

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Revised Meeting Summary
 January 5, 1995
 Kennewick, WA

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Summary of the Board's Meeting	
<u>Items of Discussion</u>	
Agenda Review and Corrections to the Meeting Summary	1
Response to Board Advice on '95 Funding Reallocations & Information and Discussion on President Clinton's and USDOE's Budget Announcements on Cuts in Agency and Clean up Budget	2
Maximizing Benefits of Clean Up in Transition to Other Uses (Economic Transition) - Medical Use of Radio Isotopes	4
Public Comment	6
Tri-Party Response to ER Advice and Carbon Tetrachloride Pump and Treat Advice	7
Report on Chair Selection Process and Criteria	7
Recommended HAB Budget/Spending Plan	8
Report on Press Contact Procedures	8
Off-Site Waste Acceptance	9
National SSAB Meeting In February	9
Board Workplan	9
Attachments List	10

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 (509)376-5856.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1995 and 1996 Budget Updates, Agency Response and Adoption of Board Advice

The Board was updated on what DOE-RL knows about the 1996 Budget. Ron Izatt reviewed several actions DOE is pursuing to reduce Hanford costs. The EPA and Ecology provided additional comments on the 1996 outlook. The Board adopted two letters of advice (Consensus Advice #11 and #12) urging Hazel O'Leary, Secretary and Tom Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management to honor the TPA while cutting costs.

The Board heard a brief overview of Ecology and the EPA's response to the Board advice on DOE-RL's budget reallocation for fiscal year 1995. In an effort to save time, the verbal DOE presentation was eliminated although Board members had an opportunity to review and comment on the overheads of that presentation. DOE also will provide the Board with a written response to the advice they received from the Board regarding the 1995 budget.

Presentation on the Medical Use of Radio Isotopes as an Example of Economic Transition and Board Advice to the Cultural and Socio-Economic Committee to Continue Working on the Topic

The Board heard a presentation by the Cultural Socio-Economic Committee on the possibility of developing a process for using waste from Hanford for medical purposes such as using medical isotopes in cancer therapy. The purpose of the presentation was to provide general information and to help the Board begin thinking about the new concept that not everything from Hanford is waste. The Board agreed that the Committee should continue working on the topic.

Tri-Party Response to ER Advice and Carbon Tetrachloride Pump and Treat Advice

Dennis Faulk reported that due to comments received on the ER change package, the Tri-Parties will reopen negotiations. He also reported that the carbon tetrachloride pump and treat project will go forward and pointed out that because of Board input, the dense non-aqueous liquid investigation is included in the project and innovative technologies will continue to be explored.

Report on Chair Selection Process and Adoption of Interim Vice Chairs

The Board was updated on the work the ad hoc chair selection committee has done so far. The Board adopted all three recommendations submitted by the Committee and decided to continue Marilyn Reeves as Acting Chair and appointed Patty Burnett as Acting Vice Chair.

Report from Budget Committee and Board Charge to Budget Committee to Re-Work the Budget

The Board reviewed the recommended budget from the Budget Committee. The Board offered input and advice on ways to reduce the budget and still maintain a high level of facilitation services. The Board urged the Budget Committee to look into a variety of suggestions that were presented during the discussion.

Board Decision to Send out a News Release

The Board adopted a news release pertaining to the USDOE Hanford Budget cuts which was released to agencies' and interest group press contacts list.

Report on Off-Site Waste Acceptance and Board Decision to Address the issue again in February

The Board heard an informational presentation on Off-Site Waste from the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee. The Board will be asked to act on Committee recommendations in February to meet the DOE March deadline for draft submission of site treatment plans.

Revised Meeting Summary
January 5, 1995
Kennewick, Washington

Thursday, January 5, 1995

The meeting was called to order by Acting 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: Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), Hanford Watch/Hanford Action (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), Columbia Basin Minority Economic Development Council (Public-At-Large), and Grant County (Local Government). Members of the public and others in attendance are listed on the sign in sheets included in *Attachment 1*.

Several announcements were made:

- Don Merrick is now an alternate for Gordon Rogers, (Public-At-Large Seat) and Martin Bensky is the second alternate.
- Rich Steele is sitting in for Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environment Seat).
- Ray Isaacson is now the member and Sandi Strawn the alternate for Benton County (Local Government Seat).
- The N Reactor Facilities De-Activization Environmental Assessment began a thirty day review on December 22, 1994. 10 copies of a report were made available for those interested.

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

Acting Chair M. Reeves reviewed the revised agenda that was distributed (*Attachment 2*). Changes had been made in order to make time to discuss the late breaking issues associated with the President's announced budget cuts and to accommodate another presenter's schedule. The Board adopted the revised agenda. The revised agenda and this meeting summary reflect the original agenda item number.

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark then asked for corrections to the meeting summary and noted that written editorial corrections had been submitted and would be incorporated into the final draft. The meeting summary was then approved.

AGENDA ITEM 3: RESPONSE TO BOARD ADVICE ON '95 FUNDING REALLOCATIONS & INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ON PRESIDENT CLINTON'S AND USDOE'S ANNOUNCEMENTS ON CUTS IN AGENCY AND CLEAN UP BUDGET

Information and Discussion on USDOE's Announcements on Cuts in Agency and Clean Up Budget and Fiscal Year 1996 Budget

(Note: This section is a summary of the discussion on this issue that took place on Thursday morning, Thursday afternoon and was continued over to Friday morning).

Ron Izatt, DOE-RL, responded to the Board's request to present an overview of what is known and not known in regards to the '96 budget (*Attachment 3*). He noted that DOE honestly does not know where they are in '96 and that it is a tough time for them. He recognized the frustration the Board must feel. DOE is being asked to make several cuts. He reviewed several actions DOE is pursuing to reduce Hanford costs and to reduce the budget. He explained that the actions were goals for reductions but not necessarily what will happen (*Attachment 4*). They have a series of teams who will analyze reductions to be made in the area of indirect/overhead using radical and "out of the box type thinking." R. Izatt explained that the Board will be updated on the '96 budget and that DOE will discuss and analyze the impacts of making these reductions with the Board.

The Board had a brief question and answer period with R. Izatt. Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Seat) asked if there was anything the Board could do to help. She subsequently drafted a letter to Tom Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, asking for flexibility in the allocation of resources. The Board reviewed the draft and provided feedback and suggestions. On Friday morning, the Board adopted the letter as Consensus Advice #12 (*Attachment 5*).

EPA and Ecology commented after R. Izatt's overview on the 1996 budget.

Dan Silver, Ecology, explained that Ecology is still thinking the budget issue through. They are aware that reductions are coming. He said Ecology is not after a particular dollar number but a notion of environmental value and wants to maximize environmental value. He stressed that Ecology is not interested in a wholesale re-negotiation of the TPA and that it is not open to re-negotiation in terms of reduction of scope. Ecology is especially sensitive to the suggestion that the Columbia River Strategy is at risk and will fight for the Columbia River. Finally, he formally requested from DOE a budget figure for what is being paid to Washington D.C. for the Grumbly operation and what kind of reductions will be taken in the Grumbly operation so it can be compared to on the ground, in the field, reductions that Grumbly is asking DOE-RL to take.

Carol Rushin, EPA empathized with R. Izatt and explained that the EPA is going through similar, although not as drastic, budget exercises. She had two major concerns to add to the comments that had been made. The first had to do with the color of money that comes out and the need to

have budget flexibility. The second is that there is a tendency for all parts of the program to take a cut and share the pain. She would like to see something more specific. Instead of wholesale cuts across all departments, she would prefer DOE to do an analysis on what those cuts mean, and what they get for those cuts program by program.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) presented the draft advice letter prepared by the Dollars and Sense Committee which had been faxed to the Board prior to the meeting (*Attachment 6*). He also distributed several graphs which showed the amounts budgeted for DOE-HQ from 1990-1995 (*Attachment 7*). In the afternoon the Board considered the draft proposal regarding the 1996 budget cuts and had a lengthy discussion providing suggestions and edits to the Committee. The Board adopted the proposed advice in concept and agreed to finalize the letter Friday morning. Those interested in working on the wording were invited to do so immediately following the close of the Thursday session. After more discussion on Friday, the Board adopted the final copy as Consensus Advice #11 and agreed to send it to Secretary Hazel O'Leary and Tom Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management and courtesy copy it to Ecology, EPA, DOE-RL, and the Governors of Washington and Oregon (*Attachment 8*).

