

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

**Meeting Summary
October 5-6, 1995
Kennewick, Washington**

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Summary of the Board's Meeting	
<u>Items of Discussion</u>	
Announcements	1
Agenda Review and Corrections to the Meeting Summary Updates	1
Proposed Board Comments - Advice on Draft Request for Proposals for a Management and Integration Contractor for the Hanford Site	4
Hanford Strategic Planning	7
St. Louis Plan Update from Salt Lake City Meeting	7
TWRS Privatization	8
Waste Management PEIS	9
Proposal for Independent Technical Assistance Technology Development/Science and Technology	10
HAB Administrative Matters	11
Plutonium Roundtable	12
Plutonium Roundtable Workshop	12
Consolidation of Health Oversight Functions	13



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 Rosemary Guse at Westinghouse Hanford (509)376-8908.

1705100



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Board Adopts Advice on Draft Request for Proposals for a Management and Integration Contractor for the Hanford Site

Susan Brechbill, DOE Chair of the Source Evaluation Board reviewed the comments received from over 700 people on the draft request for proposal (RFP) for a Management and Integration (M&I) Contractor at the Hanford Site. After discussion, the Board concluded it wanted to advise DOE that the Board does not feel DOE has made the case that going to this form of M&I Contractor will solve the problems it is aimed at. An ad hoc committee drafted advice to that effect and incorporated specific concerns. The Board adopted the advice with the City of Richland and TRIDEC abstaining.

Board Adopts Advice on TWRS Privatization

The Board learned that the Secretary's decision was announced earlier this week and DOE has decided to go forward with the privatization path it had presented to the Board at previous meetings. The Board adopted advice clearly stating that the Board cannot support the currently outlined TWRS privatization plan.

Waste Management PEIS Planning Committee Developing and Video Teleconference Scheduled

Don Beck is working on establishing a planning committee to deal with the need for cross site dialogue on the Waste Management PEIS and related waste management EISs. The Board's representatives will be Gerry Pollet, Harold Heacock and Mike Graine.

Regional public meetings are being scheduled on the waste management PEIS in the form of a video teleconference on November 9 from 7 to 10 p.m. at Pasco, Lacey, Portland, Seattle and Pendleton. The Board was concerned about the lack of meaningful discussion on how to involve the public on the PEIS and asked the Chair to communicate the concerns to Headquarters as soon as possible.

Board Considers Proposal for Independent Technical Assistance Technology Development/Science and Technology and Defers Taking Action

Board member Tom Engel drafted a concept paper regarding hiring a technical team to evaluate the science and technology program at Hanford. The idea is to have a review on what the path forward is and what needs to be done to ensure that science and technology at Hanford are needs based, designed to meet the needs of the TPA and moves DOE into a competitive era. The Board decided it is not ready to start an independent review but will track the issue and continue evaluating the need for one. Board members were urged to get in touch with the Dollars and Sense Committee and Tom Engel.

Board Administrative Matters

The Board decided to add two additional "at-large" seats to the 5 member Executive Committee. The Chair was given the authority to appoint the at-large members with the approval of the Board and Harold Heacock and George Kyriazes were thus appointed.

The Board agreed to have the Executive Committee take the functions related to the Board budget.

Board Participates in Plutonium Roundtable and Workshop

Board members and the larger public heard presentations by a panel of experts and a response panel regarding the disposition of Plutonium reserves. Four workshops were also held on: The Implication for the Northwest, Proliferation and International Cooperation, the Spent Fuel Standard and Beyond - relationship to commercial fuel and waste and Development of a Farsighted Political Process - public involvement. Each of the workshops then reported to the whole and the whole group brainstormed "Next Steps."

Board Defers Action Regarding Health Oversight at the Hanford Site

Dick Belsey referred to a memo discussing increasing the effectiveness of health and safety oversight through a reorganization of health and safety resources at the site, regardless of the contracting mechanism. The Board decided to defer the issue back to the Health Safety and Waste Management Committee to make further refinements and come back to the Board at a later date.

Draft Meeting Summary
October 5-6, 1995
Kennewick, Washington

Thursday, October 5, 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 italics. Seats not represented were: Franklin County (Local Government Seat), Grant County (Local Government Seat), University of Washington (Higher Education Seat), Benton Franklin District Health (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) and the Business-Agricultural Seat. Members of the public and others in attendance are listed in the sign in sheet included in *Attachment 1*.

Announcements

- ◆ Rico Cruz was introduced as a new alternate for the Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government Seat).
- ◆ Alice Murphy was introduced. She is replacing Nadine Highland as the Chief Financial Officer for DOE-RL. Nadine has retired.
- ◆ Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) announced that the Plutonium Roundtable and Workshop begins this evening. She explained that Tom Grumbly and Governor Lowry would not be attending the Kennewick meetings but would be in attendance at the Seattle meeting on Friday evening. She highly encouraged Board members to attend the workshop.
- ◆ Marilyn announced that she had received an annual report from Rocky Flats which was available for Board members to look through.
- ◆ Facilitator Elaine Hallmark announced that Debbie Kaufman, of her office, clipped a lengthy article on Hanford (with photographs) from a major German newspaper, Die Zeit. It was made available for Board members.

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

Agenda Review

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark reviewed the revised agenda. She pointed out that neither John Wagoner nor Tom Grumbly were available for this meeting so the time that had been set aside for them was consolidated. Thursday morning's agenda was arranged to allow for consideration of the proposed advice on the draft request for proposals for a Management and Integration contractor as well as for the TWRS privatization update. Several informational updates and

Board administrative matters were scheduled on Thursday afternoon. Thursday evening and Friday morning were dedicated to the Plutonium Workshops. On Friday afternoon the Board will reconvene to complete any matters that were not completed at the end of its Thursday meeting. Marilyn pointed out that at the September meeting on the final day some items were hastily approved. She reminded the Board that it should not strive to approve substantive issues without having a night in between to fully consider the issue.

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

September Meeting Summary

The September meeting summary was approved as submitted. Marilyn asked Board members to strike out "draft" and insert "final" on their copies.

Updates

Continuing Resolution

Alice Murphy reviewed DOE's funding situation. She explained that as of yet there is no appropriation bill for 1996, but there is a Continuing Resolution. The Senate and House bills are approximately 750 million dollars apart. Under the Continuing Resolution, DOE is limited to the spending level of the lower mark, which is the mark set at the House. Only programs continuing from '95 can be funded. There can be no new starts until there is an appropriation bill. One of the ramifications is that the Spent Nuclear Fuel canister program cannot be started. The House and Senate are supposed to meet the second week of October to consider the appropriation bill. The Continuing Resolution runs through November 13, which is when the issue of raising the national debt ceiling must be decided. This is 44 days or 12% of the year.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, updated the Board on EPA's funding situation. There is even greater pressure on the EPA's budget, as the 2 marks cut its budget 34% and 36%. The travel budget is being limited to a 66% cut for these 44 days, which is why Randy Smith was not able to travel to this Board meeting.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Seat) said that it was her understanding that the House mark for advisory boards was zero and asked whether that meant the Board was required to cease operations. Alice Murphy committed to look into it and bring information back later in the day. Pam also pointed out that it was her understanding that under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, if a Board spends money that is not available, Board members are personally liable. Alice reported back later in the day that the House budget had reduced the office of public accountability from 32 million to 4 million. The Senate version has restored it to \$20 million. However, under the Continuing Resolution DOE does have to operate under the lesser amount. She had confirmed that \$100,000 is being transferred to RL for Hanford Advisory Board operations during this interim period.

100 Area Record of Decision

Linda McClain, DOE, announced that a record of decision (ROD) had been issued for the 100 areas. Board members should have received a copy of the press release (*Attachment 2*). This is a significant milestone event and one that the Board and the Environmental Restoration Committee spent time working on. This decision means that by next summer DOE will be in full scale remediation.

One Board member wondered whether the DOE budget limitations would affect this important work. Linda explained that for FY 96 and 97 the funding is there for that work. She also pointed out that this cleanup work is a high priority for DOE.

Tim Takaro, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) announced that he heard a ten second national public radio spot on Hanford which recognized the 100 Area decision and summed it up by saying that the emphasis of clean up work has now shifted from the tanks to the river. Both Doug Sherwood and Linda McClain pointed out that the remediation work in the 100 areas is not affecting the tank work schedule.

Columbia River United Meeting

Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) announced that Columbia River United is sponsoring an open discussion on the clean up work for the Columbia River. The meeting will be Wednesday, October 18 at 7 pm at the Hood River Inn in Hood River, Oregon. Greg has asked the regulators to attend the meeting to talk about what they are doing to protect the river and what strategies have been designed.

Comprehensive Land Use

Merilyn noted that she had received a letter from John Wagoner regarding comprehensive land use planning which was distributed in the Board packet (*Attachment 3*). The letter invited her to appoint Board members to attend a September 27 meeting to work with DOE in the development of the site's comprehensive land use plan. She had not responded, as she did not understand what the process was to be.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, explained the main focus of the meeting was to look at information that should be used in developing a plan, to get a good, consistent set of information on which everyone agreed. The intent is to have weekly meetings every Tuesday from 9 am to 12 noon. He stressed that the weekly meeting is not a decision forum. The next meeting is on the extent of groundwater contamination and biological diversity. She noted that Ralph Patt, Oregon Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon Seat) will be attending these weekly meetings to represent the State of Oregon.

Merilyn asked the Board to think about what it feels the Board's role should be if DOE moves forward on land use issues. She noted that Dick Belsey has prepared a summary of public values, principles and advice promulgated by the Future Site Uses Working Group (FSUWG), the Tank Waste Task Force (TWTF) and the Hanford Advisory Board relevant to the development of new

TPA milestones (M-33) affecting the siting of a solid waste storage and treatment facility, which she thought might be helpful in addressing other land use questions (*Attachment 4*). It was left that the Executive Committee will discuss with Ron Izatt how the Board may best deal with this issue, along with its discussions on Strategic Planning.

AGENDA ITEM 2: PROPOSED BOARD COMMENTS - ADVICE ON DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR A MANAGEMENT AND INTEGRATION CONTRACTOR FOR THE HANFORD SITE

Susan Brechbill, DOE Chair of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) explained that since the draft RFP for the Management and Integration Contractor (M&I) was completed and made available on August 16, 1995, six meetings were held to get comments on it. Approximately 700 people gave comments. Three meetings were held with employees, one with potential offerors and two with the public. Susan then reviewed the categories of comments received; summarizing the main concerns in each:

- ◆ Employee concerns - revolved around minimum commitments to employees for jobs, continuity of service for pension plans and salaries. Susan said they are in the process of revising language to deal with employee concerns and will issue a revised draft section in November.
- ◆ Site wide health and safety standards - concerns were about holding subcontractors to sitewide standards.
- ◆ Hanford Environmental Health Foundation (HEHF) - concern about assigning the health contractor as a sub to the M&I contractor. Since Bechtel is now not going to be assigned as a sub the notion of everything being under the M&I contractor has been broken. They are in the process of relooking at the benefit of having HEHF as a subcontractor weighed against the loss of credibility that might bring.
- ◆ Competition. Best in team suggested rather than best in class.
- ◆ Performance objectives. Not spelled out in RFP. Section J and Appendix D are meant to be examples.
- ◆ Economic Transition. Received positive comments on these provisions.
- ◆ Health and Safety Standards - the RFP embodies the "necessary and sufficient" safety standard. They will clarify that the "minimum safe" language is not a different standard.

Susan also explained that several comments urged the SEB to compare the RFP with the Rocky Flats M&I contractor and the problems they are having. She explained that her board is going to visit Rocky Flats and Idaho National Engineering Labs (INEL) to determine if their current contracts are working and what they would do to improve them.

Susan concluded her remarks by explaining that the public comment period on the draft RFP has been extended from September 29 to October 20. Susan also introduced the members of her board that were present at today's meeting. She explained that they were appointed by the source selection official who is Tom Grumbly's deputy. While the Board is charged with putting out the RFP and making a recommendation to the source selection official, it is the source selection official who makes the final decision.

Merilyn invited Board members to first ask Susan clarifying questions. Then the Board would discuss its advice.

In response to one member's question regarding whether her board looked at what Rocky Flats and INEL wrote into their contracts, Susan explained that they had, as well as looking into what Oakridge and Savannah wrote into their contracts. She explained that there is an ongoing process of communication with other sites.

The comment was made that the notice for the public meetings was confusing. Susan acknowledged that she had received several similar comments. She apologized for any confusing notice.

Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Labor/ Workforce Seat), raised several questions. One of Jim's questions had to do with whether the SEB looked at the past history of Hanford as far as contractor reform is concerned. Jim explained that the history reflects movement toward a consolidation effort. Given the history, he wondered why DOE now has a mind shift away from consolidating. Jim also wondered whether the SEB studied the history of how benefits have evolved and the effects it had on the community. Jim also pointed out that he has seen two privatized efforts at Hanford which resulted in reductions of 25 to 40% in salaries and encouraged the SEB to study that history if they have not already done so.

HEHF

Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat), brought up the issue of Hanford Environmental Health Foundation (HEHF) being made a subcontractor to the M&I contractor. He introduced Sandy Matheson, CEO of HEHF, whom he had asked to come and explain to the Board HEHF's function. Sandy Matheson provided the Board with an overview of who HEHF is and what they do (*Attachment 5*).

HEHF was formed in 1965 to provide occupational medicine and industrial hygiene when GE divided into multiple contracts. In 1989 DOE and HEHF agreed to expand into a full range occupational health program. One of its goals is to provide scientific insight into adverse health environments. To accomplish that goal, the HEHF does monitoring and targeted evaluations. Sandy explained that the key to the program is prevention, based on the evaluation and analysis of risks to the general population. The HEHF is the primary coordinating body for surveillance of all health activities. It must assure accurate and unbiased data and must be able to report without fear of reprisal.

The Board then entered into a brief question and answer period with Sandy. One Board member raised the concern that every organization which would be supervised by a single health contractor would mean less physicals would be given to workers. Sandy explained that the physicals given would be targeted physicals meaning that not everyone would have to go through extensive exams if they were not in a group targeted to be at risk for a condition that an extensive exam would pick up.

Another Board member asked that if the switch was made to targeting on risk, how do you assure that the targeting is based on anything real. Sandy explained that the program is not yet mature; they are still gathering information. She further explained that the change to targeted exams was felt to be better health care and was not done due to budget pressure.

Mark Hermanson raised the question of whether it was true that HEHF data was showing that employee injuries have recently been on the rise. Dr. Ross Ronish, MD, from HEHF responded "yes, not only has there been a rise in injuries, but there is also a rise in personnel exposure incidents."

Jim Watts noted that it seemed to coincide with the release of the M&I contract draft RFP, and he was aware of considerable stress among the employees.

After discussion, the Board generally agreed with the proposed advice that the health contractor should report directly to DOE rather than to the M&I Contractor in order to maintain credibility and true oversight. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), distributed Heart of America's comments on the RFP as well as proposed advice he drafted (*Attachments 6&7*).

Other Board members raised many other concerns on the M&I Contractor RFP, some of which were:

- ◆ If integration is not working under a single contractor then how does moving to integration with a number of subcontractors improve integration?
- ◆ Strong provisions for the oversight and control of the contractors should be in the RFP
- ◆ How can assurances be made that Milestones will be met?
- ◆ Have transition costs been analyzed?
- ◆ Moving to a single M&I contractor does not address the root cause of the problem: what is the root cause of the problem: has it been defined?
- ◆ Not convinced that undertaking this contract will be solving problems or accomplishing the goals intended
- ◆ Stress on site is unbelievable; accident rate is on the rise; RAD violations are on the rise; transition will continue stress, cost more money

- ◆ RFP does not reduce costs because subcontractor fees and costs eat up any savings

Overall, the Board had a lengthy discussion with Susan, asked many questions and raised many concerns about going to a single M&I contractor. Susan noted that many of the concerns would be used to rework the RFP and asked Board members to submit specific language if they had any in mind on the various issues.

After discussion, the Board concluded it wanted to advise DOE that the Board does not feel DOE has made the case that going to this form of M&I Contractor will solve the problems it is aimed at. The Board, therefore, cannot support it.

The Board committed to working with DOE to develop more specific advice about what direction DOE should pursue if it would be useful.

Over lunch on Thursday, an ad hoc committee drafted the proposed advice stating the Board's concerns and its disagreement with the fundamental approach of an M&I contract as reflected in the current draft RFP. The draft was briefly presented to the Board Thursday afternoon to see if the Board felt the advice was on the right track. The Board gave some brief comments and the ad hoc committee further refined the advice Thursday evening and brought it back to the Board Friday.

On Friday, Pam Brown explained to the Board that her community has concerns with the wording and wanted to defer adopting the advice until November as they cannot support the current version. Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Seat), also noted that his constituents would probably have some concerns, and he supported deferring the matter until the November meeting. The majority of the Board, however, felt the Board should adopt advice this month as the public comment period closes October 20. The Board adopted the advice with the City of Richland and the TRIDEC seats abstaining as Consensus Advice #33.

Hanford Strategic Planning

A letter to Marilyn from John Wagoner on Strategic Planning was distributed (*Attachment 8*). Linda McClain, DOE, briefly explained that a variety of new issues such as the Blush report, privatization and performance based contracting have necessitated the need for DOE to reassess its strategic thinking. DOE wants to work with the Board and engage the Board in key planning decisions. As the letter indicates, Ron Izatt will meet with the Board's Executive Committee at its first meeting to discuss the strategic planning initiative in more detail, and to discuss the best way for the Board to participate.

AGENDA ITEM 6: ST. LOUIS PLAN UPDATE FROM SALT LAKE CITY MEETING

Marilyn reported that she attended the St. Louis II meeting which was held in Salt Lake City. It was a real working meeting; she was very impressed with the meeting and the work and

discussions that took place there. A memo summarizing the meeting and the resulting action items was distributed (*Attachment 9*).

Dan Silver, Ecology, pointed out that Marilyn was very helpful at the meeting. The purpose of the meeting, he explained was to review the last five months. He noted that the regulators are on track with the regulatory promises made at the first St. Louis meeting. He also explained that a helpful briefing was presented by Arthur Anderson about what needs to occur to get costs under control. Dan noted that there was a clear sense that there has been a failing in the public involvement on many of the environmental processes and no one has a clear idea of how to improve the process. They need the Board's help.

Linda McClain, DOE, added that it was apparent in Salt Lake City that this is not a one shot deal but is the tip of the iceberg. The challenge, she believes, is to keep the process going.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, responded to a question by explaining that the EPA and Ecology have streamlined the regulatory process while preserving regulator oversight of the cleanup. The responsibilities have been divided so that there is a single regulator and a single regulatory process for each project. Both he and Dan Silver indicated that this leaves some potential for mistakes, but the costs and use of staff resources make it the wise choice.

Marilyn explained that she volunteered the Board's executive committee to work with DOE-RL and the regulators to address the recommendations from Arthur Anderson to develop clear outcomes expected in 3 years as a result of these cost-cutting measures. In the memo listing Action Items, DOE-HQ and DOE-RL committed to prepare a paper for the Board describing the relationship between the national environmental impact statements with possible impacts to Hanford. Reference was also made to the commitment made by DOE-HQ and DOE-RL along with Ecology and the EPA to draft a proposal and consult with the Board on how to consolidate public involvement on the numerous EISs which have been issued: spent fuel, PEIS, mixed waste PEIS etc.

AGENDA ITEM 4: TWRS PRIVATIZATION

Dick Belsey reminded the Board that at its June meeting the Board passed advice regarding privatization. Committee members from the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee then took that advice to Washington DC to support the concept of privatization but to point out reservations with DOE's current plan. Dick pointed out that as of today no response from DOE has been made regarding that advice. On Friday the Board received DOE's written response to HAB Consensus Advice #24 (*Attachment 10*).

Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) informed the Board that DOE has decided to go forward with the privatization path it had presented to the Board at previous meetings. The Secretary's decision was announced earlier this week. A packet with the announcement was distributed to the Board (*Attachments 11a&b*). Todd explained he

feels DOE has ignored advice from stakeholders, regulators and the Department of Defense. Todd reviewed proposed 4 advice concepts which were continuations of earlier advice:

- ◆ DOE and the regulators should add a milestone to the TPA that would require a thorough evaluation of privatization alternatives by DOE.
- ◆ DOE should provide the Board with copies of the previously requested risk analysis report and a summary of critical assumptions concerning (waste) product specifications for evaluation by Board members.
- ◆ Ecology must be an equal partner with DOE to determine what constitutes failure in the dual path approach.
- ◆ DOE needs to define, commit and actually undertake an open public involvement process, acceptable to stakeholders that includes but is not limited to the HAB.

He then proposed adding a new piece to clearly state: The Board cannot support the currently outlined TWRS privatization plan.

Toby Michelina, Ecology, explained that Ecology still believes that the general concept of privatization is a good and valid approach. Ecology feels, however, that DOE's implementation proposal is an extremely high risk proposal. Ecology therefore, is pushing for the dual path of following DOE's preferred path and having an alternative path to be followed if DOE's proposed path fails. Toby further explained that the state is 100% committed to making privatization work. It is important that privatization succeeds in whatever path it follows. He explained that the state wants an open process on the regulatory, procurement and financial aspects of privatization. The state is putting together its standard to be clear up front. How DOE will implement and manage the contract is its decision.

Todd pointed out that this is not the end of the dialogue and that Bill Taylor, DOE, will be attending the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee's next committee meeting. The committee will continue giving input but that does not mean it is endorsing the concept. Todd noted that Bill Taylor had been available on Thursday morning to address the Board but was not able to stay for the afternoon session which is when the privatization discussion began.

Todd, Dick and interested Board members, at the Board's request, reworked the 5 concepts presented in the form of advice and brought it back to the Board on Friday afternoon. It was adopted as Consensus Advice # 32.

AGENDA ITEM 10: WASTE MANAGEMENT PEIS

Merilyn explained that Don Beck would like to establish a planning committee to deal with the need for cross site dialogue on the Waste Management Programmatic EIS (PEIS) and related waste management EISs. The thinking is to have 10 to 12 individuals from most of the sites participate on the committee. Three of the representatives would be from Hanford. Merilyn suggested the representatives be Gerry Pollet, Harold Heacock and Mike Graine. The Board

agreed. Marilyn also mentioned that on Monday, October 9, Jon Yerxa, Sharon Braswell and Don Beck would be participating in a conference call to organize getting the group together.

Sharon Braswell, DOE, then explained that regional public meetings were being scheduled on the waste management PEIS in the form of a video teleconference. She explained that the video teleconference would be November 9 from 7 to 10 p.m. in five different locations. The locations were Pasco, Lacey, Portland, Seattle, and Pendleton. There would be representatives from Headquarters at four of the locations.

Gerry Pollet noted several concerns. He requested the chair and the meeting summary reflect concerns about the planning process for public involvement on waste management. One concern is that DOE is going ahead with the public meetings despite the concern that the public will not be able to voice their concerns during the video teleconference. He further noted that the PEIS public involvement is not being taken seriously and that it should not proceed until there is a dialogue, integrated at the national level, and a dialogue at the local level which must follow the national dialogue. One of the overarching concerns is the failure to have meaningful discussions on how to involve the public on the PEIS.

Sharon Braswell explained that Jon Yerxa communicated to Headquarters several times that the Board is not comfortable with a video teleconference. He was, however, told that due to budget concerns a video teleconference would have to be used instead of face to face dialogues.

The suggestion was made to communicate the Board's concern to Headquarters. The Board agreed and Marilyn committed to communicating the Board's concerns.

Dick Belsey noted that there is also a second issue which is getting the shippers and receivers together. He explained that there has still been no firm commitment to do that, and bringing them together needs to be pursued.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), asked how the public is going to hear about the video teleconference. Sharon Braswell responded by explaining that there would be a twenty minute video aired several times a day on public access television in the various locations. The video announcing and describing the video teleconference would begin to be aired 7 to 10 days before the video teleconference.

AGENDA ITEM 9: PROPOSAL FOR INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT/SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Gerry Pollet explained that Tom Engel, University of Washington (Higher Education Seat), drafted a concept paper regarding hiring a technical team to evaluate the science and technology program (*Attachment 12*). The idea is to have a review on what the path forward is and what needs to be done to ensure that science and technology at Hanford is:

Needs based
Designed to meet the needs of the TPA
Moving DOE into a competitive era

Several members commented that the Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG) was set up to do just that. It has begun to make some progress. Todd Martin, Gerry Sorensen and Cyn Sarthou are Board representatives on it. Gordon Rogers is on the mixed waste focus sub-group.

Gerry asked the Board if there was advice the Board can offer in order to allow the STCG to move forward. One member suggested to delay doing anything about Tom's proposed advice on hiring a technical team to evaluate Hanford science/ technology until the STCG has more time to get going. Another Board member suggested that the Dollars and Sense Committee may want to spend more time in getting a full picture of what is needed.

Overall, the sense was that the Board is not ready to start an independent technical review but to track the issue and to continue evaluating the need with the idea of doing it in the future. Board members were urged to get in touch with the Dollars and Sense Committee to work on this topic further and also to talk directly with Tom Engel.

AGENDA ITEM 8: HAB ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Proposed Charter revision regarding appointment of members

The Board was referred to an amended version to Section III. Membership and Ex-Officio Agency Participation, A Membership to the Charter & Operating Ground Rules of the Hanford Advisory Board. In considering the changes which call for Ecology and EPA to work to fill vacant seats on the Board, several questions were raised as to how members are currently appointed and what seats are vacant. Jon Yerxa, DOE explained that he has made attempts to contact seats that have been absent for a number of meetings. Kathy Hackley, Columbia Basin MEDA (Public-At-Large Seat) informed Jon that she is very interested in maintaining her seat but has been seriously ill and has not been able to attend meetings. He also announced that Paula Mansfield, alternate for the Business/Agricultural Seat, has resigned.

Gerry Sorensen, Battelle, Pacific Northwest Labs (Labor/Workforce Seat) explained that their seat selection does not follow the procedure described in the amended language, and he is not sure that Battelle would be willing to do it differently. The Board decided to send the issue to the Executive Committee for further clarification.

Proposal to revise Executive Committee number

The Board considered a proposal asking the Board to reconsider its decision on a five member Executive Committee to add two additional "at-large" seats specifically to be selected for purposes of balancing the interests on the Executive Committee. The Board adopted the proposal and gave the Chair the authority to appoint the at-large-members with the approval of the Board.

The first Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for October 12, 8-5 p.m. in Portland. A memo discussing the tentative agenda items was distributed (*Attachment 13*). Marilyn announced on Friday that she had appointed Harold Heacock, TRIDEC and George Kyriazes, City of Kennewick, as the two at-large members. The Board concurred.

The question was also raised whether the new Executive Committee was taking over the functions of the Board budget committee, and if so, whether the Board needed to identify a "treasurer" to work with the Executive Committee on managing the Board's budget. The Board agreed to have the Executive Committee take the functions related to the Board budget. If the Committee wants to designate one of its members as the "treasurer" it may do so.

Plutonium Roundtable

Thursday evening, Board members and the larger public heard presentations by a panel of experts and a response panel regarding the disposition of Plutonium reserves.

Friday October 6, 1995

Plutonium Roundtable Workshop (con't.)

Elaine Hallmark presented an overview of the presentations and discussions of Thursday evening's Plutonium Roundtable. Board members then attended one of four workshops dealing with the following plutonium issues:

- Implication for the Northwest
- Proliferation and international cooperation
- The spent fuel standard and beyond - relationship to commercial fuel and waste
- Development of a farsighted political process - public involvement

Each of the break out groups reported to the whole. Then the whole group brainstormed "Next Steps." The ideas generated included:

- ◆ Aggressively inform and involve the public; Objectively discuss pros and cons of the options, life cycle costs and risks; Open Process
- ◆ Separate short term from the long term
- ◆ Define the problem clearly and fully
- ◆ Categorize the issues and identify who has the resources to tackle them; be aware of information from well funded interest groups, be cautious in approach
- ◆ National referendum/vote?
- ◆ Find out what DOE will do with the work from this process
- ◆ Do more of these types of workshops around the nation
- ◆ Gather the information from this workshop and present it to DOE

- ◆ Access and use the report on the workshop that will be developed by the League of Women Voters
- ◆ This group could advise the HAB to further develop a report on the issues from the workshop
- ◆ HAB, League of Women and other organizations should work together to prepare group comments on the PEIS process
- ◆ Attend next meeting of the Plutonium Roundtable on October 17, 1995 from 2-4 p.m. at the Group Health Central Hospital in Seattle
- ◆ Provide leadership in context of national cooperation
- ◆ Have an inter-site national dialogue about the movement of all waste types which must happen before final comment on the PEIS
- ◆ Link waste management and plutonium EISs in a round of meaningful public hearings where people are able to consider inter-related issues
- ◆ Convey to DOE: strong encouragement to NOT dispose of facilities that could be used for plutonium disposition until final decisions are made
- ◆ Build on Progress
- ◆ Focus on excess weapons material

All participants were urged to take on what next steps they could. The Board was urged to consider taking some follow up action.

