

0042361

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

~~Draft~~ Meeting Summary  
 August 3-4, 1995  
 Spokane, Washington

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Summary of the Board's Meeting	
<u>Items of Discussion</u>	
Corrections to the Meeting Summary and Agenda Review	1
Congressional Updates	2
TWRS Privatization	4
DOE' Risk Report to Congress	7
Public Comment	8
100 Area Interim Remedial Measures	9
St. Louis Plan Implementation	9
Update on Use of Pre-Existing Cross Site Transfer Line	11
Feedback from Agencies	11
Summary of the Board's Reflections	14
Plutonium Disposition	17
Spent Fuel	19
Draft Public Participation Plan	20
Board Planning	21

Attachments List

*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

### Congressional Updates

Jeff Breckel, Ecology, provided the Board with a general overview of the regulatory reform bills in the House and the Senate including the Johnston Bill, S.871. The Johnston Bill is based on the premise that environmental regulations and regulators are the root cause of the escalating costs and delays in cleaning up DOE facilities. In response to that bill, Ecology and the Attorney General's office developed an alternative, The Hanford Management Demonstration Act which was forwarded to Senators Gorton and Murray and Representative Hastings. From that, HR 2110, the Enhanced Environmental Cleanup Management Demonstration Act was developed as a combined alternative melding a number of ideas, concepts and beliefs.

The Board had a question and answer period and decided to extend an invitation to Congress members to speak with the Board about Congressional developments regarding cleanup at a future Board meeting.

### TWRS Privatization

The Board heard an update on the proposed privatization strategy, the path forward, the status of a feasibility study, principles imbedded in Tank Waste Remediation Systems (TWRS), the TWRS privatization time line and the relationship between the TWRS EIS alternatives.

### Board Adopts Advice Regarding the Risk Initiative Report

Maureen McCarthy reviewed DOE's "Risk and the Risk Debate: Searching for Common Ground" report in detail for the ER Committee and drafted comments expressing concerns about the report as well as advice on how risk evaluation should be conducted. After discussion, the Board adopted the draft advice as consensus advice #28.

### Board Adopts Advice on 100 Area Interim Remedial Measures

Ralph Patt explained that the proposed plans for final resolution of the 100-IU-1, 100-IU-3, 100-IU-4 and 100-IU-5 operable units is one of no further action. The agencies preferred alternative for the contaminated soil and associated structures from selected source areas within the 100-BC-1, 100-DR-1 and 100-HR-1 operable units is to remove, treat and dispose. The ER Committee proposed advice supporting both plans. The Board adopted the advice as consensus advice #27.

### Update on the St. Louis Plan Implementation

The Board heard an overview of what has been done since the first St. Louis meeting from the agencies. The agencies assured the Board that they are committed to moving forward on the St. Louis Plan and that a St. Louis 2 meeting is currently being planned for sometime in mid September. Mike Wilson reviewed the draft Single Regulator list which designated either Ecology or EPA as the single regulator on each of the five project areas. The Dollars and Sense Committee will be following the St. Louis plan implementation in more detail for cost efficiencies.

### **Board Learns that CSTS Line Successfully Pressurized**

As recommended in the Paulson Report, the existing cross site transfer line (CSTS) was pressurized and used to transport waste from the west area to the east area. Chair Reeves requested the Executive Summary highlight this use of the CSTS as a clear example of a project which has met the Board value of getting on with cleanup.

### **Board Hears Feedback from Agencies on How the Board is Perceived**

The Board heard from DOE-HQ and RL, US EPA and Ecology on how the Board in general is viewed, how its advice is used, what is helpful from the Board and what the agencies need from the Board. Don Beck specifically reviewed what happens when Board advice is sent to Headquarters. The Board had a lengthy and productive dialogue with the agencies and urged Don Beck to be their advocate and to defend the Board in Washington D.C.

### **Summary of the Board's Reflections**

A clear evolution was noted in the Board's assessment of its functioning between its self evaluation in December 1994 and its "Reflections" in June-July 1995. Some trends stood out: a dramatic increase in the expression of positive working relationships and trust levels; more productive and successful at producing consensus advice that has impact; Board's role in opening up DOE Budget process is significant; and, dialogue among agencies and stakeholders and the ability to emerge from the dialogue with a regional consensus is seen as most positive outcome of Board's existence.

### **Board Adopts Advice Regarding Plutonium Disposition**

The Board was briefed on the Stockpile Stewardship and Management PEIS and the public scoping meetings to occur as well as the Draft Pantex Sitewide EIS and its scoping. The Board adopted consensus advice #29 requesting both an extension of the public comment period and the scheduling of several open meetings for citizens around the Northwest to be involved in the scoping process. Further, the advice urges USDOE to include Hanford stakeholders as it prepares any decision that considers sending waste or weapons functions to the Hanford site.

### **Update on Spent Fuel**

The Board was presented with an update on refinements made in the spent nuclear fuel project and on the technical plan. Chair Reeves requested the Executive Summary highlight this project as a clear example of a project which has met the Board value of getting on with cleanup.

### **Presentation of the Draft Public Participation Plan**

As a result of the August public participation involvement strategy meeting, a Draft Site Public Participation Outline was drafted. The Draft is an attempt to summarize what the DOE, the regulatory agencies and stakeholders believe to be the key Hanford issues needing public participation. The issues listed are: TWRS privatization and EIS, Waste management programmatic EIS and waste importation, Hanford remedial action EIS and land use planning,

Draft EIS of safe management of K-Basins spent nuclear fuel, Plutonium disposition, 100 area cleanup, 3161 workforce restructuring plan, Plutonium finishing plant EIS and M-33.

### **Board Planning**

The Board spent time in small groups coming up with the large and cross cutting issues it should emphasize in the next fiscal year. It then addressed the issues regarding how it will operate within the available resources to accomplish its goals. Specific recommendations were to participate in document declassification through its Environmental Restoration Committee; to focus its work through three committees, keeping the other two in a standby status to meet on an ad hoc basis; to reduce to eight meetings per year and to create an Executive Committee. Recommendations developed will be brought back before the Board in September for further refinement and adoption.

**Draft Meeting Summary**  
**August 3-4, 1995**  
**Spokane, Washington**

**Thursday, September 3, 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 at the meeting are listed in *Attachment 1*. Seats not represented were: City of Kennewick (Local Government Seat), City of Pasco (Local Government Seat), Franklin County (Local Government Seat), Grant County (Local Government Seat), Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental/Citizen Seat), Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/ Citizen Seat), Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government Seat), Business-Agricultural Seat and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. Members of the public and others in attendance are listed on the sign in sheets included in *Attachment 1*.

**Announcements**

- ◆ Marilyn informed the board that Charles Kilbury's wife had recently passed away. A card expressing the Board's condolences was made available for Board members to sign.
- ◆ Carol Henry, DOE, who had intended to come for an evening Environmental Restoration Committee meeting was ill and would not be able to make the meeting. The Environmental Restoration Committee meeting was canceled.
- ◆ Pam Brown, City of Richland, (Local Government Seat), introduced Ben Floyd who is an alternate for the City of Pasco.
- ◆ The Dollars and Sense Committee will meet during the lunch break in the dining room.

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

**Meeting Summary**

One typographical correction was noted and the meeting summary was approved as corrected. Marilyn pointed out that it had been several months that there have been no substantive changes to the meeting summary. She recognized the value of that report.

### Agenda Review

The congressional update scheduled for the morning of Friday was deleted from the agenda as Congress was still in session and Members were not able to make the Board meeting. Instead, the Thursday Agenda would begin with updates on the invitations and on current proposals before Congress and their potential effect on cleanup and Board activities. Also, an update from Mark Hermanson, Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/ Work Force Seat) on the meeting he attended with Tom Grumbly was added to Agenda Item 4.