Response to Board Advice on 1995 Funding Reallocation

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

At the request of Acting Chair Marilyn Reeves, Roger Stanley, Ecology, gave a brief overview of the letter of joint advice from Ecology and the EPA on DOE-RL's budget reallocation for fiscal year 1995 (*Attachment 9*). R. Stanley also noted they would distribute a point by point comparison of the two agencies' responses with the HAB's advice (*Attachment 10*).

The Acting Chair then announced that the response DOE planned to give was on overheads of which copies had been made. Copies were distributed (*Attachment 11*). It was decided not to have the presentation that went with the overheads due to time constraints. Instead, R. Izatt briefly explained the purpose of the presentation which was to point out some of the highlights of DOE's response to the Board advice. The DOE will still provide the Board with a written response to the advice they received from the Board.

The Board decided to use the lunch hour to review the overheads and come back to this topic at the 3:00 agenda time slot.

When the Board returned to the discussion in the afternoon, Acting Chair Marilyn Reeves asked Board members to raise any concerns or questions with what they read in Nadine Highland's overheads.

Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades Council (Labor/Work Force Seat) wanted the meeting summary to reflect a question he had with the first item on page four regarding the

privatization of WRAP 2 which stated that "privatization may not be local." His question had to do with why DOE is looking at sending things out of the area. He noted that the statement is contrary to what they have said before. He also wanted his opposition to this idea to be reflected in the meeting. Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Labor/Work Force Seat) also raised some concerns and opposition with this statement. Ron Izatt assured the Board that DOE was not changing its commitments to local business. He was not sure what the intention was in N. Highland's overheads. Acting Chair M. Reeves asked DOE to get back to the Board on the meaning of this statement and what the rationale behind it is. She acknowledged that N. Highland could not stay for the afternoon session and that it was unfortunate the morning agenda did not allow time for her comments.

Tom Engel, also asked DOE to present next month its reaction to reports by the press of a breakdown in the maintenance organization. DOE agreed to respond either to the Board or to a Committee depending on what the Board wanted.

AGENDA ITEM 7: MAXIMIZING BENEFITS OF CLEAN UP IN TRANSITION TO OTHER USES (ECONOMIC TRANSITION) - MEDICAL USE OF RADIO ISOTOPES

The Cultural and Socio-Economic Committee distributed a white paper memo on medical isotopes (*Attachment 12*).

John Lindsay, Tri-Cities Economic Development Council (Local Business Seat) began the presentation to the Board by explaining a variety of economic transition strategies (*Attachment 13*). He then discussed the concept of using waste from Hanford for medical purposes. Mike Fox, WHC, then presented and illustrated in more detail the process of how strontium-90 breaks down to Yttrium-90 which can then be used as medical isotopes in cancer therapy.

The Board then heard from a response panel consisting of Doug Sherwood, EPA, Ron Izatt, DOE-RL, Dave Lundstrom, Ecology, and Hank McGuire, WHC.

H. McGuire explained that he was on the response panel in his role as a representative from the Tri-Cities Cancer Center. He noted there was strong support in the community for a center and encouraged the Board to pursue its development.

R. Izatt spoke next and noted that strontium-90 is available at Hanford. He also stressed that the isotope project is not in competition with clean up money. Finally, he noted that DOE is looking forward to a partnership with businesses and investors working on the project.

D. Sherwood mentioned a few concerns the EPA has. One is that this is a chemical process that produces waste, and the waste must be handled and disposed of properly. If this process is to go forward, the EPA wants it done with Board support and wants new programs to comply with applicable laws and regulations.

