

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Revised Meeting Summary
February 2-3, 1995
Pasco, 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
Budget Updates	2
Worker Health and Safety	8
Tank Safety and Emergency Response (C-106)	11
Public Comment	11
Introductions and Announcements	11
Offsite Waste Acceptance	12
Recommendation Regarding National SSAB Discussion of Cross Cutting Issues	13
Letter of Support for Secretary O'Leary's Action on Plutonium	13
Facilities Transition Change Package	14
Internal Board Business Items	14
Risk Assessment	17
Announcements	19
Public Comment	19
Recommendation re: Pursuing Exploration of Radioisotope Production	19
Proposed Approach to 100 Areas Remediation	20
Public Involvement Committee Report	20
Final Matters	20
Attachments List	21



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

Briefing on Budget Issues

John Wagoner, Manager DOE-RL responded to Board advice on Fiscal Year 1995 and briefed the Board on the cleanup strategies at Hanford in light of the Federal Budget cuts. The Dollars and Sense Committee then informally responded and will give a formal response at the April Board meeting.

Board provides feedback and comments on Worker Health and Safety recommendations

The Board heard a presentation on worker health and safety from the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee and considered three recommendations including linking health status with specific exposures and adopting values relevant to public health. The Board provided suggestions to the Committee. The Committee will continue working with the recommendations and will bring them back to the Board at a later date.

Adoption of Advice on Offsite Waste Acceptance

The Board considered revised recommendations on Offsite Waste Acceptance presented by the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee. After discussion and some amendments, the proposed recommendations were adopted as HAB Consensus Advice #13.

Adoption of Advice regarding National SSAB discussion of Cross Cutting Issues

The Board adopted advice encouraging the DOE to establish mechanisms for members of Site Specific Advisory Boards across the complex to discuss cross-cutting issues.

Adoption of letter of support for Secretary O'Leary's action on Plutonium

The Board decided to send a letter to Secretary O'Leary to commend her on her decision to prohibit the use of plutonium -239 and highly enriched uranium separated or stabilized during cleanup for nuclear explosive purposes.

Facilities Transition Change Package

The Board heard a presentation from Ecology and DOE on the Change Package. The Board decided to send members to represent the Board at each of the upcoming public comment hearings.

Internal Board Business Items

- The Board was informed that new travel reimbursement procedures were in effect and instructions as to how it would work were given.
- The Board adopted the workplan that was in the packet.
- The Board decided to have 8 meetings per year in the Tri-Cities, 2 in Portland, 1 in Seattle and 1 in Spokane. The Spokane meeting was scheduled for August.
- The Board decided not to have an external chair. The Board recommended that DOE appoint Marilyn Reeves as Chair and selected Patty Burnett as permanent Vice Chair.
- The Board adopted an interim budget as proposed by the Budget Committee, for review in April.

Risk Assessment

The Board heard a presentation from Carol Henry, DOE on Risk Assessment at DOE. Lynn Alban and Doug Wells, Department of Health also made presentations illustrating how risk assessment is done and addressing some of the issues that arise. The Board then had a substantial question and answer discussion.

Adoption of Advice on Pursuing Exploration of Radioisotope Production

The Board adopted HAB Consensus Advice #14 endorsing the pursuit of possible economic opportunity such as using Hanford's radioisotopes for beneficial medical purposes.

Proposed Approach to 100 Areas Remediation

Linda McClain, DOE-RL, presented and updated the Board on the negotiation that has been going on since August 1994 about how to best carry out the Board's Advice on ER. There has not yet been a resolution but a recommendation is expected at the end of February.

Public Involvement Committee Report

The Committee briefed the Board on the work it has been doing.

Adoption of a Press Release

The Board adopted a press release regarding offsite waste acceptance, the plutonium letter of support to Secretary O'Leary, and the use of radioisotopes for cancer.

Revised Meeting Summary
February 2 and 3, 1995
Pasco, Washington

Thursday, February 2, 1995

The Meeting was called to order by Acting Chair, Marilyn Reeves. The meeting was open to the public. Four public comment periods were provided. Members present for the meeting are listed in *Attachment 1*. Seats not represented were: Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon Seat), University of Washington (Higher Education Seat), Grant County (Local Government Seat), Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government Seat), and the Business-Agricultural Seat. Members of the public and others in attendance are listed on the sign in sheets included in *Attachment 1*.

Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco (Local Government) as a citizen of Pasco welcomed the Board to Pasco.

Several announcements and introductions were made:

- Denny Condotta, TRIDEC (Local Business Seat) introduced John Burnham who is now the second alternate for TRIDEC.
- The hotel where the meeting will be held next month in Seattle will hold rooms at the Government rate only until the end of this week.
- Those who watched the two ten minute videos that are required in the badging process, were reminded to also sign up with Barbara Wise, certifying that they have watched them. Others were invited to watch the videos at lunch and before or after the meeting even if they had not yet submitted the paperwork. To get a badge, people must go to central badging after having watched the video and have their picture taken.
- A letter from John Wagoner to Marilyn Reeves dated February 1, 1995 responding to the Board's advice on the 1995 Funding Reallocations was distributed (*Attachment 2*). The letter should be labeled in the lower left corner, "Response to HAB Consensus Advice #8 (Dec. 12, 1994) 1994 Funding Reallocations, From DOE", and should be placed in the Consensus Advice section of the HAB Notebook.
- M. Reeves announced that the press release issued at the end of the last meeting seemed to be successful based on the number of responses there were to it. She had been interviewed and had received several specific inquiries for the advice the Board gave at the January meeting (Consensus Advice #11 and 12).

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

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark explained that agenda items number three and four would be switched to accommodate the schedule of Dr. Seligman who would present to the Board via the telephone.

M. Reeves pointed out that a discussion on the new travel reimbursement plan that Board members will be required to use would be added to agenda item number nine.

E. Hallmark corrected agenda item number ten. Carol Henry should have been described as from DOE Headquarters, not DEQ.

The Board was asked for corrections to the meeting summary. One minor typographical error was noted on page nine. The meeting summary was approved as corrected.

AGENDA ITEM 2: BUDGET UPDATES

John Wagoner, Manager, DOE-RL was present to respond to Board advice on Fiscal Year 1995 Funding Reallocations (FY '95) and to brief the Board on the cleanup strategies at Hanford in light of the Federal Budget cuts (*Attachment 3*). He explained that he had reviewed the advice from the Board and would give feedback on how DOE-RL interpreted this, review what DOE-RL is doing in terms of cleanup that will be reflected in the '96-'97 budgets, and would hope to get some feedback from the Board to determine if DOE-RL is on the right track. He noted that his letter giving the specific responses to the Board's advice on the '95 reallocations had been distributed at the start of the meeting, and that he would not be giving the Board a detailed dollar summary of the upcoming budgets because that is what the Dollars and Sense Committee received from program managers in a full day briefing yesterday.

