

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Revised Meeting Summary

March 14, 1996

Kennewick, Washington

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Summary of the Board's Meeting	
<u>Items of Discussion</u>	
Announcements Made Throughout the Meeting	1
Agenda Review	2
Approve Meeting Summary From February Meeting And Executive Committee Items	2
Report on Site Technology Coordinating Committee	3
FY '98 Budget - Presentation And Proposed Advice	6
Public Comment	11
Cesium Soil Contamination Beneath the Tanks	11
1100 Area and North Slope	12
Tribal Roundtable on Plutonium	13
Administrative Matters	13
Public Comment	14
Attachments List	16

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



REVISED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Board Hears Presentation on Technology Development

Tom Engel provided the Board with an overview of current issues relating to technology development, including barriers to getting technology on site. The work of the Site Technology Coordinating Group and other committees that work with technology issues was reviewed. Board comments included a suggestion that a general presentation on the state of applicable technology for key problem areas be a future agenda item.

Board Adopts Consensus Advice on FY '98 Budget

The bulk of the Board meeting was spent considering budget advice and dialoguing with Alice Murphy. The Board reviewed the advice section by section and added concepts it wanted incorporated or deleted. Those revisions were made and reviewed later in the day. The nine pages of advice was adopted as Consensus Advice #44. A cover letter was included which highlighted the Board's primary areas of concern:

- ◆ Deferral of clean-up along the Columbia River
- ◆ External cost review and overhead cost reductions
- ◆ TWRS funding levels and privatization funding set aside
- ◆ Changed assumptions
- ◆ Risk evaluation process

Board Learns About Cesium Soil Contamination Beneath Tanks

The Board was briefed on the Tank Farms Vadose Zone Characterization Project conducted by Rust Geotech. Recent analysis shows that Cesium may be deeper in the soil than previously predicted. The new information on Cesium does not appear to pose a near term threat to worker or public health and safety. Mike Thompson, DOE, pointed out that there is much uncertainty in what the data means and multiple conceptual models can be drawn from it.

1100 Area in Delisting Process

Doug Sherwood informed the Board that the 1100 Area is in the process of being delisted from the National Priority List. The area that is expected to be delisted comprises nearly half the Hanford Site.

Board Adopts Advice on Tribal Plutonium Roundtable

The Tribes would like to develop a Tribal response on the Plutonium PEIS. As a way to most effectively do that, the idea of a Tribal roundtable has evolved. The Board considered a letter supporting such a roundtable and requesting that USDOE provide the Tribes with financial support for travel expenses. Several Board members had concerns with requesting funds from USDOE for this purpose. The letter was adopted as Consensus Advice #45 with three abstentions.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Revised Meeting Summary
March 14, 1996
Kennewick, Washington

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Thursday, March 14, 1996

The meeting was called to order by Chair Marilyn Reeves. The meeting was open to the public. Two public comment periods were provided. Members present at the meeting are listed in *Attachment 1*. Seats not represented were: Kathy Hackley: Columbia Basin Minority Economic Development Council (Public-At-Large Seat); vacant: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government Interest Seat); vacant: Benton-Franklin Regional Governmental Council (Local Government Interest Seat); Jim Watts: Hanford Atomic Trades Council (Hanford Workforce Seat); Richard Berglund: Central Washington Building Trades Council (Hanford Workforce Seat); Frank Ochoa: Agri-Business (Local Business Interest Seat); Greg deBruler: Columbia River United (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization Seat); and, vacant: Benton-Franklin District Health Department (Local and Regional Public Health Seat). Members of the public and others in attendance are listed on the sign-in sheet included in *Attachment 1*.

