

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING**

***March 20, 2006
Richland, WA***

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Presentation – DOE-ORP	1
Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Presentation – DOE-RL	5
Committee Discussion about Scoping Advice.....	10
Preparing for the April Board Meeting.....	11
Action Items / Commitments	12
Handouts	12
Attendees.....	12

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.

Welcome and Introductions

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, welcomed the committee and introductions were made.

The goal of meeting was to hear budget presentations from the US Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and the US Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (ORP) and to develop advice for the Fiscal Year 2007 (FY 2007) and Fiscal Year 2008 (FY 2008).

February’s meeting summary was approved.

Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Presentation – DOE-ORP

Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, presented the DOE-ORP FY 2008 budget information. The meeting objectives were to provide a federal budget process summary, information regarding the River Protection Project (RPP), and to elicit meaningful discussion and gather timely input. She said at any given time, DOE-ORP is budgeting for three years. Currently, they are focused on executing the FY 2006 budget, reviewing the FY 2007 budget, and planning for FY 2008. She provided a graph illustrating Hanford budgets FY 2000 to FY 2011.

Shirley said that DOE-ORP is renegotiating their commitments, discussing strategies, and identifying critical assumptions with the regulators – US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). By

September 2006 they will have a new baseline for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) and in April DOE-ORP will be renegotiating milestones as appropriate.

The RPP critical path is the design, construction, and commissioning of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), with a focus on High-Level Waste (HLW) and Pretreatment (PT) facilities. Tank Farm critical activities include retrieval, treatment, disposal, closure, and base operations; the Tank Farm schedule will go before ESAAB in October 2006.

RPP Critical Activities include:

- Critical path and key activities have not changed
- Continue early discussions/negotiations with regulators regarding TPA milestones
- Schedule will be revised once DOE-ORP receives ESAAB approved updated baselines (the figures presented to the committee are not accurate)

RPP Key Commitments include:

- Safely managing tank waste
- Building the WTP
- Managing the WTP and tank farms as an integrated system
- Pursuing supplemental treatment capabilities
- Relying on the TPA process to prioritize risk
- Collaborating with regulators, stakeholders, and tribes
- Implementing the updated ESAAB approved tank farm baseline
- Managing the tank farms in a safe and environmentally compliant manner and perform the appropriate number of single-shell tank (SST) waste retrievals to maintain adequate double shell tank space.

Goals for 2007 include implementing the ESAAB baseline for the WTP and obtaining approval of the update ESAAB baseline for the tank farms. In 2008, they will be identifying best management for retrieval double-shell tank upgrades. DOE-ORP is not looking at constructing new double-shelled tanks.

Shirley said it is difficult to maintain a consistent cost and schedule baseline in a dynamic program. DOE-ORP is addressing impacts of the delayed start of the WTP on the timing of retrieval, treatment, disposal, and closure activities. The WTP is now funded with five separate funds control points: Low Activity Waste (LAW), High Level Waste (HLW), Pretreatment (PT), LAB, and BOF.

Planned key accomplishments for the WTP include continuing design and construction work on the WTP with a focus on PT and HLW Facilities. DOE-ORP will submit a FY2008 over-target budget request, which will include accelerating the WTP critical path construction.

Planned key accomplishments for Tank Farms in FY2008 include managing in a safe and compliant manner; continuing to retrieve single shell tank (SST) waste at a reduced pace;

initiating construction of the Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System (DBVS); issuing the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS); and implementing updated approved ESAAB approved baseline. The proposed over-target activities include accelerating construction of the DBVS; initiating C-Farm closure demonstration; and performing additional SST retrievals.

Regulator Perspectives

- Jane _____, Ecology, said they are concerned the funding level will inhibit consistent progress under the current schedule. The schedule is critical and they have not renegotiated milestones. Ecology is concerned that creating a new baseline before reaching milestones doesn't work well under the mutual working arrangement. They are concerned with the WTP delay and the retrieval portion of budget. Slowing of tank waste retrieval is a concern to local safety and the environment; single-shelled tanks need to be cleaned out. Ecology does not support slowing retrievals before they've looked at alternative overall milestones. Key decisions need to be made about the LAW facility and the path forward, and they see reduced funding for bulk vitrification as inhibitive. Ecology supports the DBVS. Ecology thinks the budget is resource limited and will continue to be limited. Jane said the baseline level of planning is adequate; they currently don't have specific figures to recommend.
- Rod Lobos, EPA, said EPA is still talking with Ecology and DOE-ORP and currently doesn't have a perspective on the DOE-ORP budget.

