



HAB Consensus Advice #17A, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The fiscal year 1997 USDOE Budget as currently proposed for Environmental Restoration at Hanford is inadequate to protect public health safety, and environment. With the proposed budget USDOE fails to meet its legal obligation to request the necessary funding to meet the milestones in the Tri Party Agreement, and Federal Executive order #12088.

The proposed budget also fails to address the values of the Hanford Advisory Board and the values the Board has endorsed from the Future Site Use Working Group and Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System Task Force. The proposed budget would fail to deal with groundwater contamination and with contaminated sites which threaten the Columbia River. The proposed budget significantly reduces most environmental work at Hanford.

The Board is committed to continuing its evaluation of USDOE's budget to determine essential environmental restoration workscope, and the Board supports restoring a level of funding to the ER budget to meet the legally enforceable milestones contained in the Tri-Party Agreement, for example, the "High Payoff" pump and treat actions for contaminated groundwater.

The Board recommends continuing the following Pump & Treat Programs:

1. 200-ZP-2 Vadose Zone Carbon Tetrachloride Vapor Extraction
2. 200-ZP-1 Groundwater Treatability Testing
3. 200-UP-1 Groundwater Treatability Testing
4. 100-HR-3 Groundwater Treatability Testing

The Board recommends discontinuing the following Pump & Treat Programs:

1. 200-BP-5 Groundwater Treatability Testing - 216-B-5 Reverse Well
2. 200-BY-Cribs Groundwater Treatability Testing

In addition, in reference to 100-N Reactor Area Groundwater IRM (Nsprings), the Board recommends beginning Pump & Treat Treatability Test at N-Area, as agreed upon in the TPA Refocusing.

HAB Consensus Advice #17B, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM (TWRS)

1. Restore funding to the disposal program sufficient to maintain TPA milestones to protect human health and the environment.
2. Aggressively pursue efficiencies in both disposal and operations to ensure the most efficient and

productive TWRS program. Given the flux of the program, and to aid in increasing efficiencies and maintaining a workforce of appropriate size and technical capability, DOE needs to respond to the HAB's TWRS infrastructure and staffing level concerns. This information was requested in HAB Consensus Advice #8.

3. Obtain fast-track approval and construction of the Cross Site Transfer System (CSTS). In accelerating the project, care must be taken to minimize the environmental impact in the corridor. However, the estimated costs of the CSTS should be scrutinized in an effort to reduce them.
4. Evaluate cleanout of Tank 102-SY so it can be utilized for emergency storage and as a staging tank for cross-site transfers.
5. Evaluate building small (150,000-300,000 gallon) transfer tanks in 200 West in the event 102-SY does not provide a suitable transfer tank.

HAB Consensus Advice #17C, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL (SNF)

1. Accelerate and minimize movement of spent nuclear fuel.
 - A. The HAB endorses the plans for the proposed accelerated path forward with the selection of the HWVP canister building for pre-interim and interim storage, provided it will not restrict or preempt the future construction of the vitrification plant. The HAB also agrees with the selection of the site adjacent to the TWRS operations facility for the construction of the treatment facility. This will help minimize movement of spent fuel and reduce the need for additional transportation.
 - B. SNF Program and site infrastructure funding need to be coordinated to assure that funding for operation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure is sufficient to provide safe and reliable support throughout the SNF Program.
2. Classification of sludge in the basins.

DOE should classify basin sludge as waste and negotiate with the regulators for exclusions from RCRA regulations for K-Basins. The HAB does not believe there is sufficient potential value in the K-Basin sludge to merit handling it as anything other than waste. It is also believed to be more expeditious and cost-effective to transfer the sludge to TWRS if necessary exclusion from encumbering the K-Basins operations with RCRA regulations can be obtained. If this approach to managing the sludge is feasible, DOE should reconcile any deficiencies in the TWRS budget and schedule necessary to accommodate receipt of K-Basin sludge in accordance with the accelerated SNF path forward.

3. Privatization of SNF program management.

The HAB appreciates the emphasis being placed on initiatives to achieve efficiency and re-invent government contracting. It is understood there will be various contracts bid and let for portions of this program, such as design and construction services. However, because of the urgent need to move forward, the complexity associated with competitive bidding and the aggressive schedule already outlined for the removal of spent fuel from the K-Basins, the Tri-Parties should not

pursue the general privatization of the Spent Nuclear Fuels Program management.