Announcements Made Throughout the Meeting

- ◆ Mike Grainey, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon Seat), announced that Governor Kitzhaber issued a statement to the Oregon Hanford Waste Board at its February meeting (*Attachment 2*). This is the first extensive statement from the Governor regarding Hanford and outlines his interest and concerns with Hanford.
- ◆ Marilyn Reeves called the Board's attention to a letter from Glenn Paulson (*Attachment 3*). Glenn attended and presented at a waste management conference in February. At a session on public involvement, he discussed his study on the Double Shell Tanks and the role of the Board and the Dollars and Sense Committee in raising the fundamental issues behind the proposal.
- ◆ Joe King was introduced. He is returning to the Board as an alternate for Pam Brown of the City of Richland (Local Government Seat).
- ◆ Marilyn Reeves read from a letter she had received from John Wagoner announcing that Alice Murphy, DOE-RL Chief Financial Officer, will replace

Ron Izatt as the Official Federally Designated Officer required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Agenda Review

Merilyn reviewed a revised Agenda that was distributed this morning. This was a specially scheduled meeting for the main purpose of discussing and acting on proposed advice regarding the FY '98 budget. The Board Committee had worked to develop the advice between the February 29 budget briefing and this meeting in order to complete it by DOE's March 15 deadline.

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 FEBRUARY MEETING AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ITEMS

The meeting summary was adopted as submitted. Merilyn requested Board Members to write the word final on their copies of the meeting summary. Revised copies will not be distributed, except in response to specific requests.

Executive Committee Items:

Executive Committee Meeting Summary

The Executive Committee had met March 1 for approximately two hours. A summary of that meeting was distributed (*Attachment 4*). Merilyn recognized the Board had not had time to review the summary and suggested that if there were any concerns or questions they could be directed to her or Elaine Hallmark.

HAB Financial Report

Bill Sanderson, WHC, referred the Board to a packet of information that was distributed regarding a financial review of the Board (*Attachment 5*). Bill reviewed the material which covered:

- ◆ FY '95 Ending Balance
- ◆ Expenditure Summaries for FY '94, '95, and 1st Quarter, FY '96
- ◆ Board WHC Expenses
- ◆ Board RL Expenses

At the request of the Executive Committee, Elaine had prepared a cumulative Hanford Advisory Board billing report from Confluence Northwest (*Attachment 6*), which was also distributed.

Report on Distribution of Progress Report

Bill Sanderson, WHC, reminded the Board that at its February meeting, copies of an FY '95 Progress Report by the Board tracking the Hanford clean-up was distributed. Since then, over 400 Progress Reports have been sent to Congressional Delegations, Pacific Northwest news media, and select interested regional and state stakeholders. One thousand more mailings are expected to go out. Former Board members and alternates of the Hanford Advisory Board, the Future Site Uses Working Group, and the Tank Waste Remediation Systems Task Force will receive a Report. Board Members who would like more reports should contact either Bill or Rosemary Guse.

Merilyn stressed that the shelf life of this report is up to Board Members. Mike Grainey commented that this report is an important one. A similar summary of what the Board has done and how DOE has responded, should be done annually.

Facilitation Contract Rebid Process

An Ad Hoc Committee composed of Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon Seat), Lynne Stenbridge, HEAL (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organization Seat), and Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interest Seat) was created to work with DOE to review the scope of work for the Facilitation Services Rebid Contract (*Attachment 7*). The Committee will also work with DOE after the request for proposals to review those bidding on it and provide advice. Merilyn requested Board Members give feedback on the kind and level of facilitation the Board will need in FY '97.

Nominations for Vice Chair

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Interest Seat), reported that the Tri-Cities Caucus identified Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interest Seat), and Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Technical Council (Public-At-Large Seat), as potential nominees for Vice Chair. They wanted to select one nominee. Eighteen (18) ballots were sent out to the caucus and ten (10) were returned, resulting in their nomination of Gordon as a Vice Chair candidate. Mike Grainey then nominated Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations Seat).

The Board voted for either Gordon or Betty. Eleven votes were cast for Gordon and nine for Betty. According to the Board's Charter, changes in Board leadership are major procedural issues requiring either consensus or a two-thirds majority vote. Thus, on the vote for Vice Chair there was neither consensus nor a two-thirds majority vote. The Board will re-address the issue at a later meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 3: REPORT ON SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Merilyn reminded the Board that Tom Engel, University of Washington (Public-At-Large Seat), Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organizations Seat), Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interest Seat), and Gerry Sorensen, Batelle (Hanford Workforce Seat), are all members of the Site Technology Coordinating Group (STCG). Tom Engel gave the Board an overview of the current status of various technology development processes, reports and issues as well as the organization of the STCG and its work.

