, County Cambria County Council U.K.	John Perreault, Heart of America Northwest
Tom Heim, Environmental Management Support	Shauna Larson, FFRRO	Nanci Peters, Yakama Nation
John Hethering, Cambria County Council U.K.	Trina Martynowicz, FFRRO	Phil Richardson, Enviro Consulting U.K.
Lois E. Hill, FFRRO	Chris Muliek, Tri-City Herald	Ruth Siguenza
Eliza Johnson, Heart of America Northwest	David Perr, Heart of America Northwest	S.B. Swift Northwest Development Agency U.K.
		Rex Toft, County Cambria County Council U.K.