J. Wagoner then began by explaining that because of the proposed 4.5 billion cut in the Environmental Management (EM) budget, DOE cleanup will have to be "reinvented" so business can be maintained without program disconnects. He described to the Board the savings that DOE-RL has already made through efficiency gains. He highlighted the advice DOE has received from the Board and pointed out that DOE-RL agrees with the Board that DOE should:

- Integrate sitewide planning
- Achieve cost efficiencies
- Do more cleanup
- Base decisions on sound, out-year plans
- Carefully consider, define and explain priorities

He outlined what DOE-RL is now doing:

- Developed baseline

The process of developing the baseline was completed in September 1994. DOE-RL is also switching to a project approach and have begun to use a Multi Year Program Plan.

- Will develop an integrated program for Hanford

J. Wagoner explained that DOE-RL is committed to developing this. DOE will be seeking site by site appropriations in FY '97 to minimize barriers to an integrated sitewide approach. This is being requested for Rocky Flats in FY '96 as a pilot.

- Have developed a prioritization methodology - DOE wants feedback on the methodology and expects to be refining it. DOE wants similar methodologies across sites.
- Have developed a management strategy

J. Wagoner then reviewed the management strategy that had been described by Ron Izatt at the January meeting:

- Address urgent risks
 - Tanks
 - Spent Nuclear Fuel
 - Plutonium
- Pay off mortgages

- Stabilize and contain wastes
- Reduce overhead costs
- Reduce infrastructure costs - This includes costs like building, improving, and maintaining roads and paving parking lots. No significant investments in infrastructure will be made unless they are required for safety or to meet the clean up goals.

- Minimize retrieval of excavation of low-risk waste
- Focus pump and treat to high payoff areas
- Don't invest in government owned treatment facilities - use private sector

The results of this management policy in budget allocations are:

- New Spent Nuclear Fuel Approach is supported (moving it out of K Basin away from the River)

- Tanks wastes stored safely- will support what is needed and look at new ways to do it
- Currently planned TWRS disposal facilities construction is not supported

Needs re-look

- New tanks may not be needed - The Evaporator system is working well, and with the new Cross Site Transfer line, they may be able to get by without new tanks. He stressed that a final decision on this has not been made; he was just providing the Board with an advance look.

- Construction of low risk liquid effluent facilities is not supported - He explained that the budget does not support the next phase of this project, which is to treat relatively clean water. He asked the Board if DOE should deal with this water now or reschedule and rephase this facility.

- Solid waste treatment services should be procured

-Facilities won't be constructed by DOE

- TRU waste retrieval delayed until needed - The drums appear to be in good shape, even though built for only 20 years. The purpose of the retrieval is to repackage to ship the waste to New Mexico. They propose waiting to do it only once, at the time it needs to go.

- ER program will focus on high risk waste sites and facilities

-N Reactor, 100 Areas, 300 Area

Next, J. Wagoner reviewed the measures DOE needs to take:

- Restructure Hanford organizations

-Reducing costs significantly

J. Wagoner explained that management needs to be streamlined to minimize the layering of people over those doing the work. DOE intends to bring in outside experts to help them do this. They are already getting a good deal of advice, and just received a Galvin evaluation of the labs that provided them with advice on how to streamline.

- Take advantage of new performance based contracts to achieve maximum progress

An example is the Environmental Restoration contract with Bechtel which is a different type of contract than the ones traditionally used in the past.

A contract modification with Westinghouse Hanford Company (WHC) was just signed last week.

J. Wagoner explained that the reformed contract provides for:

- Fee for results - The award fee, the traditional basis, now only accounts for 30% of the renegotiated contract. The rest, 70% of the fee is on a performance base.

- Safety emphasis

- Incentives to outsource (if cost effective and comply with terms and conditions of the

bargained employees)

- Incentives to reduce costs - Committed to save \$170 million and gets 4%; if save move gets 15%. These awards are to be shared with employees and the community.
- Take advantage of new performance based contracts to achieve maximum progress
- Greater accountability

The current contract format was developed during WWII, to pay a small profit, but to indemnify for any risk. Now, however, under these new contracts the contractor is responsible for its own negligence and is not reimbursed for:

- Fines & penalties
- Litigation
- Government property
- Whistleblowers

DOE will not finance the suit, resulting in a very significant change in how contracts have been established.

J. Wagoner summed up his comments by stating that DOE needs continued Hanford Advisory Board input in developing strategy and prioritization decisions. He also reiterated that DOE remains fully committed to the objectives of the Tri-Party Agreement. Finally, J. Wagoner recognized the value of the Board and the insight and direction they have provided DOE-RL.

Response from the Dollars and Sense Committee

The Dollars and Sense Committee was then given an opportunity to respond.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) began. He told the Board that the Dollars and Sense Committee had participated in a thorough budget briefing the day prior. He thanked John Wagoner for his presentation.

G. Pollet then gave an overview of the Environmental Management FY '96 Congressional Request (*Attachment 4*). He indicated that there would be a 20% reduction in the budget for FY 1997. Wagoner responded that the reduction would probably be 10% with more in the out years to make the overall reduction in the five-year period the same.

He said that one of the key issues is the question of whether the budget will be cut equally at all sites, as was recommended in the Keystone National Recommendations, and indicated that this was not what was going to happen; there were significant increases for other sites as Hanford's dropped by 30%. He said that he was disappointed that Wagoner's response letter to the HAB's advice did not address Environmental Restoration (ER), as the Board's advice was to increase funding for ER. To the contrary, numerous Milestones will be missed, and the funding will go from \$203 million for 1995 to \$143 million for ER. The Board's advice was to increase the priority for ER, and to breakdown barriers in the budget nationally; this has not been addressed or responded to.

Pollet indicated that a request had been made to DOE to see the detailed written guidelines that had been given to Westinghouse Hanford Company to guide their process of reallocation of the FY 1995 budget, and their building of the FY '96 and FY '97 budgets. They were told it did not exist. He responded that this seems to be a significant management problem that should be explored by the Board.

Pollet said that the Board had explicitly requested an explanation of how the Board's December and January advice was transmitted to program managers, and how it is incorporated into the building of their budgets. From the Budget Briefing the previous day, he feels that some programs are very aware of the Board's advice, some are aware but do not incorporate it, and others are not aware at all. Pollet went on to report on prioritization, being tracked by Mike Grainey and Technology Development, being tracked by Tom Engel as neither was present.

