

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Revised Meeting Summary
July 15-16, 1999
Richland, 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.

Announcements Made Throughout the Meeting1

Welcome and Introductions2

Approve June Meeting Summary2

TPA Senior Managers Presentations: Progress and Challenges3

Opening Comments from Senior Managers3

Board Questions and Discussion.....6

Tanks and the Office of River Protection10

Health and Safety.....12

K Basins - Spent Nuclear Fuel13

Plutonium Finishing Plant13

Discussion with Keith Klein after Announcement to Employees.....14

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Processes for Responding to Board Advice16

Fiscal Year 2000 Performance Agreements Advice17

Off-Site Waste Advice18

Board Focus and Workplan20

Administrative Matters20

Vice-Chair Election21

Agenda.....22

Updates22

Fernald Transportation Workshop.....22

Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement22

Path to Closure 10-Year Plan23

Public Comment24



Executive Summary

Discussion with Senior Managers

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) held an open forum with senior managers to discuss major issues on site and to learn of upcoming organizational changes. Representatives included Keith Klein, Hanford site manager; Dick French, Manager of the Office of River Protection (ORP), Tom Fitzsimmons, Director of the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology); and Chuck Clarke, Regional Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10.

The Board questioned U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) managers and regulators on their goals and views for the future of the Hanford site cleanup. Questions and discussions addressed policy issues in the new Office of River Protection, health and safety issues on site, progress in the K Basins, work at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), budget and funding issues, and inter-site relationships.

The HAB voiced concern over the new policies splitting decision-making authority between ORP and DOE-Richland (DOE-RL). Keith Klein explained the changes he proposed for helping the contractors to perform more work with the available resources.

Advice on Fiscal Year 2000 Performance Agreements and Off-Site Waste

The HAB adopted advice on the Fiscal Year 2000 (FY2000) performance agreements. The advice expressed the value that contract incentives drive progress on the site. The Board recommended that DOE-RL and DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) work together to make sure that performance agreements meet this goal.

Advice was also adopted regarding off-site waste. The Board recommended that DOE charge generators the fully-burdened cost of disposal of radioactive and mixed wastes at Hanford. Currently, the generators pay only a set fee per cubic meter of waste for disposal that does not reflect the complete life-cycle costs of waste disposal at Hanford.

The Board began to address issues regarding the process for developing and adopting advice. It was suggested that the HAB Executive Committee look at the best way to convey the Board's message and develop a general format and procedure for writing advice. Several members expressed concern that some advice coming from the Board is not understandable to the general public and that the time and energy spend wordsmithing advice at HAB meetings could be better used and focused on other Board business.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Revised Meeting Summary
July 15-16, 1999
Richland, 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.

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting was called to order by Marilyn Reeves, Chair (Public-at-Large). The meeting was open to the public. Four public comment periods were provided at 11:45 a.m. on Thursday and Friday, at 4:45 p.m. on Thursday, and at 3:45 p.m. on Friday.

Members present are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public and others attending. Board seats not represented were Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Audubon Society (Local Environmental), and Donald Worden, Public-At-Large.

Announcements Made throughout the Meeting

[Items are listed in chronological order rather than in the order made. Announcements with no dates are listed last.]

- Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (GAP) (Hanford Work Force), announced that Norm Buske would be giving a slide show presentation at 7:00 p.m. on the findings from his strontium-90 sampling on site. The meeting was open to the public and Board members were encouraged to attend.
- Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), introduced his new alternate, David Johnson who has worked at the Hanford site for a number of years and has a Ph.D. in nuclear physics.
- Madeleine Brown, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), stated that the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) celebrated its 50th anniversary on July 5th.
- Max Power, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), stated that an announcement was made to all employees on site soliciting applications for a non-union, non-management alternate for Susan Leckband. Nominations are due August 6th. Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Max can provide further information.
- Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), stated that the Health of the Site Conference is scheduled for November 2nd and 3rd. A draft agenda for the meeting has been developed, but not all the roundtables have been filled yet. He would appreciate attendance and input by Board members. Additionally, a keynote speaker has not yet been identified and suggestions are welcomed.
- Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Environmental/Citizen), announced that Columbia River United is celebrating its 10th anniversary. He pointed out a poster at the back of the room with more information on the August 7th celebration in Hood River.

- Marilyn Reeves announced that Pete Knollmeyer, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), is the acting Deputy Designated Federal Official for the HAB until the position is permanently filled. Pete stated that despite changes in lines of authority, one person will report back to Keith Klein and Dick French with the information from the Board meeting.
- Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues, announced that the Health, Safety and Waste Management (HSWM) committee meeting will be August 4th in Room 147 of the Richland Federal Building.
- Max Power announced the issuance of a news release announcing a settlement regarding the Plutonium Reclamation Facility (PRF) explosion. The settlement totaled \$90,000, of which \$80,000 will go to improving safety response on the site. The remaining \$10,000 will be given to a scholarship fund. No money will be put into the state general fund.
- Max Power announced that Steve Alexander has been replaced by Jane Hedges as the manager for Ecology's Kennewick office. Also, Moses Jaraysi has taken a position at Bechtel and his position will be filled by appointment from within Ecology.
- Doug Sherwood, EPA, announced that EPA expects to announce the replacement for Randy Smith in the next week.
- Pete Knollmeyer announced that Maureen Honeymiller is leaving the site for a position in Virginia.
- Pete Knollmeyer announced that a truck bridge is being installed over Tank 241-Z-361 at PFP. DOE will then sample the ground to look for contamination. One of the cores was inserted two feet from the wall of the tank, and no contamination was found. DOE remains hopeful that the tank has no serious leaks.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting began by showing a video celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and the successes it has helped to accomplish on site. The video provided interviews with DOE, EPA, Ecology, tribal representatives, the Chair of the HAB, and others.

Marilyn Reeves welcomed Keith Klein, Hanford Site Manager; Dick French, Manager of the Office of River Protection; Tom Fitzsimmons, Director of Washington State Department of Ecology; and Chuck Clarke, Regional Administrator of EPA, Region 10 to the meeting. She stated that the morning was designed for managers to share their views on the challenges across the site, to highlight progress being made, to outline goals and visions for Hanford, and to identify how the HAB can support cleanup most effectively. It was an opportunity for the public and the Board to hear from senior managers and to look at progress and the path forward.

APPROVE JUNE MEETING SUMMARY

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, stated that all changes given to her prior to the meeting would be made in the June meeting summary. Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), indicated that she has an additional change that she would send to Ruth clarifying key

issues requiring resolution in the TPA negotiations for PFP. The June Meeting Summary was approved as modified.

TPA SENIOR MANAGER PRESENTATIONS: PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

Keith Klein, DOE-Richland

Merilyn Reeves introduced Keith Klein, the new Hanford site manager, and asked him to share his thoughts and impressions of the Hanford site with the Board. Mr. Klein has served in many leadership roles within DOE ranging from manager of Rocky Flats cleanup efforts in Colorado to acting manager of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico.

Keith Klein, DOE, stated he has just begun to form some initial goals and vision for the site. These are a direct result of listening and learning from workers on the ground. He stressed the importance of listening to the workers in the field, interest groups, contractors, tribal nations, Congressional delegations, and the federal work force. He stated that if cleanup is to be sustained at Hanford, performance must increase while still using the same resources. There are many intelligent people on site, and they must be mobilized to achieve cleanup goals. He has been laying the groundwork for changes to facilitate the effort and hopes to see more results and progress.

Mr. Klein stated that his vision for the site focuses on protecting the Columbia River and the region. The River is the reason the reactors and complex were constructed in this area. It is also what makes the region unique for the future. The federal government has an obligation to clean the area that served the nation well during World War II and not to leave it in shambles. His team has the opportunity to meet these goals, and to move forward with economic transition consistent with the desires of the community. The assets and processes are already in place to guide the site in the most efficient manner, and now action must be taken. He is excited to work with the Board and share his thoughts and vision with them. He hopes that through cooperative efforts, the site can convince Congress of its budget needs.

Dick French, DOE-Office of River Protection

Merilyn Reeves introduced the new Office of River Protection (ORP) manger, Dick French. He has years of experience in the field and has spent considerable time at both the Idaho and Hanford site. Most recently, he served as President of Kaiser Engineering.

