

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

**Meeting Summary
June 1-2, 1995
Portland, Oregon**

Executive Summary	Page i
Summary of the Board's Meeting	
<u>Items of Discussion</u>	
Corrections to the Meeting Summary and Agenda Review	1
Privatization	2
Risk Assessment Workshop	4
M&O Contract Rebid Process	6
Budget Information	8
St. Louis Plan Implementation	9
USDOE-HQ Risk Report for Congress	11
Updates and Internal Board Business	11
Attachments List	14

Note: Attachments are numbered according to the order in which they are mentioned in the summary. The attachments that were distributed at or before the Hanford Advisory Board meeting are not routinely distributed with this summary. If you need a copy of an attachment, please request it from Sarah Cloud at Confluence Northwest (503)243-2663 or Celaine Hadley at Westinghouse Hanford (509)376-5856.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Adoption of TWRS Privatization Advice

The Board adopted, as Consensus Advice #24, advice on TWRS privatization which recognized the appeal of privatization yet noted significant concerns that the Board has with the current proposal. The advice recommended that DOE proceed with privatization under specific conditions which include evaluating promising privatization alternatives in the context of the values of the Board and do so in an open process.

Risk Assessment Workshop

The Board participated in a risk assessment workshop presented by Dr. Genevieve Roessler and Dr. Margit von Braun. The goal of the workshop was to help the Board better understand the role of risk assessment and how it is used in risk management.

Four panelists who represent diverse opinions on risk assessment at Hanford were also present to reflect the spectrum of issues on risk assessment, articulate substantive questions and interact with Board members.

Board gives Feedback on M&O Contract Rebid Process

Susan Brechbill, Chief Counsel, DOE-RL walked the Board through the contract rebid process. Basically, a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) is forming and will develop the RFP, solicit and review proposals and make the selection for the new Management and Operations Contract. A draft RFP is expected to go out in early summer.

Susan asked the Board for their comments and thoughts on how to develop a performance based contract to be used by DOE and a productive discussion ensued.

Recap of the Internal Review Budget Hearings and Board Response

Jim Peterson, DOE, reviewed the overheads used in the presentation John Wagoner gave at the DOE-HQ Internal Review of Budget process. His presentation illustrated how DOE-RL plans to deliver on its obligations for \$1.2 billion. A 37 percent overhead reduction goal was highlighted as well as a target for reduced employment by 7,700 people. Many Board members were upset to see the employment reduction numbers presented to them in this format for the first time. Linda McClain agreed to get a written response back to the Board and to take the message of the Board's outrage back to the agency.

Update on the Follow up from the St. Louis Meeting

Linda McClain, DOE, reminded the Board of the St. Louis meeting where EPA, Ecology, DOE-RL/HQ and the Contractors strategized changes to the ways of doing business at Hanford which resulted in the Blue Print for Action. Since then, the agencies have been working on implementing the strategies in the blue print. The concentration has been on pulling together plans and timelines for some of the key activities identified in the blue print. Linda walked the Board through the plans and the timelines. The Board and the agencies then had a fruitful

dialogue on the implementation of the St. Louis blue print and a list of ideas and concerns was developed.

Adoption of Advice Urging Consolidation of Public Involvement Activities

The Board heard a report on the Public Involvement Strategy Meeting that occurred early Friday morning. At that meeting it was explained that there are several separate public involvement activities being developed for different programs, all of which relate to TWRS. The suggestion was made that the separate activities should be integrated and consolidated so the activities and resources do not have to be spread out. The Board adopted advice, as Consensus Advice #25, which recommended consolidation of public involvement on all TWRS-related activities as a prototype of a consolidation effort.

Adoption of Advice Defending the TPA in the Face of Emerging Legislative Initiative

In response to hearing about a bill to make the DOE self regulating in its cleanup work and to repeal both the TPA and DOE's waiver of sovereign immunity, the Board adopted, as Consensus Advice #26, a letter urging the agencies to aggressively defend the integrity of the TPA. The letter also states that the Board protests any action which would allow the Federal Government to avoid its legal and moral obligations to fully clean and restore the Hanford Site.

Board Decision to Have Strategy and Planning Meeting the Focus of the August Meeting

The Board confirmed that they would not meet in July and discussed a proposal to have the August meeting canceled. Instead a smaller group could meet to take a hard look at the Board's FY '96 budget and workload and develop a proposal for how the Board will accomplish its business on that budget. After discussion, the Board decided to keep the scheduled full Board meeting in August in Spokane with strategy and planning FY '96 as the priorities on the agenda. It was recognized that, if needed, time would be allotted for any issues that may arise requiring action in August.

