0043326

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Revised Meeting Summary
November 2-3, 1995
Richland, Washington

MAR 1996
RECEIVED
EDMC

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Summary of the Board's Meeting	
Items of discussion	
Announcements	1
Corrections to the Meeting Summary	2
Congressional Budget Status	3
Dialogue on Agency Response to Board's Advice on Draft Request for a Management and Integration Contractor for the Hanford Site	4
Dialogue with Agency on Board's Advice on TWRS Privatization	7
Waste Management PEIS	11
Plutonium Disposition Workshop Report	14
Proposed Advice on Holding FMEF until Decision is Made on Need to Produce MOX Fuel	15
HAB Administrative Matters	16
Strategic Planning	17
Presentation by Valeriy Konyshkin and Boris Nekrasov, Members of the Ecological Initiative, Tomsk, Russia (Siberia)	19
Land Use Planning Efforts	21
Public Involvement	23
Next Meeting Agenda Items and Committee Updates	26
Attachments List	28

Note: Attachments are numbered according to the order in which they are mentioned in the summary. The attachments that were distributed at or before the Hanford Advisory Board meeting are not routinely distributed with this summary. If you need a copy of an attachment, please request it from Sarah Cloud at Confluence Northwest (503)243-2663 or Rosemary Guse at Westinghouse Hanford (509)376-8908.

DRAFT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Board is Updated on Congressional Budget Status

Alice Murphy, DOE, explained the DOE budget has a mark from the Congressional Conference and has passed both the House and Senate. The budget from Congress reflects a 9% reduction in Environmental Management's budget as a whole. Although it is unclear what Richland's share of the cuts will be, Richland program managers were asked to assume a 9% reduction and reported they were able to make the budget cuts in areas beside the TPA. The Board shared its concerns regarding a budget cut with Alice.

Board Dialogues with DOE on DOE's Response to Board Advice on the Draft Request for Proposals for a Management and Integration Contractor for the Hanford Site

Susan Brechbill, DOE, reviewed the amendments made thus far to the draft RFP and then entered into a lengthy discussion with the Board. The Board dialogued with Susan on its various concerns and questions with the draft RFP. Susan listened to the concerns and clarified and responded when appropriate.

Board Dialogues with DOE on Board's Advice on TWRS Privatization

Bill Taylor, DOE, shared an overhead that delineated the status of DOE's response to the Board's consensus advice #32 into the following categories: Closure with Disagreement, Closure with Agreement and Areas still under Discussion. The purpose of the dialogue was to hear and understand DOE's response to the Board's advice, to hear whether DOE understood the Board's advice, what parts they accepted and what parts they rejected.

Board Learns Details of WMPEIS Public Hearing, Adopts Advice Regarding Inadequate Notice and Begins Board Comment on the WMPEIS

The Board viewed a video which was produced by Headquarters overviewing the Waste Management Programmatic EIS (WMPEIS). Details of the November 9 video teleconference were discussed. During the discussion, the Board raised the concern that adequate notice on the public hearing was not given and adopted consensus advice #34 reflecting that concern. The Board also decided to have the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee draft a statement of official Board comment on the WMPEIS and bring it to the Board at its December meeting.

Board Defers Adopting Advice on Holding FMEF

If a future decision is to fabricate mixed oxide fuel (MOX), one of the best places to do it is at the Fuels and Materials Examination Facility (FMEF). Thus, advice was drafted by the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee to keep the FMEF available until a decision is made on the process for disposal of surplus weapons plutonium. While considering the advice, the Board learned that DOE is looking to sell or lease the FMEF and has received substantial interest in the facility. The Board also learned of an option to sell or lease the building while saving a portion of it for future plutonium operations. Given this new input, Board members decided to

send the proposed advice back to the committee for further work on the issue.

Board Decides to Become Involved in DOE's Strategic Planning and Develops Ad Hoc Committee to Begin the Process

Ron Izatt, DOE, explained there is a new statute requiring a strategic plan to drive planning and prioritization decisions. The strategic planning starts to focus the multi year program plans. Ron invited the Board to work with DOE to concentrate on a process to develop a strategic plan that has buy in from all the stakeholders. The Board agreed that it should participate in some capacity with strategic planning. An ad hoc committee was created to work with the facilitators and agencies to develop a process for working with DOE on strategic planning. The committee will bring a proposed process to the December Board meeting.

Russian Guests Share Their Experience with Plutonium Disposition in Russia

Leaders from a Russian citizens group watch-dogging a major nuclear weapons plutonium processing plan in Russia explained that their Minister would like to use Tomsk-7 as a storage for all the plutonium around Russia. Tomsk-7 is a plutonium plant similar to the Hanford plutonium processing plant. The visitors hope Hanford and Tomsk can work together for common methods and solutions for a future of clean sites without nuclear waste storage that threatens the life and health of people.

Board is Briefed on DOE and Other Local Land Use Planning Efforts

Lloyd Piper presented the Board with an overview of the emerging integrated Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) strategy at Hanford. The CLUP will identify existing and planned future land uses with accompanying restrictions which will cover a specific time frame and be updated as needed. Phil Mees, a Benton County Senior Planner presented Benton County/City of Richland's planning process which is required under Washington's Growth Management Act. He pointed out some of the differences in the local planning process and DOE's process.

Board Steps Back and Looks at Public Involvement from a Broad Perspective

Each of the three agencies addressed the Board and discussed what they do in terms of public involvement. The purpose of this agenda item was to develop a common information base on what it is the agencies are trying to do, what they have tried, what works, what does not work and how the Board fits in.

Draft Meeting Summary
November 2-3, 1995
Richland, Washington

Thursday, November 2, 1995

The meeting was called to order by chair Merilyn Reeves. The meeting was open to the public. Four public comment periods were provided. Members present at the meeting are listed in *Attachment 1*. Seats not represented were: Franklin County (Local Government Seat), Grant County (Local Government Seat), Benton Franklin District Health (Local/Regional Public Health Seat), Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), Business-Agricultural Seat, and University of Washington (Public-At-Large Seat). Members of the public and others in attendance are listed in the sign in sheet included in *Attachment 1*.

Announcements

- Emmett Moore was introduced as a new alternate for Washington State University (Public-At-Large Seat).

- Tim Takaro, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat) announced that those interested in discussing the next steps of the Plutonium Roundtable meeting would be meeting in the Board's meeting room after the Board adjourns on Friday. The meeting time was later changed to meet over lunch on Friday in order to accommodate people who would need to leave the Board meeting right after it adjourned.

- A meeting was scheduled for Thursday evening over dinner for those who had volunteered to review a draft of the Community Relations Plan.

- The Dollars and Sense Committee meeting date was changed from November 17 to November 16 in the evening in the Tri-Cities.

- Madeleine Brown's e-mail address that was included in the November packet was incorrect. The correct address is Madeleine_C_Brown @rl.gov.

Chair's Overview and Goals for the Meeting

Chair Merilyn Reeves explained that she hoped at this meeting to have a real dialogue on two of the agenda items: the draft request for proposal (RFP) for a Management and Integration Contract for the Hanford site and the TWRS Privatization proposal. The purpose of the dialogues would be to hear and understand the agencies' response to the Board's advice on those two items. She recognized that having this type of dialogue is new for the Board and may feel a little awkward, but she hoped it would be productive. She reminded the Board that such a dialogue was not to put the agency representatives on the spot, but to hear whether they

understood the Board's advice, what parts they accepted and what parts they rejected.

Merilyn referred to Agenda Item 11, the Next Meeting Agenda Items and explained that before the Executive Committee was created there had been an agenda building committee consisting of the committee chairs. The Executive Committee is trying to develop a more inclusive and efficient way of creating an agenda and felt it would be helpful to spend some time on Friday afternoon to discuss future agenda items. She encouraged Board members to think about what they would like on next month's agenda.