The hope and promise is that the development of new technology will drive down the cost of clean-up. In the past there was either a short amount of time allotted for technology development or an infinite amount of time. In response to those criticisms, DOE made changes. There was a reorganization of technology development which resulted in the creation of the STCG. Five focus areas at various sites were established to feed back the actual technology needs at the site related to the particular area of focus.

On another level, and due largely to Congressional Committee actions, DOE has established an Environmental Management Science Program (EMSP). Its purpose is to develop innovative technology in a long term time frame. It is also attempting to reach those outside the usual channels of who develops technology. As such, \$20M has been granted for national laboratories and \$20M for universities on a proposal bases.

Tom referred to two reports that highlight some of the problems with technology development. One is titled "Barriers to Science" from the National Academy of Science. This report finds that the technology management of DOE's Environmental Restoration (ER) Program is driven too often by the internal needs of the organization charged with the Remediation work rather than the overall goal of ER. Free copies of this report can be obtained by calling the National Research Council at (202) 334-3066. An executive summary of that report was distributed (*Attachment 8*).

The other report is a 1996 GAO report titled "Management and Technology Problems Continue to Delay Characterizing Hanford's Tank Wastes." It discusses the lack of methodology in the characterization program and concludes there is no fundamental basis underlying the characterization program.

Another development within the area of technology is the work of the STCG Management Council. In a year long process, this Council compiled a list of technology needs in the various focus areas. They were defined by a broad committee of interested and diverse stakeholders.

This list of needs has been sent to Headquarters for funding consideration within EM-50. At this point, the STCG is addressing what the further role of the focus groups should be. It is an ongoing discussion and those with feedback should communicate them to Tom.

Tom asked the Board to focus on two issues that have come up at recent STCG meetings. One is the barriers to getting technology on-site. A panel of vendors, DOE and PNNL met to analyze why, despite numerous efforts, the vendors have had difficulty bringing their commercially well-established, non-experimental technologies on-site. Some reasons they think they are having problems are:

- ◆ Procurement Process - complex and detailed
- ◆ If they use the technology at one facility and try to do the same at another facility, they have to begin all over again demonstrating the project and going through the procurement process
- ◆ Lack of ownership of the whole problem
- ◆ Income is not generated for the contractor; state of art technology is largely patented
- ◆ No clear bottom line
- ◆ Process displaces the actual goal

This was the first of a two-part meeting. The second part will be held in late March.

Another reason new technology is not getting on-site is because there is no money in it for the existing contractors. Tom noted it may seem that moving to an M&I contract will help solve this problem. Looking at Rocky Flats, however, that is not the case. At Rocky Flats, a 93% tax on technologies not in the initial consortium has been levied. Thus, Tom believes, Hanford's M&I contract should not be modeled on Rocky Flats in this area.

The other area that Tom asked the Board for feedback on was the Hanford Demonstration Zone. Currently, in order to use technology approved and used at one location on site at another location, it must be demonstrated again at the new site. There is an idea that a protocol can be established so the vendor could get technology certified so it is valid at every individual unit on site. Tom cautioned that this may be set up so it takes a considerable amount of money to certify the technology. One way to circumvent that would be to have the programs bear the cost of the technology demonstration if it can be shown the technology meets a high priority need identified by the STCG.

Tom is on the Environmental Molecular Science Laboratory Advisory Committee (EMSL). The Committee is working on building a large unit to focus mainly on developing a base for environmental remediation at molecular level science.

Merilyn noted that technology development issues touch all of the Board's committees. She suggested that those Board members involved with the STCG develop concerns and pass them to the relevant committees.

In the discussion the Board had on the topic, it was suggested the Board move to drafting advice regarding incentives for site contractors so the barriers Tom discussed are removed. Also, a request for a general presentation on the state of applicable technology for key problem areas in which the Board is interested and what is being done about it would be helpful. Particular emphasis could be on TWRS, ER and mixed waste issues. Merilyn wholeheartedly agreed and felt this would be an excellent agenda item at a future Board meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2: FY '98 BUDGET - PRESENTATION AND PROPOSED ADVICE

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

Merilyn introduced this topic by asking Alice Murphy, DOE-RL's Chief Financial Officer, to bring the Board up to date on the work that has been done thus far on the FY '98 budget. Alice began by pointing out that at DOE's February 29 budget briefing, 130 people were in attendance. At that briefing, John Wagoner gave an overview of the '98 budget and talked about the work planned to be done in '96, '97, and '98. The process used for developing the '98 budget was discussed. Comments were heard from EPA and Ecology regarding priorities for the '98 budget clean-up. The briefing also included presentations from the Consistency Team on its work with the Risk Data Sheets (RDS'). The afternoon consisted of break-out sessions on Waste Management, Tank Farms, Facility Transition and Landlord, Environmental Restoration, and Environmental Safety & Health (ES&H) priorities and Indirect/Support costs. Following the break-out sessions, there was floor discussion of people's initial reaction to the budget.

Merilyn next reviewed the Board's involvement working with the '98 budget. She reminded the Board that because the RDS' were the basis of the budget numbers, the Board had Naseem Rakha as its technical staff in the Consistency Team which reviewed them. The Consistency Team process was used for the first time and lasted 12 days. Throughout those days, five to six Board Members attended various meetings and Naseem was there at all times. At the February 29 briefing, 12 to 15 members were present. On March 1, those Board Members present at the briefing met to discuss what they learned and how to proceed. On March 13, the Dollars and Sense Committee and the Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee developed advice on the budget and refined it to bring to the Board today.

The process used for considering proposed advice was that the Board reviewed the advice section by section and added concepts it would like incorporated or deleted from each section. Those revisions were made and reviewed once again later in the day. The Board again reviewed each section of advice, clarified any questions, made suggestions to improve the advice, and in some cases dialogued with Alice Murphy about the advice. Refinements were made and the advice was adopted by consensus as Consensus Advice # 44. A cover letter was included with that advice which highlighted the Board's primary areas of concern:

- ◆ Deferral of clean-up along the Columbia River
- ◆ External cost review and overhead cost reductions
- ◆ TWRS funding levels and privatization funding set aside
- ◆ Changed assumptions
- ◆ Risk evaluation process

DOE-RL is planning to mail the budget to Headquarters on April 12 (*Attachment 9*). Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations Seat) wondered whether the Dollars and Sense Committee, at its April 11 meeting, could review what DOE-RL sends to Headquarters to see how the Board advice was incorporated. Alice thought it might be possible, although she was not sure what the format would be and noted it may be verbal.

Max Power, Ecology, passed on Dan Silver's appreciation for all the good work the Board has put into this budget process. Dan feels it is very valuable and is sophisticated input. Alice echoed the thanks.

What follows is a brief summary of the substance of each section of advice and, in some cases, a synopsis of the Board discussion that occurred while considering the advice.

Stakeholder Involvement in the Budget Process

Don Beck, DOE-HQ, addressed the Board and highlighted the historical concept of the Board's involvement in the budget process. The advice recognizes that involvement and commends USDOE for furthering the level of stakeholder involvement in the FY '98 budget development. It also points out, however, that the public involvement was limited and inadequate, due to the constrained time frame in which information was available.

Risk Evaluation Process

Naseem Rakha, Confluence Northwest, reviewed the advice and explained the idea here is to highlight the positive aspects of the Risk Data Sheet (RDS) Consistency Team process. The role of the Consistency Team was only to assure that the RDS' were consistent. The Consistency

Team did not have a role in developing the methodology used. Board involvement in the Consistency Team came at the request of DOE. There was, however, no financial support from DOE. The advice recommended that money be allocated for this kind of stakeholder participation. The following points were made in the dialogue that ensued:

- ◆ It may not be appropriate to ask for more funding to review the budget, as reviewing the budget is a fundamental activity of the Board
- ◆ Funds must be requested for technical assistance because without technical assistance the Board would not have participated in the RDS process; DOE needs the Board's participation in this process for credibility
- ◆ The Board needs more information about how the integrated priority lists are used at Headquarters
- ◆ Doubts about why the Board participated in the Consistency Team in the first place and whether it will have any impact
- ◆ Credibility of RDS' need to be addressed
- ◆ DOE-RL went beyond the other sites in having an open budget process; the advice should not go beyond constructive criticism

Several changes were made incorporating the comments made by the Board. Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Technical Council (Public-At-Large Seat), wanted the meeting summary to reflect that while he would not block consensus on this portion of the advice, he wanted the summary to reflect his strong feeling regarding the section of the advice that states "activities like the Consistency Team that go beyond the scope of the Boards' planned budget, be organized and scheduled in such a way as to either minimize or support participants' costs." Gordon feels that additional funds are not necessary for the Board to participate in reviewing the budget process. He observed that the Board criticizes DOE for lack of prioritizing, and he feels the Board needs to prioritize its work as well. The Board needs to take a hard look at the tasks it wants to accomplish and do it within its budget.

Stakeholder Priority Ranking

The Board opposes any prioritization of stakeholder value that has not been developed by the stakeholders themselves. The advice also points out that DOE's process in developing the integrated priority lists (IPLs) and assigning numbers to stakeholder values is severely flawed; the logic of the prioritization does not seem to exist.

In addressing how IPLs and priority of ranking was done, Alice Murphy explained that every site is doing it differently. The RDS is one tool that is used to develop the IPL. Much of the overall

prioritizing, however, came from sitting around the table and using managerial judgment. DOE-RL was told to prioritize in five different categories by Headquarters. One of the categories was stakeholder values which included cultural and socio-economic values. Instead of passing it off to particular stakeholders, DOE-RL tried instead to interpret the various pieces of advice they have heard from the Board, the Tribes, the public, Ecology, and EPA. Items on the IPL were ranked as high medium or low importance to stakeholders. Those that had all "high" rankings were then just listed in order of the RDS number. Therefore any of the first 15 through 20 could be viewed as top priority.

Overall Priorities for Funding

This section of the advice calls for sufficient funding to meet minimum safe levels and Tri-Party Agreement requirements.

In the brief discussion that followed, one member felt it was not the Board's function to give the Secretary of Energy advice on how to split the funding pie. Another member, however, pointed out that if the Board does not give such advice then the number that comes from Headquarters is based on a budget target and not necessarily on the clean-up work that should get done.

The advice also asks that the TWRS privatization set aside of \$147M not be taken from the site's clean-up budget. Instead, Congress should create a special national privatization liability pool to cover the privatization approach and spread the risk of the privatization projects being initiated across the nation.

The advice pointed out the Board's concern that certain essential items in TWRS and in facility transition are not funded, which is inconsistent with many of the values and recommendations previously provided by the Board.

Alice Murphy, DOE, urged the Board to tell DOE where to take the money from when it advises DOE to spend more on something.

New Assumptions

Gerry Pollet reviewed the advice which calls for not utilizing new assumptions, goals, or end points in Hanford's planning, prioritization, and budget preparation without the disclosure of impacts and alternatives, public reviews and dialogue.

There was considerable dialogue on exactly what new assumptions were used in the budget process and how they affect projections. Much of it centered on assumptions of restricted use in the 100 Areas. Although the extent of the new assumptions was not clear the Board did agree that some did appear to be used and did have an effect. It was also noted that the underlying issues here will be addressed in the strategic planning process.

Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS)

Todd Martin reviewed the draft advice on TWRS. The advice does not support the currently proposed TWRS budget because TPA requirements are not being funded, and because the Board lacks confidence in the validity of the TWRS budget numbers and in the prioritization of dollars across activities. The advice also addresses the concerns the Board has had in the past regarding privatization.

Considerable discussion was had on the set aside fund. Alice explained the idea behind the set aside is to have a fund for the contractors in the event that DOE terminates the contract before the work is finished. In response to how many years the TWRS Program would have to wait to get the money and what happens to the reserve money, Alice explained that many of these questions are unanswered. The suggestion was made that unless an additional source of set aside funding can be found, TWRS should not be privatized.

Alice Murphy specifically addressed the portion of the advice that requested the Office of Federal Procurement Policy be consulted to determine the potential for disclosing privatization set aside budget numbers. Alice explained that it is her understanding the numbers cannot legally be released because it will give bidders a negotiation strategy for bidding on the contract. Todd clarified that the advice asks DOE to go to the federal office and to ask whether DOE's interpretation of that law is correct.

The other major concern that was discussed and incorporated in the advice is the lack of funding for a fall back alternative should privatization fail. The Board considers this unacceptable.

ER Recommendations

This advice reflects the Boards's concern that because the target level funding for ER is at a minimum, any funding level below that target level would seriously jeopardize TPA requirements as well as increase costs related to clean-up over time.

Independent External Cost and Efficiency Teams

The Board re-adopted advice it had previously adopted in 1995 in its review of the FY '97 budget. That advice calls for independent external cost review teams to be established with authority to recommend how to provide necessary indirect functions and services at optimum costs, and to challenge expenditures which do not directly serve the goals of the clean-up mission. The advice also calls for the establishment of a separate team with similar authority to review Project costs.

Alice Murphy pointed out there is already a lot of oversight, and she fails to see the value another team could provide. Gerry Pollet invited Alice to attend the Dollars and Sense Committee meeting to discuss her concerns with the advice in greater detail.

Facilities Transition

The Board continues to support funding for facilities transition as an essential element of successful waste management, waste clean-up and waste disposal at Hanford. The advice notes that an additional \$5M of facilities transition projects will not be funded under the currently proposed FY '98 budget. While the projects are not required by the TPA FY '98, the advice points out the Board's concerns that the deferral of these projects will result in higher clean-up costs and greater risks to worker and public health and safety.

Waste Management: Off-Site Waste Import Costs

This advice highlights the Board's concern that DOE take action to assure that the full costs of treatment and long-term storage of waste and Special Nuclear Materials which are to be stored, treated, or disposed at Hanford, are fully provided for. It also urges the full disclosure of all the long term costs of offsite waste storage treatment and disposal at Hanford, including the costs of deferring other cleanup.

Public Comment

Paul Gubanc introduced himself. He is the Hanford Site representative for the US Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB). He introduced Dan Ogg who arrived this week and is the second Hanford Site representative. Dan told the Board and explained he feels like he is returning home, as he is from Prosser. He has been with the DNFSB for four years. He is anxious to get on site and make sure DOE and the contractors are doing the right thing.

AGENDA ITEM 5: CESIUM SOIL COLUMN CONTAMINATION BENEATH TANKS

Casey Ruud, DOE-RL, briefed the Board on the Tank Farms Vadose Zone Characterization Project being conducted by Rust Geotech (*Attachment 10*). Rust Geotech is exploring the Vadose Zone, the soil from the surface of the ground down to the groundwater. They are doing measurement logging in the Tank Farms using a process called spectral gamma analysis to quantify the subsurface contaminant distribution of 1M gallons of High Level Waste known or suspected to have leaked from 67 Single Shell Tanks (SST). They are also assisting in determining the risk posed to groundwater resources.

Recent analysis shows that at least one radioactive isotope, Cesium, may be deeper in the soil than predicted. If this is the case, it represents a significant contradiction to the current model that Cesium does not migrate far from the leak source. It also changes the plans for the future. Other major issues that have come from the characterization project are:

- ◆ A significant Technetium-99 contamination plume is located in the groundwater directly beneath SX Farm
- ◆ There is a gap in data from bottom of drywell to top of groundwater

- ◆ The relationship between new information and existing groundwater contamination is unknown
- ◆ Site contractor individuals present strong evidence that a significant recharge occurs and may drive contaminants deeper into the Vadose Zone

Casey pointed out that the new information on Cesium does not appear to pose a near term threat to worker or public health and safety. A path forward which will evaluate and validate current models is being developed. Long-term plume monitoring in the Vadose Zone using the spectral-gamma method will continue.

Mike Thompson, DOE, noted there is much uncertainty in what the data from the Vadose Zone Characterization Project means (*Attachment 11*). Care must be used in analyzing and using the data. Currently, multiple conceptual models can be drawn from the observed data:

- ◆ Sorbable tank waste (Cesium) migrating downward through the soil column to (or below) 125 foot depth, mobile radio nuclides reaching groundwater
- ◆ Drywells providing preferential vertical pathways for migration of radio nuclides

Mike stressed that geophysical logging data does not have one interpretation. He recognized that finding the Cesium and interpreting the data to analyze where it is coming from is a controversial issue. He recommends that Rust Geotech finish its work so a careful and unbiased look can be made both from within DOE as well as outside DOE.

There was some concern that too much time will be spent characterizing and looking for Cesium rather than dealing with it. Casey pointed out the thinking is to find it in order to study and understand why it is down there and how it got there. Once that is known, the risks can be better understood and steps forward can be made.

Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organization Seat) pointed out that the Vadose Zone Characterization Project represents creative and out-of-the box thinking on the part of DOE. Secretary O'Leary met Casey at a conference in Washington, D.C. where he was advocating that high level radioactive waste leaks may pose a much higher threat to groundwater and the Columbia River than the DOE had acknowledged. As a result, Secretary O'Leary hired Casey to monitor the contamination under the leaking tanks and run the sampling program.

1100 AREA AND NORTH SLOPE

Doug Sherwood, EPA, informed the Board that last September, the EPA adopted a policy that allowed them to delist parts of Superfund sites that had been cleaned up even though the entire

site was not cleaned up. As such, 1100 Area is in the process of being delisted from the National Priority List. This Area includes the area near Richland and the Arid Lands Ecology Reserve. In addition, a No Further Action Record of Decision was signed in February for the River Land Site and the Wahluke Slope area. Not all of these areas have been cleaned up to the unrestricted uses standard. Some will have restricted use because contaminants were buried in place in several areas. The area that is expected to be delisted comprises nearly half of the Hanford site.

The process for delisting began with the Natural Resource Trustees. EPA was required to send a letter to the counties and affected cities. A first round of letters has also been sent to the affected Tribes. Currently, a letter from Ecology stating that they would like to just delist the site is needed. Doug pointed out that the EPA has not had any adverse comments regarding this action. In May the delisting should be finalized and notices will be in the public register.

AGENDA ITEM 6: OTHER POSSIBLE UPDATES: TRIBAL ROUNDTABLE ON PLUTONIUM

David Conrad, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government Seat), reminded the Board that at the October Plutonium Roundtable, the Nez Perce were represented on the respondent panel. One of their remarks was that they need to develop a Tribal response on the Plutonium PEIS. As a way to most effectively do that, the idea of a Tribal roundtable has evolved. Such a roundtable would allow for national level consultation with Indian Nations to bring the Tribes up to speed on disposal options for surplus plutonium and associated issues. David proposed on behalf of the Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee, a draft letter from the Board supporting a Tribal roundtable on the PEIS and requesting financial support for travel expenses from DOE to allow concerned Tribal leaders from across the country to participate.

In considering whether to adopt the letter, several members had concerns regarding requesting funds from DOE for the roundtable. Others felt the funding from DOE would provide an opportunity for meaningful and necessary Tribal involvement. After a brief discussion, the letter was adopted as Consensus Advice #45 with three absententions from: Ben Floyd, Benton County (Local Government Seat), Mark Hermanson, Westinghouse-Union/Non-Management Employees (Hanford Workforce Seat), and Gordon Rogers, the Tri-Cities Technical Council (Public-At-Large Seat).

AGENDA ITEM 7: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Draft Guidelines for Executive Committee Action

In the event that the Board meeting schedule does not accommodate DOE or Tri-Party time frames or deadlines, draft procedures allowing the Executive Committee to approve Board advice in between Board meetings was proposed (*Attachment 12*). If necessary, the Executive Committee may approve consensus advice or letters using the prescribed guidelines. The Board approved the draft procedures with the caveat that it will revisit in the future the fifth point which

deals with advice adopted under these procedures needing to contain reference to the procedures to differentiate it from regular advice adopted by the full Board in session. In addition, the Board added that any advice adopted in this manner will be immediately distributed to the entire Board.

Board Resignation Procedure

A memo of the resignation protocol was distributed (*Attachment 13*). Before a vacancy can be fulfilled by a successor, a formal resignation must be processed. In order to process a resignation, a formal dated letter of resignation should be sent to Alice Murphy. Successor designees cannot be reimbursed for travel expenses until they are formally appointed to the Board by DOE.

Headquarters Visitor

Don Beck, DOE-HQ, was introduced to the Board and given the opportunity to give the Board feedback. He pointed out additional unanticipated benefits that Headquarters has received in chartering the Board. The Board has shown strong leadership and has forced DOE in an integrated direction. It has also pushed DOE to practice good management practices. The amount of energy and commitment of the members, and the Board as a whole, is impressive. Among the messages from the Board Don will carry back to Headquarters from this meeting are:

- ◆ Work on the EIS' and integration of them
- ◆ The Board is concerned with privatization and feels moving forward without an established record of decision is not good business
- ◆ The Board wants as much time to review the Plutonium EIS as Headquarters had to review the TWRS EIS.

Public Comment

H.Y. Fouad, a WHC engineer addressed the Board (*Attachment 14*). He focused on potential business development opportunities for the Hanford Nuclear Site. To minimize the impact on the Tri-Cities economies, contribute to the success and progress of the nuclear industry, and safeguard the national security interests, lines of business development can be used for the nuclear site. Suggested lines comprise:

- ◆ Maintaining a contingency Plutonium production capability for the defense program, to deter against potential change of the political winds
- ◆ Plutonium recycled for the civilian nuclear program
- ◆ Converting the Plutonium reserve, nationally and internationally, from liabilities to assets

- ◆ Integrating the waste disposal programs for the defense and the civilian nuclear waste
- ◆ Pursuing international projects addressing nuclear waste disposal needs

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- | Number | Item |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | March Board Meeting Attendance List |
| 2. | Letter from Governor Kitzhaber to Oregon Hanford Waste Board Members, dated February 28, 1996. |
| 3. | Letter from Glenn Plauson to Merilyn Reeves, dated March 1, 1996. |
| 4. | Hanford Advisory Board Executive Committee Meeting Summary, dated March 1, 1996. |
| 5. | Memo from Jon Yerxa to the Board regarding Board finances. |
| 6. | Cumulative billing report from Confluence Northwest to the Board, dated February 28, 1996. |
| 7. | Memo from Jon Yerxa to the Board regarding the facilitation Sevices rebid, dated March 13, 1996. |
| 8. | Executive summary of the "Barriers of Science" report. |
| 9. | Proposed process and schedule for finalizing FY '98 RDS/ADS/IPL. |
| 10. | Viewgraphs of Casey Ruud's presentation titled "Briefing on Single Shell Tank Vadose Zone Issues," dated March 14, 1996. |
| 11. | Viewgraphs of Mike Thompson's presentation headed "Many believe that the 'weight of evidence' supports the conceptual model that the drywells have provided a preferential pathway for contaminant migration." |
| 12. | Memo from Merilyn Reeves to the Board's Executive Committee regarding draft procedures for Executive Committee approving HAB advice in between HAB meetings, dated March 11, 1996. |
| 13. | Memo from Jon Yerxa to Board members and alternates regarding resignation protocol, dated March 13, 1996. |
| 14. | Summary of H.Y. Fouad's public comment to the Board, dated March 14, 1996. |

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.