The meeting summary reflects the original agenda item numbers, but is in the order in which the items were actually taken up by the Board.

### Congressional Updates

Herald Heacock explained that through TRIDEC several congress people were contacted and invited to attend the August Board meeting. To update the Board on Congressional legislative proposals regarding cleanup. Although they were not able to make the August meeting, they indicated they may be available for the September Board meeting. Harold explained that there is much activity in Washington that affects the cleanup program. He recommended that the Congress people be invited to attend a Board meeting.

Jeff Breckel, Ecology, provided the Board with a general overview of the regulatory reform bills in the House and the Senate (*Attachment 2*). The Johnston Bill, S.871, is, Jeff believes, a progression of what has happened over the last several months. S.871 is based on the premise that environmental regulations and regulators are the root cause of the escalating costs and delays in cleaning up DOE facilities. In essence S.871 would:

- ◆ Make DOE self regulating for Hanford cleanup and waste management.
- ◆ Have the DOE secretary set cleanup and waste management standards as well as determine the appropriate management approach or remedy based on, and after considering risks, costs, benefits and land use.
- ◆ Make the EPA, Tribes, State, and the public advisory bodies only.
- ◆ Exempt Hanford from all national and state environmental laws unless the Secretary decided to comply with them; the TPA would be set aside.

Jeff explained that in response to S.871 Ecology and the Attorney General's office developed an alternative, The Hanford Management Demonstration Act. That alternative was sent to Senators Gorton and Murray and Representative Hastings. Some of the highlights of that act include:

- ◆ Using penalty monies for environmental improvements at Hanford
- ◆ Considering land use in clean up decisions
- ◆ Eliminating DOE orders except those required to protect works and the public
- ◆ Placing all Hanford environmental cleanup activities within the TPA

Efficiency measures include:

- ◆ Giving preference to performance-based or fixed price contracts rather than cost reimbursement contracts
- ◆ Authorizing privatization of cleanup facilities
- ◆ Requiring the involvement of outside experts in developing contracting strategies and reviewing costs
- ◆ Authorizing DOE to shift funds between different environmental accounts to allow greater flexibility in responding to site priorities

Senators Gorton and Murray and Representative Hastings provided feedback to the State that this act did not go far enough to combat S.871. Thus HR 2110, the Enhanced Environmental Cleanup Management Demonstration Act was developed as a combined alternative melding a number of ideas, concepts and beliefs. HR 2110, Jeff pointed out, is different from the Hanford Management Demonstration Act in terms of approach. HR 2110 would:

- ◆ Center decision-making authority at Hanford rather than Washington D.C. through the use of a site manager appointed by the President
- ◆ Provide the flexibility to better focus funding on cleanup priorities
- ◆ Streamline regulatory processes by making the State of Washington the sole regulator at the site and by requiring the integration of regulations to eliminate needless, time consuming redundancies
- ◆ Eliminate DOE orders not necessary to protect human safety and the environment
- ◆ Improve the quality of cleanup decisions by requiring greater considerations of risk, land use, benefits and costs
- ◆ Require contract reform to ensure greater competition, facilitate privatization, and maximize the use of fixed-price contracts, incentives and performance guarantees

Jeff explained that the status of this bill is uncertain. Currently hearing arrangements for September and October are being made for the bill. There may be action on this bill in the House before the Senate although at this time there is no detailed strategy. Jeff recognized that the development of this bill was done very quickly in order to get it announced before the last hearing on S.871; was a compromise piece of legislation, not what Washington would have drafted on its own; and there are inconsistencies and problems with this draft. Summaries of the bill were distributed to Board members (*Attachment 3*). For those who would like a copy of the full bill, contact Jeff Breckel at Ecology.

Jeff explained that Ecology wants to hear comments and feedback on this bill in order to make it one that works. Marilyn pointed out that while the function of the Board does not include lobbying or making comments on bills, it is appropriate for Board members to provide their feedback on the bill in their roles outside the Board.

The Board then had a question and answer period.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) said he understands the bill to exempt Hanford from state environmental regulations, and proposed that the Board have a presentation on those provisions. He questioned the State's support of the bill. Jeff explained that the state, including Governor Lowry, supports the bill. Ralph Patt, Oregon Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon Seat) clarified that as of last Thursday, July 27, Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon was not in support of HR 2110.

Tim Takaro, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) asked about the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) standard and wondered if HR 2110 voided that standard. Jeff explained that HR 2110 does not void the standard. As far as he understands the bill, the MTCA standards would be fully supported by the bill.

Chair Reeves requested Board approval for her to extend an invitation to Congress members to speak with the Board at a future Board meeting. Several Board members were concerned that a conversation with members of Congress would be a one way conversation. Marilyn pointed out that the purpose would be to give members of Congress a forum to hear concerns and feedback from the Board. Gerry Pollet suggested that members of Congress who had alternate views on HR 2110 be invited to attend the September Board meeting as well as those in favor of the bill. He particularly suggested that someone from the Northwest delegation who refused to sign the bill be present. Marilyn explained that any member of congress could be invited, or perhaps the Washington State Attorney General might be invited. She assured the Board that if members of Congress used the Board as a forum, a responding panel would be provided. Later in the meeting Marilyn reported having discussions offline with Board members, assuring them of an evenly balanced panel of Congress people. With those assurances, the Board agreed to extend the invitation.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: TWRS PRIVATIZATION**

Jackson Kinzer, DOE, presented which covered the proposed privatization strategy, the path forward, the status of a feasibility study, principles imbedded in Tank Waste Remediation Systems (TWRS) privatization, the TWRS privatization time line and the relationship between the TWRS Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) alternatives (*Attachment 4*).

The privatization program, Jackson explained, consists of two phases. The first phase is a proof of concept phase which would award three pay for product contracts for pretreatment and low-level and high-level immobilization with partial capital payments. After the design and permit application, there would be a down-selection to two contractors. The second phase would be full production capacity by the two contractors and the government would pay a fixed price for product output.

The path forward is to go through a procurement process, followed by integrating privatization into the TWRS baseline program. The TWRS privatization time line will have the EIS process tracking along with the Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Thus it is expected that the record of decision and the contract award will come at the same time, approximately the end of August, 1996.

Jackson next discussed the status of the feasibility study. The consultation process was held for 120 days and closed on June 10. From this process DOE learned there was strong support for the privatization concept although there was some debate over the implementation methods. Jackson acknowledged that serious concerns were expressed regarding the DOE approach. Those concerns were that there was too much risk involved, lower cost was not demonstrated, and the other HAB concerns identified in Consensus Advice #18. Since then, Jackson explained, numerous issues have been addressed and resolved. Full responsibility has been assigned to Richland, so the procurement will be managed by Richland. Risk has been examined in detail and has been considered acceptable. A meeting was held with the vendors on May 31, 1995. Changes to the approach were made based on input from those meetings.

Jackson introduced Bill Taylor who is now heading the Waste Disposal section of TWRS. Jackson called attention to the detailed plan he had distributed pointing out that the overall project must be kept in mind, because the big payoff comes at the end of the process.

A question and answer dialogue ensued with the following issues being raised:

One Board member wondered how DOE can be on such a fast track with TWRS privatization when there seems to be much unknown about product specification. Jackson recognized that this is an issue and noted that DOE is trying to do many things for the first time. He explained that there are many gates to go through. Figuring out the specifications of what goes in and what comes out is the first one. DOE has confidence they will get through it. They are concentrating first on the tanks that contain a limited number of different wastes and ones in which the contents are known in order to develop clear specs and gain experience before getting into the more unknown ones.

Several Board members wondered how the financial risk to the vendors was balanced with the risks to the public, the stakeholders and taxpayers. Jackson responded that because the proposed privatization strategy is two parts, the first phase proof of concept phase, will not require vendors to take on any risks. The second phase will involve some risk. There will be a down selection to two contractors who will be awarded bids based on what they think the cost of the final product will be.

Toby Michelena, Ecology, next addressed the Board. He pointed out that the State supports the concept, but it is a DOE decision. Ecology believes the current concept for implementation of privatization is not appropriate as currently set forth because there is a tremendous amount of

risk involved. Risks, are involved in the procurement process, in the financial area, and in the managerial area. He noted that too many steps are being taken by DOE for the first time. Ecology believes the process can be done in a more step wise, in incremental manner. Smaller steps are what Ecology, believes to be the wiser path to follow.

Toby then explained that he believes DOE will follow the current privatization path forward. He then posed the question as to how does Ecology support this path, maintain the integrity of the TPA and develop a fall back position. He explained that Ecology will do this by:

1. Working within the context of the TPA; he pointed out, however, that because of the near term risks of the procurement process the next two years will be extremely risky
2. Looking for a bridge into the TPA, a bridge over the high risk. They hope they can mold TPA and privatization together with a concept like that recommended by the HAB?

In closing Toby mentioned that the regulators and DOE recognized that they need to change the way they work and they are under intense pressure to produce. However, at the same time the regulators and DOE need to make sure the dangers are highlighted and understood.

Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) informed the Board that George Kyriazis, City of Kennewick (Local Government Seat) had been selected by the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee to sit in on the procurement piece of the privatization path forward.

Lynn Stembridge, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) pointed out that there were huge areas identified by the Board and stakeholders that had not been responded to by DOE. She also wants to know where the public involvement mechanisms are in the TWRS Privatization process. Another question she had was how the integration of two facilities and two companies will be managed.

Mark Hermanson, Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/Work Force Seat) noted that a white paper identifying risks had been mentioned, and wondered if that would be available to the Board. Jackson responded that the White paper Mark referred to was an internal DOE document and he will see if it can be distributed. Mark also wanted to know what the fall back position is; what is the contingency plan if privatization does not work, and how do the various scenarios affect other values? Jackson explained that there had been discussions regarding what will be done if the current path forward does not work, but there are no contingency plans.

A question was raised about the anticipated regulatory interface with the NRC, OSHA and others. The NRC will not be involved in Phase 1, but it is still unclear whether the plants will become NRC licensees in Phase 2. The contracts will incorporate "necessary and sufficient" criteria for the safety framework. Ecology is committing to doing the necessary permits in two years, which is quite accelerated. The permits will integrate Washington Departments of Health and Ecology air quality standards.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: DOE'S RISK REPORT TO CONGRESS**

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

Maureen McCarthy, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) addressed the Board and explained that she reviewed DOE's "Risk and the Risk Debate: Searching for Common Ground" report (Risk Initiative Report) in detail for the ER Committee. After reviewing the report she drafted for the Environmental Restoration Committee comments expressing concerns about the report and advice on how risk evaluation should be conducted. The Environmental Restoration Committee proposed the review, advice and cover letter be adopted by the Board.

Maureen highlighted some of her concerns with the risk initiative report:

1. The conclusions presented in the report do not reflect the uncertainties and concerns discussed in the body of the document. These indicate that a complex-wide risk assessment is not reliable (or even possible) at this time!
2. Although site-specific risk analysis can be more reliable, the overly simplified method used in this report does not address complex attitudes or synergistic health risks.
3. Broad definitions of low, medium, and high contain arbitrarily chosen time scales that cause site evaluations to be subjective and inconsistent.
4. There was a limited amount of public involvement sought for in the preparation of the report.

The Board considered the draft advice, including a cover letter which highlighted the concerns and the advice, and Maureen's review of the risk initiative report. The proposed advice included a suggestion that a national advisory board be convened to consult on the complex-wide risk evaluation analysis. Board members expressed concern that convening another advisory board would be counterproductive and might indicate endorsement of complex-wide risk assessment which many feel is inappropriate and impossible. A consensus developed to eliminate that suggestion from the advice. An ad hoc committee was developed to reword the cover letter. On Friday, the advice was brought back to the Board and it was adopted as amended as Consensus Advice #28. The advice also had as an attachment consensus advice # 15 and Ecology's response to that advice.

Maureen also pointed out that DOE-HQ, has awarded a \$30 million five year contract to the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP). She and several Board members expressed concerns that such a grant was given with no consultation with the Board, at a time when the Board's resources are being cut substantially and yet the Board would be asked to participate in the deliberations.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Charles Powers introduced himself and explained that he is the executive director of the Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation (CRESP). CRESP, he explained, is not a private consulting firm but a cooperative arrangement of universities from Rutgers University, School of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and the University of Washington. The function of CRESP is to recognize the problems with risk assessment, such as those noted in the Board's review of the Risk Initiative Report, and define ways to break through the limits of the current risk assessment process. The question CRESP is asking is, is there some way to do risk assessment and carry it beyond politics? Mr. Powers recognized that risk assessment will not work without informed stakeholders.

The University of Washington is the lead on CRESP for the Hanford site. The major contact is Patricia Boiko. Gil Omann is the Director at UW, and was unable to be here.

Scott Barnhardt introduced himself and explained that he is a medical doctor with the University of Washington, and will focus on occupational health issues for CRESP.

John Kissel introduced himself and explained he is with the Department of Environmental Health at the University of Washington. He works with exposure to soils, and has proposed data gathering on soils and diets. He asked the Board to think about how CRESP may be able to interact with the Board.

Patricia Boiko next introduced herself and explained she is the lead on this project.

In response to the public comment Board members raised several concerns. One was the concern that CRESP may not fully understand who the HAB is and what the HAB does. Particularly, it was pointed out that the SSAB's were created as a substitute to TAGs (Technical Assistance Grants). The Board has done well with hiring experts to work on a specific problem. In response, Charles Powers explained that CRESP would not be a substitute for the independent experts that work with the Board. He stressed that CRESP does not want to usurp the Board's authority and instead would like to collaborate and dialogue with the Board.

Steve Hwang, DOE, also presented public comment to the Board. He explained he was involved in writing the Risk Initiative Report to congress. In doing that he looked at the CERE report as well as many other documents. The points he was bringing today to the Board were:

- ◆ If the comments on the Risk Initiative Report are be submitted to DOE-RL by August 11, they will be in the draft risk initiative report submitted to Congress.
- ◆ Steve can provide details of how The Risk Initiative Report was written and is happy to make himself available to the Board.
- ◆ Richland did their own analysis of the risk data sheets in terms of what they mean regarding risk assessment, but none of this was incorporated into the Risk Initiative

- report, because it was a more general, nationwide report.
- ◆ EPA guidance on risk assessment, is primarily directed to environmental restoration sites, and does not fit the risks at Hanford well.

Finally, he noted the environmental management advisory board (EMAB) wants to make the HAB aware of its work in the area of risk. At a recent meeting of the EMAB there was stakeholder input but none from Hanford although there were some stakeholders from Idaho.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: 100 AREA INTERIM REMEDIAL MEASURES**

Ralph Patt introduced the topic and explained that August 9 was the deadline for comments on the proposed plan for the 100 Areas. Thus, the Environmental Restoration Committee was bringing a letter of advice to the Board. Nancy Werdel, DOE, and Doug Sherwood, EPA, briefly reviewed the proposed plans for the 100 area.

The proposed plan for final resolution of the 100-IU-1, 100-IU-3, 100-IU-4 and 100-IU-5 operable units is one of no further action because they have been cleaned up under expedited response actions which removed all hazardous substances to meet the residential use clean up standards of the Washington Model Toxics Control Act. The advice presented to the Board for adoption recommended supporting the agencies' preferred alternative of no further action. Likewise the advice recommended supporting the agencies' preferred alternative to remove, treat (as appropriate or required) and dispose of the contaminated soil and associated structures from selected source areas within the 100-BC-1, 100-DR-1 and 100-HR-1 operable units. The Board adopted the advice as drafted by the Environmental Restoration Committee as consensus advice #27.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: ST. LOUIS PLAN IMPLEMENTATION-UPDATE**

Ken Bracken, DOE, distributed a variety of handouts which are drafts of various St. Louis plan time lines and schedule (*Attachments 5*). The agencies then gave an overview of what has been done since the first St. Louis meeting.

Carol Rushin, EPA, began by explaining that all three parties are committed to moving forward on the St. Louis plan. She stressed that the handouts are works in progress translating St. Louis into deliverables. The plan is to projectize, which is to break projects down into focussed projects with deliverables. The general idea is to focus people to getting the job done and to give them the authority to do so. This is done by assigning an individual the responsibility for a deliverable and giving them the tools to do it.

Ken Bracken, DOE, informed the Board that a St. Louis 2 meeting is currently being planned for sometime in mid September. Once the meeting is set he will immediately inform Marilyn of the exact date and the location and invite her to represent the HAB. Currently they are trying to have

the meeting in Seattle.

Mike Wilson, Ecology, reviewed the draft Single Regulator list that had been distributed, which designates either Ecology or EPA as the single regulator on each of the five project areas. The only changes from the current lead agency assignments under the TPA are in giving EPA all the projects in 200 West and Ecology all those in 200 East.

For the facility transition projects, Ecology and EPA have agreed to a basic framework although all the details have not been worked out. Ecology will be assigned the lead regulatory authority for any facility where permitting or closure of RCRA units within the facility is an issue. PUREX and FFTF are clear examples of where Ecology will be the lead. Final determinations have not been made for the other facilities within this category.

For the environmental restoration project, Ecology and EPA have had difficulty assigning regulatory authority in alignment with the five project structure of environmental restoration. The three agencies have not come to full agreement here although Ecology and EPA remain in favor of an area-by-area breakdown for this project.

For the technology management program, Ecology will be the lead agency for the laboratory management and legacy waste project. Both Ecology and EPA will continue to be involved in the technology development project activities.

Finally, Mike explained that Ecology and EPA will develop a memorandum of understanding to document their working relationship on issues where full authority over certain programs are in transition. For example, Ecology will remain the single regulatory agency for all RCRA issues and EPA will only review Ecology decisions as part of reviewing Ecology performance as an authorized state. Ecology and EPA will develop an agreement on CERCLA cleanup action similar to the one that now exists between Ecology and EPA elsewhere in Washington State.

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark, explained that Dollars and Sense Committee will be following the St. Louis plan implementation in more detail for cost efficiencies. What the Board just heard was a brief update. She then invited the Board to provide quick feedback, mention their concerns and ask questions, so the Committee could follow up on any concerns.

One concern mentioned was what happens in this projectization scheme to the central environmental compliance units. Will each project have its own, and won't they focus on it less when it's only a small part of their job? The response was that there will still be a central compliance unit to serve all the projects. It is in the project's control as to how/when to get them in order to achieve compliance.

In response to what the disaster plan is if there were a one third budget cut, both Carol and Mike explained that plans have not yet been made. Mike pointed out that if a full cut happens it is very

likely that Ecology will be the sole regulator. Board members expressed concern about pushing EPA off this site, and see the value in the support role of one agency for the other. Another suggestion was to give the time savings expected with the St. Louis Plan.

The Board was encouraged to get major comments and concerns on the St. Louis plan implementation to the agencies. The next draft of documents will be brought to the Board. Actual changes in current commitments or decisions will have a publicized comment period. The Dollars and Sense Committee will follow the dollar expectation of the savings.

#### Update On Budget Briefing With John Wagoner

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Seat) informed the Board that a video tape was made to inform the local community on the Hanford budget as well as on highlights of the clean up. John Wagoner presented highlights of the positive aspects of the Hanford cleanup including Milestones met and projects which came in under budget. A panel was also convened to ask John questions and to have a dialogue. This video tape was then shown in the Tri-Cities area approximately 8 to 10 times. Pam commented that positive coverage is helpful in terms of how the Board and the Hanford cleanup is viewed in Congress.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8: UPDATE ON USE OF PRE-EXISTING CROSS SITE TRANSFER LINE**

Dick Belsey explained that one of the key recommendations of the Paulson Report was to use an existing cross site transfer line (CSTS) to transport waste from tanks in 200 West to tanks in 200 East where there is more capacity. Dick informed the Board that on May 7, 1995 that line was successfully pressurized. Jackson Kinzer then went into more detail about using the CSTS. Jackson explained that the process of getting ready was extensive because the line had not been used for six years. After it was successfully pressurized the line was used to transport waste from tank 102 SY in the 200 west area to tank 104 in the east area approximately seven miles away. Jackson reported that the transfer went exceptionally well and did not cause a problem. In response to Merilyn's question as to whether using the existing CSTS was a result of previous HAB advice Jackson responded that it was.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 9: FEEDBACK FROM AGENCIES**

##### Update On Meeting With the Three Agencies, Merilyn and Patty Burnett

Merilyn reported that she and Patty met with Ron Izatt, Dan Silver, and Randy Smith in order to get a sense from the agencies as to how the Board can build on its successes, find out what the agencies see as successes from the Board and to see if the agencies have any advice as to how the Board can learn from its mistakes. The purpose was to find out from the agencies what the Board has done that has been useful. Merilyn explained that the meeting was a very productive meeting. Merilyn explained she wanted to build from that meeting and take time at this Board meeting to hear from the agencies and from Headquarters on how the Board in general is viewed,

how its advice is used, what is helpful from the Board and what the agencies need from the Board.

#### DOE Headquarters Perspectives

Don Beck, DOE-HQ, began by explaining how the Board is viewed in headquarters. He explained that his job is a clearinghouse for all the Site Specific Advisory Boards. He deals with the logistics of the boards and access to the process. Because of his job, he has a skewed view because he often spends time dealing with problems. He explained that the perception at Headquarters of the Hanford Advisory Board is that it has hit a stride and is coming along. He recognized that the initial reaction to the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) was one of concern due to the size of the board, that it tends to micro manage and use a Cadillac approach, and there were accountability concerns as to who is in charge of the Board. Don pointed out that many of these concerns are now diminished as the HAB has gotten on track and produced much helpful advice. The advice he noted as particularly helpful was the budget advice which showed a level of sophistication and leadership on the Board. Leadership, he felt is also illustrated in that the Board is a step ahead of other boards because it has already done an evaluation of itself.

Merilyn then asked Don to explain what happens when Board advice is sent to headquarters. Don explained that the recommendations from the Board to headquarters were some of the very first recommendations received by HQ. When the boards were initially organized, Headquarters thought the advice would go only to the sites and was not prepared to deal with recommendations to Headquarters. Since the initial organization, however, Headquarters has set up a system for dealing with board advice. When advice comes in, the front office calls either Don or Cindy Kelley. Don or Cindy take the advice directly if it is advice dealing with process or fair access. If the advice is of a substantive nature, it is the responsibility of either Don or Cindy to identify the right technical person to review it and insure that a response is made. Don also explained that Headquarters is tracking all advice that comes in and the status of the response.

Don recognized that the system is not perfect and that there have been some problems. One problem is that occasionally the advice goes to the wrong desk, or the person who receives it and should respond to it does not understand what it is nor what they are to do with it. Thus, he and Cindy Kelley have spent time interviewing and educating people at Headquarters on the importance of citizen advisory boards. Once a response is made, it then goes to Tom Grumbly who may make final changes.

#### DOE-RL Perspectives

The Board next heard from Jackson Kinzer for DOE who was sitting in for Ron Izatt. Jackson explained that the Board exerts a strong influence on headquarters. Jackson noted that his job is to make decisions based on safety, schedule and cost and that the collective thought from the Board is considered when he makes those decisions.

### Washington State Department of Ecology Perspectives

Mike Wilson then presented for Ecology in place of Dan Silver. Mike explained that Dan believes there is a widening gap between government and the people when it comes to Hanford cleanup. Dan believes the Board is a significant factor for closing that gap. He specifically noted that Ecology often acts on the informal board advice that comes in the form of comments and questions at Board meetings and particularly at committee meetings. Ecology staff have been conditioned to factor the Board in at the earliest possible time. Dan believes Ecology needs to tell the Board more explicitly how its input has been used and to do this not just through the formal response mechanisms. Mike then noted his personal reflection is that when he came to his first Board meeting, he was amazed at the ability of the Board to develop consensus advice that is not wishy washy but meaningful.

### US EPA Perspectives

Carol Rushin, EPA, presented both her and Randy Smith's views. She noted that Randy is a strong supporter of the Board. Marilyn referred to the letter from Randy in the packet responding to the Board's advice. She pointed out that the Board allows a forum for open communication and as a direct result, regional and national bridges have been built. Carol also noted that many tough issues have come through the Board and there has been effective conflict and dispute resolution. The issues have been worked out through the hard work of the Board and its facilitators. Carol also noted that the information and ideas and analysis, such as the Paulson Report, that come from the Board help the agencies move from their technical positions. Finally, on a personal level, Carol pointed out that both she and Randy sincerely appreciate all the hard work of the Board.

### Board Dialogue

The Board then entered into a dialogue based on the previous discussion. Many Board members urged Don Beck to be their advocate and to defend the Board in Washington DC. Don responded that he does take on that role.

Many Board members felt the Board budget should not be cut because the Board has saved the agencies ten times over in the value of the advice it gives. In response, Don Beck explained that he is amazed that a program this small has so much attention from Congress. He thinks the reason for this is that the idea of this Board and the work it does is revolutionary. He also noted that he believes when public involvement is done well just about every constituent group is alienated a bit. He explained that headquarters is committed to this Board for the long term but that they do need to be aware of the criticisms so they can remain on top of them. He urged the Board to get their local representatives aware of the issues facing it.

Another Board member pointed out that it is not just that the Board is not getting the word out but that the agencies have not been giving the Board credit. It was urged that the agencies write to the newspapers letters of praise for the work of the Board. It was also proposed that site programs pay for use of the board as part of their public involvement.

In response to coordinating the efforts of all the site specific advisory boards working on cross cutting issues, Don Beck explained he is working on getting 1-800 numbers for the boards as well as setting up E-mail systems so the boards can more effectively and easily communicate with one another. He feels this cross-site communication is the next level in using the Advisory Boards, and that the Board must complement other advisory bodies, such as the EM Advisory Board.

Many Board members noted the hard work of the Board and Board members as well as their remarkable expertise. Many also noted that the power of the Board is in its size and in having alternates that are incredible workers.

### **AGENDA ITEM 10: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD'S REFLECTIONS**

Facilitator, Elaine Hallmark, called the Board's attention to the report in the Board Packet entitled, "Summary of Reflections, Hanford Advisory Board, Fiscal Years '94-'95 Assessment" (*Attachment 6*). She then distributed a second "Report to the Hanford Advisory Board Comparing Its First Two Self Evaluations" (*Attachment 7*), which she had prepared. She then explained that the first was simply a compilation of the comments submitted on the "Reflection Questionnaires" that had been returned. It simply grouped similar comments, but did not weight them in any way. She urged Board members to peruse the report.

Elaine reported that she had been asked to try to make a connection between this current set of Board reflections and the December 1994 HAB Self Evaluation. She had noticed a clear evolution in the Board's assessment of its functioning and some trends stood out. She presented the highlights of those reported:

- ◆ The Board has shown a dramatic increase in the expression of positive working relationships and trust level among Board members, among the TriParty Agencies and between the Board and the Agencies.
- ◆ The Board members are feeling more productive and successful at producing consensus advice that has a meaningful impact on the agencies.
- ◆ There was nearly universal acknowledgment that the Board's role in opening up the DOE budget process and in giving budget advice had been difficult, often tedious, but was significant and an important step forward.
- ◆ A strong feeling emerged of building on previous values and moving forward in applying them to specific areas in waste management and environmental restoration.
- ◆ The most positive outcome of having the Board was seen as the dialogue it was allowing to develop among stakeholders and agencies, and the ability to emerge from the dialogue with a regional consensus. Suggestions for improving centered on

moving the dialogue up to begin sooner on issues, and to create a safer atmosphere in which the agencies can express or test out tentative approaches or ideas that are not yet formulated into policy.

- ◆ Both evaluations demonstrated the desire of Board members to prioritize the issues they deal with, focus on major, big picture, policy issues and not on details, and to begin looking at some of the bigger policy questions in more depth. The recent reflections seem to look for a way to allow focus on details by committees or individuals, while keeping the Board focused on the policy issues on which to give advice. The desire for a lighter workload for Board members was also part of this.
- ◆ A number of specific suggestions for streamlining operations of the Board were collected in the reflections.
- ◆ It was suggested that the Board should place more emphasis in the future on its communications with the public at large and with member constituents about results achieved in clean up and in cost efficiencies, and should assist the agencies to integrate and improve the public involvement approaches they use so as to inform a broader public while not wasting resources.

Elaine also referred the Board to the draft of National SSAB Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures (*Attachment 8*) and pointed out how the Board's own assessment seemed to fit with the goals and performance measures set out for evaluating the success of the overall SSAB initiative by DOE. The criteria seem to emphasize even more the communication with the public and the establishment of constructive working relationships, building trust and providing a forum for the expression of diverse views and dialogue leading to greater understanding by the public. It was noted that this is the time for the Board to be sure as it develops its own work plan and goals that the national criteria don't establish a different set of goals for judging the success of the Board.

Elaine distributed for review prior to the next day's discussion of the HAB budget, a memo from her on Confluence Northwest's Scope of Work and Budget Options for Fiscal Year 1996. (*Attachment 9*).

Merilyn Reeves made some brief comments on "Where Do We Go From Here?" for the Board to ponder overnight, in anticipation of the Friday Board planning session. She indicated her desire to reduce the workload and cost of the Board, while maintaining the strong committee work that had allowed the Board to produce so well. She felt there would have to be more staff support from the agencies. Her suggestion was to create an executive committee of about 7 people, which would have to meet in person at least some of the time, and whose function would have to be clearly spelled out by the Board. She felt the Board could then go to meeting every other month, with an option for 2 additional meetings. She was certain that January and July meetings

could be skipped. Marilyn then recessed the meeting until Friday morning.

### Friday, September 4, 1995

#### Update On Meeting With Tom Grumbly and Health Safety and Waste Management Committee Members On Privatization

Dick Belsey reported that on June 21, Mark Hermanson, Harold Heacock, Todd Martin and Dick met directly with Tom Grumbly to present the Board's consensus advice # 18-24 regarding privatization. The group met with Tom Grumbly for approximately 40 minutes. Dick reported that shortly into the meeting Tom Grumbly realized the Board was supportive of the privatization concept and warmed up to them. Dick had the impression that Tom Grumbly really listened to the concerns brought to him. Mark Hermanson added that he feels one result of that meeting is that a face has been put on the Board and on the Hanford work force for Tom Grumbly.

Dick also explained that there was a follow up meeting with several DOE headquarter employees involved in these programs. Dick felt that there was a satisfactory exchange with them about technical details such as contracting.

Marilyn asked Jon Yerxa to convey the Board's appreciation for the televideo conference on the budget to Tom Grumbly. She explained that televideo conference was precedent setting and opened the door for meetings such as the one which occurred with the committee members from Health, Safety and Waste Management.

#### Press Release

Dick Belsey felt the use of the pre-existing cross site transfer line which transported 473,000 gallons from a tank in the west area over to the east area on July 27 was news worthy in terms of health and safety issues. Dick proposed that a press release regarding this issue be prepared at the end of the Board meeting. The Board agreed and decided to draft a press release. Marilyn pointed out that in the past there has been pressure to get the releases out by the end of the working day Friday which has caused some hectic last minute arrangements. She suggested that while this is very worthy news, it is not time sensitive and therefore it would not be necessary to rush the details to meet a Friday deadline and instead, a release could go out early next week. The Board agreed and a press release was drafted.

#### DOE Budget Process Lessons Learned Panel

Mark Hermanson announced that he was one of the panelists on a panel to analyze the DOE budget process and glean the lessons learned. Mark reported that the forum was not to discuss nor interpret Board advice but to get reactions from the panelists on the budget process. All panelists commended DOE for opening the budget process, and all agreed that this was the right thing to do. The panelists then discussed items that went well and items that could be improved.

What the panelists saw as going well were the availability of resource people, the access to

Grumbly and DOE and the awareness that some advice from the Board was received well and used. The suggestion was made to have more televideo conferences similar to the budget televideo conference on focussed topics.

The main area to be improved was to establish a protocol for receiving and tracking Board advice. Advice had not always gotten through to the right people. It was also noted that the federal budget briefings were good, but the dollar figures were presented together with the budget process explanations. It would be better to present the budget process first. Then separately get into numbers.

Other comments that panelists made were to let DOE know that when they follow up and pursue the status of their advice it should not be seen as an attack on DOE. Also it was noted that occasionally the timing of information back to the Board is late and the advice is thus obsolete before it even gets to DOE.

Mark offered to put in the September packet the summary of the panel discussion which was drafted by Eli Bronstein of DOE.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION**

##### Proposal To Hold Hearings In The Tri-Cities

Dick Belsey reported that USDOE issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) on the Stockpile Stewardship and Management PEIS and notice of public scoping meeting to occur between June and August in Tennessee, South Carolina, New Mexico, Nevada and Texas. On June 23, 1995, the USDOE Albuquerque Operations Office NOI announced additional scoping for the Draft Pantex Site-wide EIS. This included potential local impacts associated with selection of the Pantex site for Stockpile Stewardship and Storage. From this document, it came to the attention of the Health Safety and Waste Management (HSWM) Committee that the Stockpile Stewardship and Management PEIS had been changed. The change resulted in Hanford being added as a site for consideration for interim pit storage and two of the previously selected sites being deleted.

The HSWM Committee recommended that the Board adopt advice requesting both an extension of the public comment period and the scheduling of several open meetings for citizens around the Northwest to be involved in the scoping process. The draft advice also urges USDOE to include Hanford stakeholders as it prepares any decisions that consider sending waste or weapons functions to the Hanford site and urges that Washington State Department of Ecology and the US EPA likewise urge the DOE.

There is considerable confusion about which decision and EIS will deal with importing waste to Hanford. The feeling was that there should be combined meetings around this region for both, and that all waste importation issues need to be put on the table at the same time. Don Beck informed the Board that it can make specific recommendations on how to consolidate these

issues. He believes Headquarters is open to having workshops or innovative ways of pulling these together. They have asked EME programs to identify the issues they see coming to the public. Paige Knight noted that many groups are asking DOE to form a Blue Ribbon Task Force to look at ways to address waste policy, and reminded the Board of its advice to that effect on low level waste.

After minor wording changes the Board adopted the proposed advice as consensus advice # 29.

#### Plutonium Round Table

Walt Blair, Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/Work Force Seat) explained that he and Tim Takaro are the leads on this issue for the Health Safety and Waste Management Committee. Plutonium disposition is a major nation wide issue. A number of interest groups are sponsoring a round table on plutonium disposition is being planned in early October in both Seattle and the Tri-cities. The topics proposed for discussion by a panel of experts heading workshops are :

1. Options for storage and disposal
2. Dangers of proliferation and a need for international cooperation
3. Protection of workers, the public and the environment
4. Control of civilian stockpiles (moving beyond the spent fuel standard)
5. Implications for the Northwest
6. The need for public involvement and a political process which can perform in long term disposition decisions

This is meant to be the beginning of a 5 year dialogue on the issue, covering all points of view. Similar public forums are being planned in a number of Oregon cities in the Fall also (see material in Board packet).

Potential speakers include governor Mike Lowry, Dr. Arjun Makajani, Dr. John Ahearne, Dr. John Honecemp, Tom Cochran, Mike Lawrence, Dr. Mathew Bun, and Dr. John Holdren. The committee is planning a public presentation in Kennewick on the Thursday evening of the Board's October meeting. It is hoping Board members will participate and would like the Board to hold morning workshops on Plutonium Disposition with the panel as its Friday morning agenda. (The speakers will then go to Seattle for a Friday evening presentation and Saturday morning workshop). Also, the committee is proposing that the Board be listed as one of the supporting groups for this Round table. Betty Tabbutt noted that the opportunity to speak to the Hanford Advisory Board is a major draw in getting the well-known speakers to participate.

Several Board members had concerns about the length of time that would be needed for a workshop and felt Board time should be spent on issues that affect the region and not on nation-wide issues. Other members felt plutonium disposition is an issue that will impact the Northwest immensely and therefore worth a day of the Board's time. After a brief discussion, the Board voted in favor of allotting a half day on the October Friday agenda for the workshop on plutonium disposition and agreed to have the Board listed as a supporting group. Board

members will be encouraged to attend the Thursday evening public presentation.

### **AGENDA ITEM 12: SPENT FUEL**

Beth Sellers, DOE, reviewed the refinements made in the spent nuclear fuel project (*Attachment 10*). She explained that a fair number of changes have been made. In April, scoping meetings were held on the EIS. In June it was decided that the spent nuclear fuel project will not have to go to headquarters for permission to start design and construction; that step can happen locally. A policy paper was developed outlining the various roles of Richland and Headquarters in regard to the regulatory strategy. This paper was signed by Tara O'Toole and Tom Grumbly. A regulatory requirements team has been put together, and an independent review panel (IRP) has been convened by DOE to provide high-level, external oversight on the implementation of the spent nuclear fuel project regulatory policy.

John Fulton, WHC, updated the Board on the technical plan. He explained that the fuel and sludge in the K-Basins today are sitting in a variety of canisters. The original plan was to pick up those canisters and put them into overpacks. This step, however, has been revised resulting in a process that is simplified, saves money and allows the project to meet its targeted schedule. Now, the fuel will be pulled out of the canisters and the sludge will be left behind. The fuel will then be placed in pieces stacked in a basket and the basket will be placed into an overpack. This process cuts the operation time down by one half. The temporary storage of wet fuel has also been refined so that this step now is simplified, saves money and meets the schedule. The NEPA process has also been expedited. The time line is to do the process in 9 months with a draft EIS out September 1, 1995. January 1996 is the day scheduled for the record of decision. Because of the fast time line the Board is urged to get its comments in as soon as possible.

The identified next steps are :

- ◆ Finalize process functions and requirements and begin design
- ◆ Update fuel characterization requirements
- ◆ Integrate strategy within Spent nuclear fuel project

The Board then asked several technical questions in order to have a better understanding of the spent nuclear fuel project.

Merilyn thanked the presenters for the update and pointed out that it is remarkable how much work has been done on the spent nuclear fuel project. She requested the Executive Summary of the meeting summary highlight this project and the use of the cross sight transfer line as a clear example of two projects which have met the Board value of getting on with cleanup.

## Announcements

*(Some of these announcements were made at various times during the day. To minimize confusion, they have been consolidated to this location).*

◆ Charles Hansen, DOE, commented on what is going on with TPA Milestone M33 and distributed a packet of information (*Attachment 11*). DOE, he explained, will be interfacing with the Board and public regarding how they proceed. He informed the Board that DOE has integrated the plan and path forward for all the solid waste streams at Hanford. Furthermore, they have developed a systems engineering study which they have also discussed with Ecology and EPA. DOE wants public input on the topic before final guidelines and new milestones on how to proceed are set down. The Health Safety and Waste Management Committee is following this.

◆ Toby Michelena announced that he had just received by fax from Tom Grumbly a response on the financing and scope of privatization and distributed it to the Board (*Attachment 12*).

◆ Tim Takaro and Paige Knight called the Board's attention to this day being the 50th anniversary of the use of the atomic bomb. Paige reflected that this Board is here continuing to deal with the effects. Tim mentioned that in honor of this 50th anniversary there were several activities occurring in the Tri-Cities. A program detailing the activities was placed on the back table for Board members to pick up.

◆ Marilyn announced that she had been invited to participate at the TRICIPE Conference (a trade conference) on August 9. She plans to attend and will be presenting and introducing the Board at 1:30.

◆ Marilyn mentioned she had been invited as Chair to participate in a session with all the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs at this conference to be held on August 13. Since Marilyn would be attending the TRICIPE Conference, Patty Burnett wondered whether she should attend in her capacity as Vice Chair. It will be a mass gathering of federal contractors associated with DOE's environmental restoration projects. Representatives from most of the SSABs will be there. Don Beck said it was his understanding that if a board wanted to send a representative it would come out of that Board's budget. Marilyn was unsure whether it was worth the Board's money and Patty's time and asked for feedback. Don Beck said he would be attending. There was little comment. Marilyn said she would make further inquiry and decide.

## **AGENDA ITEM 6: DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN**

Jon Yerxa, DOE, explained that the Draft Site Public Participation Outline in the Board's packet (*Attachment 13*) was drafted as a result of the public participation involvement strategy meeting. At that meeting it was requested that the agencies look forward and inform the Board on the what issues they anticipate considering in the next six months. Jon explained the draft that has been

set forth has not been prioritized due to relative value of the issue, but has been prioritized due to schedule. The Draft Site Public Participation Outline attempts to summarize what all parties -- DOE , regulatory agencies, and stakeholders--believe to be the key Hanford issues needing public participation.

The issues listed are:

- ◆ TWRS privatization and EIS
- ◆ Waste management programmatic EIS and waste importation
- ◆ Hanford remedial action EIS and land use planning
- ◆ Draft EIS of safe management of K-Basins spent nuclear fuel
- ◆ Plutonium disposition
- ◆ 100 area cleanup
- ◆ 3161 workforce restructuring plan
- ◆ Plutonium finishing plant EIS
- ◆ M-33.

Jon also asked the Board whether they would like to receive a speculative calendar extending 3 months. Such a calendar, he explained, would be more speculative the further out the calendar was carried.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 11: BOARD PLANNING**

##### Document Declassification

Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon Seat), presented this proposal to the Board to assist in document declassification (*Attachment 14*). She explained that the Hanford Environmental Dose Reconstruction Project was the first externally organized document declassification effort at Hanford. More than 9,000 documents have been declassified since January 1989, at the request of the project's technical steering panel. The panel now has declassification requests pending for nearly 1,000 documents.

Mary Lou explained that the technical steering panel will disband at the end of the year. Thus the only organized and concerted external pressure on USDOE to declassify Hanford documents will be eliminated. The proposal she brought to the Board asks the Board to assume responsibility for representing public interest in Hanford past practices document declassification by filling the void that will be left when the technical panel disbands. Mary Lou explained that the list of documents needs to be reviewed and prioritized to help DOE decide the order in which to declassify. She volunteered to head a committee or subcommittee of the ER Committee to do this. Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Seat), felt this was an extremely important topic and volunteered his time and effort to help the Board do this. Lynne Stembbridge noted that the Hanford Health Effects Committee has a similar request and will follow up on documents that the Dose Reconstruction Project (DRP) had requested. It was decided that the ER Committee would take responsibility for this issue, and create a small

subcommittee to take the necessary steps.

Board Planning: Addressing WHAT the HAB Should Accomplish in FY '96

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark introduced this planning session by reiterating the goals. By the end of the September meeting, the goal is to have a workplan and budget that have been "bought into" by the Board members and by the TriParty Agencies. It is hoped that more resources and energy will not have to continue to go into this issue, except for routine flexibility and changes necessitated by actual clean up issues arising. The Board would like to focus its attention on and get on with the clean up related issues.

Today the primary goal is to get a well developed sense of WHAT the Board will try to accomplish in FY '96. The first part of the planning session is to work in small groups focusing totally on the WHAT. The secondary goal for today is to get a preliminary sense of HOW the Board will operate, if any differently, to accomplish the WHAT. The hope is not to resolve the specifics of the HOW, but to identify specific issues or questions and a method for addressing them, so that a fairly specific proposal can be developed for the September meeting.

Board members and alternates numbered off, dividing into three groups, which were facilitated by Elaine, Naseem Rakha and Molly Mulvaney of the Confluence NW team. Agency personnel were asked to divide themselves among the three groups, being sure to have at least one representative in each, and others were to participate similarly. Each group was asked to do primarily two things: 1) Discuss the subjects that people have suggested the Board emphasize in the coming year (a combined list from various sources was provided) and identify the ones that your group would emphasize and the "product" you would like to see come from it; and, 2) address the issues of communicating with the public that have been raised and identify ways in which the HAB should be communicating with the broader public.

The facilitators were asked to combine the work of the small groups over the lunch break and share a consolidated version with the whole group after lunch. A summary of the consolidated report follows.

Larger/Cross Cutting Issues to Emphasize (Look at the Policy Issues of Each)

The small groups created the following list of topics or issues to emphasize, while noting that the Board deals with all clean up issues. The topics have been grouped by major headings. Specific products that were identified are noted by the topic. However, the Board stated overall that all the types of products listed in the January 1995 Workplan, consensus advice, sounding board type feedback and in-depth reports, should be used as appropriate. It also noted that it should track issues on which it has already given advice and study new issues.

- ◆ **Cost Efficiencies** PRODUCT: All Committees contribute
  - Implementation of St. Louis Accords
  - Contract reform

Workforce Reductions, 3161 requirements PRODUCT: Vision Piece re implementation of 3161

- ◆ **Strategic Plan, Management Priorities and DOE Budget**
  - Evaluate Risk Prioritization
  - Reallocation FY 96 and Review of Advice used (PRODUCT: Responses) FY '97-98 - including Prioritization systems (coordinate with Risk)
  
- ◆ **Land Use Issues**
  - Hanford Remedial Action EIS
  - 100 Areas
  - Facility Transition
  
- ◆ **Waste Management and Disposal**
  - Spent Nuclear Fuel
  - Tank Waste
  - Plutonium Disposal and Storage
  - Privatization
  
- ◆ **Waste and Special Nuclear Material Importation**
  
- ◆ **Worker and Public Safety and Health**
  - Tank Safety
  
- ◆ **Technology Development** - PRODUCT: Report
  - Priorities/completion
  - Site Technology Coordinating Group (STCG)
  
- ◆ **Public Involvement** - PRODUCTS: Advice to agencies re reaching broader audiences; active involvement on specific issues; Board communications to public, constituents, agencies
  - Declassification - Openness Initiative
  - PI on Budget per paragraphs 148-149 of the TPA
  
- ◆ **Building Relationships and Trust/Ongoing Dialogue** - PRODUCT: Systemic Change

Other Recommendations and Ideas

- ◆ Create an ad hoc Task Group on Document Declassification (later decided to put into ER)
- ◆ Always look for lessons and principles learned
- ◆ Develop criteria for prioritizing and taking on issues.
  - Form a work group to develop proposed criteria for prioritizing issues coming before the

Board. Begin by using the TPA Criteria/Values for Assessing Levels of Public Involvement, the Public Involvement Strategy developed by Triangle, and Ecology's recently developed process for prioritizing.

- ◆ Systematic and continuous feedback on advice
- ◆ Have a 3-4 month agenda for the Board meetings
- ◆ Need a framework for integrating the pieces into the larger picture. How to deal with crosscutting issues?
- ◆ How do we bring (include) all Board members?
- ◆ How do we know we have the right committees
- ◆ Develop system to track clean up progress

#### Communications With Public

- ◆ Help expand information to different audiences
- ◆ Use other media besides print: videotapes; electronic media
- ◆ Tracking cleanup progress
- ◆ Taking media on tours of specific areas
- ◆ How much is the Board role to do the communicating & how much is the agencies'?

#### Look at Each Issue to See How These Fit

- ◆ Land use
- ◆ Cost/budget
- ◆ Risk prioritization/ health and environmental effects
- ◆ Public involvement
- ◆ Worker Health and Safety

Following the summary report of the small group work, the Board had some general discussion about whether setting criteria for assessing topics is useful, how to get the appropriate input from the agencies, etc. It was then decided to leave this discussion for further development after the summary of the discussion is prepared and distributed.

#### HOW the Board Will Operate to Accomplish the WHAT in FY '96 Within the Constraints of Resources Available (Budget and Personnel)

Elaine distributed a summary of the "Specific Suggestions for How the Board Should Work/Organize Itself to Accomplish the Work It Outlines in FY '96 Within the Budget It Is Being Given." (*Attachment 15*). This discussion was wide-ranging, but focused in on several specific issues on which tentative decisions were made. However, since a quorum was not present for most of the decisions, it was agreed that all would be compiled and brought to the September meeting for review, refinement and action.

#### Number of Meetings

Initial discussion was on setting the number of meetings based on what was needed to get through the issues and complete the Board's work plan, rather than on the basis of budget. After

considerable discussion of a variety of options, the Board members present took a poll, which approved having 8 meetings per year, roughly based on a 2 months on, 1 month off schedule.

### Committees

There was no objection to forming an Executive Committee, provided its functions were clearly delineated and membership was more than just Committee Chairs. It was recommended it have no power to adopt advice. Other concerns or fears about instituting such a committee were that it is reminiscent of an hierarchical, male-oriented model of decision-making. Members do not want to lose their consensus model of decision-making.

There was considerable discussion about how many other committees to keep. Betty Tabbutt reviewed her written proposal in the Board packet (*Attachment 16*) regarding making the public involvement committee less active in meeting on its own, and encouraging its members to be added to substantive committees with the charge of bringing in the question of how the public should be involved in each issue, and including this advice with the substantive advice on an issue. Patty Burnett, made a similar suggestion for the Cultural, Socio-Economic Committee.

The tentative agreement was to continue the two substantive program oriented committees, Health, Safety and Waste Management and Environmental Restoration and the cross-cutting budget/priorities committee, Dollars and Sense as the three major committees, meeting regularly and developing issues for the Board. The Public Involvement and Cultural, Socio-Economic Committees were tentatively put on "standby", with the idea the other 3 committees would designate members to specifically track those issues along with the program issues of the committee. Meetings of these two committees may be called on an ad hoc basis to address specific issues or to assess progress.

### Number of Board Seats

It was recommended that the present seats generally be maintained and that the current balance on the Board be retained. However, it was also unanimously recommended to DOE that it send letters to those representatives of seats that have not been attending and asking them if they would find a different representative who is able and willing to attend Board meetings if they are not. If the seat does not find a willing person, the seat should be dropped from the Board, unless it upsets the balance or loses an interest that needs representation. It was noted that while Grant County may not be interested in maintaining its local government seat, the City of West Richland has continually requested a seat, and could be substituted. It was recommended that the attendance be reviewed once a year and such letters sent and followed up on.

### HAB Budget/Other Cost Reducing Measures

Merilyn noted that she thinks the Board is at least \$120,000 short of its basic needs in the \$360,000 budget proposed by DOE. Gerry Pollet said he computes that the Board needs \$640,000 to accomplish its work load. He reminded DOE that it had signed a document agreeing

to commit to provide adequate funding for the Board's operations before initial seats agreed to participate. The issue of funding alternates was raised, and quickly dismissed as having little effect, since it was rare that the Board had actually funded 2 people per seat at any one meeting.

Don Beck said that he had no authority to authorize more funds for the HAB, and he did not think the climate in Washington, D.C. was very amenable to an increased level. He did say that what headquarters wanted to see was: reduced costs, strong project plans (prioritized work plan), and meaningful evaluation. He also said the HAB was ahead of other Boards in already having conducted some form of evaluation. Marilyn said the Board would attempt to match the work load with the funds available or needed, and urged careful thought about this before the September meeting. She urged people to read the Confluence NW memo on workscope and budget and consider how the Board could best accomplish its mission.

All of the issues in the "Specific Suggestions" had been discussed except for those relating to procedural or membership changes suggested for implementation by committees. These were held for further discussion after the full Board acts on the basic recommendations made at this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

## ATTACHMENTS LIST

### Number Item

1. August Board Meeting Attendance List
2. Copies of Visuals titled "Hanford Land Management Act (The Johnston Bill), May 1995
3. Summaries of HR 2110
4. Copies of Visuals titled "Discussion of TWRS Privatization," dated August 3, 1995
5. Several handouts distributed in one packet with the following titles: 1)Blueprint for Action and Cost Control at Hanford, 2)Proposed Revision to the Hanford Federal Facilities Agreement and Consent Order, 3)Schedule for Meeting St. Louis Commitments, 4)Blueprint for Action and Cost Control and 5)Single Regulator Draft, dated August 1, 1995
6. Summary of Reflections, Hanford Advisory Board, Fiscal Years '94-'95 Assessment
7. Report to the Hanford Advisory Board Comparing Its First Two Self Evaluations, by Elaine Hallmark, Facilitator, August 1, 1995
8. Preliminary Draft: SSAB Performance Measures and Indicators
9. Memo from Elaine Hallmark re: Confluence Northwest Scope of Work and Budget Options for Fiscal Year 1996, August 1, 1995
10. Copies of Visuals titled "Hanford Spent Nuclear Fuel Project," dated August 4, 1995
11. Packet titled "Solid Waste Material Systems Alternatives Study"
12. Letter to Mary Riveland from Tom Grumbly, dated August 3, 1995
13. Draft Public Participation Outline
14. Memo from MaryLou Blazek re Document Declassification, July 18, 1995
15. Specific Suggestions for How the Board Should Work/Organize Itself to Accomplish the Work It Outlines In FY 1996 Within the Budget It I Being Given
16. Memo from Betty Tabbutt re HAB Organization - Public Involvement, July 18, 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