4. Procurement

The HAB supports the Spent Fuel Group's effort to expedite the process of bringing a new spent fuel storage and stabilization facility on line. The process should utilize design features to assure the quality of the facility and minimize worker health or safety risks to the facility's workers. Procurement requirements unnecessary to ensure worker health and safety or facility quality should be minimized to facilitate the rapid design, construction and early operation of this new facility.

The HAB and the public must be involved in a process to assure that neither the quality of the facility nor worker health or safety is compromised in this process.

HAB Consensus Advice #17D, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget FACILITY TRANSITION

1. The Board has reviewed and supports the accelerated closure of the transition facilities, recognizing that this accelerated funding will require the diversion of funding from other urgent cleanup tasks. The acceleration should be accomplished without increasing risks to workers, the public and the environment.
2. DOE should take the necessary planning steps to ensure that the large cost savings which should be realized in the outyears are utilized for other cleanup needs at Hanford, rather than being diverted to other purposes.
3. DOE should take every step possible to minimize the supplemental funding required by this strategy, including the deferral of non-essential tasks to a later date so as to reduce near-term impacts on WM and ER progress.
4. The Board continues to have concerns regarding the level of support provided by Defense Programs and Nuclear Energy programs for interim transition activities at these facilities. The Board recommends that all costs related to activities at these facilities be funded from the original program sponsors rather than the WM and ER programs. In particular, the costs related to Special Nuclear Materials (plutonium, uranium, spent fuel), which are considered "assets," should be paid for by the Defense or Nuclear Energy Programs.

The Board will welcome continuing reviews of programs in the deactivation of the transition facilities, with specific emphasis upon progress against milestones, continuing economies of operation, reduction of overhead and capital cost requirements, and continuing protection of workers, the public and the environment.

The draft agreement should be changed to include a description of the following criteria which should be used in selecting facilities into the transition process:

- Worker and public health and safety issues, as well as environmental concerns with potential human impacts should be of highest concern when selecting a facility for this program.

- Projected investment, cost savings and the time required to provide a return on investment should be considered the next priority level.
- Finally, future reuse considerations should be factored into the decision-making process.

The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) and EPA should present a full analysis as to whether, without further negotiation clarifying state jurisdiction to enforce RCRA and other environmental laws would be compromised at facilities included under the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA).

Based on these analyses, Ecology should evaluate whether facilities transition should be regulated under the TPA, rather than with negotiated schedules under a separate RCRA order.

If such facilities are to be regulated under the Tri-Party Agreement, the state should strive for clarifying language that preserves its authority to regulate these facilities under its RCRA authority.

HAB Consensus Advice #17E, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget OVERHEAD/INDIRECT & LANDLORD

1. **PRINCIPLE:** The HAB supports the current priority that DOE-RL is placing on the reduction of Overhead Costs, and believes it is consistent with our earlier stated advice. We encourage aggressive and expeditious actions to achieve cost efficiencies in providing overhead-funded services. Anticipated reduced funding for Hanford programs should not serve as justification for renegotiation - or missing - Tri-Party (TPA) Milestones until every possible step is taken to reduce unessential overhead funded activities.
2. Overhead spending must be reduced by amounts that exceed the proportional reduction in total funding for Hanford cleanup. These overhead reductions should be made before legally required work scope is delayed or cut.

The base for calculating reductions in overhead should not include activities and subsidies (i.e., payment of former defense contractors' legal fees for past radiation releases) that are not appropriate for funding through the Hanford cleanup budget.

There are necessary indirect services that must be provided. These should be provided more efficiently and at lower cost.

3. We are encouraged by the 1997 ADS base, reflecting reductions in overhead charges of \$92 million from the DOE-RL-acknowledged 1994 Westinghouse Hanford Company overhead expenditure level of \$451 million*. DOE's new goal of a \$200 million reduction for the site should be accomplished by the end of fiscal year 1996 to allow USDOE to meet most of its TPA milestones and critical path work for 1996 and a majority of the unfunded work scope for FY 1997.
4. Reductions in overhead should not be taken in a manner that adversely affects actual cleanup work scope. To accomplish some of these reductions, USDOE may have to achieve significant contract reforms. The Board encourages performance-based contracting, and the effort it will take to implement such major reform.

