

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting Summary
May 4, 1995 (Continued over to May 5, 1995)
Richland, 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
Paulson Report	2
TPA Public Involvement Strategy	4
Privatization Update Report	6
Update by the 3 Agencies on the St. Louis Meeting	6
"97 Budget Process	9
General Budget Advice	9
CERE Report	10
100 Areas	11
Board Business	11
Attachments List	16



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 Debbie Kaufman at Confluence Northwest (503)243-2663 or Celaine Hadley at Westinghouse Hanford.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Adoption of Paulson Report Recommendations

Dr. Glenn Paulson, the consultant hired to review DOE's proposal to build six new million-gallon double-shell tanks (DSTs) and to examine the assumptions and key policy decisions behind the proposal, presented his report and recommendations to the Board. Dr. Paulson explained that his technical team developed seven recommendations which fall in between the extremes of six tanks and no tanks and illustrate the type of thinking that might have guided DOE to a better decision in the first place.

The Board also heard from a response panel, all of whom commented favorably on the report and recommendations. After Board discussion, the recommendations were adopted as consensus advice #22.

Presentation of TPA Public Involvement Strategy and Board Discussion

Betty Tabbutt, Chair of the Public Involvement Committee, explained that the Tri-Parties had recognized the importance of public involvement and had contracted with Triangle Associates to help them develop a public involvement strategy. Alice Shorett of Triangle Associates was present to update the Board on the strategy. She facilitated a discussion with the Board on what public involvement means to them, highlighted elements of public involvement that have been helpful in the past, and reviewed some of the recommendations in the strategy. One recommendation which was previously adopted by the Board, was to have public meeting planning sessions to design and craft ways to best plan public involvement and to select the appropriate public involvement mechanisms. Betty announced that the first such meeting was scheduled for this Thursday evening following the Board meeting.

Update by the Agencies on the St. Louis Meeting and Board and Agency Dialogue on Budget

A meeting of the TPA principals, including senior managers of DOE-HQ and RL, the EPA, Ecology, and the major contractors at Hanford, had been held recently in St. Louis. The purpose of the meeting was to focus on cost control. The group discussed budget realities and created a blueprint for action which outlined action items and described ways to accomplish cleanup while cutting projected costs by \$500 million over the next two years. The Board heard from the agencies and engaged in a productive discussion on how to proceed and how to utilize the Board in putting these concepts into practice.

Board Adoption of General Budget Advice

In an effort to make Board advice integrated, the Dollars and Sense Committee drafted recommendations with site wide significance and pulled them together in its proposed General Advice. The Advice was prepared for the April Board meeting but due to time constraints was not considered until now. Some of the advice could only be implemented by DOE-Headquarters, and therefore was put in a separate package for direct transmission to Tom Grumbly (in contrast to the RL advice, which goes to John Wagoner with a copy to Grumbly). The Board reviewed all

of the recommendations for general advice and adopted them as part of consensus advice #17. It also adopted an overview statement to introduce the budget advice.

Status of the '97 Budget Process

Jim Peterson, DOE explained that Tom Grumbly will develop a draft budget and then wants one final exchange with stakeholders before the draft goes to Secretary O'Leary. Jim will make sure the Board receives a summary of the draft as soon as it is available. On June 8, there will be a nationwide teleconference in which HAB members may participate to discuss the national DOE budget.

Adoption of Environmental Refocussing Committee Recommendations on the CERE Report and 100 Areas

The Board reviewed a draft letter to Carol Henry which incorporated Board comments and concerns on the CERE report. The tone of the letter is reasonably critical of the CERE report. The letter criticizes the report for not meeting the workscope and also notes the section on Hanford is particularly poor. The Board adopted the letter as consensus advice #21.

Denny Condotta presented the 100 Area Cleanup recommendations on behalf of the Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee. The recommendations, he explained, are in response to the Tri-Parties' current plans for cleanup of waste sites in the 100 Areas which were presented in March. The Board expressed concern over one recommendation which contemplated considering radioactive decay at a few waste sites with deep contamination. This section was deleted and the Board adopted the proposal as consensus advice #23.

Draft Meeting Summary
May 4, 1995 (Continued on May 5, 1995)
Richland, Washington

Thursday, May 4, 1995

The meeting was called to order by Chair Marilyn Reeves. The meeting was open to the public. Two public comment periods were provided. Members present for the meeting are listed in *Attachment 1*. Seats not represented were: Grant County (Local Government), Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), Business-Agricultural, and Columbia Basin Minority Economic Development Association (Public-At-Large). Members of the public and others in attendance are listed on the sign in sheets included in *Attachment 1*.

Several introductions and announcements were made:

- George Kyriazis was introduced as representing the City of Kennewick (Local Government Seat).
- Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Public-At-Large Seat), introduced her new alternate, Maureen McCarthy, and explained that she lives in the Tri-Cities. She will join the Environmental Restoration Committee.
- Chair Marilyn Reeves thanked Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco (Local Government Seat) for providing coffee. Marilyn suggested coffee drinking members make donations to whoever buys the coffee.
- Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Trades Council (Labor/Work Force Seat) invited all Board members and their families to a party at his house Thursday evening.
- Dennis Faulk, EPA, distributed a request for public comment public notice on the accelerated cleanup plan for waste sites in the 100-BC-1 Operable Unit of the Hanford Site (*Attachment 2*).
- It was announced that Elaine Hallmark was not present for the Board meeting as her mother was critically ill. Later in the day, the Board received word that Elaine's mother passed away early Thursday morning. Cards can be sent to Elaine at the Confluence Northwest address.

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

Meeting Summary

Several minor corrections to the meeting summary were noted and the meeting summary was

approved as corrected.

Agenda Review

A revised agenda was distributed. Marilyn called the Board's attention to Agenda Item 10 which was an addition. She explained that senior managers of the DOE (both Headquarters and Richland), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Ecology and the major contractors (Westinghouse and Bechtel) met in late April in St. Louis to discuss how to manage the Hanford cleanup better. The agencies recently requested time on the agenda to describe the ideas that come from the meeting. Adjustments were made to the agenda to meet the request.

Marilyn also complimented the Board for last month's hard work on the budget and explained that she requested from Nadine Highland, DOE-RL's financial officer, an explanation on how the Board's advice is used and next steps for the FY '97 budget process. To hear that response, Agenda Item 11 was added.

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.

AGENDA ITEM 2: PAULSON REPORT

The Paulson report (*Attachment 3*) was distributed. Board members were reminded that in August, 1994 DOE made a presentation to the Dollars and Sense Committee to build six new million-gallon double shell tanks (DSTs). In response, the Committee proposed, and the Board approved, a consultant contract with Dr. Glenn Paulson and his Technical Team to review the need for new tanks and to examine the assumptions and key policy decisions behind the proposal for lessons to be learned in planning future projects. The report has been completed, and Glenn Paulson is here to present the recommendations within the report as well as the report itself.

Tom Engel, University of Washington (Higher Education Seat) introduced Dr. Paulson and explained that Dr. Paulson assembled a distinguished team to work on the report. The report, Tom noted, should be used as a model as it does not assume one course of action but instead examines the potential consequences associated with various actions until the tanks are stabilized.

Glenn Paulson began by explaining that the original question - whether or not to build six new tanks - was in flux. Opinions still range from no-tank to six-tank options. Paulson's team developed seven recommendations. He reviewed each recommendation. A short time was spent responding to Board questions.

The Board then heard from a response panel, all of whom extended their thanks to, and appreciation of, the work of Paulson's team.

Dan Woodrich, DOE, noted that the DOE agrees with most of the recommendations. He pointed out that the second recommendation, dealing with the option of building a smaller transfer tank if

102-SY cannot be fully cleaned out, is a good one but the DOE does not know how they can do this before 1999. Finally he noted that a new cross site transfer system (CSTS) could be on line by 1998.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, endorsed all the recommendations in the report, and commented that the report was very eye-opening. The main issues for the EPA are potential leaks in the 200-W Area.

Toby Michelena, Ecology, also supported all the recommendations. The three he felt are most important are: recommendation #4, accelerated construction of the cross-site transfer system (CSTS); recommendation #7, evaluate and continually monitor waste volume projections; and recommendation #5, develop a contingency plan. Mr. Michelena criticized the scope of the report, stating that mistakes are often made when focused on short-term needs, rather than on a long-term systems approach.

Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), encouraged all Board members to read the cover letter from Walt Hays introducing the report. He commented that the recommendation for accelerating the CSTS may seem obvious or simple, but that a very high profile team has concluded that it is not necessary. Thus, he pointed out, it is very important for the Board to say it is needed. He also noted that the Board can, via the Dollars and Sense Committee, continue to monitor the DOE to make sure the DOE continually gathers data to ensure that tank space is available for future needs.

The Board then discussed the recommendations. One idea that was raised speculated whether any streamlining of regulatory requirements could be made in regards to the new CSTS given that it is such a high priority. Toby Michelena explained that both the NEPA process and the safety analysis need to be aggressively pursued.

Another comment pointed out the hard decisions that often need to be made in the area of worker health and safety. The example given was that since some areas around the current CSTS are highly contaminated, the new one will have to be built away from that area which will take more land with cultural artifacts.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) as chair of the Dollars and Sense Committee, asked the Chair to send a letter of thanks on behalf of the Board to Dr. Paulson and his team. He thanked Glenn for putting in time long after the funds ran out and commented on his true public service. Gerry also explained that the Paulson team has provided a great model for an effective and highly useful interactive process. Finally, he pointed out that two years ago the priority was to build new tanks for which there was unanimous agreement. Without the interactive process and the analysis used by the Paulson team, the public would have blamed the DOE for deciding not to build the tanks based on budgetary reasons. Instead, increased awareness and understanding has been achieved due to the Paulson report.

The Board adopted all the recommendations by consensus as consensus advice #22. It was noted that several of the recommendations had already been incorporated into the Board's advice on the DOE Budget.

AGENDA ITEM 3: TPA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STRATEGY AND FIRST PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLANNING MEETING

Betty Tabbutt introduced the Public Involvement strategy by commenting on the effective public involvement that occurred in the Paulson Report discussion.

The Public Involvement Committee is looking into preparing a report for how the Board speaks to the public and how the cleanup work at Hanford gets transmitted to the broader public. Bill Sanderson has prepared an outline for such a report (*Attachment 4*). The committee will be addressing it at their meeting.

The Tri-Parties, Betty explained, recognized the importance of public involvement early into their process, and contracted with Triangle Associates to help them develop a public involvement strategy. Betty then introduced Alice Shorett of Triangle Associates who was present to explain the public involvement strategy report.

Alice began by outlining her presentation. She first addressed public involvement and what it means to people. Next elements that have been helpful in the past and common themes were highlighted followed by a philosophical question for the Board. Finally, some of the recommendations in the strategy were reviewed.

In addressing public involvement, Alice asked the Board what they thought good public involvement was. The following responses were given:

- advice and input is used by the decision makers - Board members agreed public input should have a demonstrable effect on decisions
- the public has access to information - the public should have all necessary documents available for full review
- broad scope of public is involved - public involvement should reach a broad array of opinion
- influences decision makers
- promotes public ownership and support of decisions - broad-based ownership developed through effective and wide-based participation
- democratic - equal opportunities to information, exchange and response

Alice then highlighted elements of what has been helpful in the past in terms of public involvement which included:

1. From the Future Site Uses Working Group:
 - a. For the first time, the site was mapped out and a common base of information was developed, with contamination and natural resources overlaid. This provided a common base of information for making decisions.
 - b. The FSUWG came up with some broad principles to guide the cleanup.
2. From the Tank Waste Task Force: Broad principles and values were developed. This was the first time the three parties opened up and discussed the issues in the negotiating process.
3. ER Refocusing: The agencies worked closely with the HAB. The Primer was produced and the agencies reported back on how they used the advice.
4. PFP: Good public involvement, except there was a "disconnect", and a round of public hearings people felt were unnecessary.

Common themes for useful public advice, Alice noted involve:

- Timing: It is given when alternatives are being discussed, so the decision-makers can hear and use it.
- The kind of advice, the way it is focussed and packaged; 5 or 6 pages of key themes is more important than a 100 page document; advice should be tied directly to the decision being made and should be succinct
- Hearing back from the officials on what they heard, what they accepted, how they used it, what they rejected and why

Alice then asked the Board to what extent is there a responsibility to get out and educate the public versus dealing only with those already interested. The question sparked a thoughtful discussion among Board members. Many recognized the importance of educating the public. It was recognized, however, that public involvement can go overboard in attempting to reach those with little or no interest.

One Board member pointed out that the public has been alienated because information is too detailed and complex for the average person. For example, the announcements for various public meetings focus on the technical aspects versus issues which could affect them. Another Board member felt that negligible public interest on Hanford cleanup signifies the success of the Board in educating their constituencies. Another remark noted that government is a partnership and having the managers present to hear the public's and the Board's values is really the issue. Overall, the Board recognized both that it is important and a struggle to reach the public.

In closing, Alice reviewed some of the recommendations raised in the public involvement strategy:

- establish a process to see what decisions are coming up that would be of interest to the public, or on which public input is needed;

- test innovative ways to reach the public such as radio, television and cable access; consider remote hookups, start using the Internet; and
- have a process or a set of criteria for determining whether an issue is going to be important.

Betty then announced the first meeting of a public meeting planning session tonight from 6:30-8:30 pm. The planning meetings are those recommended in the strategy report which was endorsed by the Board last month.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRIVATIZATION UPDATE REPORT

Todd Martin updated the Board on the status of privatization. The dialogue, he explained is continuing between himself and the DOE. He is doing research for the DOE separate from his work for the Board to find holes in their data and to explore some middle ground. The privatization concept is floundering, based on the concerns of the Board. The Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee will further discuss the issue at its Friday meeting.

Don Vieth, DOE, distributed a packet which attempted to respond to the questions raised at the last Board meeting (*Attachment 5*). Mr. Vieth met with Tom Grumbly, Assistant Manager, Environmental Management, earlier in the week to discuss privatization. At that meeting, Grumbly recognized the importance of public input, and reluctantly agreed to extend the consultation period another 60 days. Mr. Vieth also told the Board that he got a commitment from Grumbly to directly use the input from the Board.

With Grumbly's extension, the Board will need to act at the June meeting. The Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee is also doing an independent investigation.

Merilyn asked if Grumbly has asked other Boards to review the issue and if there is any national board reviewing privatization. One Board member indicated he is aware of several boards for which privatization is a background issue for them. Members pointed out that on the back of Don Vieth's handout there was information on the Advisory Committee on External Regulation of Department of Energy Nuclear Safety which may be addressing the privatization.

The Board then had a short question and answer period which will be continued at the Friday Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 10: UPDATE BY THE 3 AGENCIES ON THE ST LOUIS MEETING

Ron Izatt, DOE-RL, introduced the topic and explained that there was a meeting of the TPA principles, including senior managers of DOE-HQ and RL, the EPA, Ecology, and the major contractors at Hanford. The purpose of the meeting was to focus on cost control, not to renegotiate the TPA. The group discussed budget realities and created a blueprint for action

(Attachment 6). The blueprint outlined action items which described ways to accomplish cleanup while cutting projected costs by \$500 million over the next two years.

Dan Silver, Ecology, commented that he had felt wary about attending the meeting. He was very suspicious and took the position that Ecology was there to protect the TPA. The meeting was, however, very different from what he had expected. People were not posturing nor getting stuck in positions but worked together on the problem. He felt that it was the first time the DOE owned the problem. He also felt that Headquarters was able to see that the regulators are not monsters. There was then a lot more honest communication with people who collectively have a problem and who collectively have thus far not managed it well. He noted that although there is no grand scheme to work it all out, much productive dialogue occurred.

Randy Smith, EPA, pointed out that for the first few years of the TPA, cost was not viewed as a problem to address. Now, however, it is. Randy also explained that there have been many meetings among senior management, but never before was there one with all who are directly involved in managing and regulating the Hanford cleanup. The effect of this meeting was that because all were represented, blame could not be given to an absent group. This in turn made it clear that the problem is jointly owned.

Randy explained that the blueprint that resulted from the meeting represents an interim report on a series of actions designed to cut costs and produce more cleanup. Over the next few months, people will be assigned to work on these projects and will report back to the Board through the Dollars and Sense Committee.

Finally, Randy noted that the group spent a lot of time talking about the "train wreck" and the gap in funds to get the work done. EPA and Ecology were not willing to give up the TPA due to the budget. Instead, they went through and tried to see how much money could be saved if effective actions were undertaken. The end result, he believes, points to an excellent chance of meeting the TPA in 1997, although there may be a problem doing so in 1998. There are some substantive agreements to work out, but he stated he has confidence and believes the agencies are headed in a very productive direction.

Merilyn then informed the Board that Ron Izatt had called her to let her know the meeting was going to occur. She expressed to him that she understood that there are times when agency people need to get together behind closed doors to work on management issues. Now, with the report back in hand is the time for the public to become involved.

The Board then had a lengthy discussion with the three agencies. Many commended them for the efforts, and were pleased that all necessary management convened for a meeting.

In response to one member's question regarding whether the Board's budget advice was specifically addressed at the St. Louis meeting, Ron Izatt explained that the advice was considered and was cranked into the cost savings discussion. He explained that the magnitude of the

problem, however, is more than the \$200 million savings in Overhead that the Board's budget advice discussed. The discussion in St. Louis moved to a broader level that looked not just at reducing overhead but at a complete change in how tasks are assigned and managed. Dan Silver added that much of the work at the site is not returning value and explained there are many structure problems and contract problems which are being addressed. Randy Smith pointed out that many of the ideas came from the Dollars and Sense Committee.

Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Seat) indicated he appreciated the good of this meeting, but felt the Board had been "blind-sided". He felt that much of what the Board has been doing focused on the same thing that the St. Louis meeting focused on. He asked where oversight and accountability were.

Betty Tabbutt noted that the Board has been under serious attack and felt the agencies had an excellent opportunity to illustrate the value of the Board to Headquarters. She felt recommendations from the Board should have been explicitly noted. She also felt the Chair of the Board or the Chair of the Dollars and Sense Committee should have been invited to attend the meeting and explained the agencies likely would have had the same outcome while validating the importance of the Board. She encouraged all to read Marilyn's op ed piece in the Tri-Cities Herald (*Attachment 7*) and recommended that Tom Grumbly be invited to the next Board meeting. There was no objection to inviting Tom Grumbly. Other members suggested the agencies write an op/ed piece describing the value of the Board and stressing that the outcomes of the meeting were largely based on recommendations of the Board.

There were many concerns that the meeting and the blueprint address only cost effectiveness and not oversight and accountability. Along the same lines, many were concerned that the scope of regulations would be reduced and urged the agencies to not dilute the regulations. In response, Dan Silver pointed out that the laws have not been changed and the regulations have not been overthrown. Rather, the agencies are committed to getting the work done more cost effectively. Ecology is fed up with how much it costs to get basic work done such as digging a well and obtaining a sample. Randy Smith reiterated and assured the Board that the philosophy of the regulators has not changed. He explained that within RCRA there is flexibility and such flexibility ought to be emphasized and should be the spirit with which to use the regulations.

Another area of concern was with the action item which indicated that the state and the EPA committed to divide the Hanford workload. Several Board members were concerned that having only one regulator review a certain project would have the effect of the whole picture not being seen and the wrong decision being made. Another member felt it is often counter productive to have only one regulatory agency make a decision. Randy Smith responded that they will not be changing their regulatory authority or the law, just the management approach. Both agencies will still sign off on decisions. Dan Silver pointed out that the regulators have discovered that some of the ways they make decisions are expensive, and they don't have to be. Now, they are attempting to divide the work up so they are not spending a lot on transaction costs.

Ray Isaacson, Benton County (Local Government Seat) commented that \$500 million represents about 5000 jobs. Reducing by \$500 million he would equate to an impact of about 3,000 job reductions in '96-'97. The workforce is currently being reduced by 5,000. What this additional hit will do to the community he feels is unconscionable. Ron Izatt pointed out that their is confusion in that the workscope estimates are what are high, and need to be reduced. The real dollars for salaries are not changing that dramatically. The current reductions in workforce are to prepare for the '96 levels. There should not be significant increased reductions in workforce, depending on what Congress actually does. Both agreed that further clarification and communication on the socio-economic impacts will be useful.

The Board wanted to know what its role might be in this process, and what the agencies need from them in the next three months. Dan Silver noted that the agencies threw their hat over the wall, so to speak, but did not yet take the next steps. Board input will be useful and needed to move from there. The agencies are planning to work through the Dollars and Sense Committee, unless the Board wants to suggest another way. Randy Smith said the agencies tried to look at the root causes of high costs on the site, and came up with the five categories in the "Blueprint". He suggested that dialogue with the Board is needed to test the logic of these five categories. Because there are no answers yet, an interactive process is needed.

One Board member thought the Board should work with the agencies to comment on the conceptual framework and to provide feedback as it develops. Another member felt the Board could be helpful by giving advice on the prioritization of work in order to do the best job with the funds available. Another member encouraged the agencies to work on a long term strategic plan. The employees, he noted, are insecure about the future. A strategic plan would help all to see and understand future direction.

AGENDA ITEM 11: 97 BUDGET PROCESS

Jim Peterson, DOE was present to update the Board on the FY '97 budget development process. Jim explained to the Board that Tom Grumbly has added a step to the budget process that is unprecedented. Tom Grumbly will develop a draft budget and then wants one final exchange with the stakeholders before the draft goes to Secretary O'Leary. On June 1, 1995 the draft will be faxed to Jim Peterson and he will make sure it gets to the Board who will be meeting on June 1st and 2nd. On June 8, there will be a nationwide teleconference in several places from 8:00 am-noon pacific time. Each site will be able to ask one question on the teleconference.

AGENDA ITEM 7: GENERAL BUDGET ADVICE

In an effort to make Board advice integrated, the Dollars and Sense Committee drafted recommendations with site wide significance and pulled them together in its proposed General Advice. The Advice was prepared for the April Board meeting but due to time constraints was not considered until now. Furthermore, the Committee realized that some of its advice could only be implemented by DOE-Headquarters and therefore decided to put the HQ-directed advice in a

separate package for direct transmission to Tom Grumbly (in contrast to the RL advice, which goes to John Wagoner with a copy to Grumbly), in hopes of having greater impact.

General Advice to DOE-Headquarters

The Board reviewed each of the six recommendations. Facilitator Walt Hays explained that the recommendations are general principles and most were adopted within the program advice last month.

Slight amendments were made and all recommendations were adopted as a section of consensus advice #17. There were, however, two reservations made with regard to the second recommendation on applying productivity challenges to defense as well as to environmental management. Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) and Robin Klein, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) wanted their reservations to the advice noted. They felt the deletion of the word "defense" significantly reduced the impact of the advice. The advice was adopted with the deletion of the sentence: "The Board opposes DOE increasing spending on weapons programs which create more nuclear waste when needed Environmental Management actions are not funded." These two Board members preferred the sentence remain and thus consented with reservation.

General Advice to DOE-RL

After minor amendments, the Board adopted the proposed General Advice to DOE-RL as part of consensus advice #17. The Board also noted that previously adopted consensus advice #17F dealing with waste management (non-TWRS) should be corrected to reflect the newly adopted advice in the general advice proposal recommending that surplus facilities including non-DOE owned facilities be evaluated for possible use.

Finally, an overview of the Board's advice on the Hanford cleanup and encouragement to honor the TPA was adopted as a preface to the adopted budget advice.

AGENDA ITEM 5: CERE REPORT

The Board was referred to a draft letter to Carol Henry which incorporated Board comments and concerns on the CERE report (*Attachment 8*). Ralph Patt, Oregon Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon Seat) thanked Denny Condotta, TRIDEC (Labor/Work Force Seat) for drafting the letter and report. Denny explained that the tone of the letter is reasonably critical of the CERE report. The letter criticizes the report for not meeting the workscope and further notes that the section on Hanford is particularly poor. The Board adopted the letter as consensus advice #21.

AGENDA ITEM 6: 100 AREAS

SAFER Process

Dennis Faulk, explained that the Board's advice on the proposal for the 100 Areas was used by the Tri-Parties to recommend proceeding with the alternative which calls for excavation of the waste sites to levels that do not preclude any future use due to Hanford contaminants. He reported that the Tri-Parties are using the Streamlined Approach for Environmental Restoration (SAFER) to do remedial design and planning in order to begin remedial action at several key sites in the 100-BC area this summer. The SAFER process, he explained, focuses on building consensus on the objectives of a project prior to implementation.

100 Area Recommendation

(Note: This section is a summary of the discussion on this issue that was continued over to Friday morning).

Denny Condotta presented the proposed advice on the 100 Area Cleanup on behalf of the Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee. The recommendations are in response to the Tri-Parties' current plans for cleanup of waste sites in the 100 Areas which were presented to the Board in March.

In discussing the proposed advice, much concern rose over item number 5 which contemplates considering radioactive decay at a few waste sites with deep contamination. Some wanted more time to think about it, while others were concerned with potentially long range health issues and with giving the impression the Board is wavering from unrestricted use. The proposed advice was presented to the Board on Friday morning with the deletion of number 5. The Board adopted the proposal as consensus advice #23.

The meeting was recessed at 5:16 pm to be continued for one hour on Friday morning beginning at 7:45 am.

Friday, May 6, 1995

AGENDA ITEM 9: BOARD BUSINESS

Merilyn reconvened the meeting at 7:45 a.m. She announced that Glenn Paulson had given her for the Board's use, 2 copies of a book from the National Academy of Sciences, Alternatives for Ground Water Cleanup. Glenn had served on this panel, which was chaired by Cavanaugh. Merilyn suggested Board members could circulate the book among those who are interested. Ralph Patt said he had read the book thoroughly and would be happy to provide a summary of it for the Board.

June Meeting Plans

Bill Sanderson has agreed to draft a letter to invite Tom Grumbly to attend the June Board meeting. The meeting would be planned around the time that he could attend.

Ralph Patt reviewed plans for the Risk Assessment Workshop to be held from 10 to 3 on Thursday of the Board meeting. The USDOE two-day workshop will be compressed, and will feature two presenters: Dr. Genevieve Roessler, from the University of Florida, who is an expert on rad risk assessment, and Dr. Margrit von Braun, a chemical risk expert. There will be a panel representing the perspectives of the Tri-parties and the Indian Tribes. The panel will present opposing views and help the Board to be able to ask the right questions. The purpose of the workshop is to inform the Board so that it can ultimately give USDOE advice on risk management issues.

There will be a report on the development of the Progress Report, which is being considered today at the Public Involvement Committee meeting.

The Board will need to prepare for the teleconference on June 8 with Tom Grumbly. The need will be to package the HAB advice on the budget and point out where the differences are in what the HAB advised, what DOE-RL submitted and what the USDOE Budget contains. Marilyn had expressed concern that the agenda for the teleconference appeared to be the "announce and defend" model. The agenda appears to be evolving. At the public involvement committee meeting last evening it was reported that each site will be allowed to submit one question and then the meeting will be opened to general discussion. Marilyn asked the Dollars and Sense Committee to follow up on what is needed to prepare for the teleconference.

Marilyn noted that the consensus advice adopted at this meeting will be integrated with that adopted last month and resubmitted to the agencies.

Greg de Bruler announced that a Columbia River Impact Assessment workshop sponsored by DOE will be held in the Tri-Cities on June 14.

Gordon Rogers announced that Don Merrick will be leaving the area, so will no longer be Gordon's alternate, and expressed his deep appreciation for the service Don has given the Board.

Ray Isaacson announced that Ben Floyd will be an alternate for Benton County when neither Ray nor Sandi Strawn can attend. He also requested that the Board request the DOE to present information at the June meeting on the impacts on the local workforce and community of the current proposed reduction of between \$200 and \$500 million. The ups and downs of now reducing 5,000 workers out of the 6,000 added only a few years before has a tremendous impact on the community as well as on the individuals. Marilyn suggested the Cultural, Socio-economic Committee consider how best to address this subject, and acknowledged that Todd Martin will be addressing the impacts on the workforce of the privatization proposals. Ray pointed out that the impacts can be calculated in terms of numbers of school rooms provided. There was some

discussion of whether such a discussion is best held at a meeting in the Tri-Cities or whether informing others in the region is even more important.

Merilyn announced that she has asked Dick Belsey to represent the Board in reporting to the Advisory Committee on External Regulations that will be meeting in Richland on May 15, and asked anyone with suggestions of what to give them, to get it to Dick. She suggested a packet including the Reports of the Future Site Uses Working Group and the Tank Waste Task Force. Pam Brown added that the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will be addressing the group, followed by Steve Blush presenting his report. She has asked to have Dan Silver address them. Pam has been tracking the legislation drafted by Bennett Johnson in response to the Blush report. So far it does not have many sponsors. The draft is very troubling. It gives the Secretary authority to write the land use plan for Hanford. Clean up levels would only be to levels designated in that land use plan. Environmental regulations are thrown out; no law suits are allowed; no land can be transferred without an act of Congress. So far the bill has not been introduced. She will continue to follow any further developments with this bill.

Dick shared that he is planning to present to the External Regulations Committee a report he presented earlier on the Waste Management EIS, which frames the issues of health and safety on the site, and the need for external regulation. He will do this in his personal capacity, which he will make clear, after he has presented the packet of material from the HAB and explained briefly what the HAB is. Merilyn urged other Board members to get their perspectives out to regional as well as local media and others on issues of concern. All the issues cannot be covered just by Board releases. All the perspectives need to be heard. Merilyn was complimented on the op-ed piece she did for the Tri-Cities Herald. She hopes to do others for other papers in the region.

HAB Operating Budget

Gerry Sorensen distributed a financial statement (*Attachment 9*) showing that from the combined total of \$1.6 million for the combined 1994-95 fiscal years, the Board has spent a total of \$1,192,882.57 as of the end of March 1995. Currently the Board is spending at the rate of \$75,000 per month. It appears that the Board will be very close or over the budget unless some further trimming is done in the way the Board does business. The facilitators have been cutting back and trying to carefully tailor the services provided to the specific needs of the Board. The July meeting has been eliminated; there is consideration of eliminating the August meeting due to budget constraints.

The biggest concern, however, is how the Board will operate in fiscal year 1996 on the budget announced by Ron Izatt, which allocates \$360,000 for the Board's operations, and \$240,000 for DOE and contractor liaison and support for the Board. This will require a significant change in how the Board conducts its business. Gerry has been discussing some ideas with Merilyn, including cutting facilitation services and fewer meetings. They believe it will take more than just the ideas of the budget committee to come to an acceptable conclusion on how to operate within this budget. Gerry suggested having no full Board meeting in August, but rather having a meeting

of a smaller group, including at least the Committee chairs, to develop a proposal for 1996 operations, which could then be brought to the full Board at its September meeting.

Gerry Pollet raised a number of questions regarding overhead costs. He requested a breakdown on the overhead costs being charged to the Board's budget. Jon Yerxa responded that the rate is 17% in 1995. He said that the largest contract, for Confluence Northwest, has been assigned over to DOE so that the overheads no longer apply, as of March. Smaller contracts remain with WHC. The \$240,000 in the 1996 budget that is listed as DOE and contractor support, is what OMB has required be identified as the DOE and Westinghouse staff assigned to work with the Board for support and liaison functions. Headquarters has advised RL that they cannot provide more to the Board than Headquarters has allocated. Marilyn has requested from Don Beck information on the budgets of other site specific boards and the percentage reductions being imposed on them. (Pam Brown said she had requested these figures earlier, and was refused them.)

Gerry Pollet opposes eliminating the August meeting, because the Board wants to be involved in the changes being undertaken as a result of the St. Louis meeting. He also reminded the Board that the charter says that the HAB will seek an independent fiscal agent, and should seek to do that. Jon Yerxa informed the Board that the \$240,000 would not be "saved" and given to the HAB if an independent fiscal agent were established. Those costs represent the costs DOE has as a result of working with the Board.

Discussion continued, including comments along the following lines:

- Look into the independent fiscal agent,
- Commitment by DOE in setting up the HAB was to fund it adequately. Board members will leave if not properly funded, and regional support will be lost for this site.
- Board should benefit from the costs it helps to save, as do contractors.
- Board should keep its costs as low as possible, regardless of achievements; evaluate costs in terms of the value they provide. Overhead and facilitators' contract is not of as high a value, and may not be needed as much in the future. Use staff to do less skilled facilitation, but good administration for the Board. Need more technical report writing from independent staff.
- Look at the figures for Public Involvement and Public Relations in the DOE-RL budget, as the Board serves both functions.
- Consider dedicated staff and dedicated fiscal agent; cannot continue the outside facilitator charges
- Budget figures for other advisory boards and committees receiving grants or funding from DOE-RL, including land use planning grants, and whether being charged overhead, etc.

Marilyn summarized three needs:

(1) More information on other advisory committees and other expenditures - need a committee to formulate the questions to be asked. Asked Gerry Pollet to take the lead on formulating these questions for gathering information.

(2) Plan ahead (based on the budget figure given for Board operations in FY '96). Prepare a survey to send out to all Board members. Show a number of alternatives and the costs they reflect, using such variables as number of meetings, number of board members, staff required, etc. Marilyn requested the Budget Committee to formulate such a list of options and a survey on which options Board members prefer, to go out following the June meeting. With responses due mid-July, information would be available for further discussion in August. In discussion, it was clarified that the survey would include information looking at the options of using an independent fiscal agent and separate staff.

(3) Evaluation. Conduct another evaluation of the Board that looks at its operations, how it makes decisions, how it tackles issues, Board's perception on how these decisions are received, etc. Marilyn asked Betty to have the Public Involvement Committee put together a survey to do such an evaluation, noting that Betty is serving on the national evaluation committee.

There was discussion as to whether it would be better to have one survey or two. It was left to the Committees to work out what was needed, with the advice that discreet, simple surveys would likely be less intimidating to people and would result in more participation/responses.

In regard to the current fiscal year, Marilyn stated that if the Board continues spending at the current rate, it will end up in a deficit, which Marilyn considers unacceptable. If by the end of July, the figures don't look better, Marilyn would suggest scaling back the August meeting, perhaps putting more burden on the Committees, and perhaps setting up an executive function to deal with some of the issues coming forth.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 a.m.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

1. Attendance List for May 4, 1995
2. Draft Public Notice - Request for Public Comment on 100-BC-1 Operable Unit
3. Technical Team Review of Proposed New Double Shell Tanks at Hanford, and cover memo by Walt Hays
4. Draft Outline: Hanford Advisory Board Progress Report, dated May 5, 1995
5. Information on Privatization of the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS), letter dated May 4, 1995
6. Blueprint for Action and Cost Control at Hanford, and cover memo from the Tri-Parties, dated May 4, 1995
7. "Public Oversight Aids Hanford Cleanup", by Merilyn Reeves, dated April 30, 1995
8. Draft Letter to Carol Henry, Comments on the CERE Report, dated 4/25/95
9. Hanford Advisory Board Financial Summary as of April 1995 Monthend

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**