Meeting Summary
June 1-2, 1995
Portland, Oregon

Thursday, June 1, 1995

The meeting was called to order by Chair Marilyn Reeves. The meeting was open to the public. Four public comment periods were provided. Members present for the meeting are listed in *Attachment 1*. Seats not represented were: Benton Franklin District Health (Local/Regional Public Health), Business-Agricultural Seat, University of Washington (Higher Education Seat), Grant County (Local Government Seat), City of Pasco (Local Government Seat), Franklin County (Local Government Seat), Central Washington Building Trades (Labor/Work Force Seat), Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Seat), and Battelle Pacific NW Lab (Labor/Work Force Seat). Members of the public and others in attendance are listed on the sign in sheets included in *Attachment 1*.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) explained that her students had been studying Hanford issues and several were attending this meeting. The three students, Dan, Jill and Mike introduced themselves to the Board.

AGENDA ITEM 1: CORRECTIONS TO THE MEETING SUMMARY AND AGENDA REVIEW

Meeting Summary

Patty Burnett, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government Seat) requested the meeting summary list a condensed version of the 7 recommendations in the Paulson report which the Board adopted.

Several other minor corrections were noted and the meeting summary was approved as corrected.

Ray Isaacson, Benton County (Local Government Seat) reminded the Board that on page 9 of the May meeting summary he recommended a dialogue on the cultural and socio-economic impacts of job reductions at Hanford as a future agenda item. At the May meeting he had informed the Board that it might want to have elected officials pull together information on the impacts in the local community. Marilyn recommended the issue be addressed in the committee process in order to be focused for the Board and also pointed out that the concern may be something to bring up on the tele-video conference with Tom Grumbly.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government) explained that a grant had been received by the City of Richland to do a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis regarding the

impacts of DOE workforce fluctuations on schools and other local government infrastructure. A consultant had just been hired and may be available to provide the Board with a presentation in the future. Marilyn asked the meeting summary to record the suggestions and to reflect that both Ray and Pam's suggestions will be tracked.

Agenda Review

Several changes were made to the agenda. Agenda items 4 and 5 had time allotted on both Thursday and Friday. Agenda item 5, the St. Louis Plan Implementation was moved to Friday only. Item 4, Budget Information, would simply distribute updated information on Thursday afternoon. The discussion would be on Friday. Agenda item 6, USDOE-HQ Risk Report for Congress, was removed from the agenda as the report had not been released. Agenda Item 8 had been added and inserted at the close of Thursday.

Marilyn explained that the goals she had for this meeting were organizational goals. The first goal pertained to the budget process and ending the meeting with a better understanding of the DOE budget and its submission to the Secretary of Energy. Getting a clear understanding of how to participate in the tele-video conference on the budget with DOE-HQ and the other Site Specific Advisory Boards and how to best utilize that opportunity were also part of this goal.

The second goal dealt with preparing the Board to best work in the next fiscal year. To do that, Marilyn explained, the Board needs to evaluate what it has done, how they have done it and how to do it better in the future. She asked Board members to think about a planning session in lieu of a formal Board meeting in August to determine what issues the Board should focus on and how to best do that in the future. *(This proposal and others were taken up on Friday afternoon as part of Agenda Item 7).*

AGENDA ITEM 2: PRIVATIZATION

(Note: This section is a summary of the discussion on this issue that took place on Thursday and Friday).

Facilitator Paul Wilson reviewed DOE's schedule for making a decision on TWRS privatization. On June 15, DOE-RL is making a presentation on TWRS privatization to the staff of the group of DOE Assistant Secretaries responsible for acquisition. Then, on June 24, the DOE staff will present a recommendation to the Secretary of Energy on whether TWRS privatization should proceed.

Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) presented to the Board the results of work he has been doing under a DOE contract to study issues related to privatization. He explained that while the concept of privatization has appeal both for reducing clean up costs and demonstrating progress by cutting through DOE's inefficiencies, many view DOE's current TWRS privatization proposal as ill conceived and unnecessarily risky. He reviewed an alternative TWRS privatization proposal to illustrate that there appear to be other

approaches that appear more reasonable, feasible and responsive to stakeholder values than DOE's current proposal. The alternative proposal is different in two major ways:

1) DOE's approach requires the building of two facilities simultaneously, and the alternative requires the building of only one, with the second phased in behind the first.