Prioritization Grid

In reference to the prioritization grid which has been previously presented, Pollet reported that, according to one manager, the Board, the States and the Tribes had agreed to the use of the grid. The opposition by the States and Tribes, and the significant concerns of the Board regarding the grid were not transmitted to senior management. The grid was used to justify decisions and presented as though the rankings are objective. He noted two significant problems:

1. Neither regulators nor stakeholders were consulted about their weighting of priorities, but scores were included for their views, and
2. there was no plan for how to take advice and re-prioritize.

Technology Development

Pollet then expressed concern that technology development was not covered in either the response letter or the presentation by Wagoner. He believes it is a significant omission, as it is a large area of the budget, and there seems to be no coordination between technology development and Hanford site priorities.

Environmental Restoration

The Board's advice was to break internal budget barriers and to address cleanup along the river. This issue was not addressed in J. Wagoner's response. Pollet noted disappointment that the response from DOE was not handed out until today, which meant the Board could not analyze the response for presentation to the Board.

Other advice/issues that must be addressed are those where major costs are being put on Hanford by subsidizing other programs, such as "babysitting" weapons-grade plutonium and uranium for the Defense Department, yet Hanford is being told its other programs cannot meet their fundamental legal obligations. These issues were dealt with in the Board's January advice, but there has been no response. Pollet indicated that he thought the response should come from Headquarters, as that is in part where the problem lies.

Pollet then reminded the Board of its January 5 Advice Letter in which it quoted the most recent Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), and asked DOE to honor this agreement by asking for full funding of legal commitments. He indicated that this would be breached next week when the DOE presents its FY 1996 budget request. He said that, in the Budget Briefing on the previous day, DOE Richland had said that they had pushed for the money; Pollet reminded that the TPA is with DOE, not just DOE Richland. It is the internal budget priorities of DOE (i.e. subsidizing of the other programs) that are causing this budget problem.

Overhead

In reference to overhead, Pollet said the direction was good, but a lot more needs to be done as there is still \$225 million in indirect overhead. He expressed concerns that, in spite of Board advice and agreement by DOE, this component was not being broken out in presentations. He is also concerned that reductions in overhead are not actual savings, simply a shifting to departments.

He concluded by saying that DOE Richland has opened up in unprecedented ways in allowing access to budget information, and he thanked John Wagoner and his staff for that.

As the next step, individual members of the Dollars & Sense Committee who have taken on a program will be talking to the programs on a one-to-one basis, along with DOE staff and regulators. Then they will de-brief as a committee and prepare proposed recommendations for the FY'96 - FY'97 budget, which will be brought to the Board in April. Due to deadlines, the committee will be giving informal feedback to the programs by March 22, based on previous consensus advice, and principles and values. They will be asking the programs how these are reflected in their priorities.

Other Board members interested in this topic were encouraged to attend the Committee's meetings, including the one this evening, at which the Committee will try to ascertain how decisions are made.

TWRS

Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional/Environmental Seat) explained that DOE is reconsidering the need for the double shell tanks, so they are reprogramming funds out of the new tanks and into the programs. He referred to Ken Bracken, who explained that with the WHC recommendation, he is willing to live with the risk of not building the new tanks. This will be discussed with stakeholders; no decision has been made yet.

T. Martin felt the response from DOE met 50% of the HAB recommendation. The DOE response letter does not address the HAB advice to assess that staffing levels are appropriate for the specific programs-- that overstaffing does not occur and also that there are not too many layoffs. He asked to have a response in March.

Non-TWRS Waste Management

Gordon Rogers (Public At Large) follows the non-TWRS waste management program. He began by explaining that the Dollars and Sense Committee has not met since receiving the DOE response letter, thus these are his individual comments. He first commented that the programs were all using the priority planning grid as one tool. They also used the old abcdef program, as well as individual managers' sense of priorities. In general the priority rankings were not significantly different with either tool. The HAB supported the WRAP-2 privatization initiative, and it is being continued.

Spent Nuclear Fuel

Mark Hermason, Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/Work Force Seat) said the program is on track. Removal of materials from K basins depends heavily on reprogramming. The Path

Forward may be in jeopardy if funds are not reprogrammed. Another issue is regulatory streamlining, which needs to be looked at.

Facilities Transition

Alene Anderson, Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Seat) explained that she sat in on facility transition. The Committee had recommended putting closed facilities into low cost surveillance as soon as possible. In yesterday's meeting, it became clear there is a firm 5 year activity for shut down. The problem is that no one is willing to sign up to a 5 year commitment on the funding. It will need a congressional nod--which is something that the HAB needs to keep looking at. There was no response from DOE on the issue of the length of the payback on Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), which the HAB had raised in its advice.

M. Reeves formally requested the meeting summary to reflect the following points:

1. The Board will be hearing a formal response and recommendations from the Dollars and Sense Committee in April. The responses from the Dollars and Sense Committee members at this meeting were individual responses based on their tracking of these issues for the Board, and were not from the Board or the Committee as a whole. The Board had just received John Wagoner's letter this morning, which was to the advantage of DOE, as the Board and the Dollars and Sense Committee was not prepared to give a fully informed response nor ask questions which reflected information in the letter.

2. The Board is pleased to have received unprecedented type of information on the budget. This is to the credit of DOE-RL. DOE-RL and its contractors deserve a great deal of praise, since the October meeting, which was seen as a "breakthrough" meeting. The Chair wants to be sure that the costs associated with presenting this information to the HAB or its Committees are not charged to the Board.

Several questions were asked related to the issue of privatization and the hurdles of making long term commitments on known versus unknown technology. Where the technology is there, the current law provides for going ten years. Wagoner will circulate some materials on privatization as a follow up; he does not have it with him.

The question of why the budget does not provide funding for the 325 lab, when the assumption in the spent fuel environmental assessment was that the labs would be central to the characterization of spent nuclear fuel was asked. In response, Mr. Wagoner reminded the Board that DOE makes assumptions for budget purposes that are not programmatic decisions. If the HAB is to participate in this early information on budgets, it will have to remember that options and assumptions used are not programmatic. In this case, the question is if one lab is not needed after characterization, why upgrade it for an unknown need. But this needs to be analyzed. He also noted that the pace at which tank wastes are retrieved can be managed so that they are retrieved at a level at which they can be dealt with. Getting wastes out of tanks cuts the huge costs of safety and compliance monitoring.

In response to other questions J. Wagoner noted:

- Provisions are being made in the budget for community impact money

- All privatizations will be going out for competitive bid
- The difficult budget decisions they need to make involve what to do if the productivity challenges built in for programs cannot be met
- The infrastructure planned was based on a much larger work force, so cutting some of it will not be a long term detriment

Other questions presented for future discussion and/or response included:

- The short term and long term ramifications of not maintaining infrastructure
- Relating to privatization, if we make that investment and privatization fails what is the contingency plan? (Outsource contracts typically yield many change orders that increase the costs overall.)
- The Galvin report states that technology is available that is not being applied. Get in touch with him and get the specifics and start using the relevant technology.
- The time is opportune to ask Congress to solve long standing problem to simplify the multitude of complex environmental laws and regulations.

AGENDA ITEM 4: WORKER HEALTH AND SAFETY

Facilitator Paul Wilson pointed out that the proposed advice the Worker Health and Safety Committee was asking to be adopted has changed from what is in the packet. A revised version was distributed. He also noted that over the last couple of months the Committee has been able to develop relationships with DOE program managers, which has been helpful in carrying out its charge.

Tim Takaro, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) and Bruce Killand, Battelle Pacific NW Lab (Labor/Work Force Seat) presented the Committee's Hanford Worker Health and Safety Progress Report (*Attachment 5*). Dr. Paul Seligman, DOE-HQ Office of Environmental Safety and Health, Health Studies was connected by speaker telephone from Washington D.C.

T. Takaro explained that the Committee had received the data reflected in the Progress Report, and that he has reviewed it. He explained that there are some problems with the data. One example is that the table charting Lost/Restricted Workday Injuries/Illnesses by Facility does not help identify within each facility what job is harmful. Thus, that data needs to be improved. Also the data on malignant neoplasms is broad data. Overall, the Committee is having some problems in getting a clear handle on the real safety problems at Hanford from an analysis of the available data, and believes different data tracking needs to be established.

Dr. Seligman explained the activities at Hanford that his office is focussing on. The office, which has over 400 employees, establishes occupational health and safety policies nationwide. Its major roles are in conducting independent oversight, insuring that all serious accidents are investigated, overseeing DOE's compliance with federal laws, and providing technical assistance.

He set up a core team in late 1993 to address critical exposures that were occurring at high level tank waste farms. The primary effort is to identify and implement improvements in practices. It is a problem solving, hands on approach, which requires close cooperation and communication.

They need input on where the problems are. They focused on the opening of the tanks and the non-routine activities. Then, in the area of work planning they have established a team building exercise that encourages attention to safety.

In the area of exposure assessment, Dr. Seligman's office has embraced the Board's suggestion to link surveillance of exposure to radiation to specific individual medical data. They plan to begin to develop these programs through sub-contractors who work on the site. There is no easy data to assess this. They have spent over two years in developing software. They also will be awarding a series of grants to get schools to assist in developing model programs on how to best integrate exposure and medical data.

Question and Answers

T. Takaro clarified for Dr. Seligman that the Board has not yet accepted the recommendations, but that he appreciates the endorsement from Dr. Seligman.

In answer to questions, Dr. Seligman noted:

- They are looking to learn from other sites. Los Alamos has successfully linked exposure and medical effects, so they are working closely with them. T. Takaro noted that it takes time to get results from the implementation of a medical surveillance program here at Hanford. They are hoping that once the pilots are completed in 1995 those kind of linkages can be made, perhaps by 1996.

- The '96 budget, if sustained by Congress, will allow them to get back on track with the health and safety program.

Dr. Seligman agreed to get responses to some specific questions back to the Committee in the next few days.

Proposed Recommendations

Bruce Killand reviewed where the Committee plans to go from here in initiating a more formal dialogue with DOE. He then asked the Board to adopt the Committee's current recommendations. Dr. Seligman has already embraced the first recommendation, which is to establish comprehensive medical surveillance at Hanford which can link individual health status with specific exposures in order to prevent illness and injuries. The second recommendation simply reiterates relevant previously adopted values regarding protecting health and safety of workers, training everyone on site, informing of hazards and creating responsive mechanisms to allow workers to speak about safety concerns without fear of retribution, and to empower workers to participate in the improvement of the clean up efficiency. The third recommendation included two additional values that the Committee is asking the Board to adopt. One is to reflect that priority of worker health and safety is equal to meeting clean up goals, and expresses a zero tolerance level for worker safety being secondary to meeting clean up goals. The second, which represents the consolidation of a fair amount of effort and wordsmithing from the Committee, embraces the standard of As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) as the standard for risk of on the job harm.

Discussion:

The discussion reflected the following range of concerns with the language of the

recommendations:

- What is meant by specific exposures--to HIV, accidents? T. Takaro clarified that they were focusing on hazardous exposures, but because of the data gaps it is impossible to tell what those are.

- Not sure what was meant by the "paradigm shift from the attitudes regarding worker health and safety that were prevalent during the production era." T. Takaro clarified that the shift was from production to cleanup. Several Board members objected to the implication that production ever took priority over safety. Committee members commented that in the change from waste management to environmental restoration, the Committee had heard very clearly from their meeting with Tara O'Toole, that since no one can write comprehensive safety manuals on how to do environmental restoration, they may be trading off worker health and safety with getting the job done. The Committee does not think that is worth taking the risk.

- Concerned because detects an attempt to get safety levels at a target that is unrealistic for the rest of the world to support. Concerned by zero tolerance because it could be construed as not doing clean up at all since it has some risks.

- Recommendation 3(1) needs a little more meat to make it clear that we want collection of data which will somehow correlate a worker's exposure to their personal medical history of illness. "Medical surveillance at Hanford which can link individual health status" is unclear. B. Killand noted that Tara O'Toole has already heard this and is racing with it.

Chair Reeves recognized that many Board members were uncomfortable with the language. She referred it back to the Committee to check with individuals on revising it. Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) announced that the Committee is meeting next Friday and would appreciate language and criticisms. Paul Wilson also suggested that Board members could make comments directly to Tim and Bruce. Denny Condotta, TRIDEC (Local Business Seat) expressed that he is uncomfortable with the wording as well as the approach, which is negative and does not show that safety was always a high priority. He suggested that the Board write a letter which is complimentary on the safety practices and recognizes that there are changes and improvements which could be made. The tenor of the letter should recognize that this group stresses get on with it, but not to sacrifice safety in doing so. DOE is running into budget cuts which affect safety.

T. Takaro pointed out that in this report the Committee focussed on the problems and not on successes. B. Killand reported that the Committee is now starting the dialogue on what has happened since the Tiger team. Great things that have happened and will be reported to the Board.

M. Hermanson expressed concern as a current employee that the proposed advice lacks tangible things that the Board would like to see done. Terms like zero tolerance make it so injuries, cuts, are not reported. He feels that ALARA needs to be looked at and pointed out that WHC applies it now. Sonja Anderson, Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Seat) noted that workers use vacation time so time off does not go on their record as illness. She feels the whole system is so confounded that it does not relay what is really happening. Get on with it; meet your milestones; cut budget; but don't do it by overlooking safety.

AGENDA ITEM 3: TANK SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE (C-106)

Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Labor/Work Force Seat) reported that the draft report in the Board packet on C106 is still under going revisions and is not ready for Board action. The draft that went out got more attention from DOE and WHC and is beginning a good discussion. They are meeting over lunch and again Feb 10 to develop it further. The Committee expects to bring it back at the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Knight spoke and stated that he agrees with Sonja Anderson about workers using vacation time for sick days. He also said he knows many people in the area who have gotten cancer but are no longer smoking. He believes 99% of people have 0 exposure. In terms of worker health and safety, he explained that last year's accident rate was half of the national average so he does not know if there is a real health problem. He also explained that there is going to be traffic so driver education should be looked into. He noted that he felt exposure to toxic substances is a valid concern but questions where the line is drawn in determining what is toxic. He urged the Board to be careful when balancing risks and benefits and what is and what is not worthwhile to do.

Sally Sanders presented public comment. She also referred to Sonja Anderson's comments, saying she was worker at Hanford for only 3 years and would not go back. She is concerned that there is still exposure out there. She has a niece out there who said dosimeters are not being used. She has a real concern for the workers out there. S. Sanders recently requested her medical records on her exposure and found it had been 3850 rads. She has a sister who died of thyroid cancer and a brother who had his thyroid removed. They were born and raised in the Yakama valley in the Tri-Cities area. She noted that when she was a worker, she and her co-workers were all safety trained, oriented, watched films, and always tested on their exposure. They were told that when they heard beeps, it was okay because that is normal amount. She has 90 pages of records on her exposure for just 3 years. Her father worked out there in the 60's and was sent home without clothes and boots, because of his exposure. She requested his records and was told there were none.

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Reeves introduced Linda Lingle, from DOE Headquarters. L. Lingle acknowledged that she reports to Cindy Kelley informally on the Board activities and that there is no formal reporting. She stays in touch with Jon Yerxa, the DOE-RL liaison to the Board, at least weekly, almost daily.

Announcements were made regarding committee meetings taking place in the evening and the next morning. Board members were reminded that the videos required for badging would be shown during the lunch break. The meeting was recessed for lunch.

AGENDA ITEM 5: OFFSITE WASTE ACCEPTANCE

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

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Seat) and Walt Blair, Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/Work Force Seat) presented the report and recommendations on Offsite Waste Acceptance at Hanford on behalf of the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee. They briefly reviewed the information presented at last month's meeting. The Federal Facility Compliance Act (FFCA) requires DOE to develop plans for the treatment of mixed waste (waste containing both hazardous and radioactive waste) generated by the US nuclear weapons program at 49 Energy sites in 22 states. In the draft site treatment plans issued in August, 1994, DOE proposed sending waste to Hanford from 16 other sites. The concerns identified by the Committee were:

1. Process was well underway before we were informed. It is being coordinated at the national level.
2. Concerned about additional waste coming to Hanford, and with limitations in the clean up budget, will Hanford have to bear the cost.

Last month when the Committee's recommendations were submitted G. Pollet had an additional page of comments. The Committee members working on this issue had a conference call with G. Pollet, made some modifications, spoke with G. Pollet again and have attempted to incorporate his comments. P. Brown reviewed the recommendations and noted the changes that had been incorporated in the new introduction and in the underlined items in paragraph #6 (*Attachment 6*). P. Brown explained that DOE will make a final decision on its treatment plans in March. W. Blair noted that the Committee has worked with the DOE and Ecology on this. Agency people were also available at the Board meeting to answer questions.

G. Pollet shared the four areas that were of concern to him:

1. Other wastes besides mixed waste are being proposed for shipment to Hanford. He feels this is an opportunity to also pay attention to them. He feels Hanford is like the bulls eye on the target with a variety of darts being thrown. All the darts need to be addressed.
2. Concern that incineration is being proposed here at Hanford.
3. Concern about the permits for waste and continued receipt of wastes that is currently going on.
4. Waste acceptance should not be occurring without compliance with Washington state laws.

The Committee responded that spent fuel and plutonium were not classified as mixed wastes, so they are not covered by the FFCA, and the Committee did not deal with them. Dan Silver and Rudy Garcia (DOE Program Manager) clarified that there are no plans for funding an incinerator on the Hanford site. That came out of a 1992 baseline, when for a short time one had been considered. People should not get confused about thermal treatment. It is not incineration. Other low level wastes have been coming to Hanford for the last 20 years.

Two primary concerns emerged from the discussion, leading to amendments to the proposed advice being developed overnight and brought back for Board adoption on Friday. One was in regard to financial impacts, particularly of emergency preparedness required to deal with the potential of accidents during transport. This was dealt with by amending paragraph nine to

include the concept that emergency preparedness will require financial support from DOE for state, tribal and local involvement, and timely notice to transportation agencies.

The second concern that emerged was that the state's only leverage over shipment of wastes to Hanford is in the requirement for a site wide permit for accepting mixed waste. There was an interest in urging the state to take advantage of this leverage to deal with other materials that might be shipped to Hanford. After evaluating whether the state could legally hold up a mixed waste permit to deal with other waste issues, the Board decided to adopt a provision that requests the State of Washington to "explore options to control other materials (including low level waste, plutonium or transuranic (TRU) contaminated waste) intended for transport by DOE to Hanford for storage, treatment and/or disposition."

The advice was adopted as amended (*Attachment 7*), and a press release was issued on this topic. (*Attachment 8*).

AGENDA ITEM 6: RECOMMENDATION REGARDING NATIONAL SSAB DISCUSSION OF CROSS CUTTING ISSUES

Discussions about the Federal Facilities Compliance Act focussed the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee's attention on the fact that there are issues being addressed throughout the complex that may have an impact on the Hanford site. Therefore, the Committee proposed that the HAB formally adopt the following advice for DOE:

The Department of Energy should establish a mechanism (such as conference calls, video conferences, or meetings) for members of Site Advisory Boards across the complex to discuss cross-cutting issues.

The recommended advice was adopted without change.

AGENDA ITEM 7: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR SECRETARY O'LEARY'S ACTION ON PLUTONIUM

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

T. Takaro presented a draft of a letter he and other members of the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee had informally proposed at last month's meeting. It was to commend Secretary O'Leary on her decision in a memorandum dated December 20, 1994 (*Attachment 9*) to "prohibit the use of plutonium -239 and weapons usable highly enriched uranium separated and/or stabilized during the phaseout, shutdown and cleanout of weapons complex facilities for nuclear explosive purposes." D. Belsey explained that one purpose of the letter was to call attention to the decision, which has not been clear, and to recognize that this helps get on with the clean up and make better use of the dollars because the plutonium does not need to be made retrievable for weapons use.

Some Board members felt the letter was unnecessary as the action was complete, and perhaps went too far in giving opinions of the Board. There was no initial consensus to send the letter. However, those opposed worked with those proposing the letter to simplify the language and it

was approved in its changed form on Friday (*Attachment 10*). T. Takaro also announced that he and Walt Blair are the Leads for the Health Safety and Waste Management Committee on plutonium disposition, and invited Board members to contact them with ideas.

AGENDA ITEM 8: FACILITIES TRANSITION CHANGE PACKAGE

Tom Tebb, Ecology, substituted in giving the presentation for Roger Stanley who was ill. Paul Krupin, DOE also responded. Copies of the Change Package had been mailed to the Board members. Some copies were available at the meeting. They reviewed the negotiation objectives, scope of the negotiations, the proposed Hanford site decommissioning process, regulatory streamlining, each of the facilities scheduled for transition, other issues addressed in the negotiations and the key policy issues associated with transition negotiations. The overheads used are in *Attachment 11*. The 45 day public comment period begins February 13, 1995. Public meetings will be held on the draft agreement in The Dalles, OR on February 21, in Seattle, WA on March 2 and in Pasco, WA on March 9. The public comment period ends on March 30, 1995; projected final signature is June, 1995. In response to questions, it was noted that the Environmental Assessments on Spent Fuel and PUREX will be out on February 10.

The Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee has taken on tracking facilities transition, although it has not really been involved in following the renegotiations. The Committee requested instruction from the Board as to whether it should develop any recommended comments on the renegotiated package from the Board.

G. Pollet raised the issue of the Board's Consensus Advice #8, which raised a question about the large investment required for transitioning FFTF. The Board had requested further information on the payback documentation for FFTF and has not yet received it. No response to this issue was included in the DOE response received today. Paul Krupin responded that most of the negotiations on the FFTF were completed in June and July before the Board's advice was issued. They now have a level 3 cost analysis which shows a payback period of something like 15 years. The shutdown plan now coming out will show costs in more detail. The Chair reiterated the Board's request for more detail on the payback analysis for FFTF before this goes out for public comment.

It was suggested and agreed that the Board's comments should be inserted into the public comment record at each of the public hearings. Chair Marilyn Reeves appointed the following Board members to represent the HAB at the public hearings: Dick Belsey at The Dalles, Patty Burnett at Pasco, and herself at Seattle. She is interested in having the Board participate in more of these hearings from a public involvement standpoint to establish a presence for the HAB as well as to give substantive input.

AGENDA ITEM 9: INTERNAL BOARD BUSINESS ITEMS

New Travel Reimbursement Procedures

Jon Yerxa, DOE-RL, explained that now that the Board members and alternates are officially appointed by DOE, they qualify for DOE travel rates. To do this, travel arrangements must be done by DOE. He introduced Lorette Beits who explained the process for getting travel

authorization and reimbursement. She distributed a handbook, went through the procedures, addressed questions and called attention to her number, which is listed in the handbook to call with any further questions. **All expense reports under the current system (for this and any previous meetings) are due to Westinghouse procurement for reimbursement by March 17, 1995. After that date all Board purchase orders will be closed out, and no further reimbursements will be made.** The new system requires DOE to purchase tickets for travel, so Board members will no longer have to advance the travel money themselves.

Board Workplan

Chair Reeves called attention to the revised workplan that was in the packet and reviewed the process by which it had been developed over the last several months. This plan contains all changes submitted by Committee Chairs. She asked if there were any additions or changes to the workplan. Hearing none, the workplan was adopted.

Revised Meeting Schedule

Chair Reeves called attention to the proposed revised meeting schedule in the packet. It had been changed to schedule the one day meetings in the Tri-Cities so as to make agency personnel more available for the committee meetings held on the second day. It had also added a meeting in Spokane, and proposed that one day of the April meeting be conducted on site as a part of a tour. She requested that Committee Chairs begin developing plans as to what business could be conducted as part of the tour, and to work with the facilitators in planning that, as it will take considerable preparation. It was noted also that provisions must be made to make it a public meeting.

Some discussion followed on meeting locations. It was ultimately decided that the Spokane meeting should take away from one meeting in Seattle, rather than reduce the number of meetings in the Tri-Cities. Therefore, there will be 8 meetings per year in the Tri-Cities, 2 in Portland, 1 in Seattle and 1 in Spokane. The Spokane meeting was scheduled for August.

Chair Selection Committee Report

Dick Belsey reported on behalf of the Committee. He reminded members that a revised report had been faxed to them last week; additional copies are available today. (*Attachment 12*) This report reflects the Committee's revised recommendation that the Board select one or two Honorary Chairs (external) who would be ex-officio members of the Board, and select a working Chair and Vice Chair (internal), rather than the original proposal of a paid external Chair and two working vice-chairs.

After some discussion to understand the concept of an honorary chair, the Board came to a consensus on not needing an external, person of status to serve as a chair. There was a unanimous agreement to recommend to DOE that it appoint Marilyn Reeves as Chair of the Hanford Advisory Board. The Board then unanimously selected Patty Burnett to serve as vice-chair. Ron Izatt immediately made the official appointment of Marilyn Reeves as Chair of the Hanford Advisory Board on behalf of DOE.

The Board adopted the proposed changes to its Charter and Operating Ground rules as proposed in the Committee's recommendations one and two as they related to the Chair and Vice-Chair in

order to clarify the language. At the Committee's suggestion, the Board also agreed that the "Qualifying Attributes" and the Selection Criteria for Chair and Vice Chair be preserved to guide the Board in any future selections it may need to make.

The Board's Budget

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

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch/Hanford Action (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) presented the Budget Report (*Attachment 13*) on behalf of the Budget Committee Chair, Gerald Sorensen who had to leave the meeting today due to an unavoidable conflict. This budget incorporates the suggestions and direction of the Board at the last two meetings to preserve the current level of facilitation services for the remainder of this fiscal year and to delete some of the miscellaneous costs. It proposes a spending plan for the balance of the funds available from the '94 and '95 fiscal years.