Dick French commented that the ORP job interested him because the rewards of completing the work are great and vital to the health of the region. Work on the tanks must begin and move ahead as most of the tanks are years beyond their design life. Characterization has been completed on 139 tanks, and now waste must be retrieved, processed, and stored to guard against further leaks. It is timely to begin vitrifying waste. The one looming issue is the ability to fund the vitrification plant. ORP needs a total of \$1 billion per year for the next seven years in order to get the project on line. He stressed that the program needs help from all sources to convince

people of the need to fund the project to deal with the legacy of World War II. The longer the delays, the higher the cost climbs for treating tank waste. ORP is going to focus on making the primary path as workable as possible. Backup plans are being examined as well, including options for taxes and other financing strategies. Mr. French supports the privatization effort and is committed to carrying the plan forward. Anything deviating from this plan will cause huge delays in the program and is not acceptable.

Mr. French updated the Board on progress with his five initiatives proposing changes within ORP and its relationship to DOE-Richland (DOE-RL). ORP now receives a budget from DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) and efforts are ongoing by congressional staffers to create a separate line item for ORP in the congressional budget. The contractor alignment issue is being worked in collaboration with Keith Klein. Also, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed to clarify the decision-making process between ORP, DOE-HQ, and DOE-RL. It places more authority within ORP to allow more consistent and faster operations. In an effort to establish a separate identity, ORP will be moving to a new building and has almost completed staffing activities. He estimates that 80% of the five initiatives are complete. Once the changes are in place, Mr. French will shift his focus to performance and finding faster and cheaper ways to speed tank waste treatment. He emphasized that the HAB is vital to the success of his program because without public input and support for decisions, the region is not unified and Congress will not fund the project. He needs the HAB to be involved in major policy decisions in his organization.

Tom Fitzsimmons, Washington State Department of Ecology

Merilyn Reeves introduced Tom Fitzsimmons, Director of Washington State Department of Ecology. He has many years of experience within Ecology and in Washington State environmental protection efforts.

Tom Fitzsimmons commented that several topics were omitted from the TPA 10th anniversary video. Ecology's desire is to ensure that the mission of cleanup is accomplished at the site with little wasted energy on process and with maximum output. He stated that Ecology is committed to the site and will join DOE to help as much as possible to integrate the new managers. The appointment of Carolyn Huntoon as the Assistant Secretary of Energy and the other senior managers on site provides an opportunity to help DOE overcome some of the institutional problems it faces. However, Ecology, maintains its commitment to holding DOE accountable for completing work to get the vitrification plant on line and will join DOE to make these commitments real. Ecology will not agree to language that diminishes regulatory responsibilities and leaves the state with no legal recourse now or in the future. He hopes that TPA negotiations on privatization will improve and finish on schedule at the end of July. Ecology believes that it is an opportune time to get Congress to buy in to the tank waste treatment project and to commit to completing the work.

The current focus on tanks does not mean that other cleanup efforts on site are of less importance. Ecology is equally concerned about progress in moving spent nuclear fuel away from the Columbia River; making the River available for resource protection, recreation and

tribal use; getting transuranic (TRU) waste into a safer form; and focusing on the 300 Area. Ecology's vision for the site includes focusing on the issues blocking progress and finding ways to meet milestones. He hopes to find successful ways to do this and integrate with the new site leadership. The cleanup goals in the immediate future are moving waste out of the tanks, moving spent nuclear fuel away from the river, stopping the flow of groundwater contamination, protecting the Columbia River, and stabilization and shipment of PFP waste.

The second vision is related to technological advances and possibilities for application in other areas outside the site. The State places importance on developing, experimenting and deploying new technologies onsite and experimenting with industrial scale advances. Ecology will use its regulatory, oversight, legal, relationships, and all other tools to help move toward these objectives. He added that Washington Governor Locke and Attorney General Christine Gregoire are extremely committed to Hanford goals, interested in the HAB's views on policy issues, and in how they can help to speed progress.

Chuck Clarke, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10

Merilyn Reeves welcomed Chuck Clarke, Regional Administrator from EPA, Region 10. She stated that his responsibilities include overseeing activities throughout Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

Chuck Clarke stated that although progress has occurred in certain areas, the complexity of the relationship between DOE and the regulators is difficult. He sees huge challenges in this area in the future. Energy levels must remain high for managers to be successful in working issues, keeping pressure on meeting TPA milestones, and realizing environmental progress. As the issues become increasingly complex, EPA continues to struggle to make sure TPA milestones are met. There are challenges related to regulatory compliance and how activities are processed as the more important milestones begin to near. EPA has also examined emergency planning issues and has made recommendations for improvements. Mr. Clarke stressed EPA's responsibility for representing the tribal interests of the region. These issues continue to be major challenges for EPA to make sure DOE's accountability is enforced.

Chuck Clarke remarked that the next few years will focus on reaching an agreement on tank waste remediation by the end of July, getting milestones in place, and in making progress in the K Basin project toward the November 2000 date. There are also river corridor issues, groundwater concerns, solvents, and the vitrification plant to consider. The critical needs for EPA are looking at accountability and commitment to milestones. The public must be able to hold EPA and DOE responsible for cleanup progress and for meeting milestones. They are currently in negotiations discussing the recent multi-media inspection on site, and there will be a number of inspections on site over the next few years. EPA hopes to push the idea of a partnership with DOE, but has to be comfortable in using its regulatory capacity as well. He stated that the HAB has been responsible for increasing public trust for DOE to provide information and the regulators to engage in the cleanup work. This must continue in the future. The HAB must bring light to the issues that need work and improvement. He stated that DOE must continue to build public trust so that it can meet milestones. This is the only way to get the

necessary political and financial support over the next decade. Unless DOE begins to have more successes, funding will continue at the same level and important cleanup work will not be funded.

Board Discussion

Merilyn Reeves commented that she also felt the TPA 10th anniversary video left out some important facts and statements. The Board had asked her to convey the lack of milestones in the treating tank waste because they do not exist. She did raise this concern in her interview, but it was not included in the final video.

Tom Carpenter commented that the video reflects the state of mind of the Hanford site. He expressed concern that it was filmed without the public's knowledge, left out facts, and avoided controversy. The video was a one-sided presentation that avoided input from stakeholders, environmental groups, and watchdog groups. It gave a false portrayal of the state of the Hanford site. Additionally, it ignores issues associated with the vadose zone contamination, radionuclides seeping into the River, production of nuclear weapons at Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), and worker retaliation on health and safety concerns. Mr. Carpenter does not feel that cleanup is going well. GAP has been documenting strontium-90 seeping into the river near salmon spawning grounds and has not yet received responses from DOE or the regulators. He asked if a dialogue would occur in the near future. Keith Klein stated that DOE is serious about making changes in the vadose zone project. He also commented that he is not complacent on the issue and will pursue it aggressively to find the facts. Chuck Clarke stated that EPA is reviewing Norm Buske's report and will respond when finished. EPA may disagree with the results, but will send an evaluation to GAP. He agrees that there should be a response right away. Tom Carpenter responded that GAP wanted a dialogue rather than a written response. Pete Knollmeyer stated that DOE and Keith Klein had committed to talking with GAP before the end of the month and then asked for a one-week extension. There are many people working on the request and an answer will be given.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), thanked the senior managers for their comments. He stated that words used in making pleas to Congress are extremely important. He feels that cleanup is a "wimpy" word and that stronger language must be used when asking Congress for funding and in milestone negotiations. Humans give more money based on emotion, and he stated that the real mission at Hanford should be portrayed as disaster prevention. Congressmen do not appropriate money to cleanup sites. The work done is prevention for a major disaster, not only for the region but the nation as well. He asked what language was being used in addressing Congress. Dick French replied that the issue has been discussed internally and the language used is "cleanup". They are trying to sell the need for a higher budget based on the accomplishments of the last few years. DOE's credibility to manage a project like this is the largest problem standing in the way of additional funding. Mt. French does not think that the positive words have gotten out yet. He hopes for a balance in wording and that in the future, credibility will be increased based on action. He agreed that disaster prevention is an accurate representation of the work at Hanford.