Adoption of Advice

After the workshops the Board reconvened for an hour to act on the proposals for advice to the agencies that had been presented on Thursday. The results of those discussions have been incorporated into this meeting summary under the specific agenda items of the M&I contract and Privatization. One piece of advice was brought forward at this time:

Consolidation of Health Oversight Functions.

Dick Belsey referred to a memo from him dated October 5, 1995 (*Attachment 14*) regarding health oversight at the Hanford site. The memo explained that in reviewing the draft RFP, he became aware of an opportunity to increase the effectiveness of health and safety oversight through a reorganization of health and safety resources at the site, regardless of the contracting mechanism. The memo explains that there is currently a workforce dealing with health and safety on the Hanford site. This workforce provides health and safety oversight for the operations contractors. The effectiveness of this workforce can be enhanced if they were directly responsible to, and were supervised by the health contractor which is currently the Hanford Environmental Health Foundation (HEHF). This could provide a responsible site-wide monitoring system that would also provide DOE-RL with timely and reliable information about the state of worker health and safety around the site.

The memo also suggested proposed advice. The proposed advice suggested that DOE consider reorganizing health and safety oversight professionals on the Hanford site to increase the

effectiveness of Environment, Safety and Health's (ES&H) presence out on the site, regardless of the contracting mechanism selected.

A concern noted was that when the word safety is used, many view it as modifying only health when safety means much more than health. Several other concerns were raised regarding the proposed advice and the actual effect it would have on activities that may not have been thought about. The Board decided to defer the issue back to the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee to make further refinements and come back to the Board at the November meeting, if desired.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- | Number | Item |
|--------|---|
| 1. | October Board Meeting Attendance List |
| 2. | Press Release titled "Record of Decision Paves Way for Hanford Cleanup, dated September 29, 1995 |
| 3. | Letter to Marilyn Reeves from John Wagoner headed "Participation in Comprehensive Land Use Planning at U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office," dated September 8, 1995 |
| 4. | Memo from Dick Belsey reviewing public values, principles and advice relevant to the development of new TPA milestones as it affects the siting of a solid waste storage and treatment facility, dated September 14, 1995 |
| 5. | Information on Sandy Matheson and HEHF |
| 6. | Comments of Heart of America Northwest and Heart of America Northwest Research Center on the USDOE's Draft Request for Proposals for a Management and Integration Contractor for the Hanford Site, dated September, 1995 |
| 7. | Memo from Gerry Pollet to the Hanford Advisory Board headed "Draft Proposed Advice (for October, 1995 HAB Meeting) on DOE's Draft RFP for a Management and Integration Contractor" |
| 8. | Letter to Marilyn Reeves from John Wagoner on the Strategic Plan for Hanford cleanup, dated October 5, 1995 |
| 9. | Letter to Marilyn Reeves from Richard Guimond, Dan Silver, John Wagoner and Randall Smith on the St. Louis II meeting with attached list of follow-up actions from the meeting, dated September 27, 1995 |
| 10. | DOE-RL's Response to HAB Consensus Advice #24, dated October 6, 1995 |
| 11a. | Memo from USDOE headed "Delegation of Selected Near-Term Key Decisions for the Tank Waste Remediation System," dated September 25, 1995 |
| 11b. | Memo from Thomas Grumbly on the Implementation of a New Program Strategy for the Tank Waste Remediation System at Hanford, dated September 5, 1995 |
| 12. | Memo from Tom Engel to the HAB headed "Hiring a technical Team to Evaluate Hanford Science/Technology" |
| 13. | Memo from Elaine Hallmark to the HAB headed "Executive Committee Meeting," dated October 4, 1995 |
| 14. | Memo to DOE, Ecology and EPS headed "Health and Safety Oversight at the Hanford," dated October 5, 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 Rosemary Guse at Westinghouse Hanford (509) 376-8908.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**