Jim Hansen, Mayor of Richland, City of Richland (Local Government Seat) referred to an article in the Tri-City Herald which had been distributed. (*Attachment 14*) This article was based on a draft letter that the Hanford Communities (an organization of the local governments in the area) had considered sending to the HAB, asking it to reduce its own expenditures and limit its budget. Several of the member governments had decided not to endorse the letter. Therefore, the City of Richland will be considering a letter which Mayor Hansen read in draft and later submitted (*Attachment 15*) asking the Board to reduce its operating budget for fiscal year '96 to \$250,000.

There was considerable discussion about the elements of the Board's budget, how important the facilitation services, which represent the largest chunk of the budget, are to the Board, and how the Board is looking at various cost savings, including the decision today to have an unpaid chair. Chair Reeves requested that Board members discuss the budget among themselves, think about it and come back tomorrow prepared to act on it.

On Friday, the Budget discussion resumed with a quick report from Gerald Sorensen, Battelle Pacific NW Lab (Labor/Work Force Seat) and Chair of the Budget Committee. He apologized for not being available when this item came up on Thursday and thanked Paige Knight for filling in for him. He reviewed the proposed 1995 HAB budget of \$1,026,30 stating that it represents a total of the 95 budget plus what was left over from 1994, and attempts to incorporate the changes recommended by the Board in January, specifically not to cut facilitation.

Several members again commented on the proposed budget. Chair Marilyn Reeves acknowledged that she had misunderstood Jim Hansen's draft letter yesterday. She now understood it to be a proposal for limiting the Board's budget for FY '96, so that it would certainly be referred to the budget committee. Jim Hansen stated that since DOE is undergoing major budget cuts in this fiscal year, the HAB should do likewise. He recommended that the HAB budget be cut in several areas, including elimination of technical consultants, compensation for members, hired meeting rooms and travel for alternates, and also recommended that facilitation time be cut by one-third. P. Knight agreed with the objective of trimming HAB costs but questioned whether meeting in government facilities would save money, because of added costs of setup and transportation. G. Rogers agreed with the need for facilitation but said the

facilitators should help the HAB confine its focus to major issues, and also noted that the HAB should not hire technical consultants without checking to see if its needs can be met by existing reports or consultants.

Denny Condotta proposed that the budget be approved on an interim basis, to be reviewed in April for possible savings for the second half of the fiscal year. Jim Hansen said he would support the proposal only if all possible savings are considered. Patty Burnett, Benton Franklin Regional Governmental Council (Local Government Seat) suggested that the Committee obtain a breakdown of facilitation time used by each committee. With those suggestions, the proposed Hanford Advisory Board FY-95 Budget was adopted by consensus.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1995

The resumed meeting was called to order by the Chair, Marilyn Reeves. Before launching into the day's agenda, she asked if revisions had been completed on two items from Thursday's agenda; namely, (1) Advice on Offsite Waste Acceptance; and (2) letter of support for Secretary's action on plutonium. The answer on both was yes, so the Chair obtained the Board's consent to start drafting a Board press release on the two issues. She also joined with the Board in wishing Charles Kilbury, Pasco City Council, a happy birthday, noting that his birthday was on Thursday.

AGENDA ITEM 10: RISK ASSESSMENT

Facilitator Naseem Rakha introduced the topic, stating that since it is controversial, the ER Committee will be presenting a series of informational programs on it before presenting any recommendations for Advice.

Dr. Carol Henry, a special consultant to Assistant Secretary Thomas Grumbly, spoke first, stating that she had recently been hired to give direction to DOE's efforts to deal systematically with risk assessment. (Dr. Henry used overheads in her presentation, copies of which were distributed to the Board (*Attachment 16*)).

Dr. Henry first outlined the enormous cleanup challenge that DOE faces, with 3700 contaminated sites in 34 states and territories. She then reviewed the major parts of the EM program, indicating budget percentages. By way of history, she noted that until the 1980s, the DOE was almost exclusively self-regulating, but since then it has come under many regulations (listed in the overheads). Its principal environmental quality objective is to eliminate the risks posed by its past activities, and it believes that credible risk assessment and management are keys to success in that endeavor.

Dr. Henry reviewed the basic steps in risk assessment—hazard identification, dose-response assessment and exposure assessment. She also candidly listed some problems DOE has had in applying those steps, including (1) the former insulation of each site from others for security reasons; and (2) lack of public involvement. To deal with those problems, the DOE asked the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to determine if a risk-based approach to cleanup is feasible and desirable, and in a January 1994 report the NAS answered "yes." In addition, PL 103-126,

enacted October 28, 1983, directs DOE to report to Congress by June 30, 1995 on the use of risk assessment in establishing cleanup priorities. Following up on the NAS report, an interagency federal committee developed a set of "Risk Principles," including principles for risk assessment, management and communication, as well as for priority setting using risk analysis. DOE modified the principles to meet its specific needs and is the first federal agency to adopt them. DOE has assigned 10-12 senior EM managers to the Office of Integrated Risk Management (Dr. Henry's office) through March 1995 to evaluate compliance agreements (such as the Tri-Party Agreement at Hanford) in light of the adopted principles and to prepare the required report to Congress.

In questions following Dr. Henry's presentation, Gerry Pollet asked why the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) was not itself a satisfactory negotiated resolution of risks and priorities. Dr. Henry responded that Congress has mandated that DOE go through the process she outlined, but it is not her intention to undermine the TPA. Dick Belsey asked how, after all the abstract analysis that goes into risk assessment, DOE plans to validate that its conclusions conform to the real world. Dr. Henry responded that the "iterative process" called for by NAS should accomplish that objective. Carol Rushin, EPA, noted the need to separate risk assessment from decisions on risk management.

Ralph Patt, State of Oregon, spoke next providing a critique of CERE (the Tulane/Xavier Consortium for Environmental Risk Evaluation), which was hired by DOE to assist in preparing its June 1995 report to Congress. Patt was quite critical of CERE's efforts at public involvement, noting for example that in compiling its list of documents to review about Hanford, CERE contacted only Westinghouse, USDOE and PNL and did not talk to other contractors, the regulators, the tribes, or anyone on the HAB. CERE will issue a draft report in March, providing only a week for public review, and will then submit its recommendations to DOE for forwarding to Congress, even though the data behind its report will not be available until later in the year.

Several HAB members raised questions about the deficiencies described by Patt and how they would be corrected. Dr. Henry assured the Board that her Risk Team would attempt to correct them. Gerry Pollet finally proposed that the ER Committee prepare a written critique incorporating Patt's comments and present it to the HAB in the form of Advice to be transmitted to DOE. That proposal was adopted by consensus.