5. The federal government has a legal and moral responsibility to fund its negotiated commitments to Hanford cleanup. The U.S. EPA and Washington Ecology should not agree to renegotiation of any TPA milestones, nor allow any milestones or critical path work to go unfunded, prior to USDOE demonstrating that it is reducing overhead budgets in accordance with the FY'96 EM goal of \$200 million for the site, without claiming reductions for overhead expenses simply shifted into direct program accounts.
6. USDOE should give specific guidance to contractors for reducing overhead, rather than delegating this essential governmental function (setting the Hanford site and cleanup budget) to the contractors. Specific guidance should go well beyond stating a minimum of reduction in overhead expenditures and address:
 - a. specific areas of overhead that should be eliminated because they do not serve the essential cleanup mission;
 - b. overhead rates that should be reduced and "prices" for services that should be reduced as inappropriately high;
 - c. specifically bar the shifting of overhead costs into direct programs, except for those cases where the costs can be more directly controlled and reduced, and in those cases incremental funding should be provided to cover these costs.

* Does not include overhead expenses of other contractors, nor DOE-RL.

HAB Consensus Advice #17F, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget WASTE MANAGEMENT (NON-TWRS)

1. Analytical Laboratory Services.
 - A. Funding for completion of the 222-S Lab Radwaste Line must be identified in order that Milestone M-32 can be renegotiated to permit conformance to regulatory requirements for facilities needed for continuing cleanup activities.
 - B. We support funding for evaluation of privatizing routine Analytical Services functions as a candidate for economic transition.
2. Liquid Effluents
 - A. The HAB recommends a study with PNL participation to evaluate the economics of 340 Radwaste Facility Upgrade versus tank truck pickup from different numbers of operating facilities to support the most cost effective option.
 - B. Move the Tritium Removal Technology Status annual report to the National Technology Development Program and release the funds to other cleanup needs.
 - C. Funding for Phase II streams must be increased, pending agreement by Ecology and EPA on proposed alternative treatment.
3. Solid Wastes

- A. The Board confirms our prior advice #8 with respect to the WRAP 2 facilities privatization, which is:

The Board supports the funding reallocation as proposed by Westinghouse Hanford Company (WHC) to the Department of Energy, Richland Operations (DOE/RL) as of November 16, 1994. The reallocations appear reasonable in that they support most of the ongoing waste management activities. Exceptions are a potential delay and renegotiation of Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Milestones for the 222-S Lab Radwaste Line and in the WRAP 2A completion. The Board recommends that USDOE terminate the in-house design of WRAP 2A and pursue privatization of the design, construction and operation of WRAP2. Our assumption is that such privatization will result in the cost savings to make up the funding short-fall, and will honor all labor agreements currently in place. The Lab Radwaste line work delay will lead to increased maintenance impacts, but will not prevent lab operation.

- B. We support deferral of additional RCRA-compliant storage facilities and retrieval of low-risk post 1970 buried wastes, but recommend that a plan be developed as a guide to prioritizing future actions in waste retrieval and processing as funds may become available. Investigation of integrity of TRU waste containers to support deferral and establish priority of retrieval is needed.
- C. We recommend that surplus facilities, including non-DOE owned facilities, be evaluated for possible use. DOE should avoid constructing new facilities when structures meeting nuclear facility codes and regulations are available.
- D. Establish a time line to assure waste management capability to meet the M-19 Milestone intent and date of 9/99.
4. RCRA and Operational Monitoring.

Evaluate this activity as a possible candidate for privatization.

HAB Consensus Advice #17G, Fiscal Year 1997 Budget TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

1. The administrative infrastructure surrounding Technology Development must be simplified in order to make it more efficient and productive. This includes altering the EM-50 (Technology Development) budget cycle to be congruent with the EM-30 (Waste Management) and EM-40 (Environmental Restoration) budget cycles.
2. Within the 1997 budget, DOE must ensure that EM-50 technology development funds directly support cleanup activities, in accordance with the recommendation of the Site Technology Coordinating Committee.
3. In order to obtain meaningful stakeholder input, DOE must provide the HAB, through Dollars & Sense Committee, budget access and information commensurate with what has been afforded in other programs.

[Hanford Home Page](#) | [HAB](#) | [Advice Index](#)

For questions or comments, please send [email](mailto:Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov) to Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov

HAB Consensus Advice #

Subject:

Adopted: