

START

0038095

TPA MEETING - Portland, Oregon

5/10/94

TAPE ONE - SIDE A

DB: Good Evening. I'd like to welcome you to this meeting which is going to be devoted to a discussion of progress toward achieving the goals of the Tri-party Agreement--the agreement between the Washington Department of Ecology, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the United States Department of Energy--governing what is euphemistically called cleanup at Hanford Reservation. Also to be discussed will be refocusing of the environmental restoration component of the cleanup process. I'm Dick Belse. I'm a member of Oregon's Hanford Waste Board and Chair of the site of the waste cleanup and site restoration committee of that board. And I'm also a member of the Hanford Advisory Board which is a newly formed board, supposedly dealing with cleanup issues at the Hanford reservation. I want to welcome the people from EPA, DOE, and Ecology, and at the same time I would like to say that I thought we had learned how to do meetings and how to give adequate notice so that in fact we could get a nice turnout. This is a nice turnout, but notifying people that you're going to have the circus come to town 10 days from now and it's not going to come around for another year is a little delinquent. And we've learned that public involvement pays, that the people coming tonight want to get their questions answered, and people who may not be here tonight, because they didn't have enough notice, will miss that opportunity. But we're glad that when you come out on the tour that you come to Oregon. Oregonians have a real stake in what's going on up in Hanford. We are concerned primarily, but not exclusively, with issues that impact on the lifeline and lifeblood of the Northwest and its economy, the Columbia River, and this is a very appropriate spot to have this meeting. It might have been better if it were a little closer to public transit, and I don't mean to sound crotchety, but we really want to be able to get as many people as we can involved. And because the meeting came up so late and needed to be

911227.000
200102146



scheduled, it came out at the edge of Portland and at the edge of Washington rather than in town. So gentlemen, welcome, thanks for coming, and I ask that you do it better next time.

MP: Hello. I'm Melinda Page and I am going to facilitate the meeting tonight. I work with a company out of Seattle called Triangle Associates. We'll be going through the agenda with a couple of changes. Some of the people who have been active in following the process here have asked that as especially the presenter, Steve Wissen, on the budget, and the priorities for this year and the coming years is speaking that you be able to ask questions. The budget presentation has a lot of information in it and it's hard to sometimes remember the question by the time we get around to the questioning period, so we will run that a little differently than the agenda indicated. Also, it will be really helpful if you have the handout that looks like this, the environmental restoration program background, and the handout that says budget allocation in the environmental management program. If you don't have those two handouts would you please raise your hands and we'll bring them to you. They're reproductions of the view foils that are going to be used in the presentation, but sometimes those things are hard to see from a distance. As you can see from the agenda, we're going to begin the meeting by presentations by the three agencies, looking at where the tri-party agreement has come, where it is now, and where it's going. And then also focusing on the '95 budget as it has gone forward to the Congress. Then we'll skip the interest group presentation on the '95 budget because the interest group that was most interested in giving the presentation isn't here tonight, and we'll go straight to public comments and questions. There'll then be a presentation on the environmental restoration program. And after that presentation, we'd like to gather you into smaller groups



than this large group and have you spend some time sitting with some people from the agencies and have a chance to ask questions in a much less formal way. Sometimes it's hard for people to come up in front of a lot of other people and ask a question or make a comment. So we're going to do the smaller round table discussions, and when that's over, we will go to the more formal public comment period. If there's anyone here who came now expecting that in half an hour you'd be expecting to make your public comments and you have somewhere that you have to be, if you'd let me know that we'll go ahead and call on you so you don't feel frustrated at having to wait until 9:00 to make a formal comment.

DB: I understand some of you came here expecting maybe that this was going to be a meeting about the Hanford releases and the ??? construction project. That meeting is scheduled for Thursday evening at 7:00 at the Holiday Inn in the 1000 block on Grand Avenue, which I think is in the Lloyd Center. So if you're here for the Hanford Environmental ??? construction project meeting it's time to get off unless you'd like to hear what's going on here.

MP: Those announcements on the airplane, is that what we're doing? You're headed for Seattle and if you didn't mean to go there you'd better get off now? OK. The next thing I get to do is introduce the presenters for this evening. On my immediate right is Roger Stanley, and Roger's going to talk about the past year. Roger's with the Washington State Department of Ecology. In the middle is Steve Wisen who's going to do the presentation on current and future years of the tri-party agreement and the budget. And to my far right is Doug Sherwood. Doug is going to talk about the environmental restoration refocusing program, and he's from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Unless there's

questions about format and approach tonight, we'll move right into the presentations.

RS: Thank you, Melinda. And if you'd do the pictures tonight. Again my name is Roger Stanley. I'm with the Department of Ecology. I'm their Hanford Project Manager. I've been working on Hanford issues for the state of Washington for about the past 6-7 years. I've been asked to provide an overview tonight, kind of a Washington state perspective on some of the highlights of this past year before we move onto the main topics of tonight's meeting--the cleanup budget, especially the FY' 95 budget and refocusing the Department of Energy's environmental restoration program. In short, I think Washington's perspective is that this last year is probably, I'll say it's the best one. That doesn't mean that we don't have a stack of difficulties associated with Hanford cleanup that aren't a mile high. But I think the best one in comparison to the previous three or four years since the original signing of the TPA in that we started this past year to see some more significant progress on a few fronts. And I'll go over a few of those. Basically, we started to see some progress after about five years of struggling to get some of the more significant cleanup projects underway at Hanford. I'm going to start with what we called our tours negotiation this past year, our tank waste remediation system, negotiations that focused on the work schedules for cleanup of Hanford's double shell and single shell tanks. Those negotiations began this last spring. Once the Department of Energy gave us a pretty voluminous set of proposals and basically asked us to do two things. First of all to buy into a delay and start of construction of the Hanford high-level waste vitrification plant. That start of construction was scheduled for the end of March '93. And, at the same time, asked us to consider major restructuring of the tank waste or tours program. What prompted DOE was that at that time they were at the

point of basically taking off and starting to move forward with their grout program. The grout program being that portion of the tank program to solidify, stabilize, and dispose of high volume but relatively low ??? portion of Hanford's tank waste and upwards of what was then scheduled to be on the order of I think 150 very large sub-surface vaults and, as I mentioned also, were right on the verge of starting construction of a powerful vit plant. So I guess one way you could look at it is that news this last year was that the DOE did not get those major processing plants for the tank waste actually under construction. However, Washington's viewpoint after going through the negotiations through the Spring and the Summer into the Fall, and then going through public comment, was that the delay was worth it. I think we've come through with a far better program. As a result of those negotiations on tanks and as a direct reflection of tribal and stake holder public concern, Hanford's grout program was canceled. Actually the funding level has gone from around \$37 million last year down to about the \$1 million mark this coming year, that million being earmarked for basic monetary maintenance. And DOE, in lieu of the grout program, is now focusing on glassifying their low-level tank waste, so moving to a far superior waste form and when that low-level glass plant actually gets under construction, they'll wind up with equitable disposal will be still land disposal but of that more advance waste form, and I think that number of vaults is less than 50 anyway, so a far smaller number. We also with that shift in focus on low-level waste going from the grout program to glassifying low-level waste, it allowed us to put construction of the high-level vit plant out in the 2005-2009 time frame, which is when it's needed. And we can wind up getting waste out of the single shell tanks at the earliest possible date. Another side benefit is that it allows us up front to be able to put in a lot more emphasis now on pretreatment that is going to wind up being

necessary for those tank wastes. Another major benefit of the negotiations that is paying us some real benefit on the grounds now is that we were also able to put tank farm upgrades and tank safety activities into the TPA. They had not been in the TPA prior to the last year. And what that did is once we put those schedules into the TPA, it drove funding, and there's a tremendous amount of work right now that is going on out in the tank farms to upgrade all of their systems that is gradually fallen into disrepair over quite a number of years. And they're going through their ventilation systems, the monitoring systems, electrical systems, waste transport systems, and as I mentioned a tremendous amount of work. This slide just shows one of the electrical relay boxes out in the tank farms, and the type of work they are doing is just going through all of their electrical systems and basically cleaning them out. Another area that DOE has started to show some progress in this last year is in the area of tank safety. I know we all have heard a lot about their watch list tanks, their most infamous tank being 101SY that generates hydrogen gas to where there was an explosive potential. They wound up this past year successfully putting in the 101SY mixer pump which you see here. That pump just being designed to basically mix the waste, keep it mixed in the tank so that the hydrogen is actually evolved at a gradual rate rather than being allowed to build up under the crust and then periodically burp out. This mixer pump is working well enough that they're actually, the original plan was to have this initial pump, then go into fairly detailed design of what was going to be a permanent pump that would be put in place in a couple of years. This pump is working well enough that just recently they've gotten to the point where they're going to wind up constructing a spare like this one that is going to have the same life expectancy that they had planned for the original permanent pump. And they're actually projecting a savings on the order of about \$7

9413287.0007

million that is going to go into other areas of cleanup. Finally, as far as our tank negotiations, another benefit that we saw was that this last year we took a different approach, whereas in the past the three agencies had basically gotten together when we had major issues that had to be hammered out and had negotiated with one another until we had a draft document and then put that out for public comment, go through a series of meetings, make whatever adjustments were necessary, and sign it. This last year, because of our reluctance, this last Spring when we actually got out proposal for the tanks, and the fact that we could see that there were some major changes that were likely to be in the offering for the tank program, we knew that frankly that they wouldn't have a chance of flying unless we did a lot more with the public so that they could see what was coming, see what changes were being proposed, see what the rationales were. And we wound up forming the tank waste task force that basically allowed us, as we went through the negotiations to be able to hold groups, get values and principles and be able to take those to the negotiations. That approach proved to be very successful, and we're going to be using it over the coming months for other portions of the TPA most noted for the environmental restoration program. We also this last year have started to see finally DOE turn up the heat on its contractors and on its own management systems, which for quite some time it has been more and more apparent that they need to squeeze the excess cost out where they can and make their management systems far more efficient. What we did along those lines was to negotiate a separate document called a cost and management efficiency initiative that basically was the end result of a long series of audits of different methods the DOE and its contractors can utilize to do better. Those types of activities include contract reforms, cost analysis, regulatory reforms, and procurement system modifications, with the bottom line that DOE committed to savings on the

order of \$1 billion in costs with the same scope of work on the table over the coming five years. The EPA and the state are a party to that agreement. I know that as far as the Department of Ecology is concerned, we have a pretty substantial effort just going back into our own regulations that if we go overboard ??? frankly can be about as bureaucratic as you can get, and trying to strip out some of those requirements that are not necessary. Also this last year was the first year that we started to see some physical progress pop up, physical progress a lot more significant than we've seen in the past. We have the mixer pump up here, just from my own perspective, we've also started to see DOE and its contractors upgrade its overall infrastructure, basically getting ready for the major projects that are going to come up in the coming years, getting roads, office building, those types of things that don't get a lot of airplay, that are necessary before the real major projects actually get off the ground. And also in those areas, in kind of a related area of getting their overall infrastructure in place, we've seen completion of laboratory facilities. This slide here shows a facility called the waste sampling and characterization facility or the ??? lab designed to handle low-level samples. It's going to be primarily helpful in working with liquid effluent treatment facilities and also keeping tabs as far as quality control goes with lab work that is going to continue to be ongoing in the commercial sector. We also are near completion of a significant upgrade of their laboratory hot cells. You can't really tell by this slide, but hot cells are those lab facilities that they utilize for the analysis of highly radioactive samples, such as those taken out of the tanks. And those facilities were in need of a major upgrade and it getting pretty close to being operational now. Another example is in the area of liquid effluence. Of course Hanford in the past has had a pretty long list of liquid discharges to ground throughout the

reservation. This facility here has the acronym of CO18. It's out in the middle of the Hanford reservation in the 200 East area designed to take process streams from the 200 area, most notably process ??? from the tank farms. There are other liquid effluent treatment facilities that are under construction as well. That's the same facility, just a drawing. And, is that the last one. Well there was one more that I thought I had there that is a facility called the 242A evaporator which is basically a waste concentrator for the tank farms that has been down for a number of years, has gone through a major upgrade, and DOE was able to successfully restart it just recently. That facility is going to be very helpful in order to keep the volumes of the waste of the double shell tanks down as low as possible so that we have tank space that is needed prior to the time that we get the major tank processing facilities on the ground and operational. So to summarize and, I want to make it clear, I was a little hesitant to put those slides up because people always have the tendency to think, Oh God, you know we're just trying to paint a nice rosy picture of Hanford. And I don't want to do that. Hanford has tremendous problems on a lot of fronts, just about all of the major areas of work out there. But from my own perspective dealing with Hanford every day and having been involved in Hanford cleanup since day one basically, at least as far as the EPA is concerned, this last year is the first one where we've started to see the leading edge of a few things with a little more significance to them. So I don't want to overplay that. We certainly still have a lot of problems, but we're starting to see some progress. We also wound up where our negotiations as I mentioned resulted in a far stronger TPA, a far superior tank cleanup program, and I think we've gotten to the point where we're doing better on public involvement, short of getting announcements out with not enough lead time, but basically when we get to the point where we have major renegotiations of portions of

the TPA we're past the point where we were in the past where it was basically decide, announce, defend. So, we're trying to do better, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

PK: I have several so I'm going to ask them one at a time so they get answered one at a time, otherwise I don't get the kind of answer I'm looking for. On the grout . My name is Page Knight and I'm from Hanford Watch here in Portland. On the grout, Roger, you were saying, I didn't understand this from the Seattle meeting last week, you were saying that there is going to be no grout program, but we are going to spend \$1 million on it in the next year for monitoring and maintenance. What are we monitoring and maintaining if there's no grout program?

RS: I know we got that question last night, and we were trying to get a cost break out of that.

PK: But what?

NV: Basically it's keeping the grout facility in a standby mode to act in case of emergency until we get the new double shell tanks built.

PK: What kind of emergency might you have?

NV: Well, for instance, if you need to pump a number of single shell tanks and get the liquid out of the single shell tanks, you would have to possibly put that into grout. So that would be the only contingency, I think, at this point that we would be considering. That was part of the negotiations...

NV: Yeah, when we went through the negotiations this last year and at that point, I recall, there had been four grout

vaults that had been built that were standing empty. And because of the concern that we received over moving forward on the grout program, we basically reached agreement that the grouting of Hanford tank waste was not going to go forward. There was some concern on the part of DOE that we shared that if in fact we ever wound up with a true tank emergency, it might be valuable to have those grout vaults there.

PK: Even though the grout wouldn't hold?

NV: Well if we had a situation where the liquid waste, you know, to where we had an emergency that was a large enough emergency that, you know, going to grout might be able to save us a lot, I can't really guess what kind of an incident that might be, but just as an overall contingency.

PK: So it's kind of like use the grout vaults because they cost a lot to put together? I'm just, I'm leery. I'm just little concerned that we might end up with grout even though we worked all summer to ensure that there would be no grout. I will take that, and I'll ponder it. What is happening to the grout vaults right now? You said something and I missed that. Are they planning to be used for something besides this emergency, or is that what they're there for?

NV: I think right now just for emergency. There has been talk about using them to store liquid discharges, liquid wastes. But just conceptual at this point. I don't know of any other uses that are being considered.

PK: Would they be safe enough in terms of leaking into the ground water to hold waste discharges?

NV: In terms of being ???, I don't know, probably.

NV: First of all, there aren't any proposals, and the state hasn't been approached with any kind of proposals to utilize the grout vaults at all. If DOE came to us with some sort of a proposal, and first of all we'd be pretty hesitant to do that, but if they did we'd have to take a look at the engineering that was associated with the vault and see if it would work. And it would be something that tribes and the stake holders and the public would know about up front, so.

PK: OK, and be part of the decision-making process?

NV: Exactly.

PK: On the 101SY pump, what is the life expectancy of that pump and of the new one being made to replace it when it goes? You mentioned life expectancy.

NV: I don't know the answer to that one.

NV: That's a great question. Do we have any person here to answer that? No.

NV: OK, we'll have to check that one.

PK: Yeah, I'd really like to know that. You also made a comment that made my heart flutter a little bit in fear, and that was you were talking about the values and principles of the tank waste task force that I was lucky enough to sit on. And you said that you were using the public values and principles that this task force came up with for five or six months last year, in conjunction with your work in renegotiating the tri-party agreement. You said that you have used this in looking at the tanks, and you're going to use it for other portions of the cleanup. I got a little afraid because I'm wondering if that implies that you're meaning you will only use our values and principles when you

choose or if you're going to use them straight across the board.

NV: No, we use them straight across the board. What we did last year, it was the first time that during a set of negotiations we tried to get values and principles at the start of the negotiations instead of at the end to make final adjustments. So we got them at the start, basically, and then tried to apply them. And that basic approach, we're going to continue to use.

PK: OK. I just got concerned that you were picking and choosing, and I'd hate to see that after all the public work and interest that's been put in. I noticed that on one of the handouts here on the fiscal year 1994 budget for tours or for the tank waste remediation system, there was an 18% increase. Where did that increase come from? And I ask that question because I am told that the budget now, that there have no budget increases for Hanford and for cleanup at Hanford, and that the budget is going to remain flat. So when you say we have an increase, where is that increase coming from in the rest of the budget for Hanford?

NV: You mean from '94 to '95?

PK: Well, I'm using a quote out of your little two-page paper, and it says, on the larger one under the pink task force, it says the fiscal year 1994 budget for tours is \$594 million which is about an 18% increase from the fiscal year 1993 budget level.

NV: Jim Peterson from our budget division.

JP: Thanks, Steve. I'm Jim Peterson from the budget office. And essentially the tours increase came from ??? transition, that's a landlord and former production facilities.

- PK: So does that mean that there's something that we're not getting but we're getting this instead? Can you kind of spell it out for...
- JP: What that amounts to is we have stretched out the progress on the ultimate shutdown of former production facilities. Wait, let me look closer at this before I... Yeah, it's a slowdown on the shutdown of former production facilities.
- PK: OK, thank you.
- MP: Anyone else with questions?
- NV: I was wondering about grout again. I remember discussions about what kind of emergency you'd be able to respond to by restarting the grout facility. I know that things at Hanford tend to take longer than we always expect, and I thought it was going to take at least a year or 12 and 18 months of starting up and getting things moving before you could do anything from the grout facility standby mode. That's not a response, from my perspective in the usual sense where you say, well we've got an emergency, we've got to do something today, we'll wait a year and a half. What are you talking about?
- NV: What do you mean?
- NV: In the grout facility, holding it in standby. What kind of an emergency can you respond to?
- NV: No, there would have to be some sort of situation that would demand immediate action, and you know I'm not going to conjecture on what that might be, but it would not be a situation where DOE or its contractors have 14 months to ramp up. That doesn't sound like an emergency situation.

NV: Well no, but we talked about how long it would take to restart the facility, and it was not something we could do overnight in a usual urgency response, it would take a long time for the fire trucks to get out to the site, from what I understood. And so I don't see why we're spending the money to keep it open.

NV: We can get some further information unless Dave, do you know what we'd be projecting as far as the time it would take to get grout restarted?

DF: I'm David Forhan with the Westinghouse Hanford Company. Your time frame on the 1-2 years to get the grout facility up and operating is what I've heard all along. And we haven't sat down and hypothesized any specific emergency, but generically what we were thinking about ties in with our new double shell tanks that we are designing, have constructed on line in 1999 or 2000, I don't remember the exact year. But if some situation arose where we were running short on double shell tanks that we could not make room before the new tanks came on line, and we could get the grout facility up and operating, it would take some of the least problematic waste, and solidify it, we'd make those trade-offs with the public involvement. But we haven't come to any explicit expression of that.

NV: Dick, I think the term emergency is probably stretching it a bit.

NV: And also the waste that is most suitable also has some of the heaviest ??? of anything that you were talking about. And so it seems to me that was exactly what we were talking about not doing. That's a two step thing, and I would imagine that there would be serious questions before we allowed you to go ahead with that, and the idea of keeping

it on standby for a shuffling emergency response in case something goes wrong, I mean really the upgrades to the infrastructure, the tank transfer capability and other things is far more important than any of that, and I'm surprised that the grout is still around. And I know that there are some people on the Hanford Advisory Board who think that grout is not dead. I thought it was dead, but they believe it's not, so I have to worry about it.

RP: I'm Ralph Pat. I had a question about the grout pump. I understood that the pump 101SY was the grout pump. Do you have another back-up pump if you had to start grout, or do you have to redesign or build another pump?

NV: Dave, do you know? I don't have any idea if there's a back-up pump.

NV: Well it's my understanding that the grout pump went to 101SY.

DF: This is David Forhan again. I believe you're right, Ralph. And whether we went out and purchased a replacement grout pump to put in and have available, I don't know. But unfortunately we didn't get the grout disposal representative here tonight. But I'll get Russ ??? and get these answers back to you.

NV: Before you sit down sir. You're saying right now that the grout pump, that you would have to go order one. But Roger just told us on the slide that you are designing it and making it yourself. So we're not talking about just going out and ordering a pump if you need it right away, are we?

NV: We don't fabricate from scratch. We contract or procure from pump manufacturers. But we have to make modifications to the pump. It's designed to go in a tank that would move

waste to transfer to the grout facility. The 101SY tank has a different configuration so we'd have to make some modifications to it. When we modify it, it won't go back in to the tank for the grout feed. But we contract with pump manufacturers to fabricate these pumps and deliver them to us. We don't manufacture from scratch.

NV: There may be some confusion about which pumps are being...

NV: And it just leaves the question open as to whether there was a back-up grout pump.

NV: Right. So if I understand you right, the emergency alarm goes off and then you go through the procurement process of getting a pump, and then when you get the pump and you go through the transfer, the delivery, and then you go an install it, and then you start the start-up process, which is another year or two, what kind of return on investment, I mean it will be the year 2010 before you get the darn thing really up and going. If that pump is not sitting on the stand, getting it is then factored into that 12-18-24 months, it's not starting after the pump is delivered. There are many other things that we have to do also, like transfer the operators back to the grout facility and train them and make sure they understand all the procedures.

NV: So should we move along? Go ahead. While he's coming to the mike, one ground rule is, there may be some of you that haven't been following this process for a long time. And if you don't know a term that's being said, I'll try to get on them if they use initials instead of words, but like grout. If you're sitting here saying why are they talking about this and want to know what it is, please raise your hand and say, please tell us what that is, don't sit there and wonder. Raise your hand. OK there's a hand up. So could

you take just a second and describe what grout would have done?

NV: Well grout is the treatment, actually a stabilization process, that had been planned to dispose of the high volume and relatively low ??? portion of Hanford's tank waste. And so the plan that was on the drawing board up until this last year to over a number of years fill upwards of 150 vaults, flush with the surface concrete vaults, with this grout material, that is a cement tissue material with the waste mixed in with it so it would take over a period of years to actually fill those vaults. But a cement tissue mixed with Hanford low-level tank waste in it.

LP: I'm Lynn Porter from Hanford Watch. First I'd just like to comment that one annual public party meeting in Portland is not nearly enough. I think we should go back to doing it quarterly. Roger, I'd like to ask you a couple of questions. I've heard from more than one source that ecology is very reluctant to press DOE and Westinghouse to enforce milestones, that you just seem to have a very nonconfronting attitude, and I'm wondering if that's true. Recently ??? told me that ecology is very underfunded, way overworked, and way understaffed. I'd like to know if that's true, and if that has something to do with your reluctance to press DOE.

RS: I don't think we're underfunded although, with Hanford, my experience has been the staff that we have that are assigned full time to Hanford have work load up to here, no matter how many we have. We've been a little bit careful on the funding because there's no way we can match the people on the reservation one-for-one, and it's not our intent to have folks looking over everybody's shoulder over there. But we don't feel that we're underfunded. DOE has been supportive of our requests for funding, haven't been stingy or held the

purse strings too tight under our grant request. As far as reluctance to enforce. I don't see it myself. We are very cautious. We don't take enforcement action unless we know we're on solid ground, that the instance that we're dealing with, we have researched fully, and we feel a penalty or an order or whatever the action is necessary is fully warranted and is the best thing to do rather than to negotiate a change to the TPA. If, on a particular issue, when we, let's say we're coming up on a milestone date and it's readily apparent that date is not going to be met, we naturally have a dialog with DOE, its contractors, and often times the EPA, and many times the numerous stake holders to figure out what the reasons are, whether or not they make sense, whether or not a penalty would make sense, would it be a benefit or not. You know, so far there have been a few orders and penalties. Not a long list of them, but from a management perspective I don't see any reluctance. We did have a problem prior to this last year when we went through these tank negotiations. Prior to that time the federal hazardous waste law that provided states clear authority to enforce was real weak. The language was weak. And one of the things that we did during our negotiations is take the provisions of revisions to the federal ??? status, the federal hazardous waste management statute, that had just passed under the name of the Federal Facilities Compliance Act, and basically recognized that states do indeed have the same enforcement powers over federal facilities that they have in the private sector. We took those terms out of that act and folded them into the TPA, so that now our basic enforcement powers are much stronger than they were in the past. I hope that helped.

NV: We've been told that the Washington state attorney general's office is not giving you adequate support. Is that correct?

RS: No, that is certainly not correct. We get all the support we need. I know of no instances where we have asked for their support and they've told us that they're too busy or can't.

TAPE ONE - SIDE B

NV: OK, I'd like to ask about your treatment of whistle blowers, specifically Casey Rood who spoke to Hanford Watch recently. We understand that he's been demoted and that for speaking out, and that his transfer to DOE has been blocked. Would you comment on that?

NV: Casey was not demoted. I know he's gone to work for I think it's Westinghouse.

NV: Well we understand the transfer's being held up.

NV: I believe he's on loan to the Department of Energy right now. I'm not sure of the exact status or how that works, but he is...

NV: Well we're told that that's been blocked, that's been held up.

NV: I don't believe so.

NV: Not to my knowledge. I had thought that he had started working out in the tank farms, but...

NV: I think that's something you're going to have to find out.

NV: We can check on that. I haven't been directly involved in that, so I'm not certain that's actually taken place, but he wasn't demoted. I know recently when he's been working out of our Kennewick office, he was working on ??? permitting

where we needed his help. But there wasn't any kind of a demotion involved.

NV: OK, well I wanted to check on that because that's a big concern of ours.

NV: Does anybody here have any background on that? Karen, do you?

KR: I'm Karen Randolph with the Richland DOE office, and I understand that Casey is on staff now with DOE. I made an announcement to a reported to that effect five or six weeks ago, I think. So I haven't heard of any change in his status. So that was my latest understanding.

NV: OK, I'm real glad to hear that. Finally, I'd just like to ask Roger, so far this year what percentage of the TPA milestone's have been met? Have they all been met?

RS: I can't give you a percentage. I think Steve has a slide on that later on, although number are deceptive here because a large portion of the TPA milestones, especially those associated with tanks, were renegotiated this last year. So if we think back to milestones that were in place roughly a year ago, as far as grout was supposed to get going, the high-level vit plant was supposed to be under construction. We changed those. We moved them, so of course they don't show up as a missed milestone. But, if you just play a numbers game and look at how often a milestone was in place and DOE did not meet it, then the number of noncompliance is pretty small.

MP: Why don't we get on with the presentation then, with that slide?

SW: I want to talk about the Department of Energy's cleanup budget in very summary fashion, and also about expected accomplishments under the TPA over the next couple of years. I'm only going to be summarizing. You do have a handout which maybe provides you with a little bit more detail. Also, I've proposed that Seattle and Hood River, if we need to get into more specific detail on the actual programs and the scope of the programs and the budgets, we could set up a workshop down the road a ways to do that. And I think it would be in that form where we could bring the program managers out and get into the details like on the grout program, so we could go through that and understand completely what that \$1 million includes and why, and we could interrogate the program folks. So, I'll try to summarize as best I can. We still want to hear from you as to your comments and concerns and questions. I think that's one of the more important things here tonight. Let me start with the total Department of Energy environmental management budget and show how that's broken out. The pie chart in the middle shows the breakout of what is about a \$6.3 billion budget, for the Department of Energy. The biggest piece of that pie is waste management. That's management of our hazardous and radioactive wastes, about 46.5%. If you take that piece of the budget you can further break down waste management into ongoing operations of 64%, construction underway at 22%, and construction that is complete but not quite yet in the operational phase at 14%. The next biggest piece of the pie is environmental restoration at 27.5%. You can further break that out with about 52% going to the assessment and the characterization of all waste sites, and 37.7% to the actual cleanup or remediation of those waste sites. The other major piece of the pie are facility transitions at 13%, and that's a process of taking our old shutdown production facilities like the Purex plant, the Uranium oxide plant, from the shutdown condition to a surveillance and maintenance mode as you await the

9413287.0023

9413287.0023

decontamination and decommissioning of those facilities. And then the technology development is 6.5%. If you look at the original budget compared to the total environmental management budget by major program, you can see that here and you can see that we're about 25% of the national cleanup budget, at \$1.6 billion. If you look at it by state, this shows the '94 appropriation and the '95 Congressional budget. Washington state is over here on the left. We receive about twice as much funding for cleanup as any of the other states, with South Carolina and Tennessee being the next closest at about a three quarters of a billion dollars. This shows in a little bit more detail, the breakout of the various programs for the '94 appropriations and the '95 Presidential budget requests. The increase of the '95 budget over '94 is about 11%. In '94, our budget looks good as far as meeting all our TPA requirements. There is a reprogramming in works right now that is scheduled to be going to Congress fairly soon, when I say reprogramming what I mean is shifting money from the various funds. What this will do is it will take prior year cost of funds and it will apply them to the '94 activities. And mainly in the areas of waste management and facility transition. No TPA activities are impacted because of this. No funding is being taken away from TPA activities. This is about a \$30 billion reprogramming. It's going to be applied to things like payment in lieu of taxes for the three counties within the tri-cities area. NEPA documentation for the petronium finishing plant, and also the environmental impact statement for the new double shell tanks. When this does go forward, we will have more details on that that we could share. The '95 budget was submitted to Congress in February of this year. That budget as it was racked up did not totally reflect the tri-party agreement that was renegotiated and signed in January just days before that budget was submitted. And because of that the Department of Energy, Ecology, and EPA entered into a process of reracking

that budget to make sure that we're going to be able to make those TPA commitments. So we've done that, and we expect this month to be going forward to the headquarters with what will be a budget amendment. And we will have to go forward to Congress to revise that budget. Once that happens, again we'll be able to share the details of that budget amendment. When we go through our budget exercises, the very first thing that we consider is to make sure that our facilities can be operated safely. Those are minimum safety requirements. The second thing that we consider is to ensure that we're in compliance with the tri-party agreement and other environmental laws. Then we go and we pick up some of the other safety, not so critical safety insurance requirements such as electrical system upgrades, demolition of unoccupied facilities that may pose a threat to the Hanford workers. Then we start picking up other environmental and safety compliance activities, and lastly conduct of operations, enhanced operations. And here's where you start picking up things like site infrastructure support, funding for the states, and Indian tribes and so on. We do have some funding issues in '95 that we're wrestling with right now. The spent fuel activities are receiving more emphasis, and that's going to require additional funding. The waste receiving and processing facility is assuming privatization of that activity. If we were having to build that with our own capital funds, and operate the government facility, we would probably need additional funding. But the defense nuclear safety board has recommended that we speed up the characterization of the waste in the tanks by up to two years over and above what's in the tri-party agreement right now, the TPA that we just negotiated. If we had to do that, that would take additional funding. The last item deals with the environmental restoration program. That is subject to negotiation this summer, and Doug is going to be talking more about that. But last year when we renegotiated the

9413287.0025

restoration program we asked for some things for our plate. We recognized that the values from the tank waste task force and the future site users working group needed to be incorporated into that program. So depending on how those negotiations go will determine the adequacy of the budget for the ER program in '95. One of the ways that we would fund any shortfalls would be through the cost and management efficiency initiative. As one of the key points, later on in the negotiations last year that we recognized with fairly level budget projections, that we were going to have to be much more efficient in how we did business so we could get as much clean up done for the money that we are getting. As Roger mentioned we've committed to \$1 billion savings over the next five years, that would be applied to cleanup. Here's a question that somebody, was it Page, you were asking about the milestones. Or no, you were asking that. As of 4/30/94, we had completed 310 milestones under the agreement. Now let me tell you what that includes. That includes original TPA milestones, it includes milestones that have been changed or extended out but still met by their extended due date, and that also includes new milestones that have been negotiated. I don't have an accounting of those different categories but that's what's included there.

NV: ???

SW: It depends on whether they were changed or not.

NV: ???

SW: Without changing? I don't have that number right now. I will say this though, that over the five years of the tri-party agreement, there isn't hardly an area in the agreement that hasn't undergone some kind of a change, especially from this last renegotiation, there were significant changes.

Like the grout program was canceled, the pretreatment program changed significantly, all of the high-level waste vitrification milestones were extended out, and so on.

NV: ???

SW: I hope so. And if we don't, you ought to know about it. And right now, I don't know of any that are particularly in jeopardy. Can any of the program folks help me with any of those, at least in the next year or two. What we do is we sit down with the regulators on a monthly basis, and we go over 1/4 of all the TPA milestones, go over the status and issues, and what we expect to accomplish in the next year or so. We also issue a site management system report which discusses milestone accomplishments and issues, and those go out to the reading rooms and are available for public viewing. That also includes cost information as to what we're spending on each of the milestone and the other programs.

NV: ???

SW: OK, good point.

NV: As far as the double and single shell tank waste milestones, our estimate anyway is that in DOE is in much better shape or has much better capability now to meet those milestones that develop here in the tank waste remediation system negotiations this last year. Frankly, the tank milestones that were developed under the initial TPA were our best shot at that time. There were a number of areas where we didn't have adequate data, and there's no doubt that as a result of the lack of that data, DOE's overall ability to meet those milestones were pretty low. They're not doing too bad now, they're capabilities to meet tank milestones without changing them is much much higher. I think that in the area

of liquid effluent control DOE's also doing pretty decent. I'll let Steve or Doug talk about the ER program. But in those two areas I think we're in pretty decent shape now.

NV: I am going to talk about an issue with capsulation of the fuel and the sludge in the K Basins which is a schedule issue right now. Although there are some target dates that we're projecting that we're going to miss, and I'll talk about that a little bit later. Yes?

DM: My name is Dean Morrison, and I'm from Hanford Watch. You've complete 310 milestones?

NV: Yes.

DM: How many have you missed?

NV: The last time I checked, I mean if you count the one's that we just flat missed, whether they were changed or not,

DM: Even including the adjustments, I mean the extended time periods. Have you missed any milestones?

NV: Yeah, I think there's been 5 or 6, something like that.

DB: I'm Dick Belsing. I have and have had some concerns about the cost and management efficiency initiative. A billion dollars is a lot of money in anybody's game. And I wonder at the time that this was negotiated there were fuzzy explanations about how those were going to be realized. And I still have not heard nor seen any detail identifying where in the budget we are going to get a billion dollars worth of additional cleanup over the next five years without any additional funds. And I hope that the EPA and Ecology, for their part, will take the efficiency and that cost and management efficiency initiative seriously and go through

the process of identifying what if is that you guys are actually delivering. Because in the face of an enlarging mission more people, you have 18,000 employees now, up 1,000 since I last looked. It looks like we're spending more and not necessarily getting more. And that was a commitment to the people of the region in terms of effective use of resources, and a commitment to the Congress to say hey, we're not jerking things around, and we really are reducing. In that aspect you made a very firm commitment to get the arid lands and north slope were completed by October of 1994, and do you still expect to finish that on time?

NV: Mike? Mike Thompson from the environmental restoration program with DOE.

MT: We're working very diligently right now on the north slope and starting to work up on the ???. From our investigations up on the north slope or ??? slope, whichever you prefer to call it, we haven't found too many surprises in terms of the burial grounds and that sort of thing. So I think we should be able to meet those, barring any unforeseen surprises up there.

NV: I'm glad to see that. The resources that you have been dealing with the spent fuel, and particularly the ??? Basin has been upgraded. It's been a real concern to me and I think that it's, at this point, in terms of worker safety and worker exposure together with the TFP where things are being done in the two most critical areas to deal with, and I hope that the focus and energy that additional resources bring will energize those people to really start things moving. And I know you're going to talk about it a little, but I'm glad to see that.

NV: I don't think there's hardly a week that's gone by where the DOE senior management level at Richmond that ??? hasn't been discussed and the need for moving on with that.

FG: Frank Gerhart from Gresham. I'm with Healthy Water 2000. Just a quick comment, about this cost and management efficiency initiative. I guess this is kind of a pie in the sky type of thing, because you're looking at a budget here, and you're saying well we save a billion dollars in the budget, but still it's a pie in the sky. If we had a total cost for the overall cleanup and we knew for sure that when we got down to the year 2000, or whatever, we'd have it all cleaned up for many billions. But we don't have that. It looks to me like the whole thing is flying an aircraft by the seat of your pants up there. I think one of the basic problems as I as a concerned citizen see that we got Westinghouse Corporation who started the problem at instigation of the U.S. government, sure. But they're still managing the problem. And so I guess for another 1,000 years maybe we've still got the same management team up there. And just a comment about spent fuel. That is kind of a misnomer to the average citizen's understanding of what we're really talking about up there. I've got a little ??? which I got at the PR up there at Hanford last year. And it's not spent fuel. The reason why your not using it anymore, not ??? but some like it in these fuel rods, is because it's too hot to handle. You can't use it anymore, and I think you guys ought to come clean and tell the citizens that we're not talking about spent fuel, we're talking about something too hot to handle. And yet you want to take it up there and bury it so we can move it in some future generation. I think we ought to put this whole thing on hold until you find out where you're going.

NV: I'd like to shift now and talk about what some of the actual physical accomplishments will be over the next couple of

940207.003

9413287.0031

years. First of all, dealing with the single shell tanks. Well complete the emergency pumping of tank T111. We will be starting the pumping of two tanks in '95 and we'll also complete the pumping of four tanks this year. We're going to be resolving our ??? safety questions concerning those tanks and solving a number of liquid observation wells around those tanks and also improving our ability to emergency pump those tanks if it's found that one of the tanks is leaking. In the double shell tank arena, and this shows the construction of one of the prior tank farms. We will actually be starting the construction a new tank farm this year and we'll begin and complete the conceptual design of the low--level waste pretreatment facility, and we'll be issuing 50 characterization reports for not only the double shell tanks but the single shell tanks. The waste receiving and processing facility will begin operations in '97. Construction has begun on that facility. What that is a part of, is it's a two phase project. And this phase will receive, sort, examine, certify, and then repackage our solid radioactive waste. Roger mentioned the waste sampling and characterization facility. And that will be operational in November of this year. Construction is complete right now. He mentioned some of the liquid effluent projects. In '95 we'll be ceasing the discharge of untreated liquid effluents for our highest priority phase one stream. One of those activities would be cease a discharge to the ??? trench that you see here. There are three major construction projects for those streams in the 200 area and the 300 areas. I don't think you can see it but the 300 area facility would be over in this location here. K Basin's particular problem right now is trying to get the fuel out of these basins in a safer configuration so that we don't have the ??? water further leaking into the ground water. One of the issues that has come up just recently is that because of a more sophisticated seismic analysis, it looks like under designed bases earthquake, that you're gong

to have much greater leakage from those basins than what was originally forecast. So we're in the process of figuring out what the contingency is to deal with that and it looks like we'll be able to construct some copper dams in those basins so that the construction ??? which would be subject to this earthquake would be protected by this copper dam. This just shows you the fuel as it sits in the basins now. Another activity that we're doing right now is we're negotiating milestones for facility transition. Those negotiations are to be completed by the end of this year, and then by the end of '96 we will have negotiated the milestones for the decontamination and decommissioning of those facilities. ???'s facility is just one of those, and here you can see the ??? facility. So, with that, I'd be happy to... Oh, also, the ER program is something that Doug's going to cover a little bit later. There's a lot of thing happening in that program.

MP: Before you take questions I just want to pose something to the group. We worked in advance with some of the interest groups asking them to help us put together an agenda and get everybody talking to each other and still have time to ask questions. And at this point we haven't heard one of the presentations and we're about to start questions on this presentation and we're way behind on the schedule because we were also asked to take questions as we went along. So my dilemma is how many questions to take right now. Do you want, if we could take a lot of questions there won't be time for smaller groups unless we extend the overall time of the program by another 1/2 hour. So the people from the agencies are happy to do that, but I don't want to just assume that it's OK with everyone. So, the choice, I think is, shall we go ahead and hear the environmental restoration program and then take questions on both, or should we stop now and take some more questions knowing that it's going to

put us further behind on the planned schedule? Anybody have an opinion.

NV: I think we should hear the environmental restoration thing first ???

MP: Is that OK? What he's saying is just let's keep going and hear what Doug has to say about environmental restoration and then lump the comments together, the questions and the comments. Is that all right with everyone? OK, let's do that.

NV: Yeah, I think one of the questions that came up just now is one of the most critical questions to these type of meetings and that is, what really is the ER program. I think it's hard for people to understand what the ER program is without looking at all of the other parts of the Hanford cleanup program and really the whole Hanford site mission. Steve has given you some of this information in terms of the budget and how the budget is broken out. But this is a different breakout of what the program is and a little bit about what the types of facilities that are in each program. Is this OK? As Steve had discussed the waste management budget is really the two top items in the top corner over here--the solid and liquid waste programs which handle the ongoing waste that's generated at Hanford today as a result of ongoing operations or tank farm operations, and then the tank waste remediation system which is the tank safety and tank waste disposal program. Those are combined together into what's called waste management. Along this side we have the regular site support services and then these few categories in the lower right corner--science and technology and multi-program laboratory. Those are really the research and technology development programs at Hanford. Most of those programs are done by ??? Pacific Northwest Laboratories. On the far side, the special initiatives are

really the cost and management efficiency initiatives and other ongoing activities like economic development for the Tri-city area. The other category, that are called the former nuclear facilities, that's what Steve referred to as the facility transition activities are taking plants that were formerly operating and putting them in a safe and stable form for decontamination and decommissioning. The last activity I would like to talk about and the one I would like to focus on tonight, is the environmental restoration program. This is really the program that decontaminates and decommissions all the old radioactive facilities and performs the investigations and remediation of past practice sites or formerly used waste sites at Hanford. Just so you'll recognize them in the future and try to relate them to individual programs, these are the types of facilities that would be in each program, and the types of program activities that you would see under the variety of other programs, not including environmental restoration. These are the facilities and the types of waste sites that we find in the environmental restoration program. The first set of facilities are the old reactor facilities that border the Columbia River along with the building that supported and serviced those reactors. And then the final four categories are solid waste sites that may contain hazardous as well as radioactive constituents. And the last three are types of disposal sites that would have received liquids. In the original Tri-party Agreement, there was really a regulatory framework that dealt with ongoing waste management activities, that is the ??? program, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act programs, and again those are the types of facilities and activities that would be covered in that program. And the other half of the program is really the environmental restoration program, and that includes the ??? past practice sites which is comprehensive in Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act sites, and the ??? past practice sites would be subject to

closure under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The actual work that's done on the environmental restoration program, we've tried to identify it into five basic categories. The first one, cleanup, includes remedial actions and the decontamination of old nuclear facilities. Waste site characterization, which is characterization of old waste sites to make a determination of what type of remediation should be done for those site. Hazardous stabilization and elimination. Because some of these older facilities are in a bad state of repair, they can present safety concerns to site workers and a certain amount of those facilities have to be maintained until they can be torn down, or we simply just have to tear them down and spend the money now to eliminate those hazards. The last two are really support services that are needed to keep the environmental restoration program going in terms of technology and other supporting facilities. In the original Tri-party Agreement, those waste sites that were identified as past practice waste sites, were grouped into operable units. And for those of you who are not sure what an operable unit is, there are a group of waste sites that are similar that can be characterized, assessed for their potential hazard, and remediated as a group. So of all the sites at Hanford, we've grouped them into these operable units. Seventy-four of them are actual groups of waste sites, and four of them are ground water plumes that emanate from these areas. Because many plumes from various operable units overlap, it made more sense to address ground water contamination kind of as a whole rather than as a source by source by source. Today the environmental restoration program has been working on 27 of the 78 operable units. We have one record of decision that covers the cleanup actions of four of those units. Those are the equipment maintenance area units called the 1100 area near the city of Richland. And we have four completed closure plans of which we expect some closure actions to start in the near future. Here is a

9413287.0035

9413287.0035

breakdown by area. The 100 area is the reactor area along the river. The 200 area is really where the main reprocessing facilities are located. The 300 area is an area that was used for nuclear fuel fabrication and for research and development. And then the 1100 area as I described earlier is an equipment and maintenance area. These are the operable units and the operable unit names that are currently under investigation. And for many of these the investigations are nearing completion. As you can see the primary focus was on operable units which were in close proximity to the Columbia River and on operable units that were in close proximity to the city of Richland. In addition to the operable unit activities that looks at the ??? cleanup process much the same as would be done at a private ??? site. In addition to that we have what we're calling an expedited response action. And these expedited response actions are actions where the remedy or the cleanup option that should be used is obvious. And it doesn't make sense to do the long protracted investigation in order to make a cleanup decision. These are sites which are similar to sites at other facilities, or sites which just the cleanup option was obvious. And we've got a variety of those activities started. In several cases those activities are meant to do the final cleanup job for those sites. In some cases they're to eliminate a hazard that we consider important. Here's just a general location map for those expedited response actions, the ones that are complete, the one's that are in process and the one's that we're planning. Now I'd like to cover a part of the program that is currently not covered by the Tri-party Agreement, or not covered by the ??? and ??? cleanup agreement between the three parties. These are decontaminated and decommissioning activities which is a result of the recent negotiations now we're bringing in to the TPA. This is the part of the program that I'm least familiar with because it's the part that we don't follow regularly, but these are some of the

940207.0006

9413287-0037

activities that are ongoing and some of the benefits of this part of the program. Again, its main purpose is to tear down and remove contaminated structures from the site. These are other programs that are also in the environmental restoration program. The radiation area remedial action program is a program that goes out, surveys for additional areas of contamination from windblown radioactive contamination, picks it up and removes it and cleans up areas of the site which have been contaminated through this process. The underground storage tank program is to remove petroleum tanks, like you would remove from a service station that has had a leak in the past. These are that type of action, and that's one of the other actions that the environmental restoration program performs. And finally, the asbestos abatement program which is to inhibit the spread of asbestos across the site. As Roger discussed earlier, during the tank waste remediation process, and during the future site uses working group process, we received values from the public that related to how we address cleanup at Hanford. During that process we negotiated an additional set of items that would address those values and move forward with cleanup action along the Columbia River. And the main objective of this was really to address the potential of contaminants at these sites near the river in the 100 and 300 areas affecting the Columbia River and the environment near the river. So we have a host of projects here that we received public input that said, these are projects we want you to move forward with now. These are projects during the environmental refocusing effort that we don't plan to change. We plan to keep these much the same, because they're ones which the public has told us are the ones that represent their priorities. Again, here are some more of those activities, treatability tests in the 100 areas to determine what kind of materials are in some of these burial grounds and some additional consolidation efforts to address the rest of the waste sites

in the 300 area. And to initiate ground water pump and treatment actions to test technologies and to limit the spread of Hanford's ground water contamination. Now I'd like to get into what we're starting to negotiate this summer as far as the environmental restoration program. And that is, what we're really talking about is a way to align this program with the values we've heard from the public, and address the parts of cleaning up Hanford that we have heard most important. Particularly, the most important thing we've heard is that you need to clean up the sites along the river first, they're the most important in terms of their potential to affect the environment and their near-term effect on the Columbia River. So those are the areas where we're initially concentrating. Another part of the strategy is to address decontamination and decommissioning of nuclear facilities concurrently with the waste site cleanup. If you cleanup all of the waste sites but you leave a contaminated nuclear facility there, you're probably not going to use that land for anything else. In order to make that land usable for other uses, you really need to address all the cleanup problems, not just the ones that are required by our regulations, but the ones that are required by our regulations as well as the other sites that are out there. I think one of the things we learned from the tank waste process was that at the end of the process I believe it was Gerry Paulette that termed what we had as a regional consensus on what the priority should be for the tank program. That is really what we want for the environmental restoration program. We want it to be doing the job that you expect it to do, and that's the main emphasis here is to try to align the balance of remediation and characterization activities with your goals. In terms of the program, I think we have some kind of ideas as to how these changes or refocusing efforts may fit with your values. The first is to have a significant increase in funding for ground water remediation. That was one thing we heard loud and clear was

don't contaminate any more ground water at Hanford. It's important that you preserve what resource there is left. Initiate river investigations and remediations along the shorelines of the Columbia River and really do a good investigation to make sure all of the parties as well as the public understand our concerns with the river.

TAPE TWO - SIDE A

...And the next part gets into one of the recommendations that we've heard from what was called the future site uses working group. It was a group of tribal and stake holder and public that looked at a variety of uses for Hanford, and they divided the site into six areas, and like the north slope and ??? which are only slightly contaminated, they said get out there and take care of those first. For other areas they had a different approach, but the main emphasis was to cleanup most of the areas of the site, leaving the 200 areas for waste management activities. This was a centralized site away from the river, probably the safest part of Hanford if we were going to store and dispose of waste for the long term. So this was really a part of how we arrived at that kind of approach. The others, I think they've been on a couple of the other slides. And, in the interest of time, I guess I'd just like to go ahead and take your questions now.

NV: I don't understand the next to the last slide on that last slide. Reduced characterization activities that require high cost analytical support. Could you explain that please?

NV: For the last 4 1/2 years we've really been spending a lot of time and a lot of money on the environmental restoration program, investigating waste sites and characterizing waste sites. And all we're trying to say by this is that we really have enough data now to make smart cleanup decisions,

we feel. And so it's more important in the near term to spend less money characterizing waste sites, and more money actually out there doing remediation. So it's really how we balance how much characterization activities we do in the next few years versus how much cleanup activity we do during the next few years. And I think what we're saying is for the first four years we've been erring on the side of doing too much characterization. I won't say that we've done too much. But I think we're far enough along to support some good cleanup decisions.

NV: Would you explain what characterization is, give some examples of that?

NV: Yeah. It would be where you would go out and look for contaminants, either hazardous substances or radio nuclides in the soil or in the ground water, and determine what the extent of contamination is, how high a level of contaminants that are there, what the appropriate treatment technologies might be for those contaminants, either in the ground water or in the soil, and how you might go about cleaning them up. And that's really what we're talking about, is characterizing the problems we have in terms of waste site cleanup. Page?

NV: OK, some of this is sort of hard with this presentation to separate comments out from questions, so you're going to get sort of a mixture from me. First thing, going back to the earlier talk on the cost management efficiency? I look at this proposed \$1 billion savings by making things more efficient, and I'm also remembering some data that's out there, and this comes from a quote that the Assistant Secretary of Energy, Grumbley himself, has mentioned a couple of times, and that's that the DOE sites have cost overruns of 30% compared to private businesses and how they manage their projects. And I hope I'm using the work

overrun right, but for example, if I were to run a business and I'm charging so much for cleanup, DOE is running the same business and they're charging 30% more for cleanup. So I'm looking at that and I'm thinking that's where some of the cost efficiency should be coming from. And are those specific things that you're looking at? Do you know where your cost overruns are, do you know where we're paying for \$500 toilet seats, or whatever.

NV: I want to correct something before you answer that. The cost overruns on the projects that I believe you're referring to are related to the design and construction of facilities, that was the number that was kicked around on the stand when Thomas Grumbley got everybody to shut down for a day and look at that issue. And it was not, the example that you used wasn't accurate what the quote was for. I was not for what it cost to clean something up. It was what it cost to build a building or design and build a facility.

NV: The capital construction projects.

NV: Exactly.

NV: But the same thing is not happening with cleanup dollars?

NV: Well a lot of the cleanup that we're doing at Hanford is unique to Hanford so I don't, no it's not true that it costs 30% more to clean Hanford up than if somebody else went out and did it. I'm not saying that we are doing it as efficiently as we could be doing it or that our runs aren't high. What I'm saying is, the man you're quoting is quoting what it costs us to do capital design and construction.

NV: Can you identify yourself?

JG: I'm Jay Gustenborg and I work for waste management division.

V: Thank you.

NV: Page, I'd like to add a little bit to that. Last year, actually over the past couple of years, as a result of a dispute on the 1100 area, the environmental restoration program did what was called the schedule optimization study. These were activities, what was done is we looked at the schedule for doing cleanup investigations and tried to identify areas where either the schedule was too long to do these activities, or the time spent preparing paper work or doing other activities just wasn't justified. And so we think there are some cleanup activities that will benefit from the cost and management efficiency initiative, because it really includes the schedule optimization studies and applying those potential savings to the ER program. So I don't think we know if it's 30% or 10% or 20% or what the potential savings is. We know that there is some potential savings in ER though.

NV: Well, you know, just a comment on that, is my suspicion is that there are a lot of areas in this whole, in the realm that I'm speaking of where a lot of cost savings could happen, and I would say as a taxpaying member of the public that I would like to see you folks get as efficient as possible and quickly as possible. So, I'll leave it at that. One of the things that I am noticing, and this is my second time seeing this presentation, there's something missing in this picture. I see a lot of pictures of things that are going to happen. The only picture, if I'm not mistaken, is the things that have happened, that are happening are the pump and in the tank 101SY and I've had the honor of seeing that in person. And it's rather interesting and impressive. And I have seen the empty grout vaults as work being accomplished. And I'm really really

wrestling with this, especially as a member of the Hanford Advisory Board, that I keep hearing all of these fancy plans. I keep hearing the planning, and I keep hearing about the characterization and I'm not a scientist and I'm not an engineer and I don't understand the need for so much time and so much studying. And I'm trying really hard to understand that and accept it. But I just keep feeling like we're not getting the bang for our buck that way. And I'm real concerned. One of the things, this also is connected to that, you said that Gerry Pauletta from Heart of America mentioned that there was a regional consensus on the tank waste task force and that you are hoping for a regional consensus on this environmental restoration, and we started wrestling with that at the Hanford Advisory Board meeting last week. What I see missing though is your talking with all of us public who are choosing to spend a lot of our time doing this, and asking us for our values and principles, and so I see us philosophizing about all of this but I am not seeing actual work happening. And by work happening I'm talking about cleanup, actual cleanup, actual protection of worker, public, and environmental health and safety. And I don't see any mechanism put in where the Hanford Advisory Board or some other citizen group can have some oversight to make sure that actual progress is happening. And I'm real concerned. I don't want to spend the next few years of my life talking philosophy about Hanford. I really want to see some progress. And when I see pictures of the office buildings and the ??? facility, and the evaporation facility, and all of that. You know, I'm assuming that year maybe we need these, although I always throw that maybe in because I am so used to being distrustful. And I know that we're all working together to get some real work done and to get beyond that, but I'm going to remain a skeptic for a while. But I don't see the work happening. So tell me, if you could show us pictures of actual work that's been done,

what would be up there besides the pump and the grout vaults?

NV: Well there'd be a variety of things up there. I think in defense of these two, they kind of left environmental restoration to me and we didn't show any pictures of ER activities because we weren't really focusing on them in their parts of the presentation. We do have a very large vapor extraction system that's working now to remove carbon ??? from the soil in 200 west area. They've recovered about 20,000 pounds of carbon tet. We still have a long ways to go. The north slope is a real cleanup action.

NV: How is it a cleanup action right now. What actually is happening as we speak on the north slope?

NV: On the north slope, my understanding of what's happening today is we're investigating a burial ground, actually we're removing materials from the burial ground that are contaminated, and we're out there investigating and looking for other hazards in that site. It's very similar to eight other landfills that we have either on the north slope or on the ALE reserve, and that's actual cleanup activities that are ongoing. There are other sites where there have been cleanup activities recently completed. The sodium dichromate burial ground area where there were crushed barrels, about 5,000 of them were removed from an area in the 100 areas. There was also a river land railed decontamination station where they decontaminated rail cars that carried nuclear fuel from the reactors to the 200 area. That area has been cleaned up. There have been some cleanup activities ongoing, and this summer and actually right now we're starting the five pump and treat activities for ground water cleanup and treatment. And so I think what you need is another site tour that emphasizes these cleanup activities rather than new construction maybe.

- NV: But I also want to make a point. I happen to be one person who will go out there and do this and make the time to do it. But I think the public needs some evidence of the work going on too. That would give us a little more of a sense of, you know, we're not in science fiction land, we're in actuality here. One of the questions I have about that in terms of work that should be happening right now is work with the tank because of still the possibility that is out there that some are explosive, possibly explosive. Are tanks being characterized right now? Which tanks are being characterized right now, all of them, some of them, can you name them, how many?
- NV: I believe there's a schedule in the Tri-party Agreement for the characterization activities.
- NV: But what's happening right now. I don't want what's in the agreement, I want to know what's happening as we speak.
- NV: They're being characterized. We take four samples from each tank and they're characterized. And I think I mentioned 50 characterization reports.
- NV: OK there have been 50 characterization reports. Fifty samples or 50 tanks?
- NV: Who could help me with this? David?
- NV: It's probably going to be 50 samples, Page.
- NV: Out of how many tanks?
- NV: I can't speak to the number of 50 samples, 50 tanks. There are 177 tanks. Approximately a month ago we finished returning our tank core sampling system back into

operations. We've sampled two tanks with that truck. And it's a truck with a core sampling system on the back of it. Since then, one of those was tank C111, I'm not sure what the other tank was. We're also working to get a second sampling truck system into operation, what we call a rotary core truck. It will actually rotate and drill into the tank waste. The one that's operating right now is just a push mode. It pushes straight down, it doesn't rotate. The rotary truck is scheduled, right now we're expecting about the first of June it will be ready to sample it's first tank, and we're planing to sample tank 106C first.

NV: Now did I understand you correctly to say that you have sampled two tanks with this truck that's operating?

NV: Yes.

NV: So we have 50 samples from two tanks.

NV: No. Page, each one of those reports covers the data available including recent sampling from a tank. So the 50 reports would be to cover 50 waste tanks at Hanford out of the total of 179, or 189?

NV: It's 177.

NV: She's right Steve. Trust her on this one.

NV: It's 177, I have it memorized. 177 tanks and 68 ???, 69 possible leakers.

NV: 149 single shell, 28 double shell, 177.

NV: That's right, so 50 have been sampled? That's a fact?

NV: That's right. Page, our sense over the last years that the tank waste characterization program has been accelerated substantially over what it was in the past years. If you're interested in getting detailed information just from the Department of Ecology's standpoint, you ought to call Megan Lerchan. She's on our Lacy staff. I can get you her phone number. I know that the rate of sampling of the tanks has been going up. We still have a long ways to go. There's going to be characterization of both the double and single shell tanks for quite a number of years, but it's getting a much faster pace.

NV: Well, I will be glad to pursue this information, but I'm also saying that this is information that I think the public needs to have. You got your largest turnout in Portland two years ago when Paul Coverstein had the articles in the Oregonian on the possibility of the tanks exploding. And that is a huge concern down here. So I do want this information, but I also want to make the point that this is the kind of information that makes cleanup more real instead of this fantasy. That's it for now. I'll make the rest of my comments at the end. Thank you.

NV: Steve, I'd like to ask you another follow-up question on K basin and then get back to money. You've talked about one of the issues in K basin in the case of the expected standard, or whatever you call...

NV: The design basis earthquake?

NV: How do you design the bases for an earthquake is another story but I'll leave that. There really are two issues. One is loss of coolant. The other one is reconfiguration and criticality. And the copper dam is not going to help you if all of the canisters get dropped around and all go

down to the bottom of the basin, even if the coolant remains there. What are you doing about that?

NV: OK, we do have someone here from the spent fuel program. Mr. Holfer.

DH: Yeah, I'm Dick Holfer from the spent fuel program. I guess to clarify this for you. All of our fuel is currently stacked in single layer on the floor of the facility. It's held in place, or it's separated by a grading array that is considered class one safety equipment, and it extends across the entire basin. And the design is such that it's designed to keep the canisters in a vertical position and separate it in the case of a seismic event. Now when that was put in, the seismic that they're using today was not the same. So I haven't read the report as far as the racks themselves go. I'm not sure what that impact of that kind of a seismic situation is, but the design is such that it is designed to maintain separation and to keep the canisters in a vertical position.

NV: The spent fuel working group report was concerned about criticality due to reconfiguration as well as criticality due to loss of cooling water.

NV: Yeah, most of the configuration that I'm familiar with involved the train accident scenario associated with shipping.

NV: This is the K basins, they're specifically dealing with K basins.

NV: No, I understand. And that's where the reconfiguration was of the train accident, because of the way that the tracks come in. If in fact you lost control of the car and it went in and piled up fuel, you'd have to add that as a

consideration. But I haven't seen anything specific to seismic and reconfiguration.

NV: The other issue from my perspective and it's the other side of the coin of the cost and management efficiency initiative, and that is a thing that was distributed at one of the Hanford Advisory Board meetings from the Rocky Mountain news quoting a debriefing or exit interview of a former DOE official who was involved in negotiating the federal facility compliance act. And he said quite straightforwardly that the government at the time that they were negotiating these agreements knew that their money to actually meet the milestones and do the work was not there. And four or five years later, I'm worrying that refocusing on environmental restoration as a code word for giving the DOE another weasel way out of what they've committed to do. And I think that I really worry about that.

NV: Do you want to comment?

NV: Yeah, I guess I'm not as concerned about that as you are, Dick. We haven't stopped any work as a result of ER refocusing. We're proceeding with the work we were doing before, and we've added the new tasks that we added last summer during the tank waste negotiations. Yeah, there probably are some long-term budget concerns, but right now I think we're actually doing more, so I'm not...

NV: I'm not questioning today. I think the issue really has to do with the out years and meeting the completion dates. One of the key completion dates that Oregon was fighting about was putting in the closure of the K basins by the year 2002. It's still a target milestone, and OK they're throwing more money at that, but in terms of closing the tanks by the year 2018, the single shell tank farms, and the other thing. I look on this as you guys know from where we are to where

we've got to be. And, yes, we're finally seeing a little progress. I remember the jubilation over the 300 area process trench. It was almost like the mouse that roared. We finally did something. And that's what we kept on hearing, that we're starting to move a little bit. But I'm really concerned about the out years after a lot of us who fought to get here are gone and all faces change and in fact, then, we'll lose some of the progress in terms of targets and actual cleanup that we're trying to achieve.

NV: Dick, in the area of tank waste cleanup, we'd naturally have the same concern as far as in those instances where we have out year milestones and it winds up being difficult to gauge progress towards those milestones. We're staying on track basically. One of the things we did in the past program last year was reach agreement with DOE that we would start to utilize a system called the critical path management system, basically trying to be able to identify those basic projects that need to be completed in order to keep us on track. That management system is, right now, scheduled to be fully in place by the end of '94. They've got the systems development is basically done now. We're trying to figure out how to actually put it in place. But as far as tanks go, I think it's going to help us a little bit to be able to stay on schedule. And I think we'll wind up gradually seeing that type of management in other areas of the TPA so we can basically keep our eye on the ball a little bit more easily than we have in the past.

DD: I'm Durke Deming from state of Oregon Department of Energy. One other question. I know we were somewhat surprised here a couple of weeks back when the Yakima Indian nation wrote a letter to the Department of Energy asking them to halt work at the B57 crib. And what basically had happened as we understand it is there is a milestone which was changed in December of 1992 for the 200 BP1 operable unit, and in

particular dealing with the B57 crib that has a treatability study no ongoing for installing a barrier over the top of that crib as its remedial action. Basically what my question is what the public involvement process was that was gone through in order to reach that decision and to have adequate input from both the public as well as the trustees in terms of what happens at the B57 crib and then beyond that into the 200 BP operable unit.

NV: OK, for those of you who aren't totally familiar with waste site. It's a group of waste sites in the 200 area on the north side of the 200 area. It's a group of 10 waste sites. B57 is a waste site that received condensate from single shell tanks. The other waste sites received direct liquid overflow from other tanks in the early 50's. The particular site that Durke is talking about is the, if you will, the least hazardous of those site. It received less contamination than the others, although it's received a much greater volume. After we had characterized all 10 of the sites, the most logical candidate technology was to leave those wastes in place and to put a cover over the top of them to keep rain water from infiltrating in and leaching the waste, and carrying the contaminants down to the ground water. The test at B57 which was a treatability test, was released a focus sheet was sent to the Hanford mailing list, and a notice was made through the papers in Tri-cities, Portland, Seattle, that identified this activity as something that we wanted to perform. There had been a long development project at Hanford for several years to develop a barrier to eliminate infiltration into these waste sites. But we had not constructed an actual scale version of one anywhere. And if you're going to say this is going to be perfectly protective or very protective you need an actual test in the field to determine if you can construct that barrier to the specifications that you had ascribed in all of your lab work. So what we had done is we had identified

this site as a good candidate place to do that actual construction and to do addition testing, not only testing of our ability to put the barrier in place, but then subsequent to that we would do actual test of irrigating over the barrier. We installed some systems to capture the water that would run off, and to actually do some tests of the barrier's integrity over the next few years. We still believe this is a viable option for these set of sites, but it's dependent on how well we can construct this barrier and how it does in the testing process.

DD: Based on the comments that you received on the 200 BP1 unit, do you believe that the public involvement process was adequate?

NV: It was actually to do treatability tests anywhere else under ???, you commonly don't even send them out to public comment. We felt we'd kind of gone above and beyond the call of duty to send these tests out for reviewing and comment. I don't know the extent to which we received public comment though, Durke. I will have to go back and look at that.

DD: Well my concern is that this was one of the first, if you would remediations being done on the site that actually consists of leaving the material in place and putting a barrier that will be most difficult if not nearly impossible to remove whose life is only in the 100s of years. I would think this would be one that would be most important to go out to public comment and public input on as well as to the natural resource trustees. And in going back through I had not found that we received the documents that you talk about, but we may have. It obviously didn't come to light, we didn't recognize it for what it was. And basically in the letter the Yakima Indian Reservation wrote, it's quite

apparent that they were very surprised. And that concerns me quite greatly.

NV: Again, as far as I know, there were ample notices as far as people's ability to respond. The final decision to leave that waste in place has not been made. That will only be made after a proposed plan for the cleanup alternative for the entire operable unit, and then it is sent out to public comment. That is scheduled for this summer so I will give you warning now I don't have the exact date, but the proposed plan for his operable unit will likely be out for public comment this summer.

NV: As I mentioned earlier, there was a projection that we get some of you into small groups and encourage you to talk with each other and some of the experts who are here, the agency people. It's getting late, and I don't want to try to form up small groups and find out that everybody goes home instead. So, how many of you who are here would like to circle up in groups of 10-12 and spend maybe 15-20 minutes talking with representatives from the agency about your particular questions or concerns. Can I see a raise of hands? Not a whole lot of interest in small group discussions. OK. So what we'll do is take any final formal comments. Oh, the question was raise earlier, when does the formal record start. This entire proceeding is being taped and there will be a transcript available to anyone who comes up and says they want it. We don't send it automatically, because it's very lengthy and then people complain that we're sending too much paper that they didn't ask for. So if you want the entire transcription you need to let me or one of the people at the table know that. There's also a summary being created that will be available much quicker than the entire transcripts and so it takes a while to do. If you would like the summary, you should also let me or the

people at the table know that you'd like that summary of this meeting. If there's anyone who came to make comments and wants to put them on the record, now would be the time. And I'd ask you just to come to the mike, identify yourself, and make your comments.

BW: My name is Bill Ward. I attended this session because I happen to live along the Columbia River and am interested in what's being done to cleanup the Hanford situation. I also happen to be a consulting engineer, and I just happened to overhear a comment made that sometime in the future you were going to be considering using critical path methods to help schedule and organize this sort of activity. As I was sitting at the table, I had a chance to browse through the TPA, and something that I noticed was that there didn't seem to be any real discipline to the milestones as far as what had to go first, what had to go second, what had to go third. I was going to suggest that maybe something like critical path methods might be applicable. It might help to put this whole program in sort of a framework that will allow people to kind of see their way through what the logical progression is. The comment, did I understand correctly that you are not yet using critical path methods?

NV: We use the critical path methods, or schedules, for individual projects. For the various programs, they don't necessarily lend themselves to critical path spending. We are, however, looking at everything and all our program from a systems engineering standpoint to make sure all the pieces fit together in ??? Where critical path methodology is appropriate, we would then apply it.

NV: One thing, let's see a hand go up if you want any more description of critical paths and systems engineering. No? Keep going then.

BW: Well I may have surmised, but that kind of ducks the issue. The issue is that unless you've got the whole series of activities under some sort of master schedule or master program, you're showing a real cavalier attitude toward cost consciousness and schedule consciousness. I would encourage you to put that sort of an instrument together so that the public and anybody else can see what your logical progression is. And the important thing is that whether you made 300 milestones and missed five is an important statistic, but what's really important is were those five that you missed critical activity that are going to hold up a number of things down the line that are going to prevent remediation from happening. So that's what I would encourage.

LP: I'm Lynn Porter from Hanford Watch. What I would like to see, the next time you folks report to us, at the least the largest part of your report structured around the milestones in terms of what ones have been met, what one's have not, and why; and what the consequences of that will be. And I'd like to follow up on Steve's report. He said that 5-6 milestones were missed in '94, if I got that correctly, could you tell us which milestones they were and why they ??? remissed and what the consequences will be.

NV: I think it's been since the Tri-party Agreement was signed in 1989, and I know that we missed the

LP: Excuse me, that's 5-6 since '89 not since the new agreement was signed?

NV: That's correct. We missed construction of the low-level waste laboratory which was subject to dispute. That was the M14 milestone.

941207-05

- LP: Excuse me, but since the thing has been renegotiated, maybe it would be more helpful if we could just talk about what milestones, if any, have been missed since the new agreement was signed. I believe it was in January.
- NV: Since the new agreement has been signed, I don't think we've missed any.
- LP: OK, thank you. And I'd like to ask one more question about the budget and so forth. Casey Rood told us that Westinghouse is basically getting paid for putting in its time, not for producing results. That it's compensation, it's not results based. Is anything going to be done to change that so that they get paid only if they produce, and they don't get paid if they don't produce?
- NV: They get paid under what's called an award fee contract. And in that contract it leaves out the expectations for that performance. And included in that award fee are things like meeting TPA milestones, safety assurance, and things like that. That's what they get paid for.
- LP: Yeah, but that's a bonus, right? He said that they're on a cost plus system which means they get paid, as long as they put in their time, they get paid their basic money no matter what and the only question is, are they going to get that final plus which I think he says last year for the first time they didn't get it. But they still got all the other money, and I sense these people are basically getting very well paid just for being there.
- NV: And every so often that contract comes up for recompetition, and if they haven't been meeting the expectations, then there is a possibility that we would recompute that contract.

LP: A possibility.

NV: A couple of other instances, just where at least from Washington's perspective, we're starting to see a little more heat on the contractors is that we're starting to see more instances where DOE is considering going outside, trying to bring in private contractors, non-Westinghouse, non-??? basically. We're starting to see that happen more and more often on a specific project by project basis. Also, I don't know what the results are, but I know that Secretary O'Leary now has a contractor reform effort going back at DOE headquarters, taking a look at the types of contractors, or contracts rather, rather than that they actually have in place. And I don't know what the schedule is for that group to make its recommendation to the secretary, but she at least is starting to look more than we've seen in the past at what modifications might be appropriate.

DD: Durke Deming, Oregon Department of Energy. I have two related questions. The first, Steve, you mentioned that periodically Westinghouse's and the other contracts come up for rebid. That actually is a little bit of a sore point as well. I think it was about a month and a half ago that the contract did come open and there were public meetings in terms of the scope of work on that contract. For Oregon Department of Energy, we found out about the meeting via public announcement in the Oregonian the day before the meeting. The meeting was held from 9-noon in downtown Portland. Needless to say with such short notice there was very little attendance. We did have I think four people total who did end up speaking on it. But there was just no time to have any reasonable look at it. The second comment you just made Roger, about the secretary's or the report to the secretary on contract reform. The initial version of that was issued at that meeting. So again, it was a problem

that the documents and the paperwork that led up to that meeting were not available until that meeting.

RS: My name is Ross Tewkesbury and I've got several comments I would like to make and a couple of questions. The first one is, something several people have been reiterating tonight, is about the notice of the meetings. And I think they ought to be not only in the Oregonian, but in the Willamette Week, and on radio stations such as the public radio and KBOO. And I also feel that you've... in the past I've requested that you have all of the meetings in Portland. And I would like to reiterate that because you have had some of the meetings, but there's a lot of issues that are important to me that you know are only in Seattle and Richland and that's it. And the second point that I'd like to make is on the issue of, in general, whistle blowers. I think that you ought to stop persecuting them and creating a climate of repression and stifling any dissent or difference of opinion. This really serves to intimidate the employees, and it needs changes in the management culture, the question of abusive power. And I keep thinking that you're making progress in that area, but then I keep hearing about more examples, and the only time that you will get to the right point on that is when someone who is a whistle blower and has a difference of opinion will be able to do that and will have nothing whatsoever happen to him except maybe action taken on his concerns. You're not going to have him transferred somewhere else or try to look for another job, or have him look out for people harassing him or her. Now, another thing, a few weeks ago I went to a meeting that was mostly held by the Department of the Navy about sending the reactors from submarine and cruisers down to Hanford, and I really objected to the way, if any of you have any type of influence or can prevail upon the Navy in any future meetings, that they would be more like this one we're having here tonight where you can have exchange of questions and

ideas. Because in that meeting all you had was a 10 minutes presentation, and then you could make comments. You couldn't ask any questions at all except for in writing. And I feel that was really a bad way to handle a meeting. And one question I did have was, I don't know if any of you know the answer, but how does this thing with the Department of Navy fit into the Tri-party Agreement, because they're a separate department but it's still a major thing that's happening here at Hanford.

NV: It's not at all a part of the Tri-party Agreement. That's a totally separate program and issue.

RS: Well that seems to be a flaw in there because if you can have these other agencies that are doing things, you know that are all happening simultaneously but are outside, then that really is not a good way to manage the thing as a whole.

940702115

TAPE TWO - SIDE B

RS: One issue that up to this point I've felt I've been really unable to comment on or influence is the question of the cleaning up of the north slope area and the other so-called more lowly contaminated sites. These areas have been exposed to 50 years of various forms of exposure, to radiation and toxic chemicals contamination, and from what I hear, the impression that I get is that basically you're saying that it can be easily cleaned up and transferred to other uses as farming. And I just think that whole attitude in movement is just completely insane, because nobody really knows what is out there because no one has really looked at it systematically and comprehensively. And I know you'll say that you've been doing that or will continue to do that, but I think that you seem to be mostly concentrating on large stuff that may be there and getting rid of that and then saying, Oh, it's OK now. It seems you're making a lot of assumptions based on minimal evidence, to me. And you also seem to be responding to local sources or people that want to use this area right away immediately, and this is really I feel looking at a short-term goal when the long-term consequences should be the highest priority. Because this has been the problem over and over at Hanford is looking at things, what's our short-term thing that we need to do, whether it's security or producing bombs or ignoring radiation. Otherwise it's really kind of a public relations scheme to show there's something that's been done real fast, and it's easy to do. One question I have on your under the page of radiation area remedial actions, it says application of herbicide on a yearly basis to control deep rooted vegetation to reduce spread of surface contamination. But my question was, what area or areas is that involved with, or where do you do that, or where do you not do it, or that type of thing?

NV: The remediation area reduction area program that controls actually the growth of tumbleweeds. Tumbleweeds are a very deep rooted vegetation. And what they have the potential to do is to send a large tap root down into a contaminated waste site, and then pick up radio nuclides that would then go into the plant tissue. And then, every year as you know, tumbleweeds break off and they go rolling across the desert. The program is done to keep tumbleweeds from growing on buried waste sites. And so it's done specifically so that you don't transport radioactivity by this method of rolling tumbleweeds across the site. So it's specifically used for burial grounds, where we know we have radioactive contamination.

RS: So it's just in those immediate vicinities.

NV: It's just right on the burial ground itself.

RS: OK. Another point I wanted to make which was touched upon by a couple of other people, was about the contract with Westinghouse. And I really think that you should discontinue that. Because they have a really bad record. And it seems to me that they're sort of viewed as the only alternative because a lot of the other possibilities or alternatives are either just as bad or worse. But I really do think that there are a lot of smaller companies with many good ideas that need to be brought in a much higher proportion. Finally, I think on the question of values, that all of the plutonium and uranium and other radioactive substances that are at the site there should be looked at as waste to be controlled and contained, and not as products to be produced for commercial use, however attractive that may seem, which on the surface it seems attractive to me. But it really defeats the main goals and purpose of the whole cleanup because you start working at cross purposes here, and then you've got more issues of transportation and other

9413287.0061

things. And the main goal should be the complete containment and cleanup of all the radiation and toxic waste whether it's in liquid and water, air, gas, or land and solid, and just keeping it from escaping. Because that should be the underlying thing under everything, and a lot of times it just seems like you're dumping more stuff in the trenches and dumping stuff over here, and it just really contradicts that, if you had that as your main, number one goal, it contradicts that basically. Because on one hand you're doing something over here, but on the other hand you're spreading it over here. And I just think that you need to really keep focused on that as the main goal. And that's it.

NV: If I may, one last comment. There's been a lot of talk about milestones, and for people in the audience who don't know about milestones, there are milestones, there are interim milestones, and both of those are subject, have important meaning. And then there are target milestones. And I'd like to talk about the consequences of one missed milestone. This was a milestone which was the subject of the first of the amendments to the Tri-party Agreement in about 1989 or 1990. And it concerned the liquid effluent treatment facilities which we've now seen are finally built. There had actually been \$10 million appropriated for building these in the original funding for the agreement. And a year later we found out that this \$10 million had been reprogrammed without any public input or involvement, and therefore was impossible because no money remained to start the work on the liquid effluent treatment facilities. As a result, those milestones were put back from I think it was June of 1991 to June of 1995 for the phase one, and then 1998 for ceasing, for fully treating all streams going to ground. Roger, do you know how many hundreds of millions of gallons of effluent were put into the ground rather than

through liquid effluent treatment facilities because of that change?

RS: No, I don't have that figure. One thing that is where I think we're getting closer to being able to avoid that kind of a situation is that EPA and Ecology and gradually the stake holders are getting more budget information and planning information up front, whereas in the past we couldn't see any of it basically. So if those changes were being made, we didn't know that. We're gradually getting more and more on board, so we're up front. We can spot those changes. We still have a long ways to go on that area, but it's moving in the right direction from an information standpoint, anyway.

NV: Yeah, the other part of that was that was a non-missed milestone. It was a firm milestone in the original agreement. And essentially the DOE came to you guys and said we can't meet it, so why don't we just recognize it. And so the milestone was put back and doesn't count among Steve's five or six that were missed. And that's, from my perspective, what the impact of these looking at the milestones in this kind of way as something to be negotiated rather than as guidelines for actually forcing the direction. And I know that a lot of people were upset that 100's of millions or billions of gallons went into the ground and didn't need to just because these \$10 million have changed. And the interesting thing was that the change was not within waste management or environmental restoration, it went over into defense production. It went outside the management waste budget. They felt a need to do that.

FG: Frank Gerhart again. ??? touched on an area that I was going to mention. And that is, how does the public measure success on this project? One way of course if that we've

got these milestones, and then if we've got a final goal and we could measure something off. Another way is if we had critical path activities, which has already been mentioned, and I haven't seen much of that. Another comment, there's been about 50 people here tonight, and looking at the one's that have some kind of official badges on, I'd make a guess that maybe half of the group are from the agencies. Now maybe it will come out in the press tomorrow that we had a large turnout here and the public was well represented. I see that hard to believe. I first attended a Hanford meeting, I believe it was in 1988. I'm not sure about that. But it was up in White Salmon and it was the same old story. The press didn't get it out and I saw it the next day after the meeting was here and I went up to White Salmon. My point is, that after four years, I'm exasperated with this whole project and I think that if the public really knew, other than a handful of people what's going on and the billions of dollars that are being spent, I think there'd be an outcry like we've never heard before. I ask tonight of Jim Peterson, how many billions have been spent on Hanford since 1943. Can anyone tell me that? I think it would be astronomical. Maybe it's trillions, who knows? Can anyone give me the answer there?

NV: Not I.

FG: And if not. Who's minding the store? Maybe our budgets are never-ending, but for the taxpayers they're ending. So I hope that we can get a satisfactory answer. Jim's got my address, and I hope that we get back here sooner than six months on how many billion or trillion we've spent up there. Let's get this thing out so the people know, and then let's move on.

DM: My name's Dean Morrison. I'm from Hanford Watch. I just have a couple of questions and comments. What now is the

best estimate for when this is going to be completed and how much money is going to be spent. I mean I've heard 30, 40 years and upwards to half a trillion dollars, but I...

NV: The estimate right now as far as completion of tank waste processing is now at 28. There'd still be D and D activities going on for a number of years. I don't know how long that, if there are even estimates on how long D and D would actually continue to be in progress, but we're out in the 20-50 area.

DM: D and D?

NV: The demolition cleanup of the old buildings basically. And let's say that eventually when we get the new tank waste processing, eventually those facilities are going to have to go through cleanup as well at the very tail end of the whole thing. But we're getting pretty close to 20, 50 I would think.

NV: Yeah, I think the message here is this. We have yet to build a vitrification plant. I don't think anybody has considered how we would tear it down yet. And so I think there are some of those activities for facilities that we have not even constructed yet that are going to be way out in the future. I like in this time frame too something that's very much unknown, we've yet to vitrificate any tank waste and yet we've developed a schedule for it. We've only remediated a very limited number of sites, to be honest with you, after four years, and we don't know how long it's going to take to clean it up if you really say the way you know is by experience. And so we have dates that are milestones, when things are going to be done, but whether we can do them half as fast or twice as fast, I think until you're out in the field actually doing the work, you can't figure that out yet.

DM: OK, the budget next year will be about 1.8, 2 billion dollars approximately?

NV: About \$1.6 billion.

DM: And so far they've spent about \$7 billion in four or five years, approximately? Six, seven, eight?

NV: That's probably a ballpark.

DM: I mean if we're spending \$2 billion a year and it's going to take 50 years, that's just a ballpark, it's going to take \$100 billion. But I've heard figures that are much much larger than \$100 billion. I'm just wondering, when are we going to start spending some real money for one thing. If it's going to take \$500 billion in 50 years, that's an average of \$10 billion a year. I know we have to start saving, but we also have to start spending some real money. But, anyway. My second question is, how many employees are at Hanford, employed by Westinghouse, DOE, just a ballpark, and the other, Ecology and EPA.

NV: I think DOE and its contractors are right around 18,000.

NV: The state has upwards of about 50 folks over there.

DM: The state has 50?

NV: And we have seven. A good strong seven, though.

DM: Seven?

NV: Yeah.

DM: You're represented well at this meeting.

NV: Thank you.

DM: How many scientist and engineer are employed of that 18,000?

NV: I don't know.

DM: Is it 1,000, 5,000, 10,000?

NV: I really couldn't tell you.

DM: Within 2,000 can you tell me?

NV: No I can't.

DM: How many managers then?

NV: Another good question that I can't answer. I can get you those.

NV: I can go through all this for our agency.

DM: You know their addresses and phone numbers. OK. Another question.

NV: ???

DM: Well I just don't understand. This is a huge project. Technically this is just so beyond anything that's every been done in the world, and I don't understand how scientists and engineers are not the most important people involved in this--research and development. That should be at the forefront, I think, of this entire project. I just had another question about your budget allocation and environmental management program sheet. You have it broken into environmental restoration budget and waste management

- budget. And I don't understand the difference. In your waste management pie you have construction underway, 22% of your budget, then ongoing operations, 64%. What's the difference between those two?
- NV: Of ongoing operations and construction?
- DM: Underway, yes.
- NV: OK. Ongoing operations would be the operations of the facilities that are already there and the current management of the radioactive and hazardous wastes through the various facilities. Ongoing construction would be activities like the waste receiving and processing facility, like at, I guess, Savannah River. Maybe the defense waste processing facility would be one of those that would be constructed but not yet operating. So it would be the actual construction of new capitol facilities for the waste management program.
- DM: So there's no buildings that have been constructed that are operating?
- NV: Yes, all the operations portion of that budget would be the operations of all the facilities that have been constructed.
- DM: Oh, OK. Also, what is Uranium enrichment, 4.5%--\$90 million of the budget.
- NV: I'm not familiar with the Uranium enrichment program. Jim or Karen? I don't think we have any of that at Hanford, I think that would be at other sites.
- NV: ???
- DM: It's a weapons program? It's in the environmental management program?

NV: ???

NV: It is on the pie chart and I'm not familiar with that program. That's not Hanford, that's the national budget.

NV: We don't do any Uranium enrichment. In fact we've had very little Uranium enrichment over the years.

DM: Oh, I thought this was Hanford's. Did you make a pie, any kind of graph like this for Hanford?

NV: If you look at the chart that just has the columns of the Hanford numbers. You could make a comparison and you could complete a chart, but I don't have a chart on that right now, a pie chart. You could figure out the percentages, just by dividing.

DM: Two more questions. It just seems to me the ground water remediation problem out there is going to be huge. And I think that's something... I don't know how much research has been done. But I know a lot of work has already been done around the world in ground water remediation. I think that's a problem that's been investigated fairly well, whereas a lot of the other problems are very specific, I think, to Hanford and probably to nuclear production. How much use is being made of other studies in other countries, research and development, in the ground water remediation. And why isn't the ground water problem, why isn't a ground water company that has years, and even decades, of experience in fixing ground water problems, why aren't they involved? Why is Westinghouse or Bechtel or someone else. Why do they have to bring in all these people, train them, you have these other companies that already have this nucleus and they know how to tackle that problem.

9413287.0069

NV: Mike Thompson will address that.

MT: We are bringing in outside experts. As a matter of fact we had Dr. John Cherry from Canada. He wrote the textbook I had in hydrogeology in college.

DM: Me too.

MT: He came to our site just this last week to talk to us about some remediation technologies for ??? 90 that we're looking at. I'm also in some discussions with the atomic energy commission of Canada concerning some ??? 90 options that are there. Bechtel, when they come on board, they have the capability of using some of the premier remedial contractors and consultants in the country, CH2M Hill, IT Companies and stuff like that.

DM: Why isn't CH2M Hill, I mean why aren't they the major player. I mean why aren't they in charge?

MT: They are a major player. Bechtel is the overall contractor, but they have preselected two companies to assist them, actually three companies and those are two out of the three.

DM: CH2M Hill and who else?

MT: IT Company.

DM: OK so they will be in charge of the ground water remediation?

MT: They will have experts in the field at Hanford working for us under the umbrella of Bechtel.

NV: Can I respond to one of your earlier comments about the percentage of the various programs at Hanford. I do have

91227 071

the numbers here. Waste management is about 63%, facility transition is 19%, environmental restoration is 14%, and technology and development is 4%.

DM: OK, the other three aren't involved at Hanford?

NV: Right.

NV: Does that comprise, then, the whole Hanford budget?

NV: No, I think there are some other programs. That's just the...

NV: ??? It's not in tonight's handout that you brought?

NV: It's not in tonight's handout, no, but I think I've got it here.

NV: ???

NV: Was that \$1.6 billion the total for Hanford?

NV: That's just the environmental management budget, the actual cleanup budget. There are other programs that...

NV: If you remember in the part I gave initially. There were two categories for technology, development, and multi-program laboratory activities. Those not only service the Department of Energy, but they also do research for say the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or the Department of Defense, or even EPA. So there's other moneys that come to Hanford specifically for research initiatives, not related to DOE's cleanup mission. So, I think Jim probably has a number for that, I think it was about \$100 million or a little more.

1200-2826146

0001-2826146

NV: In 1994, this year, for non-EM, non-cleanup activities, we have \$360 million. And I've got a breakout here. I'll just give you this. This is an extra one that shows the sources, which programs these are for.

NV: ???

NV: Yes. If I give you this sheet here it has them both together, it gives you a total. That's correct.

NV: OK. I just have one other comment. I want to reiterate what other people have said about having notice for this meeting. I think we didn't have enough notice, and I agree with having to advertise in other mediums besides Oregonian, and the notice wasn't enough, I believe, the time reference. And also, being given these sheets. The day, the hour that we arrive here to be given this and then expect us to ask intelligent questions I think isn't very fair. I liken it to someone going to school for a full year and not being graded for anything, and then the student gives the teacher their 50 page report at 4:00 and the teacher has to give them a grade at 5 p.m. And regardless, the student's going to pass and go on to the next grade, which I think is basically is what's going to happen. But thank you anyway for being here in Portland.

DD: Durke Deming, Oregon Department of Energy. Actually there was an interesting question on the Uranium enrichment that I hadn't seen before. I'm just doing a thumbnail calculation in my head that 4.5% of the \$6 billion EM budget amounts to something like \$285 million for fiscal year '95. That's particularly interesting in that I just attended a conference last week in Washington D.C. with the U.S. Department of Energy on how to get rid of the weapons grade plutonium. And some of the kinds of number they were ??? around were that we have or would have shortly, something in

9413287.0073

excess of 100 metric tons of high enrichment bomb grade U235 out of the weapons, and that the Soviets were selling to us 500 tons of bomb grade U235. Now that material's going to be diluted down to 20%, and so it isn't usable for that purpose, though they've got a large excess of material as do we. It doesn't seem to make any sense. Why the U.S. government would continue to enrich new material, given that we're about to have something in excess of 1,000 tons on the market with no home. That would look to be a budget item that could probably be lopped tomorrow and pick up another couple hundred million. The second item I had is on an entirely different subject. One of the things that we've been attempting to do for the last many months is get access, obviously as others have, to a lot of the documents. And it would seem to make sense for new documents particularly, that DOE make emphasis to try to get those into electronic format that could be distributed that way. In particular, ??? Labs up at Hanford has a site called an anonymous FTP site. In the internet jargon, the network of all network, the so-called information super highway. There is an ability to request information semi-anonymously. And they call that basically an anonymous FTP site. And what it is in effect is a computer that will let people call in that have the capability, tell it what they want, and they can just download it. EPA does something like this on a couple of different bulletin boards. One of which is the radiological bulletin board for the new regulations they're developing where it is available via an 800 number on a bulletin board so that people who have normal bulletin board type software can get to it, and that's quite common. They also have access through a normal long distance phone number if you want to go that route, though there isn't a lot of reason for that. And they also have access through the fed-world bulletin board system which is on the internet so that anybody who can from their desk reach internet on a file transfer, can reach their bulletin board and any of the

files on it. Likewise, EPA has four or five others that we've begun to tie in to as has some of the other agencies. It would seem to make sense that as quickly as possible, it would be a good idea to start getting these things available through the internet and off of things like the anonymous FTP sites, so that people can get documents in a much quicker fashion. Particularly for Washington state as well as the state of Oregon, it would be helpful if we could get the documents in that format, we can redistribute in printing them. And it becomes a little bit easier to get documents out, and a little faster format. Also for review it becomes a little bit easier, we end up wasting a few less trees and end up doing things of that nature. A different subject yet. One of the items that has just gone through an open public comment period is that end springs. One of the items that obviously we had questions on is why there was not an emphasis being put on trying to actually remediate or remove the source of the end springs, to go in and remove the covers off those springs, or off the trenches rather, and to start to take the radioactive materials out of those trenches. The emphasis there being two-fold. One, to remove the material so that it is less subject to being washed into the end springs and into the Columbia River. And the other perhaps more important one, is to use it as a first site, to do work using all kinds of electronical and mechanical equipment in high radiation fields to develop the techniques and the equipment in preparation for retrieving the waste out of the tank farms. With one of the surface cribs it would seem to be much easier to have access to it, so that when things go wrong, which they will, that you could recover the equipment to find out what happened, why it broke or failed, and learn from that rather than going in and investing a lot of money in equipment that's going to go into the tanks and have potentially similar kinds of problems.

NV: Just a couple of the activities of the principle elements of activities out at the end springs, I don't know what the timing's going to be of the actual cleanup of those crib sites, the actual sources of the end springs, but those activities, or those closures basically, are starting to be scheduled now. There's also debate on in the interim, before the actual closure whether or not there should be abatement measures to knock down the skyshine from the ??? contamination in the soils. And then there's also, of course and I know you're familiar with this, debate on different methodologies to actually get at the springs themselves in the ??? and in those waste ???

NV: In particular, one of the things that concerns me. When NASA first started doing the space program, and then into some of the early years, a lot of the equipment they put in orbit had failures. They had all kinds of problems. One of the things that they learned and something that people don't realize very much is that when you go into space the radiation fields are fairly high, particularly going through the ??? belts, but even more so whenever there's a solar flare on the sun it sends out massive amounts of radiation. And what NASA learned from that is a lot things about what that radiation does to electronic equipment. And in the early years they lost a lot of electronic equipment to radiation damage, and so they learned a lot of techniques on how to harden equipment for radiation exposure and what kinds of things you just plain couldn't use, and then what you had to do in order to made it work successfully. And I think a lot of that information could be used and brought forward into the cleanups here in the Savannah River and elsewhere. Particularly I think there's a lot of what we're going to be doing that just hasn't been tried before. It's all new stuff. There's things about how do you build robotic arms and such so that (a) they work over a long period of time without needing a lot of maintenance, (b)

9413287-0025

that they don't get so overly contaminated that people can't get near them to maintain them, and (c) that you can actually keep them running and keep them up. And I think with some of the surface cribs and some of the early work on there, you could learn an awful lot. And I think emphasis would be well spent in doing that sort of thing.

NV: I think the problem we face with remediating that particular source right now is actually twofold. One, there's significant worker exposure issue with going out and doing it now. You're going to expose the workers to a lot of high levels of radioactivity. Some of that radioactivity because its from Covalt 60 will die off a lot faster than he main contaminant we're concerned about there which is ??? 90. So to actually go out and remove the source, we're hoping to kind of do it as the Covalt 60 dies down. The second part of the problem is, once we remove the source, probably the logical thing to do with those contaminated materials would be to vitrify them into some kind of low-level waste. And since we're not going to have a low-level waste vitrification plant around for some number of years, it doesn't make sense to really remove this and store it again in another form for years. So, the actions that we're now addressing, yes they're a bandaid on a very big problem, but they do achieve the overall goal of reducing the contaminants entering the Columbia River.

NV: I appreciate that and I want also to make emphasis on is that the radiation exposure to the workers is extremely important. I don't want to undervalue that by any means. But at the same time, the total exposure cumulative over the entire cleanup is the most critical number, what the exposure is between now and the year 2100, say. And what I'm afraid may happen is that if we put too much emphasis on doing all of that work sometime in the future and not actually get out hands dirty and find out what it takes,

that a lot of that information will be information that tells us it's going to take even longer. And that we're going to end up having to do a lot of things differently because we didn't recognize what the problems were. So that there are some trade-offs there, and to a large extent what that may well say is to do other things using robotics or remote manipulators of various types so that you can reduce or remove the human exposure and to develop those techniques fairly early on. And it does create the problem, what do you do with the material once it comes out. And that is a severe problem. But I think it's something that we need to do anyway just to find out how do we physically accomplish something like this. Likewise it goes back actually to one of your points earlier on Doug. That's when you look at things like the Purex facility or the other big facilities, they are enormous problems to tear down. All of the new facilities that are being built need to be very severely built with an eye towards how do you tear it apart and bury it or get rid of it or treat it when you're done. That may well argue in some cases that you align cases with steel that you had not intended to and spend more money up front to avoid the decontamination problems downstream or other similar kinds of things.

9413287.0077

PK: I think you folks are lucky to have such a good Oregon resource such as Durke. I seriously hope that you use him as a consultant because I think he's thinking far ahead far faster than a lot of people who are stuck in the mire and can't see the forest through the trees, at least that's what it looks like to me. My name is Page Knight and I'm speaking for myself and for Hanford Watch too. I want to refer, first of all, to a statement that dear Frank, who has worked for years on clean water-the Bull Run watershed here-for us. I want to comment on something he said tonight, and that's that he's very frustrated. And what that reminded me of was sitting at our table tonight with a

few of the Hanford Watch members. We are missing some people here tonight that usually come to these meetings but that are no longer coming because they are so frustrated and have given up hope, basically, in a lot of ways. And that saddens my heart. You know, I figured out with, oh, something that Lynn brought up a few minutes ago, that I'm going to be...with the projected date of clean-up being 2050, that'd be two thousand fifty, I guess you'd call it, I'm going to be a hundred and four. And I hope I'm going to be around to celebrate that something's happened and that my grandchildren are going to have a healthy and hearty life ahead of them. And you folks right now hold that possibility in your hands, and that's a heavy burden, you know, not one to be taken lightly. And I know that you take a lot of flak from us, and I think that that's sort of needed to spur things on. I also want to thank you folks for the work that you are attempting to do, and I really hope that you're sincerely listening to the advice you're getting from the general public via the different boards and via these meetings. And, I encourage you, we need to have more than a once-a-year TPA meetings. This is ridiculous that we get to meet you next year, a whole year from now and get an update. I also am going to reiterate just for the record, that we need our handouts, that you were given tonight, and you got this comment in Seattle too. It's a very sincere comment. This is not an orchestrated effort on the part of public interest groups. You need to get us our documents early. Most of us are on your mailing lists, OK? So that we do have a chance, as Dean was saying, to study them ahead of time. And then we need longer public notices. You know, extend them out a little bit. We've had two weak public notice here and it hasn't been a real all out effort. This is not your fault, but I'm going to say this for the record hoping that somebody hears. The Oregonian should be here covering this, and they're not. They don't give us decent coverage here in this town of the things that are

9413287.0079

happening to Hanford, for the most part. And when they do, the reporters, for the most part, end up quitting soon afterwards if there's some good coverage. And that's a rather curious sort of happening. So I just wanted to make those statements, and I also wanted to thank you Doug, in particular, for being very honest and saying, you know, this is the mess out there. And I encourage all of you to say and show us pictures of the mess out there. Because when we see the pretty buildings that are going to be built with our cleanup dollars, you know the general public who isn't following this gets the impression that it's no big deal and therefore you don't get the turnouts at the meetings. And you don't really get the public values and principles except via a few of us. So I encourage you to paint the picture as dirty as it really is. And I think that some of the pictures that you had of the site there that show things going on and show problem areas are really good, because most people that come to these meetings do not or would not or can not go up to Hanford, OK? And I would encourage you to show the real pictures of what's happening and show the dirty stuff. Show us what the past 50 years has brought us and what you're really grappling with and what we're all going to be grappling with for centuries. One of the things that I am curious about, and I'm going to throw out these questions and stop for some answers before I go on to my comments, is there were several things missing from this presentation tonight. There is no mention of ERDF, the environmental restoration disposal facility, that is a very very big deal out there right now and it's tantamount to a lot of the clean up work that's being planned to continue on. So I'd like to ask you these questions and stop for the answers so that if there are any public people here they can hear. What is the ERTF for the disposal facility, where is it, what is going into it, and are there plans of bringing in wastes from other states to this proposed landfill? And then I also want to know, will long half life ??? wastes be

allowed to go into this landfill? How much? What's the limit going to be? What kinds of barriers are you going to put up in this landfill, underneath, above? What kind in every instance and how long with the barriers last? So can you kind of give us a quick overview of ERTF or the landfill.

NV: I want to make one statement first. We will be back on the environmental restoration disposal facility. We're now in the paperwork preparation process. And we expect to be back in the Portland area discussing more details of the disposal facility. Right now the location where it's planned is between the 200 west area and the 200 east area if you can go back and review the handout. It's basically located between those two areas. The main type of waste that it's scheduled to receive is contaminated soils and contaminated materials from the burial grounds and the liquid discharge sites in the 100 and the 300 areas. So moving contaminated materials from along the Columbia River into the central portion of the site. As far as ??? wastes go, I don't believe ??? wastes are subject to being disposed anywhere in the United States except at WHIP. And so there won't be any ??? wastes go to the environmental restoration disposal facility, because they're simply not eligible for it. As far as wastes from other sites, this facility is being constructed solely to service the environmental restoration program at Hanford. And our permitting and ??? record of decision strategy is to emphasize just that. It's for the use of Hanford--Hanford past practice waste, not even waste currently being generated today. It's simply for wastes related to the cleanup of Hanford. And I know I missed about three of those questions.

PK: OK, the barriers. Are you planning various barriers, are you that far into the planning stage where we can talk about the barriers.

NV: The next document that you're going to see to the public is a conceptual design report for this facility. The current design that the three parties have looked at is a double liner leach 8 collection system resource conservation and recovery act compliant landfill design. That means with a landfill cover that is retrocompliant as well as the liner systems being compliant with current hazardous waste regulations. So in terms of the waste regulations, these are the best types of liners and barriers that are available today. As far as how long they'll last, boy when you get out a few 1,000 years, who's to tell. I can't give you a year.

PK: Is Portland going to get any kind of a hearing on this whole thing? I've been up to one of a ??? meeting on it in Richland, but there's been nothing down here.

TAPE THREE - SIDE A

NV: I'm certain that we will be down here on this issue. This is a very important issue and it is the most important issue to get waste away from the Columbia River.

PK: Well I hope that on this one for sure and just on your next meetings then that we get very very good public notice and the documents and etc. etc.

NV: It's a very important meeting and I don't think we've appropriately described the need of this facility to the public.

PK: OK, well I encourage every possible thing that you can do to make sure that we get full notice and full details, etc. I also, the fellow who made the comment about critical path-- Bill Ward that spoke a little while ago--I just want to

remind all of you that when we were dealing with the tank waste issues this summer on the tank waste task force, that we talked a great deal about critical path. And when I was listening to that gentleman speak, I got the feeling that he really knows about critical path, and that perhaps that isn't a body of knowledge or way of operating that you folks are really used to. Is that true, that you're just now exploring it for the first time?

NV: No, we've used critical path for quite some time, and as I mentioned, especially on construction projects. The entire tours program, though, is being in the major projects within the tours program are being subject to the critical path process. And what that's going to do for us is any time a milestone or an activity falls on a critical path, it becomes an enforceable milestone. If it falls off of the critical path, then it becomes a target date. And then that will be reviewed at least on a quarterly basis between the three agencies to see how the activities are going and what's happening to the various milestones and the emphasis that needs to be put on those.

PK: Is it possible to look at the whole Hanford cleanup on a critical path? Is that something that is possible in the imagination at least?

NV: I think it's only possible after a lot of cleanup decisions have been made. Right now we have critical path schedules for the investigation portion of the cleanup process. But if you haven't made a decision on how you're going to clean it up, it's really hard to set a critical path schedule for those activities until you've made a decision. So I think once we've made a number of cleanup decisions and have kind of a cleanup strategy that's well founded and proven that that could be done. But I think that there are aspects of

the program that would be very hard to set critical path milestone schedules for now.

NV: The one area where we are ??? in DOE even over the past couple of months as far as looking at the overall Hanford cleanup, all of the different pieces, not so much in a critical path management but in the other area that I think was mentioned, systems engineering, looking at the relationships between the major programs. Whether it's K basins or ER or tanks or facility transition. I know I just received an initial DOE sitewide systems engineering document, and I think it's probably got draft stamped on it by ??? but they're starting to look at all of the interrelationships between all of the major programs rather than dealing with them piece by piece by piece.

PK: OK well I just encourage more exploration of this on a larger scale. Actually when you mentioned the piece by piece bit, one of my constant awareness and criticisms of the DOE is that all of the waste that we're dealing with at all of the DOE facilities in this country are being dealt with and have been dealt with historically in a piecemeal fashion. And one of the things I would like to encourage you to do, because it could be to your advantage, and this is something that activist groups around the country are doing, is that we are pushing for a comprehensive waste policy which includes how we deal with spent fuel which Hanford keeps being targeted as a possible burial or resting ground for spent fuel both from foreign reactors, from naval reactors, etc. etc. I would like to encourage you to also push the DOE that we have to have a comprehensive waste policy or we're up a creek without a paddle for the next many centuries, and it's going to hurt our children and our grandchildren. So with that I have two more comments. One of them is I am really disturbed by the terminology that's being used with milestones, that missed milestones are

9413287-0083

different from changed milestones. And that seems to me that the way that that's looked at, and I don't know where the fault lies necessarily. Perhaps it's a larger DOE issue. But when you start messing up terminology like that, you take the public back light years into the same old distrust that's still festering around. And it feels like we are being given the story again. The same old let's beat around the bush story. So when we're talking about meeting milestones out here in the public in simple terminology that I use even in the classroom, when you miss something, you miss something. When you change something, that doesn't mean you've met it, it means you've changed something and you can't put it into the category of a completed milestone. Complete and change don't mean the same thing in the dictionary. So I'm asking you again to please be careful of the words you use and the way you play around with them because therein is where you're either going to get the public behind you or the public against you. And then my final comment is that overall this whole picture of the whole Tri-party Agreement that we've been given--the cleanup, the environmental restoration, the environmental management--I keep getting the sense that what we're having is a real battle between what's going to look good to Congress so that we can keep getting more money, and what's going to really mitigate the public and environmental and worker health safety issues out at Hanford, and that's what the cleanup is all about. It is not technology transfer. That hopefully will be a secondary outcome way down there. But the main goal, the main purpose of Hanford, and I see this in a lot of your papers, they're starting to get blurred and mixed up and they're changing places in the ones, and twos, and threes. The main goal is to clean up Hanford because it is a safety hazard. And that's an understatement. We're talking about the possible extermination of people and genetic gene pools, etc. etc. years and years down the road. So safety is first and

foremost. And I don't think you can distinguish between worker, public, and environmental safety. That is the primary mission right now in the DOE sites, it is not technology transfer. That is a secondary outcome way down there. And you sort of get into the whole thing of what comes first, the chicken or the egg. But, from a public perspective, in terms of values and principles, our health and safety is of utmost importance. And I can't imagine that it wouldn't be to you too. So please remember that as we keep going through the renegotiation of the Tri-party Agreement. Thank you.

BA: My name's Bob Amundson. I'm an ecologist. I'm pleased to hear that the ALE site is going to be cleaned up by this October. As an ecologist, it is the last piece of shrub steppe ecosystem in the Intermountain West. It should not be touched. It shouldn't be grazed. It shouldn't be plowed. It should be set aside for the future. And I hope that that's on the agenda for DOE for the Hanford site. My question is are there any plans for it to be privatized, and if so that should be stopped.

NV: There are a couple of proposals for ALE right now. One of them is to turn it over to the Bureau of Land Management. The Yakima Indian Reservation has also made a proposal for the government to turn it over to them. Under either proposal, I believe that the area would be preserved as more or less an ecological reserve, very similar to what it is right now.

BA: It would not be grazed.

NV: I don't think so. I think it would be set aside.

NV: Steve, the BLM has indicated that they would make this a national conservation area and they would create a

management plan that would essentially continue it as a research and environmental area, essentially keep it as we have in the past.

BA: Without grazing?

NV: That's my understanding, yes.

NV: You might want to make that as a comment rather than a question if that's what you want.

BA: Since it's one of the last pieces of the Intermountain West that has not been grazed, it should definitely not be grazed in the future. It's the one place that researchers can go to look and see what an intact shrub steppe ecosystem can be. And it could be used for restoration of the rest of the Intermountain West. It is a research site that should be kept intact.

NV: You're on Dick.

DB: Well, I welcomed everybody here. For the bitter-enders I welcome you to the bitter end. I want to thank you all for coming and for coming to Portland. And I hope that next time you come, as other people have said, we can have a better foundation. I personally think that the interchange was open, and although there are still questions that need to be answered, I think that it felt as though it was a productive dialog. And I think we've given you as much to take home and think about as we have to take home and think about ourselves. So thank you everybody for sticking with this and you all too.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**

01495879