Bob Larson, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government), asked Mr. Klein to explain the changes he expected to make on site. Keith Klein indicated that he was holding a meeting with employees and wanted them to understand changes before the public. He commented that the changes focus on DOE's credibility and getting more results for the same resources. Nothing speaks for success better than showing successes. He hopes a better environment for supporting more work can be created by looking at the organization of DOE-RL and the contractors. For example, Fluor Daniel Northwest (FDH) is not accomplishing all it is capable of doing. FDH agrees and has proposed changes within management and supervisory positions, the number of organizations, organizational interfaces, and other issues. FDH is interested in growing its government business line and realizes that it must have results on site in order to do this. Currently, the authorization basis process is restricting, and bureaucratic layers must be removed. Mr. Klein hopes to put more focus into leading technologies that have not been tested on site. He hopes that by helping FDH to work more effectively on site, the environmental management (EM) program will benefit. He added that he would also continue to find ways to better support ORP. Keith Klein and Dick French will work together toward the same objectives on the site. Although they have different styles, they usually agree on the diagnosis of the problems.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch and Hanford Action of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), agreed with Tom Carpenter that the HAB is looking for more dialogue with the managers rather than written responses. She added that workers are not given enough credit for the job they do. She asked that the managers find a way to raise the status of the worker on site. She expressed concern about slow progress in the negotiations for tank waste milestones. Flexible milestones may be acceptable, but the public must see a measurable method for meeting these goals. Tom Fitzsimmons said he is confident an agreement on milestones will be reached before the deadline. Currently, there are milestones from 30 months out to 2018 when the waste should be treated. Ecology contends that there should be additional milestones within this period. The creative proposal is to have target milestones that would become enforceable once the contract is signed. Additionally, Ecology must look at the years after 2018 when only 10% of the waste will have been treated. Dick French added that converting the Agreement in Principle (AIP) to the TPA should be simple and that agreement should be reached by the end of the month.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), stated that workers on the site are constantly faced with responding to and complying with rules and audits from one or more of the regulatory agencies. She challenged Mr. Klein and Mr. French to streamline the process so workers are not required to generate the same information for each regulatory request. Dick French agreed and added that BNFL managers have told him they spend 50% of their time responding to regulatory requests. He supports the State having regulatory authority, but hopes that an approved evaluation list can be constructed to make sure all agencies are not auditing at the same time and that repetition is minimized. If the activity provides value, he supports continuing the audits and inspections; however, multiple reviews must become more focused. Chuck Clarke responded that EPA often is told it does not do enough on the site. He agreed that the process should be examined to ensure responsibilities are not duplicated. Keith Klein stated that work should be done to perform only one review per issue

to strengthen the DOE-RL operation. The goal is to enable workers to do a good job and be focused on the job at hand. He stressed that he understands the value of workers and the need to give them respect.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), expressed concern about the Fiscal Year 2001 (FY2001) budget. She asked for perspectives on that budget and what has been happening recently in Washington, D.C. Dick French commented that the funding issue concerns the \$608 million budget authorization needed to finish the design of the tank waste treatment facility. DOE's EM entire budget is \$5.7 billion, so this is about a 10% impact. Budget caps and DOE's credibility is hurting the request for additional funds. He feels that more work is needed to convince Congress of the needs at Hanford. If the contract with BNFL is not signed, the future is questionable. Tom Fitzsimmons echoed these comments and asked the Board for help promoting a compliance budget. It is important to raise Hanford issues to a national level. He hopes that money can be set aside for tank waste treatment; however, this is a level of commitment that the federal government has not yet made. The ideal situation would be to locate funds outside of the EM budget.

Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), asked Dick French to comment on the fact that public involvement was a topic suggested for addition to his five initiatives. Dick French stated that the five issues would remain the focus of his efforts, but that he understands that nothing will happen if those representing the communities do not feel they participated in or impacted the policy process.

Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), commented that Hanford has experienced many changes with contractors and seems to go through periods with little progress after these changes. Congressional staffers want to see progress and the efforts like the video viewed earlier show these positive results for the money allocated to Hanford. He expressed concern that the regulators were not lobbying for funding and asked why they were not more visible on this issue. Chuck Clarke noted that EPA is part of the administration and has to agree with the budget set by Congress. It will not push for a different budget than the one presented by the President or DOE-HQ. Tom Fitzsimmons hoped Ecology would push harder in the future to dispel this perception.

Leon Swenson, Public-At-Large, stated that more effective regulation rather than more regulation is needed. The focus should be placed on regulations necessary to protect the public and the region. Tom Fitzsimmons responded that all organizations should continue to focus on the mission and how each activity relates to accomplishing the site mission. By getting the regulators and DOE to discuss more effective ways to do this, these issues can be addressed. Keith Klein commented that he is focusing on internal improvement opportunities before working with the regulators.

Merilyn Reeves stressed the need to bring key players in a room, including regulators, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), DOE-HQ, and internal auditors. Several years ago at a St. Louis meeting, the site was able to look at dividing the tasks for regulators. Now a new set of managers is on site. She suggested that it is time to look at these issues again,

especially with the appointment of a new Assistant Secretary of Energy and the new structure of ORP. Keith Klein answered that contractors perform audits as well and that the process deserves attention.

Gerry Pollet expressed concern about the chemical waste management and dangerous hazardous waste designation at the site and the associated issues of regulatory oversight. The emphasis has always been on nuclear safety. When Ecology told DOE that certain wastes required characterization and removal from PFP, DOE never followed through on the request because DOE said it was not subject to the state's authority over solutions used in the production of plutonium. Even after the May 1997 explosion, progress has been small, and a dispute continues between the parties over regulation of hazardous waste. He asked if the managers believe that dangerous waste laws apply to the chemicals in the facilities like PFP, and asked the regulators if they violated state law during the explosion. Although there has been work in EPA and Ecology to do cooperative inspections, fundamental problems still exist that could lead to a catastrophe. Keith Klein stated that he had noted the HAB's previous advice and would look at the situation of regulating chemical wastes on site. Dick French commented that 95-98% of the waste in the tank farms is chemical and is covered under the State's dangerous waste provisions. He added that the State does not have sole responsibility for regulating these issues. Tom Fitzsimmons stated that Ecology is aware of the issue, and it is being worked.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-At-Large, commented that BNFL should look at all the pieces needed to complete the vitrification plant. It could be an excellent opportunity to raise the national awareness of Hanford efforts. Dick French agreed and added that BNFL is not subject to DOE procurement regulations. In order to sell the vitrification plant, it must be a national issue. Mike Lawrence, BNFL, stated that a vendor's conference is scheduled for August 10th in the Tri-Cities. Vendors from across the country are being invited. The only requirements for vendors are meeting the schedule, product quality, and budget constraints.

George Kyriazis, City of Kennewick (Local Government), expressed frustration that there are individuals on the Board with pursuing personal agendas that do not support the productive work of the HAB. He asked that petty issues be set aside and the HAB concentrate on policy issues for vitrifying the tank waste. He added that people should not accuse the regulators of compromising their position with DOE. The regulators are in a difficult position and compromises have to be made occasionally. The organization of the contractors hinders progress as well. Often, contractors have to spend money to meet a milestone, and they compromise safety in the process. They will do anything to get an award fee including working non-productive overtime hours. He recommended that the award fee structure be examined. Tom Carpenter took exception to Mr. Kyriazis' comments that he felt were a personal attack. Keith Klein stated that lessons learned in the past are being incorporated and that the process is improving. Pete Knollmeyer added that all performance agreements have a two-part criterion: a cost variance and a schedule variance. This helps in meeting the milestone and prevents the budget from being blown.

Max Power augmented Tom Fitzsimmons comments regarding Ecology's need for the HAB. The Board can and has helped cleanup by bringing the agencies back to core values. It serves as

the institutional memory during a time when so many management changes have occurred and through many budget crises. Additionally, the HAB shows the country and the region where Hanford cleanup stands and what needs to happen next. The Board is helpful in getting DOE to focus on crosscutting issues and to keep cleanup fiscally accountable. The HAB is less helpful when it operates like a bureaucracy and becomes fragmented in voicing concerns. It is important for the Board to speak with one voice to show how stakeholder values apply to policy issues. When consensus is not achieved, the range of opinions should also be expressed.

Mike Gearheard, EPA, commented that the HAB provides the forum for debate on some of the most difficult issues. It is a tool that works best when consensus is achieved. EPA also values the role the Board plays in the national discussion and in keeping the focus on the environmental goals of the region. Also, the HAB's educational role should not be overlooked. It provides the credibility for public trust between government agencies and the public that is so badly needed. Keith Klein added that the HAB is an advisory group that is different than being an organization to which DOE is accountable. Sometimes he may push back when it looks like the questions from the Board are taking too much time and energy that should be focused on cleanup. He stressed the need to focus on accomplishing work and welcomed consensus advice in the future.

Susan Leckband expressed concern about the relationship between DOE-RL, ORP, and DOE-HQ as related to public involvement in light of current and upcoming organizational changes. She asked to whom advice should be sent. Dick French responded that he oversees the tanks program, and that all decisions on site come together at DOE-HQ. The Regulatory Unit reports to Keith Klein's organization, even for those issues it is responsible for regarding ORP. Questions and advice should be addressed to whoever seems appropriate for the given issue.

Tanks and the Office of River Protection

Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), asked Dick French to share his views on an alternative path for tank waste treatment privatization. Mr. French responded that the best course of action should take into account the taxpayers interests first. BNFL is willing to put up \$500 million of its money. Therefore, the alternatives to this path are few at this time. One option is to build new tanks at a cost of \$55 million per tank. This would be the minimum "do nothing" approach. Alternative methods for the final state of the waste have been examined as well. These will not be politically palatable, but if Congress does not fund at the required levels, these alternatives will have to be pursued.

Gerry Pollet commented that the HAB has followed the contract work with BNFL as well as the creation of alternatives to the primary path. The Board has asked for a review to show that the best bargain has been chosen. It has also recommended that the rate of treatment of tank waste be increased. He asked how ORP planned to show that the BNFL contract and financing plan are the best path forward with a credible review. Dick French stated that the case would need to be made everywhere to ensure that adequate funding is given to the program. The privatization decision was made several years ago, and DOE is looking for support in the effort rather than searching out alternatives. He hopes that the Board will support the decision and the primary

path forward. Gerry Pollet commented that the HAB has asked for a role in reviewing the results and in conducting an independent review of the information. Dick French responded that he did not feel it was appropriate for the HAB to be involved in the review because it makes the HAB look like a regulatory authority. The review is mandated by Congress and will be done by the DOE-HQ Field Integration Office. However, he stated that the reviewers could provide updates and copies of the reports to the HAB.

Gerry Pollet asked if a report would be required prior to the congressional budget review to plan for treating more than 10% of waste by 2018. Roger Stanley, Ecology, stated that all contracting and financial alternatives are being analyzed. A proposal is being made concerning this issue along with tank waste negotiations. Beyond that, the question is directly related to the processing capability of the plant. The baseline of 10% can be increased, but no proposals are planned to force this increase. Dick French added that 25% of the radioactivity would be processed in the treatment of 10% of the waste by the 2018 milestone. Gerry Pollet expressed concern that the public was not able to participate in the policy analysis that will sell the privatization effort. He added that the Board needs access to independent consultants in order to make better decisions and advice. George Kyriazis added that the HAB should know what is going on in all the reviews. For example, Ecology has hired Pacific Rim, and the HAB should be briefed on these activities. Marilyn Reeves added that the HAB is looking for evidence that alternatives were examined, and the best one was chosen. Dick French stated that it is DOE's responsibility to bring information to the Board so the HAB can provide advice on policy issues. Roger Stanley stated that Pacific Rim has experience helping the State with some of the tough regulatory choices that may arise in the near future and that he could provide further information.

Pam Brown encouraged the senior managers to remain patient and observe the Board's concerns. The issues raised in the past have been legitimate, and the problems predicted have occurred. Considerable time has been invested by Board members to become knowledgeable on the issues at Hanford. She asked if they could submit questions to the review panels for consideration in the review. Dick French agreed that this would be acceptable.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked if no new storage spaces or tanks will be constructed if the privatization contract goes as planned. Dick French stated that there will be tank space problems in FY2007 no matter what happens with the contract, and space is being freed to handle that issue. DOE does not want to spend money on additional tanks without treating the waste in the vitrification plant. If the contract does not work, a re-bidding process will occur. This would be extremely difficult due to the work that has already been accomplished. If no waste is processed, new tanks must be built. However, if the vitrification plant is on line by FY2005, space will be available.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), commented that even though there is a need to promote the site and show successes, DOE should be aware that there are difficult milestones coming in the future. She asked if DOE would commit to milestones and stop stonewalling accountability. Dick French replied that they would.

Pam Brown asked about progress with interim stabilization and the work under the consent order. Dick French replied that the project is ahead of the commitments made to the State. Fran Delozier, Lockheed Martin, stated that seven tanks are currently being pumped. The high priority tanks will be started by the end of the year; 350,000 gallons of waste has already been pumped from tanks; and one cross-site transfer has been made.

Greg deBruler commented that the interface between the groundwater vadose zone (GW/VZ) project and ORP is unclear. Keith Klein replied that Dick French handles any problems in the tanks, and anything outside of the tanks is under his direction. They will work closely together on these issues. Greg deBruler also asked how independent reviews would be conducted to get information. Keith Klein stated that he is concerned about seeing things only through the bureaucracy, and he wants to see reviews from outside perspectives as well. He realizes the need for creative and broad thinking. Mr. Klein hopes to sort out the current information on modeling, geology, hydrology, and the feasibility of interim barriers before moving ahead with further decisions in the program.

Nanci Peters, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), asked how the new managers would deal with the Indian Nations and how the split in decision making would affect these relations. Dick French answered that he would work closely with the DOE-RL field office in working with the tribal governments.

Health and Safety

Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), stated that integrated safety management is the key to improving the working environment for employees. Opening channels to communicate for employees concerns is critical. A March 1999 DNFSB report noted that there have been no catastrophic accidents in defense nuclear facilities. However, he cautioned that most facilities show signs of aging and accumulation of hazardous waste in unstable forms. Many of the workers are retiring and newer employees are managing aging facilities. There have been a number of near misses, and reliable emergency preparedness is needed. Dick asked the managers to comment on their impressions of the balance between acceptable cleanup progress and protecting the workers, the public, and the environment. Dick French replied that safety is the first priority on site. There will be a single safety system that will remove some of the bureaucracy responsible for hindering progress in the past. Keith Klein stated that Hanford is in a race to complete work before having to invest in replacing aging infrastructure. He realizes that the workers must feel they can speak up when the work environment is unsafe in order to maintain safe progress in cleanup. There is a balance on these issues that must be addressed. Roger Stanley agreed that work must be done safely, and the site must be careful to keep bureaucratic layers to a minimum.

Dick Belsey stated that DOE had stored 17,000 incomplete accident reports in computer records that were never carried to completion. Some were crucial and are still unresolved. It is an inefficient system, and the reporting part of it is labor intensive. The redundancy of audits is an area of savings, but will take some work. Keith Klein stated that a system for prioritizing the

issues is important. Paul Kruger, DOE, stated that this deficiency was highlighted recently in a corrective action order, asking DOE to put a corrective action system in place. This system would highlight the lessons learned and make sure that all incidents were documented.

Tim Takaro stated that the health surveillance system on site has achieved remarkable goals. The three-year-old program now monitors 13,000 workers. He expressed concern that its success is threatened by the separation of the management structure and that full site integration is needed for a safety system to be successful. Dick French answered that the current health system and lines of authority would be used unless a better way of handling the issue was found. Tom Carpenter asked if the managers supported the "whistle blowers" on site. Dick French replied that he intended to use site-wide policies.

K Basins – Spent Nuclear Fuel

Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) (Local Business), said that there is a long history of changes in the spent nuclear fuel project and expressed concern about meeting work schedules and ensuring quality work. The operational portion of the project is beginning which has the highest project costs, need for safety, and importance in meeting TPA milestones. The changes in contractors are also another concern for this program. Keith Klein answered that he is working with FDH to speed progress on the spent nuclear fuel project. They are proceeding with plans to meet the November 2000 date and would like to speed treatment of sludge. He feels the site is taking steps in the right direction in regards to project management and increasing accountability. Mike Gearheard stated that EPA is committed to the set deadlines at the K Basins and to starting treatment in November 2000. They are not willing to adjust the deadlines in this project.

Tim Takaro commented that the technologies used in the environmental management science program (EMSP) are not utilized well and that the K Basin technology should be exported. He asked managers to share their ideas on how to integrate EMSP technologies to other projects on the site and in other areas of the world. Dick French stated that he welcomes HAB advice on how to address this issue. Marilyn Reeves commented that the HAB has not focused in this area and it may be a good time to begin thinking on these ideas.

Plutonium Finishing Plant

Shelley Cimon said that PFP is one of the highest site priorities with significant criticality issues. In 1997, Ecology sent a letter suspending negotiations pending resolution of three issues. First, the scope was unclear, including what portion of PFP was to be included in transition. Second, there was no schedule. Third, DOE had not made definitive waste and materials decisions. These problems are still unresolved. She asked how the current impasse with regulators would be resolved and encouraged negotiations for milestones to begin immediately. Additionally, there is a lack of funding to send plutonium to Savannah River. She noted that three muffle furnaces are 90% complete and need to begin operating as soon as possible. DOE has the ability to show the public that progress in cleanup is possible.

Pete Knollmeyer stated that negotiations for TPA milestones are past the scoping process. One of the largest problems at PFP is that no cleanup was accomplished before the plant was shutdown. The integrated management plan (IMP) has gone through two reviews, and DOE is acting on the draft comments. A contentious issue is the waste designation issue. Special nuclear material is exempt from Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulation. All parties want to store the material in a safe manner, and negotiations are planned in the near future. The Operational Readiness Review wrapped up in January, and no criticality concerns were highlighted during the review. Currently, the Savannah River plutonium storage facility has been delayed so Hanford is working to make sure it is self-sufficient as a backup plan. DOE is working on a modification to the IMP to modify the vaults and have the material in storage by the DNFSB 94-1 commitment. He stated that the \$17 million cost for security at PFP is in the EM budget each year and does not affect cleanup funds. The furnaces are nearly operational, and the delay is due to the need for additional funding and more employee shifts to run the furnaces. Pete stated that Tank 241-Z-361 has been sampled, and no explosive potential was found. The core sampling will be done by the end of the year.

Roger Stanley commented that Ecology has no plans for TPA negotiations on PFP until DOE recognizes that it is subject to compliance under RCRA regulations. The plant has lots of acids and organics, and Ecology is looking at compliance issues. DOE has expressed interest in exploratory dialogue, but at this point, milestone negotiations are not in the near future. Pete Knollmeyer stated that DOE does not think it is exempt from regulations. The plutonium has value to DOE, and negotiations are ongoing with the Russians to have them commit to vitrifying the waste.

Betty Tabbutt commented that the material meets the definitions under state law. She has never heard the regulators talk about the material under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) that applies to anything with the potential of a release. If the material cannot be transferred, it should be looked at under MTCA regulations.

Pam Brown said that there is reorganization at PFP by the contractors. The result is that people are only responsible for individual jobs, and there is no sense of teamwork at the facility. Pete Knollmeyer said that workers included as part of the reengineering plan have told him people are happy. PFP went from a functional organization to a project team, and this cuts the time to do work. For example, the principles applied at the B Plant allowed workers to find other jobs on site as they finished work at the plant. This same commitment has been made to workers at PFP.

Discussion with Keith Klein regarding Reorganization Initiatives

Madeleine Brown asked what the flattening and reduction of Project Hanford Management Contract (PHMC) managers means to the site and the workers. She questioned whether subcontractors will be doing more work, or the site will begin to outsource efforts. Keith Klein replied that managers and personnel would be reassigned. There is infrastructure on site that contributes to indirect costs and takes away from efficiency. He hopes to empower project

managers with more authority in order to move work faster. There will be a combination of outsourcing, fixed price contracts, decentralizing, and projectizing. He hopes to reduce the layers of management from seven to three.

Greg deBruler asked what is being done to empower workers and prevent retaliation to workers who bring issues forward. Keith Klein replied that people should feel free to bring concerns forward, and DOE supports this effort. He has heard some disturbing rumors and is looking into these issues. Greg also asked how the structure of DOE-RL would change under this plan. Mr. Klein stated that the site is planning a reorganization. He hopes to better define federal agency functions versus contractor functions. DOE is not only a customer of the contractors; it is a supplier as well. He wants to understand the roles and responsibilities and fashion the organization around supporting these functions.

Merilyn Reeves asked for suggestions on issues that the Board should follow in the next few committee and Board meetings. Keith Klein stated that he appreciates the Board's input on any issues. He stated that he heard the EM program took a \$300 million decrease in funding at DOE-HQ in the current FY2000 budget process. However, there is still plenty of time to address this before the final budget allocation.

Merilyn Reeves requested Mr. Klein's opinion on the number of separate contractors on site and how things are changing from the original Management and Integration (M&I) contract. He replied that in his experience at Rocky Flats, there were many challenges with the contractors. All the contractors have different systems of conducting business, and he stressed the need to continue using common sense.

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government) asked for insight on Mr. Klein's management style. Keith Klein commented that he likes to build networks on the ground and balance what he hears from workers with what managers tell him. He is letting common sense guide decisions and looks for people on the same wavelength as he for his management team. He stated that he is in a position to fix many issues on site, but needs to fully understand the problems first.

Susan Leckband said that fragmentation on site is one of the largest challenges for workers. The communication is not very good in many places on site, and the workers are begging for good leadership. The site needs to have one focus. They are looking for a compelling reason to do the job, and she encouraged Mr. Klein to give them those reasons. Then the evidence should go back to Washington, D.C. to show work being done on the ground. She urged him to examine the communication channels between his office down the line to workers.

Mary Lou Blazek asked how Mr. Klein's announcement about site contractor changes affected ORP. Keith Klein stated that the Lockheed Martin subcontract would be moving directly under ORP. He and Dick French are committed to making it work. He commented that Mr. French has been given great responsibility and needs the authority to do his job. He wants to have direct control over the things that determine his success.

George Kyriazis applauded the approach Mr. Klein was taking to making the contractor's work more efficient and to saving costs wherever possible. He stated that the effort is a good step in trying to create some long range plans for the future. Marilyn Reeves stated that Hanford is not always viewed in a favorable light on the national scene due to all the interest group activity and philosophical differences with other sites. She cautioned Mr. Klein to work these issues out carefully. Keith Klein replied that the Board is synchronized with the views of the site and that everyone is united to prevent disaster and to the mission of cleanup.

Tom Carpenter questioned the reorganization of DOE as being discussed at DOE-HQ and the activities on the national scene. Keith Klein stated that the Office of Nuclear Material Stewardship has considerable momentum. It is concentrated on the remnants of the weapons production complex, the national labs, and the elements of the complex involved in maintaining the current stockpile. Hanford has some plutonium here and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) is involved in the activities to some degree. He thinks that changes will mostly effect the Albuquerque labs and some work done at Savannah River.

Madeleine Brown commented that as a Hanford employee for 18 years, she has been through one contract change and has been involved in an outsourcing effort. Both were extremely rough, and the last one was especially hard. She has no union protection and her "advanced age" of 42 is somewhat of a liability. She reminded Mr. Klein that efficiencies should not come by pulling people out of their pension plans and changing the name of their employer.

Leon Swenson commended Mr. Klein's effort in listening to the Board. He asked if the site is at a national disadvantage for funding. Mr. Klein responded that the site is suffering from a perception problem that Hanford spends too much money for the results it produces. Good news is often obscured by the mistakes. The site needs a better story explaining its mission and plan for completing work. Betty Tabbutt asked how funding is being discussed in Congress. She stressed the need to move the focus from discretionary funding to the government's moral obligation, particularly related to the treaty rights.

Jim Trombold asked if the quantity of waste on site is discussed in Congress. He stated that the site needs must be sold to Congress as a high national priority for disaster prevention. He questioned if sites nearer larger population centers were at an advantage over Hanford. Keith Klein replied that the quantity of waste at Hanford is one of the reasons the site cannot be ignored. The site also has the advantage of the need to protect the Columbia River for the entire northwest region. He stated that people have a natural tendency to want to protect the river.

TPA AGENCY PROCESSES FOR RESPONDING TO BOARD ADVICE

Marilyn Reeves announced that the draft advice from the Public Involvement Committee had been tabled for further work in the committee.

FISCAL YEAR 2000 PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS ADVICE

Louise Dressen stated that this was the second year the Board provided advice on performance agreements (PAs). Much of the last year's advice was repeated in this year's draft advice. The response provided by DOE last year was passed. Marilyn Reeves commented that the response to last year's advice was excellent, and there is no point in repeating what was said in past advice. Gerry Pollet stated that the overall theme from last year was being repeated, but that there were added details. The main message of the advice is that contract incentives drive progress. When they are well defined and specific, they are more effective.

Madeleine Brown commented that she would have to recuse herself from the discussion and adoption of this advice because of a potential conflict of interest.

Board Discussion

Leon Swenson indicated that he was concerned with the statement of the principle. There are other things that drive progress, and he worried that issues like employee investment were ignored in the advice. Tim Takaro commented that incentives could be corrupted. The resources going to meet incentives should go towards doing work.

Pete Knollmeyer stated that Dick French prefers his program be called the Office of River Protection, and the project be called the River Protection Project (RPP). The RPP is divided into two sides: storage/retrieval and processing/disposal. Currently, there are no PAs with BNFL. Jim Watts commented that Mr. French is using these names in an effort to gain more funding for the program and to lose the past perceptions. Gerry Pollet emphasized that award fees should be based on actual costs of the job.

Leon Swenson expressed concern about where the advice is heading. The HAB is re-micromanaging DOE's decisions and work. Marilyn Reeves added that there are many of the same words used in the draft advice that were included in the September 1998 advice. It is confusing when the same thing is repeated, and there is no conflict with DOE's response. Gerry Pollet agreed to work on highlighting the issues that have changed since the 1998 advice. Louise Dressen recommended that the advice be rearranged to list the items from last year separately. This would encourage focus on the new issues.

Susan Leckband stated that one of the HAB's strengths is the consistency in portraying its values through the years. The advice must be tied to past work. She explained the changes she had made to the draft advice to increase its credibility.

Gerry Pollet indicated that DOE did not create an incentive for the direct programs, and if a \$50 million cost savings was found there was no award. Pete Knollmeyer suggested that the Board continue to recommend incentivizing the accelerated scope within direct funded work.

Gordon Rogers, Public-At-Large, asked what the function of a site roster to the worker/public health index is and how it establishes credibility. Pete Knollmeyer responded that each contractor uses a different method. The lists are outdated and include people who have left Hanford, so it is a difficult document to use.

Paige Knight expressed concern that the advice was too complicated for the general public to understand. She suggested that the advice be shortened and that the concepts be put in simple language. Gerry Pollet answered that the advice was not for the public and was addressed to DOE. Betty Tabbutt agreed that the advice was obscure to the public and that the main message was lost in the wording. She asked that the advice begin with an overall statement. Max Power suggested that the advice focus on accomplishments for the available resources and looking at the next level of performance.

Merilyn Reeves stated that the Board should look at the process for preparing, distributing and adopting the advice. Discussions about draft advice are always long and extended. Paige Knight asked the regulators how valuable the long detailed advice is to their work. Pete Knollmeyer responded that the shorter bullet form advice is better. He feels that a one or two sentence broad philosophical statement with the main message is valuable. Most of the details are known within DOE and the regulators, and they would rather have specific advice showing why they should change their policies. Also, DOE is leaning towards creating PAs that demand progress on issues such as health and safety rather than incentivizing them. Max Power agreed that shorter advice is more effective. A basic overall statement is important in interpreting the advice.

Paige Knight asked that these ideas be pulled out of the meeting summary and taken to the committees for a discussion on formulating advice. She emphasized that it is imperative for the Board not to look like the government agencies in the language it uses. The language must be kept clear and at a level which the public can understand. Gerry Pollet responded that this advice is not of concern to the broad public like other issues might be. DOE wants to reduce the specificity of PAs and therefore does not welcome HAB input. He stated that it is critical for the HAB to show details in this type of advice because otherwise the main message is lost, and DOE thinks that they are in agreement with the HAB.

The FY2000 Performance Agreements advice was adopted with editorial changes.

OFF-SITE WASTE ADVICE

Gerry Pollet introduced the off-site waste advice to the Board. He explained that the order of items in the advice has changed, but that the wording is similar to the draft distributed in the Board packet. He expressed concern that DOE will issue a record of decision (ROD) on low-level waste (LLW) and mixed-level waste based on faulty information. Pam Brown asked if the lack of public involvement in the programmatic environmental impact statement (PEIS) should be included in the advice. Beth Bilson, DOE, replied that they were related and that the State of Washington felt there were shortcomings in the stakeholder process.

Merilyn Reeves commented that the Board received a *Federal Register* notice for the waste management PEIS in March. The Board has not formally responded to that notice. After the Nevada LLW conference, the HAB indicated its concerns about the options. She expressed her concern about the analysis of costs and suggested that the advice should be more specific. Gerry Pollet responded that DOE provided the costs at a committee meeting. He added that one flaw in the analysis is DOE's failure to discuss and consider Washington State's dangerous waste laws. Some of the wastes fall under this category.

Emmett Moore, Washington State University (University), asked for clarification on whether the advice was addressing hazardous, mixed, or radioactive waste. Gerry Pollet replied that the HAB was speaking to all three. Paige Knight stressed the importance of documenting where all budget figures were quoted. Kevin Bazzell, DOE, stated that there are different rates for the different types of waste. Costs increase due to the type of containers, the time spent using them, and the resources needed to complete work. The \$1.046 million figure is based on the fixed cost to maintain the burial grounds plus the amount the generators pay for FY1999.

Jeff Luke commented that onsite and offsite generators pay the same amount for operation of the trenches. Gerry Pollet clarified that the State has regulatory authority over hazardous and mixed waste. It also has authority over uninvestigated LLW burial grounds. Doug Sherwood stated that the compliance status for the facility receiving the waste is set by the State. Hanford has the ability to identify the compliance status of the waste it receives and deny accepting waste if it chooses. The definition of a facility can be a LLW burial ground, tanks, landfills, or a central waste complex.

Susan Leckband requested that all bullets be written as firm advice rather than as philosophy.

Pete Knollmeyer stated that U.S. Ecology, a private disposal site, has not traditionally done a good job of burying LLW. Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (WDOH), commented that there is a reason for the burial methods and processes involved in U.S. Ecology's disposal of materials. Max Power said that Ecology has the authority to permit waste either on-site or off-site. In the case of the LLW burial grounds, they have not been investigated and so the growth of these burial grounds could be restricted. The advice is complex, but well taken. Gerry Pollet added that until an investigation is conducted, large quantities of waste should not be added to the burial grounds.

Betty Tabbutt commented that the HAB is concerned about adding to the burden of waste at Hanford. DOE-HQ has been framing decisions that are unrealistic, and the advice should note that sending waste to Hanford is unacceptable. Leon Swenson disagreed and said that Hanford is one of the better places to send waste, and the option should not be foreclosed. Merilyn Reeves added that the Board has made statements that it will not accept waste until there is a plan for treating the current waste at Hanford.

The advice was adopted with editorial changes.

BOARD FOCUS AND WORKPLAN

Merilyn Reeves stated that she was sensing nervousness from members about the way the Board operates and the procedures it follows. She asked if the workshop planned for the following day would be a good place to begin discussion on these issues. It had been recommended to her that the Board revisit the committee structure. For example, all the committees are dealing with tank issues, and there may be a better way to approach the problem. She also asked that members begin to think about a draft workplan for FY2000. Betty Tabbutt recommended that the Board wait before making definite workplan commitments while the senior managers begin to implement their ideas.

Greg deBruler commented that unresolved questions concerning privatization should be collected and sent to Dick French. If the HAB does not highlight its views and concerns up front, it will not affect the policy changes. He does not feel the issues are unresolvable, but they are critical to success. Louise Dressen asked if the letter written to Dick French during the June meeting had addressed this request. Greg deBruler answered that there were still some critical issues to address.

Gordon Rogers commented that the site must find ways to reorganize to get more done for the available budget. He hopes that the Board will make an effort to make productive suggestions. Betty Tabbutt stated that Keith Klein should get a chance to put his initiatives in place and to see the results of these changes. Max Power recommended that the HAB give clarity to what should be accomplished and focus advice on project management and measuring success.

Merilyn Reeves stated that the Board might want to review its charter, procedures, and committee processes as several new members have joined the Board. The workplan should also include looking at the future direction of the HAB. These are internal matters and can start with the Executive Committee. She cautioned that with the new program managers and new people on site, the HAB should be careful about the messages it sends.

Leon Swenson recommended that the facilitation team work to make sure draft advice is in the correct form before it comes before the Board. He expressed frustration that much of the discussions center on trying to determine the best format for the advice. Jim Trombold added that the Board does not compliment DOE's good work often enough. DOE has a difficult job, and the Board can keep pushing them while lending a sense of support.

Harold Heacock suggested that a review of the nearly 100 pieces of advice passed by the Board would be helpful. A summary look at the impacts of the advice would be beneficial in determining a better path forward.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Merilyn Reeves introduced David Stensel, new alternate for Tim Takaro. David Stensel is a professor at the University of Washington in the Department of Civil and Environmental

Engineering. He specializes in developing the bioremediation technologies to process and treat waste. He is interested in supporting Tim Takaro technically and looks forward to working with the Board. Marilyn Reeves suggested that he attend several committee meetings to determine where he would best fit and could best contribute.

Gordon Rogers explained that the EM science program develops science and technology techniques for cleanup. Site technical representatives, representatives of DOE-RL departments, and people from the Board guide the local effort. There is currently one vacancy created by Tom Engel's resignation from the Board. Gordon has been attending the subsurface contaminants meeting recently, and Pam Brown has been attending the deactivation and decommissioning meetings. There is an opening in the tanks group, and Gordon asked David Stensel to consider attending these meetings in the future.

Marilyn Reeves asked that the Executive Committee meet in August to discuss the procedures for building agendas and to review the HAB budget. Input from Board members is welcomed for Executive Committee meeting agendas.

Susan Leckband asked about a chronology that she picked up on the back table relating to the Dollars and Sense Committee. Gerry Pollet explained that he has placed it on the back table as a response to a recent editorial in the Tri-City Herald regarding his actions concerning a Defense Contracting Audit Agency (DCAA) audit. In the future, the facilitation team will ensure that the back tables are clearly marked for official Board materials and for other informational materials made available by individual Board members and others.

Vice-Chair Election

Marilyn Reeves asked George Kyriazis to describe his role as HAB vice-chair. George stated that he is involved with almost all the committees so that he knows what was going on in the entire HAB and can give advice to Marilyn when she needs it. He serves as a moderator on issues and works to help resolve issues. Marilyn Reeves added that he helps with other Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meetings and conference calls. The role of vice-chair is important, as this person is a spokesperson for the HAB in outside arenas. George will serve on the Board after September as a second alternate, but will be away for a year beginning in December. The City of Kennewick has selected Gary Miller to be its new primary member. Abe Greenberg will continue as the first alternate for the seat.

Ruth Siguenza stated that she would be collecting nominations for vice-chair until September 3rd. The election process is modeled after the committee chair and vice-chair elections. Nominations can be sent to EnviroIssues. The list of nominees would be faxed to the Board on September 7th. A secret ballot will be held in which a simple majority elects the next vice-chair. Each seat will get one vote, so members and alternates should work together to choose their preferred candidate. Special arrangements can be made for those who will not be able to attend the September Board meeting. Gordon Rogers, George Kyriazis, and Jim Watts nominated Ken Bracken. Mary Lou Blazek nominated Shelley Cimon.

September HAB Agenda

Merilyn Reeves stated that the next meeting would be held in Seattle. The GW/VZ issues will be on the September agenda. Also included in meeting topics will be environment, safety and health (ES&H) issues related to ORP, and PFP. Greg deBruler stated that another issue for consideration should be a discussion with the full Board about privatization to delineate the concerns and come to closure on controversial issues. Privatization is a critical issue, and the HAB should put together its concerns so that it can speak with a common voice. Ruth Siguenza suggested that the Tank Waste Ad Hoc Committee tackle the issue at their August 13th committee meeting.

Leon Swenson expressed concern about the culture in which workers have concerns about losing their jobs. The site must find a way to make these changes in a productive manner. Dick Belsey agreed that when workers feel their jobs are in jeopardy, they become more negative, and health and safety are compromised. He stated that the HAB should continue to speak to the issue and keep the agencies considering options for improvement.

UPDATES

Fernald Transportation Workshop

Paige Knight provided an update on the Fernald transportation workshop. She stated that Ken Niles would bring more information back to the Board about the transportation group that was formed following the workshop. The HAB needs more information before considering endorsement of the eight statements that came out of the workshop. Merilyn Reeves said that the HAB's official position is that it is deciding whether to endorse the statements that came from the workshop or not. The Rocky Flats SSAB has sent a letter of concern about the transportation working group. The group's mission is unclear, and the Rocky Flats SSAB does not have the funds to support the group's activities. The HAB should find out more about how DOE-HQ views participation in these SSAB workshops and associated workgroups.

Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Anna Beard, DOE, provided an update on Hanford's Solid Waste environmental impact statement (EIS). The draft EIS is in the final stages of development. The alternatives have been defined, and waste volumes have been reconciled with DOE-HQ and the PEIS numbers. The draft EIS is expected to be issued in late summer or early fall 1999. The public comment period will be in the fall of 1999. The final EIS will be completed by the end of 1999, and a ROD will be issued in early 2000. The goal is to have the draft EIS out right before the announcement of preference for the waste management PEIS around September. Beth Bilson stated that exact dates on the EIS would be provided at the next HSWM Committee meeting. The purpose of this EIS is to tier off of the PEIS.

Gordon Rogers asked how the site would handle understanding what the quantity of waste will be on the site. Beth Bilson replied that they have worked with DOE-HQ to understand the PEIS because they do not want to reanalyze the waste. It has taken a long time to identify these numbers, and now the schedule is behind. Betty Tabbutt asked how the state prohibition on land disposal for dangerous waste is acknowledged. Beth Bilson answered that the waste is treated like RCRA waste and is not permitted in the landfills. DOE is careful to exclude those wastes from the burial grounds.

Path to Closure 10-Year Plan

Gene Higgins, DOE, presented an update on the Paths to Closure document. DOE-RL is working with DOE-HQ to complete the document during the summer. Carolyn Huntoon was recently appointed as the Assistant Secretary of Energy and needs time to adequately review the document. It is intended to be a high-level summarization of the work needed to meet the mission and not a decisional document. It was given to the HAB because DOE hoped to receive suggestions on any missing pieces. It provides the paths being pursued to reach compliance. It has substantially changed from last year to incorporate the mission and provide a simpler format. Three documents will be issued—the strategic plan, the Paths to Closure document, and the annual report. Together they will provide an overall picture of the mission for the site, how work will be achieved, and a status of work accomplishments.

Board Discussion

Emmett Moore stated that the usual disclaimer on the back of the document stating that DOE is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of the document makes it not worth reading. Gordon Rogers urged Board members to review the document, especially the assumptions that go into preparing the baseline cost estimates. This is a good start for the Board to begin thinking about defining the final state for facilities and areas of the site.

Merilyn Reeves suggested that the document should show the relationship to the strategic plan and the annual report. She also indicated that the purpose of the plan is not easily located and should be at the beginning of the document. She stated that the Board does not have enough time to review the document and return comments by July 22nd as requested by DOE. Because several pages were missing from the plan passed out to the Board, Gene Higgins will make sure that the missing pieces are sent to Board members.

Gerry Pollet commented that there is no strategy for achieving cost savings. There is no local strategy for making sure this work is performed. DOE is currently looking at this. There are other activities besides cost savings and efficiencies that need to be examined in order to accomplish work. DOE is looking at all options in terms of Mr. Klein's initiatives. Gerry Pollet suggested that the HAB look at these issues in light of the recent managerial changes.

Max Power commented that the format was much improved and suggested using it on a national level. Stan Stave, City of Richland (Local Government), asked how the Paths to Closure

document and the strategic plan would fit into the comprehensive land use plan. Gene Higgins replied that the land use plan lays out what will be done in each of the areas and the strategic plan show how the work will be done. The Paths to Closure document lays out all the required activities. Gordon Rogers added that HAB advice on the document would be useful in the future, as the problem will be around for quite awhile. Gene Higgins re-iterated that the plan is an overview of how work will be accomplished and is not a decisional document. The Paths to Closure document will coincide with the presidential budget submission so DOE has a plan to support the budget request. Congress has asked for a plan to go along with the dollar amounts being requested. It has not been referred to as a decisional document; it is an informational document.

Betty Tabbutt commented that if the plan was generated to solicit more funding from Congress, it would have been better if DOE had taken the TPA Agreement. Gene Higgins stated that DOE asks for a budget for the entire complex. It was trying to incorporate all aspects of the plans to ask for an adequate budget for all the sites' needs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Norm Buske

Norm Buske, GAP, stated that he is no longer taking expense payments from DOE to attend HAB meetings and is paying his own way. He feels that the corruption level is so high in the HAB that he cannot take reimbursements. The easy successes have already been accomplished. The major problems are being tucked away, becoming larger, and beginning to seriously threaten the Board. As long as the public can speak, there are avenues for correcting the problems.

The main issue of concern currently is the treatment of Gerry Pollet. Gerry had come across documents that showed improper use of funds by a contractor at Hanford. He was trying to bring a major issue to light and then addressed a letter on Heart of America letterhead to DOE and others that would be concerned. In reply, a letter was sent by various members of the Dollars and Sense Committee censuring Gerry for his actions and references to the HAB. These people were attacking openness. Norm wants the HAB to apologize for its outrageous treatment of Gerry. Gerry was simply doing his job.

In celebrating the 10th anniversary of the TPA, the site must admit its weaknesses and growing problems. There is a collapse of cleanup and public involvement. The site is setting up to restart the bomb factory at FFTF. Norm stated that when he came to the Board he said that he would sample on site in order to make the Board more aware of problems. He has found some uncomfortable facts, but the Board does not want to know the facts. The public will care about the fact that the site is allowing strontium-90 to seep into the river and contaminate salmon redds. This will be taken to the newspapers and will become an issue.

Bernice Mitchell

Bernice Mitchell asked the Board what advice it has given concerning economic development. The community is divided into two factions: minorities and Caucasians. The economic money went to Caucasians. DOE canceled its contract with the minority community. She has been attending Board meetings since the HAB started, and she feels it is a cheering section for DOE. There are no incentives to force DOE to put the Board's suggestions into action. In her opinion, DOE is using the HAB to keep drawing salaries to talk to the Board with no intent of performing cleanup work. When she asked Mr. Wagoner why the site paid a fee to contractors since they should have been expected to do a good job in the first place. He responded that this was the normal process in government contracts. She hopes the HAB can stop this practice. The Board has an unfair advantage over the rest of the community because DOE will listen to it. She suggested that DOE dissolve the Board and let the money go back for cleanup. She feels that the HAB has cost too much money. There are too many employees on site already, and the money used by the HAB could be better spent on other employees and cleanup work. DOE will eventually privatize Hanford work. She asked the Board to apply for its own repeal.

Gerry Pollet

Gerry Pollet stated that he had been urged to comment on items distributed in the back of the room that are false and misleading and in violation of HAB information distribution procedures. He expressed concern that Board members did not understand the issues and were being misled. He felt that he had worked the issues within the Dollars and Sense Committee and that the Board's understanding was behind the Committee's.

Gerry Pollet was disturbed when the false and inflammatory editorial from the "Tri-Cycle Herald" was placed at the back of the room. Additionally, the letter from the Dollars and Sense Committee members to HAB Chair Marilyn Reeves accused him of holding sensitive information, which he identified as the DCAA 1997 Audit. He clarified that this audit was a public record and was not sensitive information. Gerry stated that it was requested for distribution for the June committee meeting. DOE showed up to the committee meeting without the document. Gerry also clarified that he was not withholding positive information about the contractors in an effort to make them look worse. He read from portions of the 1997 audit stating the conclusion that \$93 million was unaccounted for at the time. Gerry reiterated that he tried to have the information available to the committee after the June meeting as well, but that its distribution was repeatedly blocked. He added that on May 11th, Bob Tibbatts, DOE, blocked the committee from talking with DCAA representatives. He was frustrated by the fact that the information was not provided openly to the committee when asked.

Marilyn Reeves stated that she had a few items to add to Gerry's chronology of events regarding this issue. First, the committee was working with two different audits. The DCAA 1999 Audit was given to the committee at its June meeting, but the DCAA 1997 Audit has not been shared with her yet. There was question over whether DOE actually failed to provide the information in response to a clear request and why Gerry already had the documents in his possession but chose not to share them. The Dollars and Sense Committee only had access to one of the documents

(the 1999 audit) and was not prepared for the discussion at the June 8th committee meeting. Gerry became upset at the meeting and sent a letter to the TPA agencies and congressional representatives dated June 15th on Heart of America stationery. Marilyn was disturbed by references to the HAB and the Dollars and Sense Committee in Gerry's letter. The letter was not discussed by the committee and should not have referenced it. She then received a letter signed by six members of the committee expressing concern over Gerry's actions. Excerpts of the DCAA 1997 audit were given to the facilitators for distribution, but they were labeled "for official use only". So, the pages were not sent out to the committee. A meeting was then scheduled for July 8th in a rush. The Dollars and Sense Committee has resolved the issues for itself and its members.

Jim Trombold commented that the Board should not be submerged in the dates and details. The Board should be able to place any materials in the back of the room for general education on Hanford issues. He also stated that everyone could learn from the experience to only write letters as individuals if the committee or HAB is not involved in the correspondence. Tom Carpenter expressed concern that DOE was controlling the information given to the HAB. He would like to follow up on the issue and try to resolve some of the difficulties in obtaining documents from DOE. Greg deBruler said that he was appalled that the letter from the Dollars and Sense Committee members was signed with their official HAB titles. He asked how they could condemn Gerry for not including the entire committee in his letter and then sign their letter in such a fashion. He asked that Gerry Pollet be given an apology for the slanderous information that has been presented.

Merilyn Reeves said that Board policy states any letter sent to the Board or the Chair of the Board is available at the back of the room during Board meetings. She added that there were other pieces of information relating to this issue on the table, including the draft committee meeting minutes. Louise Dressen clarified that there are three groups of materials at the back of the room. The first is the material sent to the Board in the packet; the second is material that has come into the Board after the packet was mailed; and the third is copies of materials that individuals bring to the meeting. There is no Board control or responsibility over this final group of materials. Gerry Pollet stated that the material should not have been distributed because the HAB has rules against publishing inflammatory material.

Shelley Cimon noted that because this discussion occurred during public comment period, it points out that the consensus process is not nailed down yet. She suggested that the Executive Committee examine loopholes in Board processes and fix them. Betty Tabbutt felt that the Dollars and Sense Committee members should have talked directly with Gerry, rather than sending a letter to the HAB chair. Merilyn Reeves concluded that it was critical to safeguard HAB openness, including the ability to share information for discussions and achieve consensus on issues within the committees. The HAB should continue to push for distribution of material needed to conduct its normal business. Once the Board articulates a problem, follows its processes, and obtains the needed materials, it can reach consensus on most issues. This episode regarding the Dollars and Sense Committee and the DCAA audits is a clear example in which information was not accessible, and the situation escalated.

Gai Oglesbee

Gai Oglesbee stated that the Board must stay diversified with representatives like Gerry Pollet and Tom Carpenter. They are advocates, which is far different than activists. An advocate is trying to help people, and the Board should be helping people. She is disenchanted with the local newspaper and feels that the reporting makes the Hanford site a difficult place to work. Name calling in the newspaper is not good reporting. She stated that if the Board tolerated treatment such as Gerry Pollet has experienced lately, it would destroy the good work it is doing. The public needs to see diversity on the Board. Advisory boards come and go and some boards will not meet in the Tri-Cities anymore. The Tri-City Herald attacks her as well and would not allow her to give a rebuttal to the articles it published. She cautioned the Board to keep an eye on diversity within its membership.