D. Lundstrom then noted that Ecology supports recycling and reusing which are ideas behind the medical isotope process. He then mentioned several factors Ecology takes into consideration when analyzing reusing waste. They are human and environmental safety considerations, that there is a market value for the re-used material, cost effectiveness of the project, and how residual waste will be managed. He explained that Ecology does this analysis on a case by case basis. It has only recently become informed of this project.

Committee Chair Patty Burnett, Benton-Franklin Regional Governmental Council (Local Government Seat) explained that the purpose of the presentation was not to be a specific and technical analysis of using medical isotopes but was to help the Board begin thinking about the new concept that not everything from Hanford is waste. Both she and facilitator Theresa Jensen encouraged the Board to ask general questions and to remember that this topic would be pursued in further depth at the February Board meeting.

Several Board members raised the concern that the project should only use Hanford waste and not import waste.

The suggestion was made that the requirement of meeting state and federal standards be incorporated into the statement for which the Committee sought approval.

In response to whether every commercial venture would come before the Board, P. Burnett answered no. She explained that a commercial venture was brought before the Board this time because new ground is being broken. The Committee does not plan to seek Board approval for every capital venture sought. At this time, she explained, the Committee is asking only for acceptance of the general concept and not acceptance of all the specifics of a center for medical isotope research and use.

G. Pollet asked several questions and was asked to give his list of questions to the Committee.

Acting Chair M. Reeves asked the Board how many were uncomfortable with the language of the requested action proposed by the Committee and took a straw poll. Three Board members were uncomfortable with the wording: Sonja Anderson, Gerry Pollet and Tim Takaro. M. Reeves requested the concerned members and any other Board members to provide the Committee with their concerns and suggestions.

M. Reeves then asked the Board if they objected to the Committee continuing their work on this topic. There were no objections.

A request was made that the Committee come back to the Board with more information about the process chemistry as well as more information on the economic impact of this project. The final information request was that two documents reflecting a GAO investigation be reviewed by the Committee and made available.

The Board was reminded that any questions and comments should be phoned, faxed, or written to Patty Burnett.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Schenter, President of the Nuclear Medicine Research Working Group spoke and noted that the most common barrier to the medical isotope project is lack of precise information. He also said that as a public citizen, this project is extremely important and the positive benefits of it should not be under emphasized.

Ron Kathren, Professor in the College of Pharmacy at Washington State University, heartily endorsed the medical application of radionuclides and hopes the Board will make this concept a top priority for support. He mentioned the Washington State University campus in North Richland and the College of Pharmacy as two other resources that would be involved in using and researching radionuclides. He further stated the longer there was a delay, the more unnecessary suffering and deaths there would be. He felt the project would bring economic stability to the community. He wants the Tri-Cities to become a world class center for cancer research and treatment and to take advantage of the nuclear waste in the area.

Jim Knight explained he felt the medical application of radionuclides is a worthwhile project. He explained that 97% of isotopes are coming from Canada and ending up at Hanford. He said arguing about whether the Board should support this project is costing lives.

Norma Jean Germond, Oregon League of Women Voters, noted that she liked the idea of medical benefits from isotopes. She was wondering if the Committee requesting that the Tri-Parties pursue the use of the radioisotopes and if so, to clarify in the future, what is going to be private and what is going to be pursued by the Tri-Parties.

Don Segna, Nuclear Medical Research Working Group, pointed out many members of the public who were present and who have been working for two and a half years on the isotope project without receiving any internal or external support until about one year ago. He explained that although the project will eventually be funded entirely in the private sector, they do need some money and support now to get it going. He invited the Board to join the Working Group's luncheon meeting that meets every Thursday from 12:15-1:15p.m. at WSU in room 247.

Curt Leslie spoke about the history of secrecy at Hanford that has created mistrust. He called for the need for full disclosure and of not having hidden agendas.

The meeting was adjourned for lunch with an announcement that a group would be sitting together at lunch to work on the language of the proposed advice from the Dollars and Sense Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT: TRI-PARTY RESPONSE TO ER ADVICE AND CARBON TETRACHLORIDE PUMP AND TREAT ADVICE

Dennis Faulk, EPA, referred to a letter that was distributed which contained the Tri-Party Environmental Restoration Refocusing and 200-ZP-1 Interim Action Advice Response (*Attachment 14*). He thanked the Board for their hard work in giving the agencies advice. He reported that due to the comments, the Tri-Parties will reopen negotiations on the ER change package.

Regarding the 200-ZP-1 carbon tetrachloride pump and treat advice, D. Faulk reported that there were a total of three comments. All comments supported the project and a Record of Decision (ROD) is expected within the next few weeks. He further noted that because of Board input, the dense non-aqueous liquid investigation is included in the project and innovative technologies will continue to be explored.

Any further response on these issues should go to the ER Committee who will continue working with these topics.

The Acting Chair asked that the summary reflect that review of the ER Refocusing was a total Board commitment. It included the fact that the agencies provided special written material (the ER primer) in response to a recommendation of this Board. The Board has followed through and will continue to follow through on this process to review the response to comments.

AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT ON CHAIR SELECTION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Labor/Work Force Seat) reported on the work the ad hoc chair selection committee has done so far. The group met on December 16 and developed three groups of recommendations (*Attachment 15*). One was to select an external chair who has limited functions and to amend the Ground Rules to provide for an internal first and second vice-chair. The second recommendation deals with developing a more detailed job description for the Chair position. The third is a recommendation on a selection process.

The Board had a discussion which raised some requests and concerns. There were several requests for information on a salary for the Chair position and the time commitment required of a Chair. The requests were made to aid Board members in evaluating who to nominate. Several comments reflected a preference for an internal chair because of the amount of time it takes to come up to speed on Board issues. Others noted the issue of many Board members not having time to be a Chair, and that choosing only internally limits the pool of possible nominees.

After discussion, the Board agreed to recommendation number one with the charge to the facilitators to come up with the language for the amendment to the Ground Rules. Marilyn Reeves continues as Acting Chair, and Patty Burnett is Acting Vice Chair.

For recommendation number two, the Board authorized the ad hoc committee to go forward. Board members should phone, fax, or write any suggestions for a job description, qualification and selection criteria to the ad hoc committee.

The Board reached consensus on the selection process recommendation number three.

The ad hoc committee will meet again in Richland on January 20 to continue its work.

AGENDA ITEM 11: RECOMMENDED HAB BUDGET/SPENDING PLAN

Gerry Sorenson, Batelle Pacific NW Lab (Labor/Work Force Seat) distributed and reviewed the Budget Committee's recommended fiscal year 1995 budget (*Attachment 16*). The Board was asked to approve the recommendation.

The general response from the Board was that they did not want to approve the budget as recommended. The Board was particularly concerned about the reduction in facilitation services and made suggestions of other ways to save money. Some suggestions were to reduce the number of meetings, hire a \$30.00/hour consultant for each committee for 40 hours a month instead of having facilitation services for committees, eliminate advertising the Board meetings, assess the current salary for the Chair, and when meeting in the Tri-Cities, meet in DOE facilities.

Several Board members noted the value the Board has been to the agencies in terms of the costs they have saved for them. One member pointed out that without the Board the DOE would have to spend money on public involvement and on legal fees. Another member questioned whether the Board should accept \$800,000.00 as its budget when a \$1.2 million dollar budget was originally contemplated.

After hearing the feedback from the Board, the Budget Committee agreed to go back and look at the WHC overhead and see what can be cut there and look into the variety of suggestions that have been presented during this discussion. Also, Confluence Northwest agreed to provide the Committee with unmelded rates which the Committee will analyze and determine if that affects the budget numbers.

AGENDA ITEM 11: REPORT ON PRESS CONTACT PROCEDURES

On Thursday morning the Board was asked by the Acting Chair to begin thinking about what they wanted to include in a press release and solicited Bill Sanderson's, WHC, expertise in helping the facilitators work on a draft. Thursday afternoon the Board decided they did not want a final press release to be issued without Board approval and decided to review it Friday morning. On Friday the Board finalized the press release (*Attachment 17*). It was released to agencies' and interest group press contacts list.

AGENDA ITEM 5: OFF-SITE WASTE ACCEPTANCE

Facilitator Paul Wilson explained that the DOE deadline on Off-site Waste has been extended to March, so this presentation would be informational only. He asked Board members to phone, fax or write any comments to Pam Brown or Walt Blair; Board action on recommendations will be requested at the February meeting.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government) reviewed the Federal Facilities Compliance Act of 1992 (FFCA) (*Attachment 18*). John Stohr, Ecology, then provided more detail on the Off-Site Waste Acceptance process. Ed MacAllister and Rudy Garcia, DOE, highlighted what DOE has been doing in terms of FFCA. Pam Brown then reviewed the recommendations which were included in the January Board packet. The Board asked several questions and were encouraged to attend the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee on Friday when they will further address this issue.

The Board then addressed agenda item 10b which was the proposed advice to DOE on SSAB involvement in multi-site issues. It was decided that it would be added to the February agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 10: NATIONAL SSAB MEETING IN FEBRUARY

The Board was informed by Jon Yerxa that five Board members could be funded to go to the SSAB meeting in February. The Board decided to have each Committee decide on one person to send. The Board approved a letter to go to DOE-HQ to request that DOE-HQ request that the FFCA be included in the agenda for that meeting as a cross cutting issue that includes all the sites.

AGENDA ITEM 12: BOARD WORKPLAN

Acting Chair M. Reeves called the Board's attention to the draft HAB workplan that was in the Board packet. She requested that Board members review it and give any suggestions for changes to Committee Chairs or the facilitators. The Committee Chairs should do a final review and advise the facilitators of any changes, A revised, finalized workplan will then be included in next month's packet.

The HAB meeting was recessed at 5:30 p.m. Thursday, reconvened Friday morning at 8:00 a.m. and adjourned at approximately 9:20 a.m.

This summary is an accurate and complete summary of the matters discussed and conclusions reached at the Hanford Advisory Board meeting held on January 5, 1995 in Kennewick, Washington.

Certified by: _____ **Dated:** _____
Merilyn B. Reeves, Chair

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- | Number | Item |
|--------|---|
| 1. | January Board Meeting Attendance List |
| 2. | Revised Agenda for January Board Meeting |
| 3. | Copies of Visuals titled Total EM Funding Comparison from Ron Izatt's presentation |
| 4. | Copies of Visuals from Ron Izatt's presentation on Actions to Reduce Hanford Indirect Costs |
| 5. | HAB Consensus Advice # 12 |
| 6. | Dollars and Sense Committee Draft Advice non-dated letter with the following first sentence in the RE: heading "Recommendation for adoption of advice for January HAB meeting to respond to USDOE..." |
| 7. | Copies of Graphs titled Department of Energy Environmental Management Budget Operations Offices Budget Totals - FY 1990-1995 |
| 8. | HAB Consensus Advice # 11 |
| 9. | Letter to Marilyn Reeves from Dan Silver dated, December 23, 1994 with enclosure of letter to John Wagoner from Mary Riveland and Chuck Clarke, dated December 22, 1994 |
| 10. | Comparison of Ecology /EPA HAB Recommendation Letters on USDOE-RL FY 1995 Funding Reallocation |
| 11. | Copies of Visuals from Nadine Highland's planned presentation on DOE's FY 1995 Reallocation Comments |
| 12. | Letter to the Board from the Cultural and Socio-Economic Committee on Economic Transition Opportunity |
| 13. | Copies of Visuals from John Linday's presentation on Economic Transition and Medical Isotopes |
| 14. | Letter to Marilyn Reeves from the Tri-Parties dated January 5, 1995 |
| 15. | Memo from the Ad Hoc Chair Selection Committee on the Recommendations to be Considered at the January HAB meeting |
| 16. | Memo from the Budget Committee on Recommended FY 1995 Budget |
| 17. | Press Release from the Board dated January 6, 1995 |
| 18. | Copies of Visuals from Pam Brown's presentation on the Federal Facilities Compliance Act of 1992 |

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 at (509)376-5856.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**