Committee Discussion

- *Are there actual dollar amounts for managing the tank farms in a safe manner?* Shirley said there was \$150-180 million for environmental compliance and that the tank waste sampling and integrity program is around \$10 million; she said she could get a list of what falls under managing all systems. Gerry requested a complete list.
- *Is there funding "set aside" to deal with Tank Farm surprises (i.e., unexpected leakages)?* Roy said there was no special contingency fund, and if there were a leak they would pump it into a double shell tank. Money would have to be taken from the main mission fund to mitigate. Jane ____ said they require double shell tanks to meet emergency pumping requirements, and that a leak would be a number one priority. Shirley said that's why they have a minimum safe budget, to maintain the safety envelope. Roy said they are evaluating how full they can fill the double shell tanks so there is several years of pre-stage sludge when the WTP starts up.
- Gerry asked about the pace of tank waste retrieval. Shirley said currently retrieval is one to two tanks per year and they plan to maintain that pace into 2008 to avoid layoffs and subsequent retraining. Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP, added that the pace recognized the usage of multiple technologies, and the original faster pace only assumed one technology for retrieval. Shirley confirmed that five retrievals were planned if the LAW facility is operational in 2011.

- The committee thought that five separate Project Baseline Summaries (PBS), or “buckets,” reduces flexibility.
- Gerry asked about the pace of the LAW Facility; Shirley said they are currently focused on LAW construction. In 2008 focus will shift to the PT Facility and the HLW Facility. The schedule for LAW is not finalized; it will go through DOE-HQ and ESAAB before final approval. There will be details for each facility. By the end of September 2006 they hope to have ESAAB approval for the WTP, with an Estimate at Completion (EAC) completed this summer and validated by an Environmental Impact Review (EIR). For Tank Farms, they don’t expect to have ESAAB approval until next year.
- Current status of the LAW facility: Roy said they are currently putting the skin on the tiller compressor building, and that the civil and structural design is basically complete and they will move into electrical, instrumentation, and control design.
- Gerry commented that the LAW facility is not at the pace some people have urged and asked if their planning assumption reflected the slow down over the past five years. Roy said they looking at putting more resources in the PT and HLW facilities because they are critical for WTP startup and that they’ll use whatever money they have to keep LAW at pace.
- Keith Smith commented that the bulk vitrification plant is eating up the budget – how does that cost compare to an additional melter? Roy said they don’t have enough data to know that yet and that they would have better expense data once there is an approved baseline. Roy also said they would be doing one to four box evaluations to ensure that bulk vitrification is a reasonable and cost-effective approach. They want bulk vitrification to be cost effective, and bulk vitrification brings flexibility so they don’t have to wait for the LAW facility to start up.
- Al Boldt said building bulk vitrification would delay the WTP; Shirley said funding comes from different places, and Al responded that from Congress’ perspective, it’s all Hanford, and they will wonder why the money they just gave Hanford is adequate.
- Gerry said it would be wise for the Board to see a funding profile for the LAW facility and require a plan for getting the LAW facility operational, if in fact the LAW facility were funded for startup in 2011. Roy said they are looking at that and will provide more information in June.
- Al Boldt said the DOE-ORP baseline is not aggressive and that they need to request more money instead of creating over-target goals. Roy Schepens said the figures presented, including the \$580 million FY 2008 WTP funding, are based on the existing and outdated baseline for 2011; if cleanup were still on schedule, those figures would be correct. The baseline needs to be revised, at minimum to the \$690 million funding profile.
- Susan Leckband asked if the **Army Corp of Engineers report (due in June??)** would have an impact on the baseline; Roy said they would be using that report to validate the new baseline.
- *Why is there a dramatic reduction in minimum safe costs?* Shirley said minimum safe costs were \$150-180 million, which include leak detection, vadose zone and tank waste sampling. Diane Clark, DOE-ORP, said over time there are different views of what minimum safe is, and Shirley said that those activities are defined

and separated differently now. Susan said a reduction in workforce might have contributed to a reduced minimum safe budget. Greg requested a breakdown of the minimum safe budget because he's concerned about what may be missing; Shirley said she would get back to him about that.

Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Presentation – DOE-RL

Greg Jones and Jeff Frye, DOE-RL, gave an overview of the budget process, including key commitments, priorities and planned accomplishments by project. DOE-RL key commitments include maintaining TPA compliance and regulatory requirements, safeguarding special nuclear materials, and considering regulator and public feedback in planning activities. Key priorities include maintaining safe and compliant facilities and providing essential services; maintaining TPA compliance and protecting groundwater; and shipping Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) plutonium waste offsite. Protecting groundwater key priorities include: 1) Completing containerization and consolidation of K East and K West sludge; 2) Cleanup of facilities and waste sites along the Columbia River Corridor; 3) Retrieve suspect transuranic (TRU) waste from burial grounds and continue shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and; 4) Continue remedial investigations (RI) and feasibility studies (FS) on the Central Plateau (will lead to Record of Decisions [ROD]).

DOE-RL also addressed some challenges presented when managing a dynamic program, such as addressing new and emerging work scopes due to changing technical assumptions—longer duration of PFP (2009 completion), additional field characterization activities to support Central Plateau decisions, and an increase in K Basin cleanup (KBC) work scope due to sludge and debris conditions. In some cases they are “re-sequencing” activities. Greg said the regulators were briefed last week and all are committed to maintain TPA compliance.

The FY 2008 budget is due to DOE-HQ on April 14. Like DOE-ORP, they are working on three budgets at any given time. Greg presented a master-planning schedule designed by area; they are concerned and are in dialogue with the regulators about K-East and K-West cleanup milestones. Good progress has been made on cocooning reactors within the River Corridor project. They are planning an exit from the 300 Area Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) facilities per current milestones. DOE-RL is glad the Board is looking at ramping the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) down.

Planned accomplishments for the River Corridor in FY08

- Spent Nuclear Fuel Stabilization and Disposition (RL-0012)
 - Maintaining K Basin safety and compliance
 - Completing K West Basin sludge retrieval
 - Disposition and treatment of KBC sludge will be supported under RL-0013
 - Decontamination and deactivation of KBC activities will be supported under RL-0041.

- Nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) – RCCP (RL-0041)
 - Next activities on the critical path are the 100 and 300 Areas; after cleanup, resources can be shifted to Central Plateau cleanup
 - Continuing 100 and 300 Area waste sit remediation (going with current contract schedule for the 300 Area)
 - Continuing 100 and 300 Area D&D of facilities
 - Initiate interim safe storage at N Reactor (new activity)
 - Continuing D&D of K East Basin (new transfer to RL-0041)
- Nuclear Facility D&D – FFTF (RL-0042)
 - Completing deactivation and initiate long term surveillance and maintenance (bulk sodium remains stored at Sodium Storage Facility; sodium residuals remain throughout the sodium systems)
 - Transfer fuel handling equipment to the Canister Storage Building
- *Proposed Over-Target Activities*
 - Prepare and transport final 11 sodium bonded fuel assemblies/pin containers to the Idaho National Laboratory (INL)
 - Conduct small scale sodium residual removal activities (only if receive over-target funding)

Planned accomplishments for the Central Plateau in FY08

- Nuclear Material Stabilization and Disposition – PFP (RL-0011)
 - Maintain PFP complex facilities
 - Maintain safe and secure storage of special nuclear material
 - Continue shipment of plutonium offsite
 - Initiate D&D of 216-Z-9 to support TPA milestones
 - *Proposed over-target activities:* Upgrade safety systems (criticality and ventilation control system) DOE-RL will pursue because of longer surveillance and maintenance mode; requesting in over-target in case those systems need additional funding
- Solid Waste Stabilization and Disposition (RL-0013)
 - Maintain ready-to-serve capabilities for treatment/storage/disposal
 - Maintain minimal mixed low-level waste treatment
 - Continue TRU retrieval and certification of TRU waste
 - Support efforts associated with TC&WM EIS
 - Continue sludge treatment preparation (KBC)
 - Complete retrieval from burial ground 218-W-4C
 - Start retrieval in 218-E-12B
 - *Proposed Over-Target Activities*
 - Treatment of mixed low-level waste – eliminate backlog
 - Complete protection system upgrades at Canister Storage Building (may be needed)
 - Certification of TRU waste – eliminate backlog
 - Preparation for additional K Basin sludge treatment (aggressively pursue sludge treatments)
 - Support to M-91 Facility design for remote handled waste

- Groundwater Protection (RL-0030)
 - Complete focused feasibility study and proposed plan for 300 Area uranium plume (no remediation in 2008)
 - Continue pump and treat activities
 - Maintain Groundwater Monitoring System
 - Continue drilling wells supporting CP RI/FS activities and M-24
 - Support for RI/FS activities
 - *Proposed Over-Target Activities*
 - Expand ZP-1 pump and treat
 - Support well decommissioning
 - Expand 100 Area groundwater remediation systems (including in over-target helps in staying “ahead of the curve”)
- Nuclear Facility D&D – Remainder of Hanford (RL-0040)
 - Continue RI/FS activities (ROD work is funded)
 - Maintain infrastructure systems at minimal level
 - Continue surveillance and maintenance activities
 - Continue essential services (e.g., steam, Occupational Medical)
 - *Proposed Over-Target Activities*
 - Support progress toward waste site remediation (UW-1, CDI, BC cribs and trenches, UR-1)
 - Support U Canyon D&D activities (Canyon Disposal initiative)
 - Continue support to Radiological Processing laboratory inventory reduction
 - Commence additional infrastructure reliability projects
- Operate WTP (RL-0080)
 - Operate the Hanford site waste disposal facilities for low-level waste and mixed low-level wastes
- Safeguards and Security (RL-0020)
 - Protect special nuclear materials (protection system upgrades)
 - Maintain site wide security
 - **Note: Assumes plutonium shipments*
- Richland Community (RL-0100)
 - Reimburse state regulators for costs incurred in monitoring compliance with the TPA and other regulatory requirements
 - Provide payment in-lieu-of taxes to the three host counties
 - Provide grants to Washington and Oregon for oversight activities
 - *Proposed Over-Target Activities*: Support Natural Resource Trustee Council (NRTC) activities

Other

- HAMMER (RL-0043)
 - Provide realistic training for the safety and health of workers at approximately 36,000 student training days
 - Maintain HAMMER facilities in a ready-to-serve state

Greg said they want to make Central Plateau decisions so they can plan accordingly, and that there is some latitude because most environmental remediation and D&D is in the

2015 timeframe and beyond. PFP has a new assumption – initial shipments for 2007 and complete by 2009. Greg said HAB input would be reflected in the budget submittal.

DOE-RL is still responding to the President's 2007 budget, and they feel there are a number of activities within the proposed FY 2008 target allocation they cannot accomplish, which is why they are asking for "over-target" funds.

Greg added that HAMMER looks like an anomaly; it is funded, but is funded from closure services and they assume it will have its own PBS in 2008. He also clarified that B Reactor had funding in 2006, but that it was a one-time earmark from Congress. He noted major changes in funding, such as sludge treatment work moved to PBS RL-0013 and D&D in K East and K West moving to PBS RL-0041. Also, they took regulator FFTF advice and downgraded FFTF to a lower priority, which is reflected in the 2008 budget.

Regarding "breakout sessions," Jeff said there is a public meeting on April 27th. Jeff also confirmed that there is no well decommissioning planned for 2008, but they are asking for over-target funding. There are no TPA milestones for well decommissioning.

DOE-RL intends to request a fully compliant budget.

Committee Discussion

- *Safeguards and Security (RL-0020):* Greg said RL-0020 is driven by DOE-HQ and DOE-RL may have to spread RL-0020 as a distributed cost. DOE-RL gave strong input for safeguards and securities to be directly funded, but indirect funding apparently ensured that it would be funded (not DOE-RL's preferred alternative). Gerry said the committee would like to see safeguards and securities directly funded and asked that the issue be flagged for advice.
- *Plutonium shipment: Is it safe to assume plutonium shipments?* Susan said construction has stopped on interim storage and there would be a huge impact if the plutonium isn't shipped. Greg said they are planning on shipping plutonium, but it is very political. If the plutonium is not shipped, Hanford's security profile will change.
- Maynard Plahuta asked when a decision would be made to upgrade safety systems and that there should be time to figure alternatives into the budget. Jeff said there are cost estimates for upgrades, but they need more information on alternatives; updates may be necessary because of the extended timeline. Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, said it is being studied and that there isn't any current specific data. Safe operations will still be maintained with redundant systems as required.
- *Is there a cost-benefit analysis for preparing and transporting the final eleven sodium bonded fuel assemblies/pin containers to the INL earlier than planned?* Jeff said they are working on that and that it's a funding issue plus INL acceptance. The initial numbers are large, but the initial investment saves money because there wouldn't be onsite storage costs. The ramp-down of FFTF is a fresh

- proposal; technical issues are emerging. More money spent now can reduce future costs, but it depends on how much money is currently available.
- *Cesium-strontium capsule storage and fate – headed to dry storage?* Jeff said initially getting the cesium-strontium capsules out of Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) and into dry storage had cost-saving potential, but it brought up technical and handling issues. The dry storage payback becomes less and less as time goes on. Jeff said it is not currently funded and there should be a decision pathway by the end of 2007. Current plans are to maintain the cesium-strontium in safe storage. In June 2007 DOE-RL will report to Ecology on the viability of capsule disposal at Yucca Mountain. Matt said they don't want to eliminate options for capsule disposition.
 - Keith said they're assuming there is another place to put the capsules besides WESF. Jeff said they should be shipped to the repository in 2017 but it is based on a disposition decision. Milestone is 2028. DOE-HQ is working on new assumptions regarding Yucca Mountain and that they don't have any basis to change their shipment schedule until DOE-HQ directs. Jeff said he would personally look into that shipping information.
 - Greg wanted to flag the issue of the repository not opening until 2018 and asked if dry storage would be revisited. Jeff said it would be revisited if it were a potentially long time until shipment. Longer the timeframe, the more dry storage pays off.
 - Susan asked if DOE-RL would like to see advice regarding the entire budget or specifically regarding over-target items. Greg said DOE-RL would like to see advice regarding the entire budget and/or specific over-target issues and priorities.
 - Susan said there is a lack of integration with DOE-ORP – are there DOE-ORP activities that could cause a change in the DOE-RL master planning draft? Jeff said when DOE-ORP has a new baseline they will examine the impacts and key interface points, on a day-to-day basis as well as in milestones.
 - Susan said the new contract issuance will impact work elements; there will be extensions and handoffs. Jeff said those elements impact the sequence of work, such as sludge treatment. It also depends on how long Fluor is extended; having logical handoff points throughout the transition will be another driver.
 - Gerry asked if there was a target for contract transition costs. Jeff said contract transition costs are included in the budget request, about \$5 million per transition.
 - Pam thanked DOE-RL for the good detail and stated that there was a major contrast between DOE-RL's information and DOE-ORP's information. DOE-ORP should have given more detailed information, especially on tank farms; the lack of information does not inspire confidence.
 - Keith Smith asked what the funding level for HAMMER was through the indirect funding. Greg said it is budgeted at the same level. In 2006, it was a directly funded PBS by Congress. In 2007, it was indirect; in 2008, they will ask it to be a directly funded PBS.
 - Maynard asked if maintaining safe and compliant facilities were indirectly funded; Jeff said infrastructure is directly funded (see RL-0013).
 - *Is there funding for further characterization of pre-1970s TRU waste?* Jeff said there are pre-1970s materials containing TRU waste, but they don't have funding

- for them. They are testing the burial grounds planned for retrieval and plan on maintaining aggressive TRU waste retrieval and removal between now and 2010. Fluor came in under budget, so more work can be done than they had thought – a good thing, especially since there will be tougher retrievals in the future.
- Greg asked if the regulators had looked at a baseline for the underlying burial grounds. Jane ____ said they haven't had a specific line item discussion, but their assumption would be that pre-1970s TRU waste would be part of the burial grounds.
 - 300 Area remediation: The current contract for 300 Area remediation is through 2015 with incentives to complete as early as 2012. Gerry said finishing the remediation by 2012 does not include the change to unrestricted. ????

Regulator Perspective

- Rod Lobos, EPA, said EPA is glad to hear about plans for plutonium shipments offsite and the continued priority of the river corridor. However, EPA is concerned it may be years before Central Plateau remediation work begins. He said Nick Ceto is looking into a baseline figure for what should be added and that he would check with Nick to see if that would be available in time for advice development.
- Jane ____, Ecology, agreed with EPA. She said cleanup is resource-limited at Hanford. Progress could happen with added funding. They continue to be concerned about taking money from environmental cleanup for safeguards and security; EPA supports safeguards and securities but not at the expense of cleanup. EPA wants funding to progress on the Central Plateau but they don't see that happening with the current funding. They support moving materials offsite, keeping PFP on track, and TRU retrieval and milestones. They support continued river corridor work, and support NRTC risk assessment receiving over-target funding. Jane said they are concerned with well decommissioning because it seems to fall off the list every time – perhaps milestones need to be imposed if it continues to be squeezed out.
- EPA had taken a preliminary look at the CERCLA Five Year Review and DOE-RL said they hadn't heard any negative feedback. Pam thought she heard that the regulators weren't pleased with the Five Year Review.

Committee Discussion about Scoping Advice

The committee brainstormed important issues to include in the advice to be presented at the April Board meeting. See Attachment 1 for the identified issues recorded as flipchart notes. After brainstorming, the committee organized the issues into three pieces of draft advice: 1) The Inadequacy of the USDOE Congressional Budget Request for FY 2007, 2) The FY 2008 Budget Request and 2008 Policy Issues, and 3) Contracting Strategy for Hanford 2006.

Noted discussions, in addition to flipchart notes (Attachment 1)

- Pam said she couldn't support advice that "zeros" out the bulk vitrification plant.
- There was discussion over whether Hanford cleanup projects were not started because funding was used to facilitate cleanup of the smaller USDOE sites. Susan wanted to ensure that was true before including the statement in the draft FY 2007 advice. Todd thought smaller sites may have had priority in 2006, but that didn't necessarily mean that money was taken from Hanford cleanup efforts. Gerry said DOE had previously said that Hanford would receive increased funding once other sites were closed. Rick thought they could make the point that Hanford isn't receiving any increased funding from other sites' successful closures.
- The Board wants to see the DOE-ORP baseline changed to reflect accurate funding conditions; DOE-ORP had previously said that they want to wait until they have a validated cost estimate.
- Todd said that the DOE Five Year Plan outlines funding for Hanford that is on average \$100 million less than what was presented to the committee in the budget briefings. The Five Year Plan and the budget presentation do not match. Todd wanted to raise a philosophical "red flag" and Susan thought specifics would be beneficial.
- The committee agreed that it is appropriate to ask for an explanation from DOE-ORP regarding the reduced minimum safe funding.
- Rick said it would be beneficial to explain how tanks can leak even when pumpable liquid has been removed.
- Todd said it is important for the committee to work on educating the Board on budget issues.

Discussions regarding Hanford 2006 contracting strategy

- USDOE is preparing to open for competition three contracts instead of two, the third being for "mission support," or infrastructure. Gerry said USDOE is moving groundwater monitoring into the infrastructure contract. The committee would like clarification of what groundwater monitoring includes. If the contract includes program management, the committee is concerned that the infrastructure contractor will not have the necessary expertise. The committee may be less concerned if monitoring only includes sampling and testing (may provided objectivity). The scope needs to be defined.
- What is the rationale behind multiple contracts? Rick said that everything at Hanford is interrelated; the committee would like justification for three contractors.
- The committee discussed and integrated Keith Smith's additions to the draft contracting strategy advice.
- Consensus was reached on principles of the contracting strategy advice.

Preparing for the April Board Meeting

- Susan (and Todd) will revise the draft FY 2008 Budget Request and 2008 Policy Issues advice in preparation for the April Board meeting; Rick will introduce the draft advice to the Board.