2) DOE's proposal requires the first two facilities to be contractor owned. The first facility in the alternative proposal would be government owned (although built with private capital) and phases the building of the second facility, which could be government owned or contractor owned, depending on DOE's experience with the first facility.

The purpose of reviewing the alternative, Todd stressed, is not to advocate a specific approach to privatization but to illustrate there are promising alternatives out there which have not been considered. Todd proposed that the Board adopt on Friday advice to DOE that asks the agency to examine alternative approaches to privatization.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Labor/Work Force Seat) then presented TRIDEC's position regarding DOE's proposal to privatize TWRS. First Harold explained that TRIDEC is the local industrial development organization sponsored by the Tri-Cities community with a membership of nearly 600 individual, industrial and business firms with an interest in the future of the Tri-Cities economy. TRIDEC is supportive of the concept of privatization of the TWRS program but does have some concerns regarding stability of employment for the Hanford labor force, support of the TPA, provisions for contractual default, fallback provisions for workscope continuity, to name a few. TRIDEC supports the continuation of the privatization program with resolution of the more significant issues before a final implementation decision is made regarding the nature and extent of the privatization effort, and is formally conveying this to the Secretary of Energy.

Don Vieth, DOE, responded by pointing out that DOE has examined only the feasibility of privatization in general but is still in the process of examining the best way to structure the TWRS privatization. He also let the Board know that he understands that it likes the idea of privatization, but wants to make sure attempts to privatize will be successful. DOE is now doing a detailed analysis of the time frame, recognizing its initial thoughts on schedules were simplistic. Agency representatives will be having meetings next week with vendors and expect to gain significant, helpful information.

Toby Michelena, Ecology, then highlighted Ecology's view. which is that they believe in privatization in the broad context but have the following needs:

- protect the integrity of the TPA
- innovation and efficiency on the part of the private sector
- incremental approach to privatization to learn how to improve the process; small steps
- dialogue between the interested parties (vendors, Tribes, HAB, specific stakeholders) to ensure all concerns are aired and discussed and so stakeholders can understand why particular decisions are made

The Board asked clarifying questions and had some discussion. Substantive questions and feedback were given to Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee members throughout the day outside the formal Board meeting to assist them in drafting advice. On Friday, the Board made the following comments in response to a draft proposal from the ad hoc drafting group:

- Protect Environmental Health is vague; the choice should not result in risks greater than the TPA baseline
- A direct, overall program on how to handle privatization is needed; cannot divorce the basic issues and focus only on the TWRS proposal
- This advice should refer back to Consensus Advice #18 to reiterate that the Board supports privatization on selected activities
- Acknowledge the continuing dialogue that has been ongoing since April and the voluminous information that has been provided
- A cover letter should be drafted to connect the advice to the history leading up to the advice
- The concerns that are in Consensus Advice # 18 should be reinforced
- There is a concern that privatization is a method to escape responsibility; must spell out responsibility to provide opportunity for economic diversification so that all the issues are addressed
- DOE should be asked to show that privatization will be cost effective; all the hidden costs of running and managing a contract should be exposed
- More analysis is necessary, it will take time and milestones may be missed; Acknowledge that we are not taking this lightly; need to recognize that there are personal liabilities involved in missing milestones; want some flexibility but milestones are also something that we take seriously
- Will private industry enter with their own money, what guarantees are there; will Congress approve; DOE should find out what private industries will require and develop the necessary legislation to match the requirements

The overall feedback from the Board was that the advice should directly state the Board's support of the concept of privatization but should also make it clear, using stronger language, that the Board has several significant concerns with DOE's proposal. The draft was modified to reflect these concerns and to clarify that the advice pertained specifically to TWRS privatization. It was adopted as Consensus Advice #24.

AGENDA ITEM 3: RISK ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

Ralph Patt, Oregon Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon Seat), as chair of the Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee, introduced the risk assessment workshop and explained that the goal of the workshop is to help the Board better understand risk assessment and its role in risk management.

Facilitator Naseem Rakha introduced the presenters, Dr. Genevieve Roessler and Dr. Margit von Braun and pointed out that they condensed their two day workshop into five hours. Thus, the

Board was asked to limit their questions to clarifying ones only. Naseem explained that there were four panelists present who represent diverse opinions on risk assessment at Hanford who would be articulating substantive questions to the presenters throughout the workshop. The four panelists were: Steve Alexander, Ecology; Steve Hwang, DOE-RL; Mary O'Brian, staff scientist with the Environmental Research Foundation, and Randy Smith, EPA in his role of a user of risk assessment.

Drs. Roessler and von Braun then walked the Board through the workshop. The goals of the workshop were:

- to provide better understanding of the principles of risk assessment and its use in environmental decision making.
- to show similarities between chemical and radiological risk.
- to give examples of solid science upon which risk numbers are based.

The seminar focused on what risk assessment is, how it is used and what its limitations are. Panelists and Board members interacted with the presenters throughout the presentation. A key point was the Board acknowledging both uncertainties and limitations of risk assessment. It was explained that risk assessment is one of the many tools that are used to evaluate and make cleanup decisions.

At the conclusion of the workshop, the panelists were asked to address how the Board could utilize the tool of risk assessment in accomplishing its mission:

Steve Hwang felt the Board could help DOE-RL develop a risk management plan to effectively manage risk and risk reduction across the site. The focus of such a plan, he explained, should promote consistency in the risk assessment process, in line with risk principles, by developing common procedures for risk assessment.

Mary O'Brian recommended the Board get a handle on risk assessment and remove it from the high importance it is given among the various tools and instead subordinate it to the level of other tools. The Board, she stressed, should consciously fight being taken over by risk assessment. To do that, she recommended the Board constantly assess all projects and scope of work through the lens of values represented by the Board.

Randy Smith suggested the Board separate risk assessment into how risks are calculated and how those calculations are used. He felt it would be helpful for a committee to look at the numbers and how they are calculated to get a collective understanding of where the weaknesses are and where the credibility is, but then for the full Board to look

- a) to be sure the budget allocates dollars to the worst problems on which you know how to make progress, and

b) to assess how risk assessment is used and how it is folded into other elements in making site specific clean up decisions.

Finally, he urged the Board to pay attention to the national and state policy debate on risk assessment and pointed out that Oregon has a bill which requires the Department of Environmental Quality to use probabilistic risk assessment.

Steve Alexander encouraged the Board to understand the uncertainties and limitations of risk assessment. He also noted that on the ground staff at the technical level is continually looking for ideas which are outside the box. Any such thoughts should be communicated to them.

Ralph Patt concluded the workshop by thanking Drs. Roessler and von Braun and the panel. The Board, Ralph explained, needs to keep learning about risk assessment in order to best advise DOE on how to use it. Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) urged that a future agenda item be set aside to discuss the issues related to DOE using risk assessment.

An evaluation of the workshop was included in the notebook provided by the presenters. All attendees were encouraged to complete and return it.

AGENDA ITEM 8: M&O CONTRACT REBID PROCESS

Susan Brechbill, Chief Counsel, DOE-RL, introduced herself and explained she is forming the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) which will develop the RFP, solicit and review proposals for the new Management and Operations Contract (M&O) and make the selection. The SEB is to develop a performance based contract to be used by DOE. The SEB has been given free range and is not constrained by prior contract formats.

Susan informed the Board that she has met with people who represent Hanford communities, like Pam Brown, to talk with them about their thoughts and concerns. Her Board is charged with drafting a statement of work to cover five years, beginning October 1997 and she wants Board input on what to include in this draft.

The process that will be followed is that the draft RFP will be out in early summer and then there will be a series of public involvement meetings. By early fall they plan to have the final RFP. The procurement process will follow, with awards made by May 31, 1996.

After explaining the SEB, its charter and the RFP process, Susan opened up the dialogue to hear thoughts and feedback.

Many Board members recognized the importance of the rebid process and felt members of the public should be on the SEB to get their input and to keep the process transparent and open. Susan recognized that traditionally the procurement process had been closed. DOE is trying to change that, which is why it is having a draft RFP go out for 30-45 days. With regards to having

members of the public on the SEB, she pointed out some legal issues come into play, as the SEB is required to have only federal employees on it. HAB members, however, suggested that members of the public could be present to listen as ex-officio members or could be actual Board members without the right to vote, but subject to the same integrity rule. Other concerns were:

- Costs involved with changing contractors now, after just structuring WHC contract.
- New contract needs objective performance criteria. Now, incentive awards skew the performance.
- How to evaluate proposals for phony vs. real low costs.
- Affect on employees.
- Interface between M&O contract process and TWRS privatization contract do not mesh.

Susan recognized that these were good ideas.

In response to the comments and suggestions that were raised Susan

- clarified that DOE has not made up its mind that it will select a new contractor, only that it will have a new contract
- explained her goal is to have the performance based criteria be objective
- recognized that one of the major concerns is what happens to employees

Susan concluded by assuring Board members they would get copies of the draft RFP.

Merilyn informed Susan that the Board is talking about a public involvement strategy and that perhaps the Board could be helpful in developing innovative ways to take the rebid process to the public.

Announcements

The following announcements had been made at some point during the day before closing:

- The ER Committee will meet on June 27 and on June 28 will participate in a field tour of the 100 and 300 Areas. Board members interested in the tour should submit their name, social security number and date of birth to Rosemary Guse or Bill Sanderson by June 12. On the day of the tour, picture identification must be presented.
- Tomorrow (June 2), at 7 am, there will be a public involvement strategy planning meeting and all are welcome. TWRS will be one of the focusses of the group.
- An *ad hoc* committee will meet this evening to draft privatization advice.
- Committee Chairs will eat dinner together along with agencies to work on the follow up to the St. Louis meeting presentation scheduled for Friday.

- This evening the 1995 TPA annual public meeting will be held at 7 p.m.
- Pam Brown alerted the Board to Senate Bill 871 which was recently introduced by Senators Johnston and Murkowski. The bill, she explained, is in response to the Blush report and would make the DOE self regulating in its cleanup work. It would repeal both the TPA and DOE's waiver of sovereign immunity. Pam further noted there will be a hearing on June 15 in Washington D.C. The Mayor of Richland will be there to testify. She urged all to read the bill and testify or send comments.
- Jim Peterson distributed information related to the budget process and actions. A draft memo to Thomas Grumbly conveying the Board's questions for the video conference was distributed.

Friday, June 2, 1995

Sarah Cloud was introduced as a new member of the Confluence Northwest team. Sarah will be replacing Debbie Kaufman who will be concentrating on completing her Masters degree.

AGENDA ITEM 4: BUDGET INFORMATION

Internal Review Budget Hearings

Jim Peterson, DOE, reviewed the overheads (*Attachment 2*) used in the presentation John Wagoner gave at the DOE-HQ Internal Review of Budget (IRB) process. His presentation illustrated how DOE-RL plans to deliver on its obligations for \$1.2 billion. A 37 percent overhead reduction goal was highlighted as well as a target for reduced employment by 7,700 people.

Many Board members were upset to see the employment reduction numbers presented to them in this format for the first time. Ray Isaacson and Jim Watts, in particular, felt strongly that these type of budget proposals should have been presented first to the community. They felt DOE had previously misrepresented the projections by saying only 4000 jobs would need to be reduced. Ray had raised the question at previous meetings of how many more jobs would go with the additional budget reductions and was told the reductions were from other things, not workers. Others wondered if the notice provisions of 3161 had been violated. Merilyn, on behalf of the Board, asked Linda McClain to obtain more information for the Board on the reductions and on questions that related to 3161. Linda McClain agreed to get a written response back to the Board, since there is no meeting in July. As the alternate designated federal official for the Board under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) she will take the message of the Board's outrage back to the Agency.

June 8 Tele-Video Conference

Jim Peterson distributed an information sheet on the logistics of the tele-video conference that is scheduled for June 8. The purpose of the conference is to hear from Grumbly on the FY '97 draft

budget recommendation and for Tom Grumbly to get feedback from the Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) on the draft. It was unclear whether each SSAB would be able to ask more than one question and whether there would be an opportunity to directly dialogue with Tom Grumbly during the tele-video conference. Jim Peterson did explain that Tom Grumbly and his office has committed to answering any questions not answered during the video conference in writing. The Dollars and Sense Committee had drafted a list of questions and a prologue to submit with them. The Board decided not to narrow them down to one but to submit all of them. Additional questions were to be communicated to Jim Peterson who would ensure they were received by Grumbly.

AGENDA ITEM 5: ST. LOUIS PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Linda McClain, DOE, updated the Board on the follow up from the St. Louis meeting where EPA, Ecology, DOE-RL/HQ and Contractors strategized changes to the ways of doing business at Hanford which resulted in the "Blue Print for Action" distributed at the May Board meeting (*Attachment 3*). The agencies are now working on pulling together timelines for some of the key activities which were in the "Blue Print." The following plans and timeline were identified for the action areas of managing successful projects, reducing costs, tracking cost savings, and developing target endpoints:

- Identify projects and develop project organizations - 7/15
- Develop project baselines - 10/1
- Track project cost savings -12/1-ongoing
- Incorporate future land use work in site management documents -TBD

The plans and timeline identified for the action area of focussing regulatory progress were:

- Develop "Board of Directors" -6/1
 - Members -EPA, Ecology, DOE, Contractors (advisory)
 - Develop Charter, roles and responsibility
 - Assess success and value of continuation -12/1
- Identify one regulator for each project team -7/15

Linda further explained the idea behind the "Board of Directors" (which may not be the right name) is to have a key group of regulators and managers act as a steering committee or management team to assure the blue print remains activated and that everything gets integrated.

Suggested HAB involvement in the blue print was outlined:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| •Concerns about issues in the Blue Print for Action | May-December |
| •Interface with Board of Directors | June-December |
| •St. Louis follow-on | August Board meeting? |
| •Building project baselines | September-November |

Doug Sherwood, EPA, explained that at the St. Louis meeting the commitment had been made to come back in three months to check progress to date and do any necessary follow up. He agreed that the "Board of Directors" that will be established would like some type of contact with the Hanford Advisory Board. The goal, Doug noted, is to go into 1996 with baseline projects that are agreeable to all three parties and to the Advisory Board.

The Board and the agencies had a productive discussion on the implementation of the St. Louis blue print. The following feedback was captured on chartpaks:

- The Board of Directors should include a member from the Advisory Board
- Worker health and safety is not mentioned nor emphasized in the blue print
- There should be an independent cost estimate done by an outside organization in building new baselines
- Back off from oversight on details of how contractors are doing work - too many reports are required; make contractors accountable, have ownership and follow their progress
- Specific measurable goals which can be managed are necessary
- Contract change is missing from the blue print, input is needed on the new elements
- For the Board to be useful in this process, it has to have financial support for the committees to do the work
- Re: Regulatory change
 - 1) go back to the work done for Summit II
 - 2) No documented impediments from regulations
 - 3) Have a representative from an interest group on this change committee, no change to Washington dangerous waste law
- The Board needs to have a briefing/update BEFORE the agencies go to another St. Louis follow on meeting
- The Senior Management Team is like a Steering Committee - give the HAB representation on this team
- Look at DOE ORDERS to get rid of more than the 26/200 noted
- Look at upgrades planned for facilities that will be shut down; safety versus operation
- Is the sitewide EIS being used in this process; follow up information is needed on the various drafts and plans
- How many project managers are there; how are they coordinated and how do they communicate with the immediate community?
- Lands no longer used for defense become classified as agricultural use under the County plan
- Award fees drive decisions by contractors and costs (i.e. no accidents)
- Identify endpoints - may be difficult for things like groundwater contaminants; what implications are there for public input in such decisions
- Let the Board know the projects you identify
- Each committee should look through the blue print to identify areas to follow

Merilyn suggested that each committee go through the document and determine what areas each would like to follow, so that could be folded into the Board's planning for FY '96.

AGENDA ITEM 6: USDOE-HQ RISK REPORT FOR CONGRESS

The purpose of this agenda item was to address the Environmental Restoration Committee's response to DOE-HQ's Risk Report submitted to Congress. However, since the report was not out yet, it was not possible to review it. The Committee will continue to track this.

AGENDA ITEM 7: UPDATES AND INTERNAL BOARD BUSINESS

Progress Report

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Public At Large Seat), updated the Board on the development of the Progress Report. In order to get the Board's perspective on progress at the Hanford site and on Board involvement, a questionnaire was included in the packet and members are encouraged to respond. Bill Sanderson is working on a draft and responses should be communicated to him. The questions are:

- 1). What do you think are the most significant accomplishments in cleanup and waste management at Hanford?
- 2). What do you think are the most significant accomplishments of the Hanford Advisory Board?

Public Involvement Strategy Meeting

Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) briefed the Board on the morning Public Involvement Strategy meeting. The will of the agencies and Board members who attended is to have "perfect" public involvement. One of the ways the group felt they could get closer to that goal is to consolidate public involvement activities and decision making surrounding public involvement.

For example, there are several separate public involvement activities being developed for different programs, all of which relate to TWRS. The suggestion is that the separate activities should be integrated and consolidated so the activities and resources do not have to be spread out. Jon Yerxa, DOE, noted that there is no centralized budget for this type of public involvement. Instead, each program sets up their own budget. If there were centralized funds, he explained, there might be an opportunity to have centralized resources such as cable access. Randy Smith, EPA, however, cautioned the Board by pointing out that consolidation may take public involvement away from program managers. The more that public involvement is taken away from them, the more those managers are divorced from true effective public involvement and control of costs on projects.

After a brief discussion the Board adopted a letter as Consensus Advice #25 which recommended consolidating public involvement activities on all TWRS-related activities as a prototype of a consolidation effort. The advice also urged the Tri-Parties to use innovative methods and to work

with the Public Involvement Committee to inform the public, hear from the public, and evaluate public involvement results.

Evaluation Criteria for Site Specific Advisory Boards

Kristi Branch introduced herself and explained that she has been contracted to assist DOE-HQ in developing the criteria for evaluating the SSAB initiative nationwide. She and her team will be visiting Hanford next week, to interview people as to what they think the measures of success are. Don Beck is the lead. An initial list of goals has been developed. They are working on establishing performance measures. Jim Watts and Betty Tabbutt are the Board members who serve on the National Committee formed to assist in this effort.

Advisory Committee on External Regulations

Dick Belsey announced that he attended the Advisory Committee on External Regulation (also known as the Ahearne Committee). He addressed the Committee and explained the Hanford Advisory Board, its charter, ground rules and the Board's view on public involvement. The Committee, he explained is working on technical, organizational and financial issues and will be issuing a report sometime in the coming winter.

Congressional Initiatives

In response to hearing about a bill to make the DOE self regulating in its cleanup work and to repeal both the TPA and DOE's waiver of sovereign immunity, the Board adopted, as Consensus Advice #26, a letter urging the agencies to aggressively defend the integrity of the TPA. The letter also states that the Board protests any action which would allow the Federal Government to avoid its legal and moral obligations to fully clean and restore the Hanford Site.

Internal Board Budget

Paige Knight reviewed the Board's budget which showed a \$29,000.00 projected ending balance based on estimated costs for May, June, August and September Board meetings. Marilyn informed the Board that she and Patty Burnett, Vice Chair, plan to meet with the agencies at the end of June for a strategy session. She also pointed out that while the July meeting is canceled, committee activity will continue. Next Marilyn proposed that the full Board August meeting be canceled. Instead, she explained, a smaller group could meet to take a hard look at the Board's FY '96 budget and workload and develop a proposal for how the Board will accomplish its business on that budget. The proposal would come to the full Board in September for review, revision and adoption. A contingency plan could be established for any emergency issues that may come up requiring HAB action in August.

After some discussion the Board decided to keep the scheduled full Board meeting in August in Spokane with strategy and planning FY '96 as the priorities on the agenda. It was recognized that, if needed, time would be allotted for any issues that may arise requiring action in August. The agenda planning conference call usually held next week for July's meeting will be canceled. One will be held in July to plan for the August meeting.

The suggestion was made to invite Don Beck to the August Board meeting to assure that the Board is aware of DOE-HQ's plans and expectations regarding SSAB's as it develops its FY '96 workplan.

Travel Authorization Requests

Jon Yerxa reminded Board members to get their travel authorizations in, in advance, as there is no guarantee that the travel agent can fill them if they are late.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 pm.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- | Number | Item |
|--------|--|
| 1. | June Board Meeting Attendance List |
| 2. | Copies of Visuals titled "Hanford Environmental Management FY 1997 Internal Review Budget Hearings; Briefing to Thomas P. Grumbly; Presented by John D. Wagoner on May 17, 1995" |
| 3. | Copies of Visuals titled "Building from the Blue Print (St. Louis Plan Implementation)," dated June 1995 |

Note: Attachments are numbered according to the order in which they are mentioned in the summary. The attachments that were distributed at or before the Hanford Advisory Board meeting are not routinely distributed with this summary. If you need a copy of an attachment, please request it from Sarah Cloud at Confluence Northwest (503)243-2663 or Celaine Hadley at Westinghouse Hanford (509)376-5856.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**