Lynn Alban and Doug Wells of the Washington Department of Health then made presentations illustrating how risk assessment is done and addressing some of the issues that arise. (Overheads were used, and copies were distributed at the meeting. *Attachment 17*). Ms. Alban gave a specific example of risk assessment, evaluating the risk of contracting cancer on D Island from radioactive "specks" released from Hanford reactors. Mr. Wells then discussed some of the typical questions raised about risk assessment, as follows:

- Is Risk Assessment (RA) rigorous science? Answer: It uses pure science, but also makes many assumptions based on professional judgment.

- Is RA used to excuse pollution? Answer: No, because the standard used is As Low as Reasonably Achievable (ALARA).

●Does RA address special populations or cultural values? Answer: If information is available on special populations (e.g., Native American uses), it is used. However, since cultural values are not quantifiable, they are not included in the assessment, but considered separately.

●Is RA used to justify random murder? Answer: Not by the Washington Department of Health with respect to cancer risks.

Several HAB members asked questions of Mr. Wells about such issues as factoring in multiple isotopes, considering cumulative effects, varying assumptions based on age, etc. John Burnham, TRIDEC (Local Business Seat), commented that there is often a big discrepancy between real and perceived risks, with perceived risks being much higher, but he believes risk assessment should be implemented as a way of making the process more objective.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Max Power announced that Dru Butler of the Washington Department of Ecology had resigned from Ecology to take a job in private industry. She was sorry not to be able to be present today, but will visit the HAB in the future. Max introduced Michael Wilson as Dru's successor.

Ron Izatt, DOE-RL, announced that Jim Bauer has been promoted to a different position and will therefore no longer be able to serve as Ron's alternate on the HAB. Ron introduced Linda McClain as his new alternate.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Robert Schenter and Ann Worcester, each representing the Nuclear Medicine Research Working Group, spoke in favor of using radioactive isotopes at Hanford to treat cancer. Gai Oglesbee, representing herself, described her own experience with what she considered faulty risk analysis at Hanford and questioned the independence of such analysis.

The Board then broke for lunch.

AGENDA ITEM 11: RECOMMENDATION RE PURSUING EXPLORATION OF RADIOISOTOPE PRODUCTION (follow up from January meeting)

Patty Burnett, Benton Franklin Regional Council, reported that the Cultural and Socioeconomic Impacts Committee had met with all people who had expressed concerns about the wording proposed in January and made changes to their satisfaction. The revised wording was adopted by consensus as follows:

The HAB endorses the pursuit of possible economic opportunity such as using Hanford's radioisotopes for beneficial medical purposes. Economic opportunities shall not divert cleanup efforts and must comply with state and federal laws. DOE should encourage and cooperate with the examination and development of such private ventures.

Patty also noted that DOE had indicated that the radioisotope project needs a marketing plan, and she thanked the City of Richland for dedicating some of its economic transition funds for that purpose. She also thanked Madeleine Brown Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/Work Force Seat) for her help on the issue paper.

AGENDA ITEM 12: PROPOSED APPROACH TO 100 AREAS REMEDIATION

Linda McClain, DOE-RL, introduced this topic, stating that the Tri-Party Agencies have been negotiating since August 1994 about how best to carry out the Board's Advice on ER, but have not yet come to resolution. The expedited response of building a barrier wall with sheet piles did not work, so the project has stopped while other alternatives are considered, including (1) building in another manner; or (2) not building at all. Tim Takaro asked what EPA thinks, and Dennis Faulk replied that EPA still believes an action is needed because of the large amounts of strontium 90 in the groundwater. Denny Condotta asked when a recommendation would be ready, and Greg Eitem, Bechtel, indicated the end of this month (i.e., by the next HAB meeting).

Linda also spoke to the rumor that DOE might refuse to sign the TPA. She said they want to sign it and are fairly certain they can meet its milestones for 95 and 96, but need to study 97 further before signing.

AGENDA ITEM 13: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat) is taking over for Marilyn Reeves as Chair of the Committee, and gave the following report: (1) The Committee wants to evaluate the public involvement programs of the agencies and contractors and has asked for detailed breakdowns of those expenses but has not yet received them. (2) There is a contract between DOE-RL, Tri-Parties and Triangle Associates to develop a strategy for public involvement, and the Committee has been dialoguing with Triangle on the subject. (3) The Committee plans to review the Clinton Administration's Environmental Justice initiative and report to the HAB in April.

FINAL MATTERS

The Chair presented a draft press release prepared by Bill Sanderson, WHC, in cooperation with a small group who had met over lunch. She suggested that sentences be added regarding the plutonium letter and the use of radioisotopes for cancer. With those changes, the Board agreed by consensus to authorize interested parties to finalize and transmit the release.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

This summary is an accurate and complete summary of the matters discussed and conclusions reached at the Hanford Advisory Board meeting held on February 2-3, 1995 in Pasco, Washington.

Certified by: _____
Marilyn B. Reeves, Chair

Dated: _____

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- | Number | Item |
|--------|--|
| 1. | February Board Meeting Attendance List |
| 2. | Response to HAB Consensus Advice #8 |
| 3. | Copies of Visuals from John Wagoner's presentation on budget issues |
| 4. | Copies of Visuals titled Environmental Management, FY 1996
Congressional Request, from Gerry Pollet's presentation on budget issues |
| 5. | Copies of Visuals from presentation on Worker Health and Safety |
| 6. | Proposed Advice on Off-site Mixed Waste Acceptance |
| 7. | HAB Consensus Advice #13, Off-site Mixed Waste Acceptance |
| 8. | Press Release from the Board dated February 3, 1995 |
| 9. | Draft Letter to Secretary O'Leary on Plutonium-239 use, dated February 2, 1995 |
| 10. | Adopted Letter to Secretary O'Leary on Plutonium-239 use, dated February 3, 1995 |
| 11. | Copies of Visuals titled Facility Transition Negotiations Tentative Agreement |
| 12. | Report on recommendations from the Ad Hoc Chair Selection Committee, dated January 22, 1995 |
| 13. | Hanford Advisory Board Budget Proposal for FY '95, dated January 31, 1995 |
| 14. | News Article from the Tri-City Herald titled Group pushes for lean Hanford board, dated February 2, 1995 |
| 15. | Letter from Jim Hansen regarding Limiting Annual HAB Expenditures to 250,000.00, dated February 7, 1995 |
| 16. | Copies of Visuals presented by Carol Henry and titled Risk-Based Decision-Making in DOE's Environmental Management Program |
| 17. | Copies of Visuals from Lynn Alban and Doug Wells' (Department of Health) presentation on Risk Assessment |

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.