- Gerry will revise the draft Contracting Strategy for Hanford 2006 advice in preparation for the April Board meeting; he will introduce the draft advice to the Board.

Action Items / Commitments

- Budget and Contracts Committee call will be April 28th, 2006; meeting placeholder for April 11th, 2006. The Committee of the Whole will meet in May if there is work to be done.

Handouts

- Draft Hanford Advisory Board Advice on Contracting Strategy for Hanford 2006
- Draft Hanford Advisory Board Advice Regarding the Inadequacy of the USDOE Congressional Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2007
- Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Briefing – DOE-ORP
- Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Briefing – DOE-RL
- DOE Five Year Plan (FY 2007 – FY 2011) Volume II; Environmental Management
- Master Planning Schedule – DOE-RL

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollet
Shelley Cimon	Jerri Main	Dick Smith
Earl Fordham	Todd Martin	Keith Smith
Harold Heacock	Vince Panesko	Gene Van Liew
George Jansen Jr.	Bob Parazin	Dave Watrous
Rick Jansons	Gary Peterson	
Pam Larsen	Maynard Plahuta	

Others

Jeff Frye, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Karen Caddey, CH2MHill
David Brockman, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	
Greg Jones, DOE-RL	Tim Hill, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Jane ____ Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Craig Cameron, EPA	
Diane Clark, DOE-ORP	Rod Lobos, EPA	
Janet Diediker, Innovations/DOE-ORP		
Pete F____, DOE-ORP	Barb Wise, FH	
Lynda Hobt, Oregon DOE		
Eric Olds, DOE-ORP		
Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP		
Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP		
Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP		

Attachment 1

Flipchart Notes 03/20/06

Notes for Draft Advice Regarding the Inadequacy of the USDOE Congressional Budget Request for FY 2007

- Encourage moving FFTF sodium to INL soon (if there's a facility available) – cost savings and cost comparison.
- HAMMER should not be indirectly funded
- What can be done about tank farm retrieval? Need more accurate information about what can be done in 2007 at president's budget. Retrieval needs to be on a faster pace – 2011, not 2017

Notes for Draft Advice Regarding the FY 2008 Budget Request and 2008 Policy Issues

- Funding discrepancies: March 2006 Five Year Plan has out-year budget numbers that are significantly lower than what was in the public/HAB budget briefing
- Central Plateau needs to be prioritized and funded (not reliant on PFP completion)
- Other priorities: PFP, 100 and 300 Areas, U-Plant ROD – do not wait for Pu shipment.
- DOE-RL critical path (and funding) rely on completing shipment of Pu
- Public needs better information about Pu shipment
- Putting PFP on critical path could end up delaying everything following on critical path
- Continue to emphasize inventory, characterization, and retrieval of pre-1970s waste – need to include in Central Plateau milestones (regulators request?)
- TPA milestones should not be changed to meet available funding. Fund the agreement, don't change the agreement to meet the funds
- Budgeting based on incorrect funding figures – put pressure on to get correct numbers
- Cesium/strontium capsules – dry storage and/or shipment
- Low funding level is driving schedule
- DOE-RL has a clearer path forward than DOE-ORP. There is a marked difference in degree of planning. Integration between DOE-RL and DOE-ORP – how does it happen? What work needs to be done to support TC&WM EIS? Funding for characterization for waste sites, groundwater, and vadose zone?
- WTP operational
- Concerns with path forward for K-Basins and PFP
- The difference between direct and indirect funding for site safety, maintenance, etc? Move all to direct, make indirect funding more “visible”
- Safeguards and securities should not come from cleanup budget and should be directly funded – funding safeguards out of cleanup budget reduces cleanup effort
- PFP maintenance in over-target funding instead of within-target funding
- Support FFTF as a lower priority
- Keep LAW on path for 2011; bulk vitrification plant should not preclude startup for LAW by 2011. Preserve additional melter option (?)
- DOE going to use five control points (“buckets”) to say it can't change things. Support concept of two buckets instead of five. What is the cost for administration of five control points? Lack of flexibility for shifting funding from bucket to bucket.
- Baseline – creating “over-target” funding does not make budget compliant. DOE is using over-target to reach adequate; need to renegotiate milestones based on including the over-target items
- Rollout of bulk vitrification operation costs