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

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVE MEETING SUMMARY FROM OCTOBER MEETING

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

Mark Hermanson, Westinghouse Hanford Company (Labor/Workforce Seat), pointed out that the discussion on the draft request for proposal for a management and integration contract for the Hanford site failed to include the comment he made regarding an increasing number of accidents on the site. He worked with the facilitator to bring the specific language to be added to the section. The following language was accepted to be inserted on page 6 after the second paragraph:

> Mark Hermanson raised the question of whether it was true that HEHF data was showing that employee injuries have recently been on the rise. Dr. Ross Ronish, MD, from HEHF responded "yes, not only has there been a rise in injuries, but there is also a rise in personnel exposure incidents."
>
> Jim Watts noted that it seemed to coincide with the release of the M&I contract draft RFP, and he was aware of considerable stress among the employees.

The meeting summary was approved as corrected. Chair Reeves requested Board members to write in the insertion in their copy. Revised copies will not be distributed.

Mark also wondered why the specific name of a Board member was not always attributed to a comment. He pointed out that often the meeting summary refers to "A board member" and not the particular name. Facilitator Elaine Hallmark explained that often several Board members make similar comments which are grouped together without specific names. Specific names tend to be used if a strong statement or opinion was made. She recognized that the facilitation team is constantly trying to find the balance of accurately reflecting the meeting without getting bogged down with details of who said what. She encouraged the Board to offer feedback and comments to the facilitators.

Late Breaking Updates: Congressional Budget Status

Alice Murphy, DOE, introduced herself and explained she has replaced Nadine Highland who has retired as the chief financial officer. She also informed the Board that Ken Bracken has retired. Alice introduced Tony Lorenz who is the DOE Budget division director.

Alice explained that the DOE budget now has a mark from the Congressional Conference Committee and has passed both the House and the Senate. It has not yet gone to the President for signature. The budget from Congress reflects a 9% reduction in Environmental Management's budget as a whole. The mark from Congress is 6.1 billion.

Alice acknowledged that an article in the Tri-Cities newspaper had caused some confusion as to what the actual budget is. The paper had reported a mark at 6.7 billion but failed to explain that $700 million of obligated but uncosted costs from 1995 were included in that figure, which make the actual mark at 6.1 billion for '96 programs. Alice reiterated that the bottom line is a 9% reduction. At this time it is unclear what Richland's share of the cuts will be. The Conference report stated that cuts should be taken to the maximum extent possible by Headquarters. She informed the Board that RL program managers were asked to assume a 9% reduction and were asked how their programs and the TPA would be affected. The program managers reported they were able to make the budget cuts in other areas beside the TPA. DOE, thus feels confident they can go forward and keep the TPA intact with a 9% budget reduction.

With regards to the budget for the Board, Alice pointed out that 32 million was requested for the Office of public Accountability. The mark is at 12 million, which is a 63% reduction. Again it is not yet clear how that reduction will be allocated among the various functions, including Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) and Indian Tribes.

Ray Isaacson, Benton County (Local Government Seat), reported that he spoke with Representative Hastings. Representative Hastings had asked Assistant Secretary Tom Grumbly if he would be following the intent of Congress to make most of the budget reductions at Headquarters and depend more on the onsite field offices. Representative Hastings said Grumbly stated this is not his intent. Instead Grumbly's thinking is to make reductions at the field offices. Ray requested that information on the intent of the budget cuts should be made available to the Board. Ray also pointed out that he saw several job announcements at Headquarters in the realm of $90,000.00 and $98,000.00 a year which reflected that there is not a moratorium on hiring at Headquarters. Alice Murphy added it is her understanding that Tom Grumbly is trying to get Headquarters people to transfer to the field offices, to reduce the Headquarter budget.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), was concerned with what he sees as a lack of public accountability on the part of DOE. He pointed out that it appears to be there in show but not in money. He has made the suggestion several times that advisory boards should be placed on incentive programs similar to those for contractors. Boards should get a percentage of the money they save the DOE. That incentive money could be used to

increase public involvement as well as to increase the Board's budget. He strongly recommended that Alice take this idea to Headquarters and pointed out that he discussed the idea with Cyndy Kelly approximately five months ago and that she liked the idea. Alice said she would follow up.

Chair Merilyn Reeves noted that while the Board cannot lobby Congress for its budget, the interests represented by the Board can and do lobby separately. Merilyn wondered what is funded by the Office of Public Accountability. She recognized that the office does not solely include Site Specific Advisory Boards but that Indian grants, the Environmental Management Advisory Board and the State and Tribal Governments Working Group are also included. Norma Jean Germond, Oregon League of Women Voters (Public-At-Large Seat), wondered where CRESP's 30 million dollar allocation is funded. Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), explained that he has a list of all the public accountability categories that he can make available to the Board. Alice Murphy will check on these funding allocations. She later distributed excerpts from the Committee's Report *(Attachment 2)*.

AGENDA ITEM 2: DIALOGUE RE AGENCY RESPONSE TO BOARD'S ADVICE ON DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR A MANAGEMENT AND INTEGRATION CONTRACTOR FOR THE HANFORD SITE

Susan Brechbill, DOE, distributed DOE's response to Consensus Advice #33 which thanked the Board for its comments and discussion at the October Board meeting *(Attachment 3)*. Susan explained that the Board comments were received and will be given consideration along with all the other comments received by the Source Evaluation Board (SEB). She informed the Board that at this time it was not appropriate to discuss what is being done with its comments. To discuss the Board's comments now would give them preferential treatment. She also recognized that some Board members represent potential offerors and to discuss details of how comments are being handled at this point could give them a competitive edge. She did, however, assure the Board that the Board's comments are being considered and amendments to the request for proposal (RFP) should be expected.

Susan recognized that several amendments have already been made and were distributed in October *(Attachment 4)*. She then reviewed the amendments:

- Implementation of a site wide benefit plan:

An amendment has been made to the RFP which requires bidders to offer a defined contribution program which will assume assets and liabilities of existing plans - i.e. 401(k) plans - to employees of the prime contractor and major sub contractors.

- Ability of unions at the site to continue to represent their members:

The new prime and major sub-contractors must commit to bargaining in good faith with the

current collective bargaining agents.

- Health services contractor (currently the Hanford Environmental Health Foundation (HEHF) under direct contract with DOE, remaining independent of the contractors: As a result of concerns from the Board and the public, an amendment has been made which reflects that the HEHF contract will not be assigned to the M&I Contractor but will report directly to DOE.

These are the three major amendments made thus far. Other changes will come out with the final RFP in December and will not be announced earlier unless they are significant in nature.

Susan mentioned she had discussed the concerns of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) with Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Seat). She informed the Board that the OMB provided its comments on the draft and wanted it to go even further in contract reform. The OMB initially requested the draft RFP be substantially revised and that the SEB provide a second draft. In late October, Susan met with Tom Grumbly and the budget people of OMB specifically to discuss the OMB's concerns. At that meeting Susan was able to clarify that the draft RFP does indeed provide for much of what the OMB was asking for and clarified some of its misunderstandings with the draft RFP. As a result, the OMB is backing off on its request for a second draft. Overall, she felt the meeting was very productive.

The Board then entered into a lengthy dialogue with Susan.

Mark Hermanson referred to the Board's Consensus Advice #33 and specifically to the request that the rationale for moving from an Management and Operations (M&O) Contract to a Management and Integration (M&I) Contract be clearly articulated. He wondered what the basis for the new direction for an M&I contract is. In response, Susan referred to an article she wrote for the Tri-City Herald *(Attachment 5)* where she explained that the M&O concept reflected a partnership between the government and contractor with the emphasis on process and research when the results were not known. The government assumed all the risk of the results. Now, she explained, the clean up mission objectives are well known and the emphasis is on results and managing cost schedule. The change to an M&I contract has occurred because the DOE feels that the activities at the site today can be managed more like those in private industry, procured and managed using methods that foster more competition and use of the commercial practices. She stressed that an M&O contract is not appropriate when you have clear objectives such as there are today. Movement to an M&I contract is intended to get results based on those clear objectives, by rewarding the end results and having performance objectives.

Mark added that the clear objectives that the DOE wants to accomplish with an M&I contract must be clearly defined. If DOE starts down the path it must continue. It is stopping and changing direction which costs money. Susan agreed and explained that before a contract is signed clear objectives will be defined.

Charles Kilbury stated that he still fees the M&I contract will eliminate employees. Susan said that if the budget remains constant the workforce will not be reduced. It is the budget, not the RFP that will affect employees.

Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Labor/Workforce Seat), explained that he discussed the overhead costs of an M&I contract with people at the Rocky Flats Site. As he understands it, the overhead costs of Rocky Flats have doubled since they went to an M&I contract. Susan explained that she and members of the SEB have visited both the Rocky Flats and Idaho sites and talked specifically with them about overhead. She recognized Jim's and other people's concerns with overhead costs and has spoken with John Wagoner about this. She explained an M&I contractor does not necessarily raise overhead. The SEB is committed to keeping the costs of the overhead down and that intent will be reflected in the final language of the RFP.

In response to questions as to the timeline on the final RFP, Susan explained that they are basically still on the same track with a final RFP expected to be issued in December and the contract awarded in June, 1996.

Ray Isaacson wondered whether the M&I contract is similar to the MAC TECH contract in which they oversee the work, but subcontract the actual work. He also reiterated concern over its impacts on the community and the workforce.

Susan suggested that it may be helpful to think of the M&I contract as a big construction contract with a general contractor who brings in sub-contractors like plumbers and electricians. The job of the general is to make sure that the job is done within budget and correctly. She reiterated that the function of the M&I contract is not to look at cutting the number of employees. She is committed to take Ray's request for projections of the workforce at Hanford for the next five year period back to the appropriate people to get him the information.

In response to a question regarding what happens to top management when a general contractor is brought in, Susan responded that there is no requirement that top managers be hired although they may be hired. DOE believes that selected prime and major contractors must be able to select the management personnel at all levels above the first - supervisor, which they believe can best carry out their approach to conducting the work. She anticipated some managers would be kept in place.

Greg deBruler commented that he does not feel an M&I process will do much in terms of bringing in new people who can do the job, but is just a reshuffling of the deck giving different labels to the same players. He wondered where the change is. Susan pointed out that it will not be business as usual as the DOE is asking for innovative approaches. They are not looking for teams - just for the prime. She recognized that there will be some old players but there will also be new blood.

Greg wondered what chance someone who is not part of the old system would have of getting this contract. Susan referred the Board to section M of the RFP. The SEB recognized there would be incumbents so they tried to write evaluation criteria that would level the playing field. One example is when the RFP mentions experience, it does not ask for experience at the site but for management experience. There is a relative weighing system with more points given on past experience in managing projects and not past experience solely with DOE. She encouraged Board members to get comments to her if the RFP has missed the mark.

Dan Silver, Ecology, wondered what the affect Congress's action around limiting funding for economic transition will have on those parts of the M&I contract. Susan said they have not looked at the specific impact on this contract. She explained that the SEB is committed to making the M&I contract a vehicle for economic transition and this has been included in the RFP in three ways:

1. DOE funds
2. Equipment - can be used in private endeavors as well as on the government work
3. Commitment to use private contractors

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), expressed concern that the M&I contract is a way to escape environmental accountability -a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Jerry Peltier, Benton Franklin Regional Governmental Council (Local Government Seat), was concerned that DOE and the prime contractor will try to manage the same contract. Susan pointed out that section L of the RFP discussed DOE's responsibilities and role. She recognized that dual managing is a concern of DOE's. Clear objectives and end states are needed to ensure that micro managing does not occur. She pointed out that DOE managers will be trained on their new roles.

Jim Watts raised the concern that a multi-layer of continually changing sub-contractors will be created and thus more time will be needed to train them every time they change. Susan clarified that not all sub contractors will be changed and that it is a priority for the DOE to have site wide safety plans, standards and training. Jim said the Unions had initially supported the concept of an M&I contract, but had recognized the direction was wrong after the experiences at Rocky Flats and INEL and got off it. DOE will not give it up.

The Board thanked Susan Brechbill for coming and participating in a productive dialogue with them.

AGENDA ITEM 3: DIALOGUE WITH AGENCY ON BOARD'S ADVICE ON TWRS PRIVATIZATION

Elaine Hallmark reminded the Board that it has issued three pieces of consensus advice regarding the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) Privatization: consensus advice #18, 24, and 32.

She explained that DOE is in the process of drafting a response to #32. The Executive Committee thought it would be helpful for DOE to talk with the Board about their responses before issuing a final response. Elaine reminded the Board that the agencies have committed to respond to all Board advice but have not committed to fully accept each piece of Board advice. The purpose of this dialogue is to find out from DOE what parts of the Board's TWRS advice they accept and agree with and what parts they do not. It is not to try one more time to convince DOE to do what the Board would prefer.

Bill Taylor, DOE, shared an overhead that delineated the status of DOE's response to the Board's consensus advice #32 into the following categories: Closure with Disagreement, Closure with Agreement and areas still under Discussion *(Attachment 6)*. Bill began with the Closure with Disagreement with HAB advice:

◆ Request for Risk Analysis Paper: Bill explained the paper was an internal working document with hypothetical situations and was never intended as a public document. DOE's general counsel reviewed it and evaluated that it should not be released in its current form.

◆ Evaluate Promising Privatization Alternatives: DOE has evaluated several alternatives. This Board's advice appears to call for a Government Owned, Contractor Operated (GOCO) program which is not something DOE wants.

◆ Request for Source Evaluation Board Involvement: the Source Evaluation Board is not open to members of this Board, nor the public, due its procurement sensitivity and confidentiality.

Several Board members were frustrated at not being able to access the Risk Analysis Paper and pointed out they have little ability to analyze health and safety risks without the paper. Also, Tim Takaro explained that people are interested in the paper because they feel there is data in it on which programs are based, and they want to see that data. Mark Hermanson commented that he had high expectations when creating the advice that the Board would be able to see some data to help it form its thoughts on the RFP especially in terms of legal, technical and physical risks. Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon Seat) requested that the Board receive the models that DOE has used to determine it is financially able to go the privatization route.

In response to what is being used for the risk analysis, Bill referred back to the Risk Analysis Report, officially titled, the "Radiological and Nuclear Safety Plan and the Candid Evaluation of Risks of TWRS and the Approach Being Pursued by DOE." It looks at all kinds of risks including health and safety, financial and institutional.

Merilyn commented that her interpretation of the packet of material from the Secretary that

accompanied the decision to go with privatization led her to believe that privatization was a high risk endeavor. Bill agreed it is high risk.

Bill then reviewed the areas where the DOE feels there is closure with agreement with HAB advice:

◆ Established an Adequate Fallback Position: Bill noted that the advice was to maintain an adequate technical force to fallback on should privatization fail. With that in mind they have been allocated $10 million dollars for FY 96 and will receive an additional $2.5 million from EM50. DOE concludes that with this level of support they have the people to proceed forward if privatization fails. DOE feel this is an adequate fallback position.

◆ Development of Waste Product Specification: 4 product specs have been developed and 4 envelope specs for the feed will be available when the RFP is released

◆ DOE Should Not Unilaterally Determine Failure: DOE is working with Ecology to identify specific criteria and points of decision-making at a particular point in time. DOE has to officially make the decision. Ecology must say its assessment of the risks, monitor closely and require DOE to address the problems identified.

◆ Concern with Meeting TPA Schedule: Bill explained that milestones have been modified and the dates are being negotiated for low level waste glass and vitrification; the main milestones of 2018 to empty the single shell tanks and 2020 to vitrify the single shell and double shell wastes are on track.

Much of Board discussion dealt with DOE unilaterally defining failure and how failure will be defined. It was pointed out that the Board's advice was to make Ecology an equal partner. Toby Michelena, Ecology, explained that the path Ecology is trying to take is to be able to make an independent assessment of the risks on a regular basis. If Ecology assesses that privatization is failing, and DOE still plans on going forward, DOE will have to explain why and how they intend to succeed. Toby also explained that during the procurement phase, Ecology is negotiating the ability to penalize DOE. DOE can accept the penalty and proceed forward but if it is apparent that privatization will fail, DOE will have to go the alternate path. Several Board members stressed they want Ecology to have the option to tell DOE that it is failing on the privatization path and must take an alternate path.

Concerns were raised that the contractor may not give Ecology all the data it needs in order to determine success or failure, that Ecology will not have sufficient resources to provide oversight, and that evaluation by Ecology is not the same as regulation. Ecology acknowledged it will be a push for them to have the resources to do this.

Items of the HAB advice still in the Discussion column are:

◆ HAB Doubts DOE's Ability to Reduce Costs via Privatization Approach: Bill explained that DOE has evaluated the finances and models and all point to significant cost reduction; it remains in the discussion column because DOE feels the Board will want to look at the models and DOE is still discussing whether and when that information can be released.

◆ Define Public Involvement Process: Still in discussion phase because DOE feels the public is involved right now in this dialogue yet the HAB feels it is not adequate. Bill also noted that there are different times in the process when it can be more open than others due to the procurement sensitivity of giving all potential bidders the same information at the same time.

◆ Concern with Two Pilot Plant/Two Larger Production Plant Approach: Still under discussion because DOE wants to convince the Board that 2 plants is the way to go.

Board discussion on the items in this column revolved around the two pilot plant approach and how the move to the production plant is made. Questions included:

◆ Q: When the RFP is awarded to build a pilot plant, will the contractor commit to building a full scale plant at that time? Then if both the pilot plant contractors fail, could the production plant go to an unproven vendor?

A: The two (proof of concept and production) procurements are separate. If the vendors fail during the proof of concept phase, the RFP will be extended to others. At that time, more technology may be available and others will have had experience using it.

◆ Q: Will the technology developed as part of the pilot project be publicly available?

A: In the privatization approach, DOE is buying just the service, not the technology, the design nor the building. As a result, he does not think the technology will be publicly available.

◆ Q: What is the next step for privatization and how is the TPA is affected?

◆ Q: Will there be a white paper issued during the public discussion after the RFP is out delineating how DOE arrived at its conclusions and why?

A: As part of systems engineering, papers have been created discussing the options and are available.

◆ Q: Were pieces of advice on privatization from various groups and reports such as the Corps of Engineers, Smith-Barney and the Defense Systems Acquisition College used in developing the Request for Proposal (RFP)?

A: Yes. The Smith-Barney report identified some problems and DOE is now working through the RFP to ensure those problems are worked out.

Toby Michelina pointed out that the draft RFP will be available on the Internet.

In response to whether the current budget situation will affect privatization, Bill explained the budget authorization for low level plants for Phase I is provided through the OMB and is insulated from reduction.

Ecology was asked to explain how the Board can help them in the privatization effort. Toby stressed that the Board is vital in making privatization work as a whole. Ecology will need help to maintain its ability to regulate. The Board should continue to press Ecology and DOE on whether to:

- ◆ Continue with privatization
- ◆ Assess the information
- ◆ Assess the viability of the program
- ◆ Keep Ecology looking at other parts of the program

In summary, Toby noted that without the support of the region, nothing will work and thus Board support is crucial.

AGENDA ITEM 5: WASTE MANAGEMENT PEIS

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

Pete Knollmeyer, DOE, explained that Headquarters has produced a video which overviews the Waste Management Programmatic EIS (WMPEIS) and explains what alternatives have been considered. The video, which is approximately seventeen minutes long, will run on cable television in the Tri-Cities, Portland and Seattle prior to the November 9 video teleconference and will be the introductory portion of the video teleconference. Pete Knollmeyer also distributed logistical information regarding the November 9 video teleconference *(Attachment 7)*.

The video was then played for the Board. The video covered:

- ◆ Why the WMPEIS was developed
- ◆ What decisions need to be made
- ◆ What is in the WMPEIS

- What has been learned
- How decisions will be made

In general, the WMPEIS considers three alternatives besides the no action alternative:

- Decentralized alternative - maintain waste management activities essentially at the sites of generation
- Regionalized alternative - transport waste to designated regional sites
- Centralized alternative - consolidate waste management activities at one or two sites for treatment, storage, or disposal

The video also gave a number to call for information: 1-800-736-3282.

Pete Knollmeyer next discussed the details of the video teleconference. The purpose of the video teleconference will be to hold a public hearing on the WMPEIS in six locations on the Northwest going from 7:00 - 10:00 p.m. The format will feature video teleconferencing to permit senior officials from DOE-HQ to participate. A workshop will be held one hour prior to the public hearing from 6 to 7 p.m. in all six locations sponsored by the public interest groups to assist people to understand the issues.

Notice of the video teleconference was published in a display ad in the Tri-City Herald; legal notices only were published in the other areas. Additionally, a notice was mailed out by RL to the 5,000 people who participated in the scoping process giving them the logistical details of how to preregister for the conference and how to send in comments. The Richland people volunteered to send out this notice because Headquarters would not.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental\Citizen Seat), raised the strong concern that adequate notice was not given. He pointed out that inadequate notice makes it appear that Headquarter's approach to this issue is that they do not want public input.

The Board referred the notice issue to an ad hoc committee which drafted advice reflecting the concern of inadequate planning and the Board's reservations about USDOE's plans to hold one single multi-site video teleconference hearing for public comment from six cities. On Friday, the Board considered the proposed advice, made several modifications and adopted it as Consensus Advice #34.

The public review and public comment period on the draft WMPEIS ends December 21, 1995.

Merilyn noted that there is a dialogue going among the SSABs and Headquarters regarding extending the comment period. Tom Grumbly suggested that all the waste that is proposed for importing to Hanford be outlined and on the table. Betty Tabbutt suggested Governor Lowry should have a spokesperson at the first hour workshop to speak to Grumbly's commitment,

which was made during the Plutonium Roundtable in Seattle. The public should know that what is discussed in the WMPEIS is not all there is. Dan Silver affirmed that the state has a commitment from Grumbly to work out a process for doing this. It was not anticipated it would happen by this November 9 video teleconference.

Merilyn asked for a show of hands from the people who intended to attend the video teleconference on November 9 and recognized that it appears there will be good representation from the Board.

Merilyn then asked the Board if they wanted to prepare official Board comment on the WMPEIS. Several concerns were raised:

- ◆ It may be hard for the Board to reach consensus; Hanford employees feel they can store waste safely at Hanford

- ◆ The Board may not be able to synthesize all the information in the WMPEIS and deal with the salient issues

- ◆ The Board may not want to set a precedent for giving official comment given all the many EISs coming down the next two years

Others commented that: the thrust of the comments should be that the decisions should not be made in such a piecemeal fashion; could get HAB consensus on values as in the earlier advice (#13); and advice does not have to cover everything -build on the consensus the HAB already has. Dan Silver said this is an important document. Ecology needs to hear what you think. Karen Randolph echoed the same for DOE.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee will work on drafting a statement from the Board and will bring it to the Board at the December meeting.

Integration Issue

Merilyn explained that a tentative meeting with all the Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) was scheduled for November 29 in Denver to deal with how to have a national dialogue on waste management and how to get all the importation issues on the table. She explained that Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Labor/Workforce Seat), Gerry Pollet, Mike Grainey, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon Seat) and Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat), participated in a conference call to organize this meeting. Merilyn pointed out that she has not seen an agenda nor does she know who will pay for those who attend the meeting.

Jeff Breckel, Ecology, explained that the meeting on November 29 is tentative. He explained there are two parts to the intended meeting. The first is to get all representatives from the SSABs

to the same level of knowledge. Most of the Boards do not have the same level of knowledge as this Board.

The other part of the meeting is to find out what ideas the chairs and representatives have for how to deal with integrating this issue on a national basis. The purpose would be mainly one of brainstorming, looking at all the decisions to be made in the near future and figuring out what should be addressed and how it should all be pulled together. Merilyn pointed out that a pilot might be a way to go and the Northwest would be a good starting point.

Merilyn explained that it was her understanding that this meeting was expected to be limited to the chairs of the SSABs. She made it clear to the organizers that this would not be adequate as it is not how this Board works. Instead, she proposed a representative cross section using the same individuals who participated in the conference call to organize this meeting. Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Technical Council (Public-At-Large Seat), pointed out that the representatives proposed by Merilyn represented an unbalanced blend of local and regional representatives with more regional representation. Merilyn stressed that she did not intend to cause an imbalance and that Gordon's point was well taken, but that she also felt the Sate of Oregon had to be represented in addition to a regional interest group. She encouraged the Board to make suggestions for representatives.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION WORKSHOP REPORT AND PROPOSED ADVICE ON HOLDING FMEF UNTIL DECISION IS MADE ON NEED TO PRODUCE MOX FUEL

Plutonium Disposition Workshop Report

Merilyn introduced this topic by noting that the Plutonium Roundtable and Workshop at the October meeting was an outstanding effort. Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Public-At-Large Seat), explained that work is being done to consolidate the very specific suggestions that came from the Roundtable and Workshop. She noted that 130 people attended the Kennewick session and over 100 attended the Seattle sessions.

Betty briefly highlighted some differences between the Kennewick and Seattle sessions. Both Governor Lowry and Tom Grumbly attended the entire Seattle session and remained for some time after. Betty commented that the panelists were easier on each other in the Seattle sessions than in Kennewick. She also pointed out that in Seattle, four women from the former Soviet Union who represented non-governmental organizations and communities attend the workshop which created a fascinating dynamic.

Betty felt the press coverage was excellent; it made the front page of the focus section of the Seattle Post Intelligence. The panelists were very impressed and excited about the level of questions received and the discussions that ensued.

Tim Takaro, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health Seat), added that many people in attendance were surprised at how close the panelists were in their thinking and were pleased that the discussions and options focused more on process and public involvement and not on technical details.

The official report from this Roundtable will be available by the December meeting. Also available for the December agenda will be Oregon's report on its plutonium town meetings and the film prepared by the Oregon Hanford Waste Board.

Proposed advice on Holding FMEF until Decision is Made on Need to Produce MOX Fuel
Gordon Rogers introduced the topic and explained that as a result of the Plutonium Roundtable the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee drafted proposed advice on holding available the Fuels and Materials Examination Facility (FMEF) until a decision is made on the process for disposal of surplus weapons plutonium *(Attachments 8&9)*. It was pointed out at the Plutonium Roundtable and Workshops held October 5-6 that one way to dispose of surplus plutonium from weapons dismantlement is to consider the fabrication of mixed oxide fuel (MOX). Gordon explained that if that option is selected the FMEF at Hanford represents an extremely valuable resource for performing that option in the shortest time and least cost.

Mike Bennett, Westinghouse, explained DOE is looking at selling or leasing the FMEF and has received substantial interest in the facility. The proposed advice would limit DOE from negotiating with organizations that would relocate to the Tri-Cities and bring non-nuclear related jobs. He agreed that the facility has the highest use for plutonium operations but that MOX fabrication may not be the path taken and therefore the leasing or selling of the FMEF should not be held up for a path that may not come to fruition.

Hank McGuire explained that he represents one of the large corporations interested in the facility. He explained the facility has been set aside over four times for various operations that were never put in place. The facility is also suited for mixed waste handling and fuel production. He does not have a preference as to whether the building is sold or leased, but that it should be made available. He further noted he supports saving a portion of the building for future plutonium operations.

Board members then considered the proposed advice. Many Board members raised the concern that the advice was too big a step to take at this time especially given the input from Mike Bennett and Hank McGuire. Greg deBruler pointed out that this country has a national policy to not enter into burning plutonium. Merilyn pointed out that the purpose of the advice is not to come to consensus that the burn option is the way to go but to keep the facility open and available until it is decided what path will be taken.

Several Board members commented that they support the notion of preserving part of the building for MOX production while leasing or selling the rest. Gordon asked Mike Bennett if

Mike felt a sale could be concluded if part of the facility were reserved. Mike noted that it depends on the client. A commercial client would probably not want to buy under those conditions whereas a nuclear client probably would conclude a sale.

In response to a question regarding the time table for entering contractual negotiations on the facility, Mike replied that they have sent out a request for interest and have received many responses. They are now evaluating these candidates and would like to issue an RFP in December or January depending on what the Board does with the proposed advice.

After straw polling the Board it was decided to send the proposed advice back to the Committee for further work on the issue. (Five people opposed any advice at this time and three wanted to modify it.)

AGENDA ITEM 6: HAB ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Executive Committee Duties and Operating Procedures

The Board quickly reviewed the Hanford Advisory Board Executive Committee Duties and Procedures that was included in the November packet as agenda item 6b *(Attachment 10)*. No one had objections to them.

Proposed Charter Revision re Membership Issues

1. Fill in vacancies

The Board considered a proposed addition to section III.A. of the Charter and Ground Rules which had been modified to deal with non-union, non-management employee seats *(Attachment 11)*. The modification stated that when a vacancy occurs in a seat representing non-union, non-management Hanford workers, Ecology and EPA shall solicit nominations from employees of a relevant group of Hanford contractors. The Board adopted the amendment.

2. Local Government seats

The Board considered an amendment to section III.A. which called for having seven representatives of local government interests, including one each appointed by the governing bodies of Benton County, the cities of Kennewick, Richland and Pasco, and three appointed by the Benton-Franklin Regional Council *(Attachment 12)*. The concern was raised that Grant and Franklin Counties should be included as appointing governing bodies. Other Board members objected to Benton-Franklin Regional Council having three votes. Other concerns were:

- no public health representative mentioned
- no recognition of the City of West Richland which is the city that is the second closest to the Hanford reservation
- Higher Education and Technical Background seats are Public-At-Large seats and could go to other interests

It was decided that Max Power, Ecology, would continue to coordinate amendments and proposals. Board members were encouraged to talk to Max about their ideas and concerns, so a refined proposal could be brought back to the Board.

Report from the Executive Committee re HAB Budget
Merilyn reported that although the Executive Committee reviewed the budget and had extensive discussions on it, there is no proposal as of yet. She referred the Board to the November packet agenda item #7 which is a summary of the Executive Committee's Discussion and Actions from its October 12 meeting *(Attachment 13)*.

Proposal re Meeting Locations
The Board was referred to Agenda item 6d in their November packet which proposed meeting locations and dates through February 1997 *(Attachment 14)*.

Mike Grainey pointed out that an article in the Oregonian recently thanked key members in getting appropriations for the cleanup. Two names mentioned were from Washington and two were from Oregon. Mike's point was that Oregon is very interested in the Hanford cleanup and therefore there should be two meetings in Oregon and not just one as is currently proposed. Another Board member, however pointed out that if the Board wants to use the meeting as a dialogue with the agencies, doing so will be limited when the meetings are outside the Tri-Cities. Gerry Pollet recognized that it is important to have 2 meetings per year in Portland and did not object to have the rotation of meetings reflect meeting in Portland before meeting in Seattle. It was decided that Elaine Hallmark would work on a revised rotation to bring back to the Board at its December meeting, that would include 2 meetings per year in Portland and one meeting each in Seattle and Spokane.

Friday November 3, 1995

Committee Meeting Changes
The committee meeting schedule went out in the packet before the Environmental Restoration (ER) changed its meeting schedule. The ER committee will not meet in November and will meet December 6 from 7 to 10 pm in Portland at the Red Lion Columbia River.

The Executive Committee recommended having meetings in buildings where there is not a fee. The problem often, however, is transportation and costs are accrued in renting cars to get to the meetings. For meetings in the Ecology conference room in Kennewick, vans can be made available.

Congressional Activities: Budget Status
Merilyn explained that Ron Izatt had just returned from Atlanta where he was involved in budget discussions. Ron explained that on Monday he met with Tom Grumbly regarding the budget.

He also had a discussion with Cyndy Kelly. Ron announced that the President is expected to sign the Energy and Water Bill which contains DOE's budget, this weekend. It will take DOE some time to develop the allocations to the field offices.

Merilyn asked Ron about the funding for CRESP. Ron did not have any information but will look into it. He thinks it is under the jurisdiction of Carol Henry and not Cyndy Kelly.

AGENDA ITEM 7: STRATEGIC PLANNING

Merilyn reviewed the history of the HAB's reluctance to get involved in DOE's strategic planning. In 1994 the HAB heard a presentation on DOE's strategic plan and later received the actual plan, but did not take it up. DOE has now begun developing a new strategic plan as required by law. John Wagoner spoke to the Board in September and explained the objective of the new strategic plan is to get more specific. Merilyn referred to the Board's September meeting summary as a good summary of that presentation.

Last month the HAB received a letter from John Wagoner requesting Board involvement in developing the new strategic plan. The Executive Committee spent considerable time discussing strategic planning with Ron Izatt by conference call, raising questions on whether to get involved and what the strategic plan would mean. Dick Belsey, Harold Heacock, Gordon Rogers and George Kyriazis subsequently met with Ron Izatt and staff to discuss the issues further. DOE wants and needs Board attention on this topic in order to create a useful and intelligent strategic plan with buy in from stakeholders. Both groups who met with Ron recommended to the Board that it take on participation in DOE's strategic plan development.

Merilyn asked the Board to think about involvement in DOE's strategic planning process in two steps. The first is to address whether the Board wants to participate in the strategic planning effort and to think about what additional information they need from the agency. Then, if the Board decides to participate in the planning effort it needs to figure out a way that a small group can work to develop a work plan and time frame.

The Board then heard from Ron Izatt *(Attachment 15)*. Ron referred to one overhead quoting the new statute requiring a strategic plan to drive planning and prioritization decisions. He explained that strategic planning starts to focus the multi year program plans (MYPPs). The relationship between a strategic plan and the MYPPs is similar to that of the chicken and egg; that is how do you do MYPPs without a strategic plan and how do you do strategic planning without MYPPs?

Ron recognized that it is easy to get mired in the details of strategic planning but this is not what the DOE is asking for from the Board. It is asking the Board to concentrate on a process to develop a strategic plan that has buy in from all the stakeholders. He would like to have help working through the mechanics of and in crafting the logistics of how to make it work as well as in developing the plan itself. He would like help in getting the tribes and other stakeholders

involved.

Many Board members felt the Board should get involved in the strategic planning process for a number of reasons. Some mentioned it was a great opportunity to be involved in shaping the long range strategic plan which would put the Board in the positive position of being proactive rather than reactive. Others noted that strategic planning will be instrumental in developing the long term budgets and may lead to a budget that would keep the clean up moving forward. It would be a morale booster for employees to have real commitment to long term goals.

Although Board members were generally encouraged and excited to be involved in strategic planning, several concerns were raised. Board members noted that strategic planning must not be a renegotiation of the TPA and that the TPA should be the framework for a strategic plan.

The issue of budget and funding for Board member involvement in strategic planning was raised. Members wondered whether the funding would be separate from the Board budget. Elaine Hallmark pointed out that part of the Board involvement in the strategic planning process would be to draft a proposal for how to participate and for what resources are needed to support that level of participation. Ron agreed and explained he needs to see a proposal about what it is the Board feels it needs in terms of resources and funding before he can talk about how to pay it. He understands there may be need for outside experts and consultants and John Wagoner has said he would be willing to pay for technical consultants outside of the Board budget.

Several Board members commented that the Board would need to hear a panel of experts explaining what strategic planning is and what it is not, perhaps working on two levels with Committee doing specific work on the assumptions in MYPPs and the BEMR. Others expressed concern that the work load involved in strategic planning is much larger than what can be carried by the Board, and that strategic planning would involve a reconstitution of the work done by the Future Site Uses Working Group.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen Seat), reminded the Board that Ron mentioned hiring consultants and committed to involving the Board in every facet of strategic planning. She felt funding must be fixed and tied to supporting the process.

Merilyn pointed out that there seemed to be a general sense that all members agreed the Board should participate in some capacity with strategic planning. The next step is for the Board to figure out a process as to how to move forward. The Executive Committee members who met with Ron proposed appointing an ad hoc committee to work with the facilitators and DOE to develop a proposed process and a proposal for the resources to support it. She suggested Board members talk about this amongst themselves. The item would be further discussed at the Board's afternoon session.

After lunch, Dick Belsey proposed convening an ad hoc committee chaired by George Kyriazis

and including Mark Hermanson, Gordon Rogers, Gerald Pollet, Ralph Patt, Todd Martin and Jim Cochran to work with the facilitators and agencies to develop proposals for the December HAB meeting. In response to who would be paying for the individual representatives to attend this organizing meeting, Merilyn answered that at the present time it would come from the Board budget.

AGENDA ITEM 8: PRESENTATION BY VALERIY KONYSHKIN AND BORIS NEKRASOV, MEMBERS OF THE ECOLOGICAL INITIATIVE, TOMSK, RUSSIA (SIBERIA)

Merilyn introduced Hilary Harding from Heart of America Northwest. Hilary introduced Valeriy Konyshkin and Boris Nekrasov. She distributed information about the guests, *(Attachment 16)* and explained they are leaders in the Tomsk ecological initiative which is a leading Russian citizens group watch-dogging a major nuclear weapons plutonium processing plant in Russia. Valeriy Konyshkin is an assistant of the Tomsk region Vice Governor on Ecology and Boris Nekrasov is a journalist and host of a regional television program. Hilary explained that Tomsk, Russia is a city of 500,000 people which is only 15 kilometers from Tomsk-7, Russia which was one of the Soviet Union's secret cities with major nuclear weapons plutonium processing plants. The Tomsk-7 plutonium plant is similar to the Hanford plutonium processing plant which uses the same chemical process as the Hanford plutonium finishing plant and uranium plan.

Valeriy Konyshkin addressed the Board and explained that the Minister would like to use Tomsk-7 as a storage for all the plutonium around Russia. He explained that until 1992 these plans were unknown to the public. He found out about the plans in a private conversation with Thomas Cochran (from NRDC). The past three years have been a struggle between the central government agency and the people in the area who do not want the waste in their territory. He noted that Hanford is a milk brother of what they have in Tomsk because it is fed by the same mother, the Cold War. He also noted that the situation in Hanford is similar to that in his country in that it shares the same goals and difficulties. His organization has not been able to get much information on how much waste was produced. He hopes Hanford and Tomsk can search for common methods and solutions which have a future goal of clean sites without a nuclear waste storage that threatens the life and health of people.

Boris Nekrasov also shared stories of struggles in trying to ensure that Tomsk-7 does not become a giant storage for all the plutonium in Russia. Boris also noted the importance of the U.S. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). His organization has requested information through Heart of America Northwest under FOIA about what has occurred in their country and has received it through the US organization.

After hearing about the situation and similarities in the plutonium situation at Hanford and Tomsk-7, the Board asked the guests several questions.

In response to a Board member's question as to how the Board might be able to help the Tomsk Ecological Initiative take their next steps, Valeriy offered several suggestions. He encouraged the Board to influence the larger public, as the opinions and attitudes held by the US in general have an effect on their minister. Valeriy also noted he is interested in the Board and recognized that there is nothing like this in his country. He hopes to learn about the structure of this Board. While he recognized that at the present time it is not possible to have advisory boards like this one, there is some hope that one can be created in the near future. Just five years ago in Russia, citizens were afraid to pronounce the word radiation, let alone plutonium, and now they are able to talk freely about it. So he is encouraged that soon they may be able to develop advisory boards.

Board members expressed their sincere appreciation for hearing what Valeriy and Boris had come to say and thanked them and Heart of America Northwest for organizing this agenda item. It was pointed out that Valery and Boris were financed by a USAID grant that is not continuing and thus opportunities to dialogue like this may be lost in the future.

AGENDA ITEM 9: LAND USE PLANNING EFFORTS

DOE Land Use Planning

Lloyd Piper, DOE presented the Board with an overview of the emerging integrated Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP) strategy at Hanford *(Attachment 17)*. He stressed that the CLUP is a work in progress and is in the very early stages. Nonetheless, he wanted to address the Board at this stage to let it know what DOE is planning.

He explained that DOE-RL is required to manage federally owned lands and facilities as valuable national resources and must develop a comprehensive plan. The CLUP is intended to support DOE's critical missions, including support for diversification of the local economy and protection of the environment. The CLUP will identify existing and planned future land uses with accompanying restrictions which will cover a specific time frame and be updated as needed. The CLUP:

- Designates land use for given purposes required to support all required missions in the strategic plan
  - Present and future potential missions consistent with statutory authority
  - Includes consideration of expanding public access and use
- Defines existing land use
- Evaluates future land use opportunities and constraints
  - 30-50 year outlook
  - Defines how the land will be used and restricted for use and for how long
  - Does not determine land disposition

Lloyd Piper also explained that DOE-RL has been developing the Hanford remedial action (HRA) environmental impact statement (EIS) to identify land use clean up scenarios, create a remedial baseline for environmental restoration program, and provide a framework for future uses at the Hanford site. DOE-RL will integrate the CLUP with the HRA-EIS effort. Integration will include coordinating internal and external activities to ensure that it engages a wide spectrum of participants. He reviewed the DOE CLUP and the HRA-EIS process detail and the benefits of CLUP/HRA-EIS integration. He explained that the CLUP process integrates NEPA and the Washington State Growth Management Act requirements. DOE plans to cooperate with the local comprehensive land use efforts under way, such as with Benton County and the City of Richland and is committed to ensure that tribal nations interests are considered.

Lloyd Piper reviewed the current schedule for CLUP/HRA-EIS:

- Early planning working meetings - September through December 1995
- Draft CLUP/HRA-EIS issue to public - February 1996
- Public involvement period - February through June 1996
- Final CLUP/HRA-EIS - September 1996
- CLUP adoption and HRA-EIS record of decision - November of 1996.

Mr. Piper requested involvement from the Board to:

- Define Board interface and points of contact for CLUP
- Update "values important to land use planning"
- Help define involvement/public process

Paul Krupin and Larry Prosser demonstrated the GIS system on the computer, showing data that will be used in the process. This data will soon be available on a CD ROM for anyone who wants it. data and technology that will be used in the process.

Benton County and other Local Land Use Planning

Phil Mees, a Benton County Senior Planner presented the Benton County/City of Richland planning process, required under Washington's Growth Management Act. They hope to have some type of agreement with DOE-RL to finalize the end product.

He pointed out that there are some differences in the local planning process and the DOE process. For example, the County's public participation process begins very early, is continuous, iterative and from the bottom up. The County has the perspective that DOE's public participation process is top down and is influenced by the federal agency's goals or mission. There seemed to be differences in terms of the schedule as the County thinks the process will take longer than what DOE-RL thinks. The County expects to have a draft comprehensive plan by December 1996. The scope of the County's plan is different. It looks first at designations of critical biological habitat. It has to look at the site beyond cleanup and designate uses best suited

to particular areas site characteristics -not based on the DOE mission nor on the ownership. Local plans are binding as to any private uses, whether the land is leased or sold. Leasing and privatization are occurring now on the federal lands.

Merilyn reminded the Board that the purpose of this presentation was for an information briefing. The Board was invited to ask questions.

In response to how much money is being spent on a working group planning process and how much money was given to the local government, Lloyd Piper explained there was no additional money for the working group.

Gerry Pollet wanted to know how the Model Control Toxic Act (MCTA) is being addressed and whether the EPA and Ecology believe a final land use designation is needed to make clean up determinations. Mike Wilson, Ecology, explained that Ecology expects to have a role in that process but is not sure how the new MCTA regulations will connect to industrial standards. Lloyd Piper did not think MCTA affects the final land use, which is why, he explained, DOE is also going with the HRA-EIS, to evaluate the remedial actions.

The question was raised whether the Port of Benton is involved in the County's and DOE's processes. Lloyd Piper explained that the Port of Benton is involved in the economic development portions. The County explained they are also working with the Port. The Port has no land use authority.

George Kyriazis explained that he had the impression that it was the intent to turn the land back to the public 50 years from now. He explained that he was wondering about this because the cities and counties are banking on taking back parts and that John Wagoner made a statement that it may not be turned back to the public and something about a potential NASA use for the site. Lloyd Piper explained that the CLUP will designate areas that are suitable for specific uses. Ron Izatt clarified that the ultimate disposition of Hanford does not rest with DOE but with Congress.

Ray Isaacson reiterated that the comprehensive land use plan developed by the County will be enacted as a county ordinance and have the effect of a legally binding document. It will, therefore, be enforced like all other land use and zoning regulations. He pointed out that DOE cannot issue a plan with that effect; that is why the efforts need to be coordinated.

Board members had some questions about the next steps on this issue. Merilyn suggested the ad hoc committee looking at strategic planning should consider how and whether it fits in.

AGENDA ITEM 10: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Elaine explained the purpose of this agenda item is to step back and look at public involvement

from a broad perspective. She recognized that the Board itself is a new public involvement vehicle which is pushing public involvement in the agencies to new directions and often has the effect of feeling chaotic. It was hoped the panelists and the time on the agenda could be used to develop a common information base as to what the agencies are trying to do in terms of public involvement, what they have tried, what works, what does not work and how the Board fits in.

Karen Randolph, DOE, began by pointing out how far public involvement has come. She referred the Board to a memorandum from Hazel O'Leary explaining the DOE's public participation policy and its implementation *(Attachment 18)*. Karen explained this policy was prepared by a representative cross section of people and represents a lot of good work. She explained it was the first policy document on public participation and went out to all DOE employees in December, 1994.

Karen explained she views the Board as a major player in public involvement at Hanford. There have been some successful public involvement experiences which have been effective because relationships have been developed with the stakeholders, people have a sense that they are being heard, and there has been an opportunity for interchanges and dialogues. She recognized that DOE needs to be better at public involvement and get more return for the money spent on public involvement dollars. She referred to the CLUP presentation and pointed this out as an example of DOE trying to involve the public early.

In regard to innovations in public involvement, Karen pointed out that DOE is experimenting with using computers, radio, television, satellites and video teleconferences.

Laurie Davies, Ecology, presented next and pointed out that often the best public involvement is not agency sponsored. She highlighted the Plutonium Roundtable and Workshops as one example. The Roundtable was an event with which the agencies assisted but did not sponsor. She explained that Ecology public involvement covers the following:

- Board support
- A 1-800 TPA hotline number
- Hosts regulatory required public meetings

The successes she sees are ones which come from joint efforts involving stakeholders such as the Future Site Uses Working Group, which produced a long lived document and a joint effort made with Columbia River United, co-sponsoring meetings. She noted that Ecology frequently works successfully with local government and interest groups on a one on one basis. It also experimented with interactive television with the Dose Reconstruction Project.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, pointed out the experiment of the HAB as one that has been tremendously successful and helps guide the EPA. He briefly explained why the EPA is involved in public involvement. Under Superfund, a Community Relations Plan is required. Part of that plan deals

with how to get the public involved. He informed the Board that the EPA is encouraged to think in "out of the box" terms when developing its updated Community Relations Plan. They hope to have the revised plan available in early spring.

Merilyn explained the Board had received a request from the Rocky Flats Citizen Advisory Board regarding public outreach efforts done by this Board. A memo in response to that request was developed by Confluence Northwest and distributed to the Board *(Attachment 19)*. Merilyn pointed out that the memo does indeed discuss several public outreach efforts that have been made by the Board. She explained public outreach is happening by the Board, but is not tracked very well. She also noted the Board is getting comfortable with itself as a Board but needs to make sure outreach continues.

Elaine then asked the Board what its thoughts were in terms of where to go with public involvement. The Board had a discussion that covered the following points:

- How can the greater public beyond the Board be involved?
- Press coverage in the Tri-Cities seems to be good but why does it not happen in Seattle and Portland?
- A better job of announcing Board meetings could be done through public service announcements on radio, television and in newspapers
- Many comments noted that great working relationship have been developed throughout the Board which has allowed for consensus from a diverse group
- DOE's public involvement budget has been slashed which will make it so the hands of the Board are tied, less public involvement will be done
- Betty Tabbutt reminded the Board that it has not made a unified Board decision as to whether the Board should initiate public involvement beyond the Board meetings; the Plutonium Roundtable was a serious effort to involve that broader public, but it was not initiated by the Board
- Many Board members noted that the Board represents a vast number of the public and that just because a public meeting does not have 400 people attending does not mean that there has not been good public involvement
- DOE should work closely and early with people in grassroots organizations; these grassroots organizations can get the word out about public events if DOE notifies them two or three weeks before the event occurs
- Contractors on the site and DOE employees need to read DOE's public participation policy

Merilyn asked the Board if it had any ideas as to how to make public comment periods at the Board meetings more useful. She pointed out that the Board has not been encouraging public comment and has not had good public comment in quite some time. She suggested that Board members could encourage their constituents to make use of the public comment time on particular issues.

The discussion then returned to the agencies. Laurie suggested that Board members continue to reach out to their constituents. Dennis noted that he is encouraged because the agencies are improving and there has been good public involvement with the Board. He noted that people have different perceptions of what public involvement is. He suggested Board members take time in their substantive committees to think through what type of public involvement would help frame the issues under consideration. Karen Randolph sketched a diagram which had the HAB in the center as a knowledgeable and credible body that was reaching out to its constituents, its constituents were reaching to the Board, as well as the Board reaching to the public, the public reaching the Board and the constituents and the public also having a relationship of reaching out to one and other.

Merilyn concluded the session by pointing out that public involvement should be an action item and that the Community Relations Plan referred to by Dennis should also be an action item and introduced to this Board when it is available.

AGENDA ITEM 11: NEXT MEETING AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES

Due to time constraints, the Board did not hear committee updates per se. A memo from Elaine Hallmark setting out the agenda setting process with deadlines and an Executive Committee conference call for the December Board meeting was distributed *(Attachment 20)*. The Board then spent a few moments discussing potential agenda items:

- TWRS EIS (to be framed and decided by the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee)
- Oregon Plutonium Roundtable report and Washington report
- Budget related information
- Proposed comments on WMPEIS
- Administrative leftovers
- Quarterly report from John Wagoner
- EPA budget and reorganization

A draft letter requesting information for the Dollars and Sense Committee regarding "technology development funds" throughout the DOE complex was distributed *(Attachment 21)*. Board members were encouraged to give the Dollars and Sense Committee feedback before its November 16 meeting.

Mark Hermanson suggested the Board needed a tracking system, for tracking all the things it is following up on, whether through Committee or individuals. He will pass on ideas to Elaine, and he suggests tracking a list at the end of meeting summaries. Elaine acknowledged such a list would be helpful and noted she is currently setting up a tracking system for correspondence items.

Press Release

The Board gave Merilyn permission to work with Bill Sanderson to develop and issue a press release highlighting the upcoming WMPEIS video teleconference and mentioning the strategic planning process and the Russian visitors.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

Number	Item
1.	November Board Meeting Attendance List
2.	Excerpts from Conference Report on H.R. 1905; TITLE III
3.	Letter to Merilyn Reeves from Susan Brechbill regarding HAB comment on draft Management and Integration Contractor RFP, dated October 29, 1995
4.	Draft RFP Management and Integration Contract DE-RP06-96RL13200 Amendment
5.	Tri-City Herald article "DOE attorney explains proposals draft, by Susan Brechbill, dated October 22, 1995
6.	Copies of Bill Taylor's visual, Hanford Advisory Board Consensus Advice #32 Issues
7.	WMPEIS public hearing logistical information
8.	Copies of Gordon Roger's visuals on Weapons Plutonium Disposal
9.	Letter from Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee to the HAB regarding Draft Proposed Advice on the FMEF, dated October 27, 1995
10.	Hanford Advisory Board Executive Committee Duties and Procedures, dated November 2-3, 1995
11.	Proposed Revisions to HAB Charter Dealing with Membership, Filling vacancies section, dated November 2-3, 1995
12.	Proposed Revisions to HAB Charter Dealing with Membership, Local Government seats section, dated November 2-3, 1995
13.	Summary of Executive Committee Discussion/Actions, dated October 12, 1995
14.	HAB Meeting Schedule, dated November 2-3, 1995
15.	Copies of Ron Izatt's visuals on strategic planning
16.	Information from Heart of America Northwest on Russian Citizen Watchdogs of Tomsk Nuclear Facility
17.	Copies of Lloyd Piper's visuals titled: "The Emerging Integrated Comprehensive Land Use Planning Strategy at Hanford," dated November 3, 1995
18.	Memo from Hazel O'Leary to all DOE employees titled "Guidance on Implementation of the Department's Public Participation Policy," dated July 29, 1994
19.	Memo from Molly Mulvaney and Elaine Hallmark to Erin Rogers on Hanford Advisory Board Public Outreach, dated November 3, 1995
20.	Memo from Elaine Hallmark to the HAB Executive Committee and Agency Liaisons on the agenda setting process and Executive Committee Conference call for the December Board meeting, dated November 2, 1995
21.	Letter from Merilyn Reeves, on behalf of the Dollars and Sense Committee, to Roger Christensen and Bob Rosselli requesting information on technology development funds, dated October 12, 1995

Note: Attachments are numbered according to the order in which they are mentioned in the summary. The attachments that were distributed at or before the Hanford Advisory Board meeting are not routinely distributed with this summary. If you need a copy of an attachment, please request it from Sarah Cloud at Confluence Northwest (503)243-2663 or Rosemary Guse at Westinghouse Hanford (509)376-8908.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK