

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Draft Meeting Summary
November 2-3, 2000

RECEIVED
NOV 28 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDMC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS 4

ANNOUNCEMENTS 4

ADOPTION OF SEPTEMBER HAB MEETING SUMMARY 5

TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT: REGULATING FOR SUCCESS..... 5

 Spent Nuclear Fuel 5

 Waste Management 6

 Environmental Restoration..... 8

 Facility Transition 9

 River Protection Project..... 10

DRAFT ADVICE ON OFF-SITE WASTE..... 12

OCTOBER HANFORD 2012/DONE IN A DECADE WORKSHOP 12

HAB CHAIR TRANSITION 15

RECONSIDERATION OF ADVICE ON FY2001 PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS 26

ADVICE ON CONTRACTING CRITERIA 26

UPDATES 27

 Science and Technology 27

 Environmental Management Advisory Board..... 27

 Tank Closure Workshop..... 27

 Stewardship Workshop..... 28

 Ecology Workshop on Tanks..... 29

 Executive Committee Meeting and New Facilitation Contract..... 30

 Hanford Strategic Plan..... 31

 EPA Multi-Media Inspection..... 32

 Reuse of Contaminated Lead and Other Materials..... 33

PUBLIC COMMENT 33

HANFORD HEALTH AND SAFETY 33

ATTACHMENT 1 – ATTENDEES 37

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tri-Party Agreement: Regulating for Success

The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies discussed cleanup progress and the outlook for continued progress under the TPA. Four specific program areas were discussed: Spent Nuclear Fuel, Waste Management, Environmental Restoration, Facility Transition, and the River Protection Project. HAB members are anxiously awaiting the first movement of spent nuclear fuel from the K Basins, and it appears that this will happen on or very close to the November 30 TPA milestone date. The waste management program is being restructured. HAB members were interested in transuranic waste issues. They also expressed great concern about off-site waste. Concerning the Environmental Restoration program, HAB members were concerned about the implications of accelerated cleanup in the 300 Area and the timely cleanup of the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds. Work appears to be going well in the area of facility transition, and Fluor Hanford is about to mark 10 million accident-free person hours of work. Interim stabilization of tanks is making good progress, but HAB members expressed concern over the fate of the liquid in the tanks as treatment capability is delayed and the tank infrastructure continues to age and degrade.

In response to HAB member concerns regarding off-site waste, a piece of draft advice was developed during the meeting. While there was a suggestion to consider adopting this advice at this HAB meeting or at a meeting of the "committee of the whole", the HAB decided to send the draft advice to the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee for further work and discussion.

October Hanford 2012/Done in a Decade Workshop

HAB participants in the October workshop focused on the new vision and plan for Hanford cleanup briefed the full Board on the major points of agreement and concern from the meeting, including the importance of conducting work under the auspices of the TPA, public involvement, addressing the 618 burial grounds, examining trade-offs related to acceleration of cleanup along the river, developing the ability to handle transuranic waste, and clearly communicating that all Hanford cleanup cannot be completed in the next decade. Concerns were also raised regarding the applicability of closure contracts to parts of Hanford cleanup and the definition of desired cleanup end states. The HAB is debating what the product of its work will be on the Hanford 2012 topic.

Hanford Advisory Board Chair Transition

HAB members spent much of the two-day meeting searching for consensus on a single candidate to recommend to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to be the next HAB chair. This was a long and difficult process for the Board. When consensus could not be reached, the HAB made use of the fallback position in its charter and operating groundrules that provides for a 2/3rds majority vote for major procedural actions, provided a quorum is present. Three candidates were considered for recommendation to DOE: Shelley Cimon, Leon Swenson, and Todd Martin. HAB members expressed their confidence in the abilities of all the candidates and were grateful that all three were willing to serve in the challenging position of HAB chair. After numerous motions and votes, the final decision was to unanimously recommend Todd Martin to DOE to be appointed as the next HAB chair.

If appointed, Todd would succeed Marilyn Reeves who will complete six years of highly-regarded service to the HAB in February 2001.

Contracting Advice

The HAB considered two pieces of advice relating to site cleanup contracts. The first piece of advice concerning contractor performance agreements for fiscal year 2001 was adopted at the September HAB meeting without a full quorum present. The HAB reconsidered and readopted this advice at this meeting with a quorum present. The second piece of advice concerned factors that the HAB believes are important for DOE to consider in making the decision whether or extend or recompute the large Fluor Hanford cleanup contract. HAB debate included raising concerns that the local DOE office had already sent its recommended decision to DOE-Headquarters for concurrence and approval and that parts of the advice were too detailed and not focused at a policy level. After discussion and a number of wording changes, the HAB adopted Consensus Advice #112 on contracting criteria.

Hanford Health and Safety

The HAB had the pleasure of listening to and talking with a panel of workers from the Hanford site about the new Integrated Safety Management program. The frank discussions gave the HAB a good sense of the philosophy behind the new program, the commitment of the workers in making it a success, and the satisfaction with the changes in the safety of the work and the quality of communications between workers and management that is already occurring. An important piece of the program is continuous improvement to address pockets of mediocrity that still exist. HAB members expressed their gratitude for the work that the workers perform and their concern for worker safety. The HAB requested that the panel return in 2001 to provide another update on the status and progress of the health and safety program.

Updates

The HAB received numerous updates on a wide variety of topics, including Science and Technology, the national Environmental Management Advisory Board, the annual Tank Closure Workshop, the recent DOE Stewardship Workshop, a recent Washington State Department of Ecology workshop on tank cleanup, the Hanford Strategic Plan, and the outcome of the EPA multi-media inspection. The HAB also received an update on the November 1 Executive Committee meeting and the new facilitation contract. The next two HAB meetings will be on February 1-2 and April 5-6. Both meetings will be in the Tri-Cities.

Public Comment

Don Myers, private citizen, and Joyce Olson, District Director for Representative Doc Hastings, both presented public comments to the HAB. Joyce Olson provided the HAB with a copy of a letter from Doc Hastings to Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson that encouraged DOE to provide the HAB with a written determination of whether the next HAB chair can be compensated, an issue of great concern to many HAB members.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Draft Meeting Summary

November 2-3, 2000

Richland, Washington

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

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting was called to order by Ken Bracken, Vice Chair, Benton County (Local Government). This meeting was open to the public and offered four public comment periods: Thursday, November 2 at 11:45 am and 4:45 p.m. and on Friday, November 3 at 11:45 am and 2:45 p.m.

Board members in attendance are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public. Board seats not represented were: Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force). This is the fourth consecutive meeting that has been missed by Richard Berglund.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ken Bracken and Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), welcomed all participants and guests to the meeting. No new Board members or alternates were introduced at this meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco (Local Government) welcomed everyone to Pasco. He graciously provided coffee for the meeting and invited the HAB to return to Pasco.
- Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), reminded board members that Marilyn Reeves, Public-at-Large, is retiring as Chair in February 2001. It is very important to recognize her years of service as Chair. Ken has been designated the lead for this project. He asked everyone to start thinking about ideas to honor Marilyn.
- Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, introduced the new staff of facilitation team under the new facilitation, including Penny Mabie, facilitator for the Environmental Restoration and Health, Safety and Waste Management Committees; Louise Dressen, senior advisor; and Tammie Holm, administrative assistant in the EnviroIssues Hanford Project Office in Richland.
- Ruth Siguenza announced the availability of two summaries of the recent HAB self-assessment: a short summary and a longer compilation that includes all of the individual comments and responses. These will be discussed in the December meeting.
- Gail McClure, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), indicated that appointment letters from DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) have been sent to HAB members. Anyone who has not yet received a letter should contact Gail.
- Gail McClure also discussed the change in the access number for those holding federal calling cards. Those with federal calling cards who have not received the new access number should contact Gail.
- Ruth Siguenza reminded members to submit travel expense reimbursement requests to Gail McClure as soon as possible after a trip.

- Draft copies of the HAB annual progress report have been sent to the Executive Committee and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies. Comments are due back to Louise Dressen by Friday, November 17.
- Todd Martin, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), and Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), announced that they had attended a Tank Waste closure workshop, and that copies of all handouts and view graphs from the workshop were available on the back table.
- Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), commented on the recent news regarding the nuclear accident in Japan. Six people have been indicted for criminal negligence. One of the charges was violation of the safety regulations governing the operation of nuclear reactors and related equipment by altering the facility without approval, as well as ignoring laws on safety and hygiene. Two people died as a result of the accident, and several people were exposed to radiation.

ADOPTION OF SEPTEMBER HAB MEETING SUMMARY

The September HAB meeting summary was adopted with minor comments and revisions from Ken Niles.

TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT: REGULATING FOR SUCCESS

Ken Bracken introduced the discussion on the cleanup progress under the TPA emphasizing that the TPA represents is a foundation for accountability that drives funding requests to our national decision-makers. It also identifies the scope of work on a timeline to cleanup the Hanford site. It is the heart and sole about what is happening at Hanford.

Spent Nuclear Fuel

Phil Loscoe, DOE, noted that they are working eight days a week with the contractor to make the November 30 fuel movement milestone. All the facilities are complete, and all the safety documents for the authorization basis have been issued, approved, and implemented. Operational Readiness Reviews for the Canister Storage Building and the K West Basin have been corrected. Pre-start findings from these reviews have been corrected. Other issues should be resolved within the next five to six days. The Operational Readiness Review has begun for the Cold Vacuum Drying Facility. It was concluded that the facility was not ready in terms of operator knowledge and training. They are working on the issues and intent to restart the review in the next week or so. The phased startup initiative started over a year ago has assisted in testing various systems ahead of time. A readiness assessment was performed last month on the project's ability to retrieve, wash, and place fuel in the baskets. The first basket of spent nuclear fuel has been retrieved, washed, cleaned, inspected, and placed in the baskets using the remote systems. If the November 30 deadline is missed, it will only be by days. The November 30 date is definitely achievable, and the intent is to make it.

Keith Smith commended DOE for ensuring that safety takes precedence over performance.

Al Conklin, Washington State Department of Health (WDOH), said WDOH had discovered a ventilation system problem in the Canister Storage Building. This could be a potential issues in

meeting TPA milestones. There are three inspectors doing an unannounced inspection in that building today to try to identify anything else that might be an issue.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), asked for a discussion at some point of what are legitimate reasons for not meeting TPA milestones and observed that safety concerns seem to be a good reason to miss milestones.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), inquired if operators could be adequately trained for this incredibly complicated mission under the accelerated training schedule and the Operational Readiness Review. The answer was that the operators have been in training for many, many months. The Review revealed some shortcomings that need to be alleviated. The contractor is actively working on these issues.

Bob Larson, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), asked if a possible extension of the Fluor Hanford contract was linked to the success of the K Basins project. Beth Bilson, DOE, responded that there are many aspects to Fluor's performance that will factor into this decision. Fluor really has dramatically improved over several years.

Waste Management

George Sanders, DOE, indicated that overall, fiscal year (FY) 2000 was a good year for the Hanford Waste Management Program. There will be a restructuring of the program in accordance to the waste streams that need to be managed. Mixed low-level waste will continued to be treated thermally and non-thermally. The volume of treatment tends to be linked to funding. The goal is to make at least five shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) per year, although that is also funding dependent. Plans for preparing T-Plant to process remote-handled waste are underway. There is also work underway to develop an authorization basis to allow looking at covered drums in the 200 Area. There are 37,000 of these suspected transuranic, low-level waste drums. The Hanford waste management environmental impact statement (EIS) remains delayed. In addition, there is a need to understand how to implement the national programmatic EIS record of decision for low-level and mixed low-level waste. The Land Disposal Regulations dispute with the state also needs resolution.

The current schedule calls for retrieval of 10,000 drums of suspect transuranic waste by 2004. That goal will not be met. About 1,000 drums have been retrieved. There will be discussions with the state about how this fits into the priorities of Hanford cleanup. Although safety is a major concern, funding is the biggest challenge.

Laura Cusack, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said that Ecology is encouraged by the new strategic thinking for resolving disputes over the M-91 milestones and the Land Disposal Regulation reports.. Transuranic waste retrieval is very important to Ecology. Ecology has some concern over potential restructuring of regulatory commitments. DOE may be jumping to conclusions with the Hanford 2012 vision without commitment from Ecology. There are still many discussions that need to happen before Ecology is willing to restructure any regulatory commitments.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, asked if DOE is comfortable with more waste coming to Hanford under the national programmatic EIS record of decision. George Sanders said DOE is trying

to figure out how to deal with it. It is not envisioned that a lot more waste would be coming to Hanford from a lot of new waste generators. There are no new generators at this time. No treatment is anticipated to be done at Hanford.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), expressed concern that it appears there is a dramatic increase in off-site waste buried at Hanford in 2000. He asked if Hanford would ever have an EIS examining the consequences of such burials. George Sanders responded that DOE anticipates that the Hanford solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste EIS should be out for public comment in about a year. Gerry asked to hear the regulatory views on this issue. Max Power, Ecology, answered the Governor understands there are no new generators. Without the Hanford solid waste EIS, there is no interest in talking about new generators.

Ken Niles mentioned that in 1991 there was concern about using B-Plant for a pretreatment facility for tank waste treatment. B-Plant and T-Plant are of the same vintage. The concern was that B-Plant would never be able to comply with hazardous waste laws. He asked if, now that there is movement toward looking at using T-Plant for a processing facility for remote handled waste, is there the same or similar concerns about using B-Plant for this type of activity? Laura Cusack said there are concerns about T-Plant meeting regulatory requirements. The expectation is that T Plant will be a permanent facility and will be compliant. The question is how best to retrofit the facility to make it compliant.

Al Conklin explained WDOH's concern that T-Plant was downgraded from a major to a minor emissions unit. After months of going back and forth with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10, a solution was found that would allow under DOE to use the facility as major emissions unit without major upgrades. Another issue concerns the Allied Technology Group (ATG) Thermal treatment facility, a private facility for processing commercial waste, which has a contract with DOE. Some of the delays in getting the plant up and running are due to WDOH requirements imposed following a fire a couple of weeks ago. ATG's thermal treatment cannot operate again until it establishes some new procedures. George Sanders added that ATG is very important to the program, because thermal treatment capacity around that nation is very rare.

Keith Smith commented that his concern is with what seems to be a violation of labor agreement with Fluor Hanford, i.e., taking materials off site for treatment. There is also concern about occupancy of the Central Plateau because there is no sewage treatment plant there. Someone needs to address this subject in the not-too-distant future.

Susan Leckband asked George Sanders about the cesium and strontium capsules at the Waste Encapsulation Storage Facility (WESF) that contain 39% of the radionuclides on site. She asked what the disposition and treatment of those would be and if Ecology is comfortable with the planned treatment and disposal. George Sanders replied that WESF is an operational facility. The plan is to send the capsules to the vitrification plant. Laura Cusack said that Ecology agrees with this approach.

Bob Larson asked if there was a long-term safety problem with disposal of the depleted nuclear reactors coming to Hanford from the U.S. Navy. He also asked if this was covered under a TPA milestone. George Sanders responded that there are no safety issues with this. The naval submarine reactors are fairly low-level stuff. This work is not covered under the TPA.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University) asked if there were difficulties in getting transuranic waste qualified for shipment to WIPP. George Sanders replied that within the next month, WIPP should come out with its waste acceptance criteria for remote-handled transuranic waste. One of the biggest challenges is determining whether waste is transuranic waste. Laura Cusack added that being ready to send waste to WIPP and understanding the waste acceptance criteria are very important to Ecology.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said that there should be a record of generators and volumes over time that is coming onto the Hanford site. She asked for those numbers and indicated that those numbers should be provided on an on-going basis as a courtesy to the HAB. George Sanders promised to provide that information.

Jim Trombold commented that the volume of waste is more important than how many different sources generate a certain amount of volume. Jim also asked if the waste from the Navy is low-level or mixed low-level waste. Laura Cusack replied that the submarine reactors are mixed waste, not low-level waste. They have low-level components, but because of lead linings, they are mixed waste.

Environmental Restoration

Robert Potter, Bechtel, reviewed the successes of the Environmental Restoration program in the year 2000: Remedial Action and Waste Disposal; Reactors and Facilities Decontamination and Decommissioning; Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration and Groundwater Management; and Surveillance/Maintenance and Transition projects. Other work has either been completed or is currently within target at six locations next to the river. Over 2.5 million tons of contaminated soil has been moved to the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF). The actual cost is down to \$63 per ton for remediation and disposal. As of late September, all Superfund records of decision for the 100 Area are complete. Work is continuing, with \$10 million supplemental funding, on accelerated reactor interim safe storage. Engineering for C, D and H Reactors is complete. F Reactor is ready for fuel storage basin demolition and a new roof enclosure, and DR Reactor is ready for installation of a new roof enclosure. They are operating five pump-and-treat systems, treating 1.06 billion gallons of contaminated water since beginning. They have also decommissioned 14 monitoring wells and developed a plan the cumulative assessment of ecological, economic, socio-cultural and human health effects from Hanford contaminants. Work on characterization of U Plant is proceeding.

In 2001, the B/C pipeline remediation will be completed. This is a TPA milestone that needs to be revised. Other activities will include looking at the baselines for the 618-10 and 11 burial grounds and completing canyon disposition field work at U-Plant. Reactor interim safe storage will also continue within the targeted milestone dates. None of these milestones are in jeopardy except for those in the 200 Area, which are currently under negotiation as the path forward is developed for the Central Plateau.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, indicated it was a good year for environmental restoration. The 100 Area record of decision was issued, and there is ongoing work on the 300 Area burial grounds record of decision, which should be done by the end of the calendar year. EPA is also working on a five-year review of Superfund remedies. Next year there will be an opportunity to negotiate cleanup schedules for the soil sites, such as the negotiation to cleanup soils in 100 Area by 2001. The 300 Area needs a clean-up

schedule by June 2002. There is also a need to deal with the carbon tetrachloride problem in the 200 West Area. Reactor interim safe storage is going very well. Turning B Reactor into a museum poses some interesting challenges. Work should begin this spring on the F Fuel storage basin. The last thing to focus on is the Canyon Disposition Initiative.

Gerry Pollet raised the issue about the implications for environmental restoration programs from lessons learned from barrels dug up from a 300 Area burial ground which have huge inventory of toxic reprocessing wastes. He asked if this waste would be treated on or off-site and what the process for public review of these plans would be. Beth Bilson noted that this is still in the procurement mode, and both onsite and offsite technologies are being considered. DOE is also considering use of the current ATG contract. Dennis Faulk added that once a bid is awarded, the awardee will have to write a treatment plan that will be sent to EPA for review for environmental compliance. Beth Bilson affirmed that characterization of wastes will take place prior to any waste being treated.

Shelley Cimon asked what Ecology's thinking was on addressing the issues regarding the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds, especially the lack of their inclusion in the Hanford 2012 plan. Robert Potter responded that the detailed work plan includes \$6,000,000 over the next two years for ongoing work and study of those burial grounds.

Facility Transition

Jay Augenstenborg, DOE, reviewed activities at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), indicating this has been a good year. The magnesium hydroxide precipitation process is in place, and plutonium residues have been repackaged into a pipe-and-go configuration beginning September 11. The new basis documentation has been established for making B Cell waste determinations in the 324 Building. Nineteen shipments of B-cell waste have been completed. At the 327 building, a key super stretch performance initiative was accomplished: 32.5 square meters of bulk waste was packaged and shipped. This exceeds the fiscal year target. One hundred, eighty-four (184) T Hoppers containing approximately 667 metric tons of low-enriched uranium trioxide powder were shipped to the DOE Portsmouth facility in Ohio.

With reference to M-89-02, the complete removal of B-cell equipment will not be done by November 30, 2000. A discussion will be held with Ecology; and the schedule is expected to slip about eight weeks. There are no TPA milestones in jeopardy at PFP. None of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board milestones are in jeopardy either. Laura Cusack indicated that DOE and Ecology will begin negotiating milestones for PFP transition beginning in June 2001. In reference to DOE's Hanford 2012 plan, she cautioned that no changes to baselines and strategies have been agreed to by the regulators. She advised that HAB members should not assume that there is renegotiating or restructuring of baselines at this time.

Beth Bilson also noted that Fluor Hanford is about to mark a significant milestone of 10 million accident-free man-hours. There are many truly wonderful people working on site who are working very safely. Keith Smith noted that when there are injuries, they are very less severe than in the past. This has been accomplished by one simple, innovative, and difficult process: people now talk with each other. All over the site, workers are being involved in work planning resulting in work being done more safely and efficiently.

Tim Takaro asked what were the biggest obstacles at 324 in regards to lessons learned for the rest of the site. Jay Augustenborg answered that there were a number of concerns regarding crane operations, some issues with steel waste from disposal boxes, and a whole series of things throughout last year that have caused the delays. Tim also asked if beryllium was a cleanup issue. Jay said it was not.

River Protection Project

Steve Wiegman, DOE, announced that permission was received this week to initiate conversations with CH2M Hill on a five-year contract extension option. Work is on-going on the letting of the new contract for the vitrification plant. Yesterday, Harry Boston, DOE, got approval for his new staffing plan so he can now establish senior staff to manage this project as a waste treatment complex with federal ownership of the entire project. Also yesterday, the official decision to regulate the treatment plant in a more classical DOE reporting relationship, rather than through the former Regulatory Unit framework, was made. In FY2000, 18 milestones were completed, including the initiation of tank farm upgrades and the completion of C-106 sluicing. Work under the consent decree for the interim stabilization for single shell tanks is ahead of schedule. Nine tanks are now being pumped. The consent decree for interim stabilization was amended to call for the award of a tank waste treatment contract by January 15, 2001. This work is currently on schedule. Also during FY 2000, Keith Klein, DOE; Harry Boston; and Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology are working to mend the relationship between DOE and Ecology. Another recent success is the renegotiation of the M-45 milestones regarding single shell tanks.

Future activities include addressing tank space options. In February 2004, conversations could begin regarding the details of what will be happening between 2006 and 2015 in regards to second phase retrieval milestones. DOE and Ecology management is moving forward to deal with regulatory issues, accountability, and revitalizing the TPA. There are milestones in DOE contracts. The relationship between contractor work and DOE accountability will be written into the contracts. The TPA will be revitalized. Many milestones have been met, and a lot will be renegotiated.

Laura Cusack noted that negotiation of the M-45 milestone is a big success for Ecology because it addresses risk reduction rather than tank numbers or waste volumes. The M-44 tank characterization milestone is written such that the work is complete in 2001. There is additional characterization that needs to go on to support retrieval and treatment, so Ecology needs to work with DOE to come up with future milestones. Work on the M-90 milestone for glass disposal and storage facilities is about a year behind due to delays on the vitrification plant.

Ken Niles inquired about the confusion in the treatment plant request for proposal. He asked whether 2009 or 2011 is the actual date of completion, and does the date of completion mean that the treatment facility would be fully operational at that time. He also asked if Ecology was confident that the contract to be awarded in January would not result in additional timeline surprises. Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, noted that although DOE's independent analysis indicated that full operation could go as late as 2011, there is no resolution to this slippage. This will be addressed after January 15.

Betty Tabbutt asked for clarification on what is being appealed under the Director's Determination. Laura Cusack said the only thing under appeal is the accountability language in the determination, not

the milestones. Steve Weigman clarified that DOE feels it should be held accountable for the milestones, but not for regulatory judgments of whether the milestones can be met beforehand.

Keith Smith questioned whether the technology to get the hard heel out of the tanks has been successful. Joe Cruz, DOE, responded that the Hanford Tanks Initiative had a plan to deploy a secondary retrieval technology after completion of sluicing at Tank C-106. Sluicing was very successful at C-106, but there has not been a lot of work on that issue in the last couple of years. The intent of the first two demonstrations under the M-45 milestone series is to demonstrate technology that would not impose a high-risk of tank leaks to the environment.

Susan Leckband asked one of the elements of tank closure is a long-term stewardship plan. For example, if there is residual waste left in the tanks, is there a stewardship plan to address it? Joe Cruz answered that the M-45 milestones include a closure and post closure process. Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, noted that the Tank Waste Remediation System EIS required that stewardship be included in a long-term closure plan. Steve Weigman indicated that post-closure monitoring and stewardship has always been a fundamental aspect of the program. The current baseline contains scope for long-term monitoring through 2007.

Doug Houston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), noted that tanks pose a possible risk to groundwater and a possible accident risk. Both risks must be considered in negotiating new TPA milestones.

Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, asked about the impact of consent decree milestones on the funding of work. Are consent decree commitments a primary driver regardless of Congressional appropriations? Laura Cusack answered that there is more risk and liability for DOE for a consent decree commitment than a TPA milestone. Steve Weigman noted that a court-mandated deadline influences the way an agency thinks. Beth Bilson pointed out that work under a consent decree would probably be funded over the top of other things. Fran DeLozier, CH2M Hill, explained that under the interim stabilization consent decree, all parties knew what the estimated cost would be to retrieve liquids from single shell tanks to double shell tanks. There is an annual funding table in the consent decree, including the ramifications if DOE does not keep up with this expected funding. It is not clear that if costs suddenly rise more than originally planned what the ramifications would be on the consent decree schedule. However, the work is currently ahead of schedule.

Todd Martin commented on Ecology's desire for the authority to determine if DOE is going to fail to meet a milestone before the milestone is missed. This is an issue that has been addressed in the past. Because of lack of confidence in the privatization path forward, Ecology insisted that an alternative be built into the TPA in the event that privatization failed. DOE and Ecology went head to head on whether Ecology could play a role in determining when the switch to that alternative path would happen. DOE retained the ultimate authority to decide this question. However, the HAB did issue advice supporting Ecology's role in determining when DOE is on the path to failure.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked if the handouts provided during today's TPA presentations, which encapsulate the milestones fairly clearly, are on a websites. She felt that if these were available on the Internet, they would be valuable tools in helping the public better understand Hanford cleanup. Beth Bilson noted that these particular packets are

probably not on the web. While a lot of the information is probably on the website in a different format, Beth said she would make a recommendation along the lines suggested by Paige.

Ken Bracken summarized the morning's TPA discussions and observed that the agency presentations did not hit the mark he was expecting. He promised to work with the TPA agencies on improving their presentations for another TPA mid-year progress review in April 2001. He observed that the focus of this review needs to be more toward milestones, out of excruciating details, and focused on the directions we are going. He thanked the agency presenters.

DRAFT ADVICE ON OFF-SITE WASTE

Gerry Pollet proposed handwritten draft advice for consideration by the HAB at this meeting. He introduced it by explaining that the HAB heard disturbing information in the TPA presentations regarding the delays in the Hanford solid waste EIS. Further, he noted that he sees a three to four-fold increase in waste volumes imported onto the Hanford site. He espoused his belief that the HAB respond immediately by urging that the EIS be issued early in 2001.

HAB members discussed how they wanted to address the draft advice. The group agreed to send the advice back for committee work. Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), announced that the advice had been added to the November 7 Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee meeting agenda. Not all HAB members were comfortable with sending the advice back to committee. Max Power responded explained that the off-site waste moratorium was made at the Secretary of Energy's initiative. Neither the Governor nor the state Attorney General accepted that this would meet all of their concerns regarding off-site waste.

Tim Takaro urged that the participants in the November 8, Hanford 2012 workshop/"committee meeting of the whole" consider adopting the draft advice on November 8. Ken Niles commented that he thought it was a horrible idea to set a precedent of adopting consensus advice outside regular HAB meetings. Max Power remembered that the issue of arriving at consensus recommendations outside of a Board meeting was a serious issue at the formation of the HAB. It was such a serious issue that many people opposed forming standing committees at the time. Many HAB members agreed with these concerns.

After further discussion, HAB members concluded that it would not be appropriate to consider adopting advice at a committee meeting of the whole. The draft advice will be worked on by the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee for possible consideration at the December HAB meeting. Max Power noted that, from Ecology's perspective, advice from the HAB on this issue would be very timely in December.

OCTOBER HANFORD 2012/DONE IN A DECADE WORKSHOP

Ken Niles summarized a few areas of general agreement of the workshop participants:

1. TPA milestones must drive work, including accelerated cleanup, and must contain language that holds DOE accountable to its new commitments.

2. The public, including the HAB and others, must be involved in the development, execution, and completion of the plan. It must be an open process, in which DOE encourages public input throughout the process.
3. Generally participants indicated concern that characterization of the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds would be deferred for 10 or more years. These burial grounds should be folded into the 2012 plan.
4. Accelerating cleanup along the river must continue, so long as the trade-off were not inconsistent with HAB values and past advice. Past HAB advice does advocate cleanup of the river.
5. Participants had a lot of discomfort with delaying the ability to obtain capacity and capability of handling transuranic waste.
6. Concerns were also raised that DOE should not label this plan as the ultimate closure of Hanford.

The group identified several issues requiring additional information and discussion which are on the agenda for the second workshop on November 8.

Doug Houston outlined other significant issues or areas of disagreement among workshop participants:

1. There was disagreement on whether Hanford 2012 was a good idea. For some people it seemed to shift away from risk-based decision making to a public relations driven philosophy.
2. There was disagreement on whether the plan could be implemented.
3. Many people question whether closure contracts are appropriate for Hanford given the lack of detailed characterization of waste at the site.
4. There is disagreement on whether end stakes are clearly defined.
5. Concerns were raised that the DOE presentation started with the statement that plan was developed in conjunction with stakeholders.
6. Finally, the desired product of the workshop was the topic of considerable discussion. DOE wants HAB consensus advice, but some participants felt the lack of information meant that the development of advice may not be possible.

Keith Smith noted the concerns regarding cleanup of 618-10 and 618-11. As a representative of the people required to do that work, there does not seem to be technology in place to safely perform that work. He indicated that the workers he represents will not support accelerating that work at this time.

Tim Takaro asked if there was discussion of the name of the new initiative. Ruth Siguenza indicated that there was discussion of the name, and it has been changed from "Done in a Decade" to "Hanford 2012".

Wade Ballard, DOE, explained that the way the strategy will become reality is by focusing on the FY 2002 budget as the linchpin for some of the changes. DOE's expectation is that work in the river corridor could fall under a closure contract. DOE should be in position next spring to understand the implications for the FY 2002 budget. TPA impacts might occur. He emphasized that what is being talked about for FY2002 is really no change in the budget. There is no change in the risk profile. There is no change to the big hitters, such as the spent fuel program and waste management activities. There is no change in the budget formulations. All of those remain intact. What DOE is trying to get from Congress is additional dollars for cleanup.

Jane Hedges, Ecology, noted that a key to this discussion is some effort within the FY 2002 budget that show that all of these plans rest on a 10% funding increase. Laura Cusack emphasized again that discussions of changes in regulatory compliance issues have not been started with the regulators. This needs to be done in a very open and positive way. There a lot of milestones coming up. The intention is that these milestones are met, vision or no vision. There are also still questions regarding the integration of the DOE-Office of River Protection in the Hanford 2012 plan.

Bob Larson observed that it appears that closure contracts would change the contract structure at Hanford, would change the scope of work, and affect a lot of people. Wade Ballard explained that the Bechtel contract expires on June 30, 2002. There will have to be some procurement action at that time. There will be some realignment of scope for the river corridor and the plateau. Fluor has options for contract extensions, and DOE is looking at reconfiguring its contracting approach.

Wade Ballard also indicated that if there is consensus advice from the December HAB meeting, it would certainly be timely. The budget process is a very fluid process at this point simply because of the change in administration. DOE has been told to submit a current services budget of \$755 million plus 3% plus which would bring funding close to the \$800 million level for the Richland site.

Pam Brown indicated she was very pleased to hear the description of what is expected for the FY2002 budget. She noted that her counterparts at Rocky Flats have indicated that its closure contract has cleanup standards that are less stringent than their equivalent of the TPA.

Gerry Pollet said he was still unclear about timelines and drivers. Pam Brown passed out a *Tri-City Herald* editorial from October 31st, which was clearly based on someone's input urging the HAB to act and support some things, and indicates that DOE is planning to make its pitch to Congress early next year. Wade Ballard replied that Congress has asked for specific budget closure initiatives at large sites, including Hanford. DOE-RL's plan is to respond to that Congressional request.

Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business), said his sources tell him people are very happy with the closure contract at Rocky Flats. Work is getting done, and there have been no big problems. There is a disconnect over what people thought they were going to get and what they are getting in terms of cleanup. The intent is to release the entire site for a nature preserve. It will not be used for housing or other public uses. Following closure of the site, there will still be groundwater contamination. Wade Ballard responded that a closure contract does not change cleanup standards. It is just a contract vehicle.

Wade Ballard indicated that Congress has requested that DOE develop a schedule and plan for acceleration of cleanup along the river. The request came in the 2001 appropriations bill, and DOE-RL has been pulling this information together. Keith Klein was talking to Congressional representatives yesterday and explaining the difficulty of responding to this request in such a short period of time. Congress has agreed to an abbreviated public comment period on the document. It is not really clear how that public comment period and process will occur. Draft copies of this plan are available at this meeting.

Greg deBruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked for clarification about whether or not the draft plan was an internal document or had already been sent to Congress. Wade Ballard indicated that the plan not been officially transmitted to Congress, but had been sent to DOE-HQ for comment. Greg expressed concern that the plan appeared to be in the final stages of development and the document indicates that the scope of work is well defined when there are a number of issues that are still undefined. Greg specifically asked when the report would be sent to Congress. Although the original target date had been November 1, Wade was unsure of the revised date.

Greg deBruler announced that he discovered that the plan had been shared with Congressman Ron Wyden's office, that the plan was identified as the adopted new vision, and that the plan had stakeholder support. Greg expressed his frustration at this information. Wade Ballard again clarified that the report had not formally been issued to Congress. The draft is out for public comment. Wade explained that Keith Klein had spoken to legislators about the plan yesterday.

HAB CHAIR TRANSITION

Ken Bracken chaired this portion of the meeting and gave an overview of the nomination process that Norma Jean Germond and the ad hoc group had formulated. Norma Jean Germond distributed a description of the roles and responsibilities of the chair and vice chairs. The nominating committee for the new chair consistent of Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large; Dave Watrous, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business); Ken Bracken; Norma Jean Germond; Gordon Rogers; Ken Niles; Paige Knight; and agency representatives, including Dennis Faulk; Max Power; Gail McClure; and Marla Marvin, DOE. Peter Bengtson, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, also participated. The nomination guidelines were adopted by the HAB at its September meeting. Norma Jean noted that the nomination guidelines called for nominations of board members or outsiders to be submitted by October 15. Nominations were to include the name of the nominee, his/her agreement to be nominated, and any requirements for remuneration. The ad hoc group received two nominations: Shelley Cimon and Leon Swenson. DOE actually appoints the HAB chair, and the agency has requested that the HAB we submit only one nominee. Norma Jean recalled that at that September HAB meeting, there was real concern over the availability of remuneration to the chair. Wade Ballard and Gail McClure promised that they would look into it. At this point in time, Richland is under the impression that chair will be funded.

Greg deBruler felt that before the HAB had its nomination process locked in, there should be clarification about funding for the chair. He said he believed there were possibly other people on the who might be interested if the position were funded. He asked that the HAB re-open the nomination process. He also indicated that he was interested in the potential of nominating someone from outside the HAB.

Pam Brown said she had nominated Todd Martin before the deadline. She was troubled that the nomination was not acknowledged. Norma Jean Germond replied that Todd had indicated that Pam had not spoken directly with him directly regarding this nomination. This appears to be a communication problem. Dave Watrous said he also followed up on Pam's nomination. He said he spoke with Todd, and Todd declined the nomination.

Gerry Pollet thought that on the Executive Committee conference call on October 16 there was agreement to extend the nomination process until there was an answer regarding remuneration. Others remember the concern being raised on the call, but did not recall such a commitment. Gerry and others expressed the desire to have DOE's commitment to pay the next chair put in writing.

Norm Dyer, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), asked if he could suggest that the HAB open nominations from the floor and that any person nominated also present a statement as Shelley Cimon and Leon Swenson are willing to do.

Ken Bracken noted that the HAB has a process it agreed to in September. In fairness to the people who were nominated by October 15, we are following that process. Out of respect to those two committee members, I think we should continue that process. We should proceed to see if we can reach consensus on these two candidates.

Mark Beck, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen), reminded the board that Merylyn Reeves served for six years. He said that he believed the HAB should be as diligent as possible to get the best person it could. Paige Knight agreed.

Tim Takaro, Greg deBruler, and Gerry Pollet expressed the desire to change the process given the expectation that the HAB would have know about DOE's decision to pay the next chair earlier in the nomination process. Other HAB members wanted to stick with the process adopted in September and noted that it would be disrespectful to the current nominees to change the process at this point.

Ken Bracken indicated that if the HAB could not reach consensus on a major procedural issue, such as the nomination of the next HAB chair, it would vote. In such a case, there must be a quorum, and the vote must be passed by a 2/3 vote. Written ballots would be used. Norma Jean Germond wanted to know how many voting members were present and how many would represent a 2/3 majority. Ruth Siguenza responded that there were 28 of 31 members present and that 19 would represent a 2/3 majority.

Pam Brown made a motion that the board modify the process to make the opportunity available today to make nominations from the floor. Ruth Siguenza clarified that there was no provision for nominations from the floor in the process adopted in September. Ken Bracken presided over a hand vote. Twelve seats were in favor. Sixteen seats were opposed. The motion failed.

Gerry Pollet made a motion to reopen the nomination process and have people nominated for a decision in December. Jim Trombold expressed concern that this motion appears to be stalling the process. Norma Jean Germond said she would like to amend that motion to read reopen the process to make a decision tomorrow. Ken Bracken asked for a hand vote. The motion failed.

Norma Jean Germond made a motion to make the decision on who to nominate for HAB chair tomorrow. Ken Bracken again asked for a hand vote. Fourteen seats were in favor. Eleven were opposed. There was not a 2/3 majority. The motion failed. Ken Bracken noted that the HAB was now back to the original process adopted in September and the consideration of the two candidates who were nominated by October 15.

Todd Martin admitted that there had been some confusion about his willingness to be nominated. He said that prior to October 15, when he was approached to be nominated, he declined. He explained that he was unwilling to be nominated at that point in time for a variety of reasons. Compensation was not one of those reasons. He further explained that the reason he did not want to be nominated in October was that he was not sure what the HAB wanted. He noted that the HAB had two very qualified candidates and either of them could do this job. He recommended that the HAB move with its adopted process.

Tim Takaro asked if the board is unable to reach consensus or 2/3-majority vote for one of these candidates, was there a requirement to send both these candidates to DOE. Ken Bracken explained that there is no requirement to send either of them, and that forwarding two names is an option.

Ken Bracken invited Shelley Cimon and Leon Swenson to tell the Board what they believe they would bring to the HAB, to answer any questions from Board members, and to ask any questions they may have for the HAB.

Shelley Cimon noted that this is a difficult process at best.

"I live in LaGrande, Oregon with my husband. We have a 25-year-old son and an 11-year-old son. I have been a member of the Oregon Hanford Waste board for 13 years since its conception, and I chair that right now. Though smaller, there are 10 citizen seats and six legislative seats on this board. The conversations are just as dynamic as they are with this board. I am proud of representing Oregon. I participated in the Tank Waste Task Force and was one of the interviewees with the Keystone Center when they went around discussing this board and who might be on it, and I am very honored to be considered for chair at this point.

There are a few things I am passionate about, and one of them is this board. Hanford threatens where I live, the Pacific Northwest. It is not just Hanford, not just LaGrande, it is much larger than where I spend a lot of my time. I really got going when I was thinking about borders and boundaries. I think that's how my family approaches how we live there. I think about the habit we have of thinking inside and outside - who's from the Tri-Cities and who isn't'.

I chaired the ER (Environmental Restoration) Committee for two years. My goal was to provide a professional and inclusive and respectful forum for all of us to have discussions on all things environmental restoration considered. I think the testimony to the good work that that committee has done and my ability to chair it is the diversity of participation of the contractors on site with participation by the DOE and some regulators in the dialogue in that committee.

I think this board is really hard working but not terribly efficient. If we take a look at the survey results, we need to look at reorganization of this board. I like to see us take a really solid look at coming together as one committee of the whole with potentially smaller groups working off of that in the interest of a quicker and certainly more collective understanding of the issues of the site. Our investigative work is very laborious and I think very fractured at times, because we tend to take our pieces of the whole. Our picture is fragmented. We don't have a comprehensive picture. What's going on in contracting? What does deferral mean in terms of the site? What happens with pushing work out? I think the deliberations help us get to quicker, more comprehensive understanding. We haven't

been working and getting our heads out of the Hanford dirt and dust and taking a look at what is going on programmatically. We need to see how those decisions impact our site. I think groundwater is one of the biggest unaddressed issues for our site. I would like to propose that this board look at hosting a national meeting on groundwater here in the Tri-Cities. I think this could assist in developing technology to deal with this.

In terms of the chair, I see the position working for the board. I think the role of chair is to help guide the board, to look for consensus whenever possible. It is a process that I have come to find fascinating and also I respect greatly because I think we come together with consensus, the whole is geometrically stronger than any individual messages we could give. The role of the chair is to find and refine communication between the board, DOE, the facilitation team, and the regulators. If I am elected to this position, I will be looking at the Executive Committee to elevate those ideas to the full board. I think the full board needs to take a look at where we're going and to realign where we're going and what we're doing. Tom Fitzsimmons also gave a plea for a more positive outlook than we have had in the past. I would look at that. We need to look more at what we can do, rather than what we can't. I have found that when I label people, it limits their potentials. I am willing to field questions."

Norma Jean Germond mentioned that Shelley is the chair of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board. She asked if Shelley became chair of this board, would she relinquish that other chair? Norma Jean also asked about her role as chair of the Environmental Restoration Committee. Shelley answered that she would not chair of the Oregon Hanford Waste Board.

Keith Smith asked Shelley if she believed she would have the objectivity to do this job. Shelley said "yes" and that she thinks the consensus building that has taken place in the Environmental Restoration Committee is a good indication of that.

Tim Takaro asked about Shelley's plans regarding the Environmental Restoration Committee chair position. Shelley answered that she would step down as chair of that committee, but would continue to participate on it.

Paige Knight asked for Shelley's thoughts on a comment on the HAB self-assessment that said that the facilitation team had made the board lazy. She asked if Shelley would work any differently with the facilitation team and if Shelley would attend committee meetings. Shelley indicated that there are lots of things that need fixing. She said she thinks there are not clear definitions of who does what. There is a lot of work to be done. She noted that the HAB has not been very efficient, and she hoped to see more people come to the table.

Ken Bracken turned the floor over to Leon Swenson. Leon Swenson began by thanking Shelley Cimon for stepping forward to be nominated as chair.

"You have certainly done a commendable job as vice chair. I think you have demonstrated that you could lead this board very effectively. I have been a member of the board for only two years, and although I don't have the history many of you bring to this board, I have followed the actions of the board from afar. When I learned two years ago that there was a position on the board for a member of the public at large, I decided it was a good time for me to jump in, since I was no longer working at the site.

I have put together a short, one-page blurb because I am actually still on vacation at Depoe Bay, Oregon. I will refer to my notes that I have written. First, I would like to say I am not actively campaigning for this position. I did so with the understanding that I would serve if nominated. I did so with the understanding that I would serve to the best of my ability. Following July 1, I will be retiring from my position with a church in Kennewick, and I will then be available to spend a great deal of time on this board. I sincerely appreciate the efforts of those people who are willing to be invest their time and effort with this board.

I strongly believe that clean up is not going to be accomplished in a timely manner if this community of the Northwest cannot go forth and say that we believe this clean up is vital, and this needs to be a national concern. I have to admit I have some personal interest in this cleanup, and I really am interested in leaving a legacy to my children and grandchildren that this site will be cleaned up to the extent that it can be. There is some disagreement from the board about what that cleanup should be. I think this is the forum for those discussions to take place. I see my involvement with the HAB a way of giving back to the community some of the benefits I have received from this community over the past several years. I am willing to become part of HAB leadership if that's what it takes.

In terms of my personal capabilities, I have 15 years experience in engineering and project system management at Hanford including a two-year stint at Savannah River where I was the liaison at the Defense Waste Processing Facility. Some think this may tie me too closely to the mess. I believe this ties me into a better understanding of the DOE.

I have served as chair or president of volunteer organizations, including the 1,100-member Hanford chapter of the National Management Association. When I was on the program committee, I was instrumental in getting speakers to come in that didn't necessarily share the views of those of us working on the Hanford site. The objective of those exchanges was to see if we could find some agreements on how to move forward. I've served in a variety of professional societies and organizations that rely on volunteers. I think that would be helpful.

My educational background includes a Bachelor's degree in Nuclear Engineering and some graduate work in Nuclear Engineering. I'm a licensed professional Engineering in the State of California, and I have an MBA. I have served on staff of First Presbyterian Church in Kennewick since my retirement in 1994.

The four objectives I would have would be to build a community within the HAB as we focus on common values; to fairly and impartially consider the issues so we can speak with consensus. Third, I would like to assure that critical decisions are open to all interested parties. I found the process that we've had today to be a bit uncomfortable, because I'm not sure that once we are done with the process we will still have consensus. I would like to ensure that we have participation by all interested parties. Public involvement is critical. It is one of the most tangible ways to keep involved – let's them feel some ownership. Finally, I would continue to push meaningful clean up of the Hanford site in a safe and responsible manner.”

Keith Smith noted that as one who has suffered at the hands of engineers in the past, he was willing to forgive Leon for his engineering past. Keith asked about objectivity and wanted Leon's assurance that

if he was selected, he would be objective. Keith also added that whomever was selected for chair would have his 100% support. Leon thanked Keith for his commitment to support whomever is selected. Leon responded that the reason I mentioned my involvement in other organizations is that he had attempted to solicit feedback from folks he did not necessarily agree with. Leon said he thought he could set aside his personal biases and opinions to be effective with folks with a broad spectrum of perspectives. He added that if someone felt he could not do that, they should not vote for him. Objectivity is critical for whoever is HAB chair.

Susan Leckband said she had been incredibly impressed with the grace under fire shown by Shelley and Leon. She said she hoped that, regardless of the outcome, neither nominee would step away from the board. She asked if the election of Leon or Shelley would affect their ability to serve on this board. Leon indicated he has already submitted his resignation to the church, in order to spend more time on the HAB. Shelley said her commitment is not going to change. Her role may change, depending on committee restructuring or if she does not become the chair. She said she remains passionate about this board, cleanup, and consensus.

Gerry Pollet asked both candidates to give an example of how they would handle advocating for this board. He explained that one of the reasons the board succeeds is because the chair makes sure we have the information we need. He asked how each of them would handle getting information the board needs from DOE. Leon said that one of the reasons he wanted to delay involvement in the board was that he wanted there to be no perception that he was being held captive by anyone, particularly an employer. He explained that he would be persistent when he needed to be and would know when to choose his battles. He would expect to have very frequent discussions with the agencies. Shelley answered that one of the processes that has been lost over the years is having meetings once a month or every six weeks with the TPA agencies to discuss problems and to move forward. She believes this sort of communication has broken down. She noted that the HAB had just gone through the seventh draft of the Hanford 2012 draft workshop agenda. She said that when there is information that she knows is available, she will get it. She believes with better communications, there will be less frustration.

Tim Takaro asked both candidates about the board's role on the national stage. He asked what the role of our board is in that mix and how would each of them promote the HAB's views. Leon responded that he thinks the discussions with the Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) are very important for two reasons: it is important to understand what is happening at other locations and it is essential to share with others what our successes have been. He noted his belief that Marilyn Reeves has done a good job in these areas. Shelley replied that she had only participated in one SSAB meeting in Idaho last winter. She believes it is imperative that we start looking programmatically at what is going on here at our site. We forget that there was a letter that came to this site that remanded decision-making back to DOE-HQ. We need to remember what that means to this site. There is not necessarily an understanding of what's going on at a DOE. Shelley thinks there are a lot of dialogues that should happen.

Paige Knight asked Leon how he would go about building more community with the HAB. Leon responded that some of the evening functions had helped. He said he would like HAB members to know each other better so we can work together better. Paige also asked Leon about his ideas for getting critical decisions open to the public and how Leon would get the public more involved. Leon

responded that we need to go where the people are. The key is "out of the box" thinking. Shelley responded that one of the things she does is go out and talk with the people at Rotary, the Lions Club, and Eastern Oregon University.

Greg deBruler asked both nominees how they would enhance overall communication with this board. Leon indicated that he would build community and encourage more silent member of the board to speak up more often. Shelley stated that she thinks communication is one of the most difficult issues. She said that the HAB needs to have an understanding of and a belief in the consensus process. Greg also asked what type of outreach the candidates would encourage. Leon indicated he would like to make a conscious effort to have one-on-one conversations with members and their alternates. Shelley stated that she does not think it is the role of the chair to get acquainted one-on-one with all the members or to mentor or coach new members. The steep learning curve at the site is just a reality. Shelley said it is wise to develop good working relationships. Greg then asked if the candidates thought board members should be compensated for their work. Leon indicated that he would not expect to be compensated as a board member. He noted that many HAB members are here because we believe this is a very important thing to do. Shelley does not feel the agencies should have the right to define the parameters of the chair. She said she did not think compensation was necessary for board members. However, she views the chair's job as one that should be compensated.

Ken Bracken announced that the HAB would seek to reach consensus, or if necessary vote, on these two candidates on Friday.

On Friday morning, Ken Bracken reminded the HAB that it heard from two candidates on Thursday. He asked if there was a consensus for recommending one of the candidates to be the next HAB chair. There was not a consensus for either candidate.

A quorum requires that 16 HAB seats be represented at the table. Twenty-seven HAB seats were filled, therefore, there was a quorum of present. A 2/3rd majority vote would require a minimum of 18 votes. Under the HAB charter, each seat gets one vote. Voting was done with secret paper ballot. Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec, and Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues, agreed to be the talliers for ballots. Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues, and Joe Richards, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation (Tribal Government - ex officio) agreed to oversee the ballot counting.

Concerns were raised about the voting process, including how to address abstentions and write-in candidates and how to proceed if neither candidate received 2/3rd of the votes.

The results of the first vote were: 11 votes for Shelley Cimon, 14 votes for Leon Swenson, one abstention, and one write-in.

Betty Tabbutt made a motion that the HAB submit both names to the DOE agencies noting that the HAB would support either candidate. Mark Beck said he thought sending both names forward was a bad idea. Jim Trombold said that he believed it was the HAB's responsibility to identify its preferred candidate, and the HAB should not abdicate this responsibility. Ken Bracken led a hand vote on the motion. It did not pass with a 2/3rd majority..

Greg deBruler expressed concern that the whole process was flawed. He said that he believed if Todd Martin were to be a part of this process, the HAB could come to consensus fairly quickly. Greg noted that the Board was being stubborn in sticking to a process that does not work. He suggested that the HAB take additional nominations and that Todd Martin be nominated.

Abe Greenberg, City of Kennewick (Local Government), made a motion to conduct another vote. If a 2/3rds majority is not received by either candidate, then the floor should be open for additional nominations, and the HAB would delay a decision on recommending a preferred candidate until its December meeting. Jim Trombold was unclear whether or not Greg deBruler's suggestion was really a motion, but Jim suggested that the HAB take three ballots today. If there is no 2/3rd majority, the Board should entertain a motion for a different process.

Due to some confusion about whether or not Greg deBruler's suggestion was really a motion, Ken Bracken asked if there was consensus on Abe Greenberg's motion. Concerns were raised about delaying the selection process until the December HAB meeting. Ken Niles suggested an amendment to change "if neither receives a 2/3 vote" to "if there is not significant movement", because that would allow for another vote. If the vote remains the same, he did not see any point in taking another vote. If there is significant movement, it might be worth doing. Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), offered a second amendment that would delete the part of the original motion calling for a delay in the selection until the December HAB meeting.

Ken Ballard asked if there was consensus on Jerry Peltier's amendment and then called for a hand vote on the amendment. The amendment passed. Then Ken asked if there was consensus on Ken Niles' amendment. When there was none, he presided over a hand vote. The amendment passed.

A second written ballot vote was taken. The results were 14 votes for Shelley Cimon, 11 votes for Leon Swenson, one abstention, and one write-in.

Ken Niles made a motion that the Board had seen significant movement, and it take a third vote. Pam Brown disagreed and asked that the floor be opened for nominations. Discussion concerned the definition of "significant movement", how close the HAB might be to consensus on a candidate, and at what point the floor should be opened for nominations. Ken Bracken asked if there was consensus on Ken Niles' motion. There was consensus, and the HAB moved to a third written vote on the two candidates. The results of the third ballot were 16 votes for Shelley Cimon, 10 votes for Leon Swenson, and one abstention.

Ken Bracken expressed the belief that this was significant movement and that he believed that the HAB should conduce a fourth ballot. Gerry Pollet disagreed and suggested that the HAB would be better served by seeing if there were other candidates willing to be nominated and if Board could reach consensus on any of these candidates. He cautioned that reaching consensus was the real goal, not obtaining a 2/3rd vote. Others thought that getting full consensus on one candidate would be difficult, perhaps more difficult if the number of candidates was increased. Jim Trombold emphasized that the goal was to identify a good quality person to nominate to DOE.

A fourth vote was taken with written ballots. The counts were 13 votes for Shelley Cimon, 11 votes for Leon Swenson, and one write-in. Ken Bracken said that the HAB was now at a point when it would entertain nominations from the floor. Pam Brown nominated Todd Martin for HAB chair.

Todd Martin indicated that he was willing to serve. He also shared some thoughts about this process because he believed the HAB has a blind spot in its process. He commended Shelley Cimon and Leon Swenson for putting up with the process so far. He cautioned that anybody who wanted to whine about the consensus process should remember this meeting. It is not an easy or a pretty process. Todd expressed concern that the HAB had not talked enough about the process for identifying its nominee for chair at its September meeting and the implications of the October 15 nomination deadline. It was unclear how firm the October date was and whether nominations after that date would be accepted. The only question Todd felt he had been asked by the current process was "are you willing to be nominated prior to October 15th?" His answer "no". He apologized for creating an unforeseen situation at this meeting where, at best, he was being unclear, and at worst, he was seen as manipulative. This mucked up the process. The HAB has had the discussions Todd believes it needed to have, and regardless of the outcome of the process, he believes the HAB will become stronger. Todd indicated that he would be willing to serve as HAB chair contingent upon a sit-down meeting between himself and TPA agency managers to ensure that they have an ongoing commitment to create the kind of environment for this Board where we can work together and maintain the HAB's independence.

It was agreed that Todd Martin would present a statement, would be open to fielding HAB member questions, and would be able to ask questions of the HAB similar to the process that Shelley Cimon and Leon Swenson went through.

Joe Richards nominated Ken Niles. Ken thanked Joe for the nomination but indicated that he was not willing to serve. Joe Richards withdrew the nomination.

Mark Beck made a motion that nominations be closed. Art Tackett, Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), noted that some HAB members have not had the opportunity to talk with someone we might want to nominate. He thought it was unfair that we continue the process without having that opportunity. Ken Bracken asked if there was consensus on the motion. There was consensus, and the nominations were closed.

Todd Martin made his statement.

"I have no DUI (Driving Under the Influence) arrests in my background. I had a basketball coach who used to say, 'You either get better or you get worse. Nothing stays the same.' I believe that. I think that while Marilyn (Reeves) has taken us to an excellent place, we need to get better in how we communicate. We need to get better in how we address the breadth and depth of issues we tackle. We need to get much better in how we focus on those issues and prioritize. We need to get better how we organize the committees, how we are organized to reflect the work we are doing and the work that DOE is doing, and we need to get better at how we reach out to new members of this board, because we are somewhat of a fraternity/sorority that speaks its own language and it's extremely difficult for us to develop new leadership, new people who carry the burden of work. We need to get better at doing that. I come from a place where I think consensus works when every single opinion around the

table matters and is taken into account. Whether ultimately we get to a place where everybody is happy is not the goal. Getting to the place where everybody can grudgingly accept what we have done is the goal of consensus. Fundamentally, what I am shooting for is to maximize the credibility, efficiency, and effectiveness of this Board and of the Hanford cleanup, and that's all I'm going to say. Are there any questions?"

Ken Niles asked about Todd's contracts and time commitments and how the responsibilities of being HAB chair would fit in with those. Todd responded that one of his difficulties prior to October 15 was the time commitment the chair job would take and how it would fit into his work schedule. He was unable to resolve this issue until recently, after the October 15 nomination deadline. Todd explained that he is a consultant. When he started consulting two years ago, he tried to dramatically reduce his reliance on the Hanford site for paid work so he could sit on the HAB unfettered. He now does a lot of work at Fernald and Pantex. In the last two weeks, he has resolved some contracting issues. Todd said he intends to keep his Fernald and Pantex contracts, but he is not going to take on any other work, dependent upon what happens here today. He believes he can fit in the work of HAB chair at the level of about halftime a week.

Betty Tabbutt asked if Todd saw himself more effective as a chair or as a member of the HAB? Todd did not know. He responded that whoever becomes the chair, it will be different for the HAB. Todd indicated that he would resign as chair of the Tank Waste Treatment Committee, although he would not lose his interest in tank farm issues..

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Workforce), had three questions. First, he wanted to clarify why Todd was unable to accept a nomination prior to October 15. Todd reaffirmed that he chose not to have his name nominated at that time because of workload uncertainties and other considerations. Second, Jeff expressed his concern that if Todd did not get the appropriate feedback from the TPA agencies regarding working together with the HAB and maintaining the HAB's independence that Todd would step away from a possible nomination from the Board today. He wondered where that situation would leave the HAB. Todd explained that he had not sat down with the TPA agencies and got a clear understanding what commitment the chair and the HAB has from them to get the information we need and to get the opportunities for input we need. Todd expressed his belief that the HAB and its success is built on relationships. He wants to make sure that these exist. Third, Jeff asked again about Todd's ambivalence to be nominated prior to October 15. Todd explained that he thought ambivalence was the wrong descriptive word, as he had spent a great deal of time thinking about it. There was a list of reasons why Todd chose not to be nominated in October, not the least of which was the fact that his candidate of choice had already been nominated. At that time, Todd felt the process was fine. In addition, it was not clear to Todd how the decision to chose the HAB-endorsed nominee would be made. Todd again said that he thought the HAB paid short shrift to the process discussion in September. It also was not clear whether there would be other opportunities for nominations. Todd explained that the primary reason he did not jump in was that he thought the candidates that had been nominated were suitable for the board.

Jim Trombold pressed Todd on the issue of what commitments Todd wanted from DOE. Jim expressed confusion at Todd's conditional acceptance of the nomination because if made the process awkward for HAB members who were going to have to chose between the nominated candidates. Jim thought than any chair the HAB nominated would work hard to get better commitment from DOE. He

asked Todd what was different about Todd's commitment. Todd responded that his commitment is probably not different than that of Shelley Cimon or Leon Swenson. He said he stated it differently because it is extremely important to him. Todd assumed that Merilyn Reeves, if she sensed that the TPA agency commitment was not longer there, would also resign. Todd continued by noting that he though it was incredibly important for him and for the HAB, at this point in a time of transition, to re-enforce the commitments from the TPA agencies and from individual HAB members. The same level of commitment, or a stronger level of commitment, that now exists between the senior agency managers and Merilyn need to be there for the new chair. Jim Trombold noted that this commitment is a goal of the office of chair, not a condition for being selected. Todd confirmed that if the chair does not have that commitment, s/he cannot be effective, and under those circumstances, the HAB cannot be effective. Todd regretted that he had used the term "contingent" when he accepted the nomination.

Mark Beck said that we should look at the commitment issue not as a contingency but as an opportunity. He noted that the HAB does not select a new chair very often. In a sense, commitment is a bargaining chip. He observed that if the new chair does not get commitment from the TPA agencies, it would not look good for the agencies.

Ken Bracken asked if there was a consensus on any individual who had been nominated for the position of HAB chair. There was not a consensus, so there was a fifth vote held. Ken Bracken noted that Gerry Pollet and Bob Larson had left. He explained that Gerry had to leave, had wanted to cast a vote, and had completed a written ballot. The HAB charter and rules do not permit that. Ken noted that HAB members and/or alternates must be present to cast a vote for their seat. Ruth Siguenza reported that of the 30 possible seats that could be filled, there were 26 seats here and that meets the quorum requirement of 16 seats. The seats missing were those filled by Gerry Pollet, Richard Berglund, Bob Larson, and Tom Carpenter. A 2/3rds approval vote would require 18 votes.

The results of the fifth written ballot vote were six votes for Shelley Cimon, four votes for Leon Swenson, and 16 votes for Todd Martin. No candidate received a 2/3rds majority.

Norma Jean Germond suggested that there is a way to proceed by dropping the candidate with the least number of votes from the slate and conducting another vote. She made a motion to do so. Ken Bracken asked for and received consensus, with no objections, to drop the candidate with the least number of votes from the slate. The sixth vote was between the two remaining candidates: Shelley Cimon and Todd Martin.

The results of the sixth written ballot were seven votes for Shelley Cimon and 19 votes for Todd Martin. It was not a consensus, but it did meet the 2/3rds majority requirement. Norm Dyer made a motion that the HAB nominate cast a unanimous consent ballot for Todd to be the next HAB chair. There was consensus on the motion.

Leon Swenson volunteered to draft the letter to the TPA agencies transmitting this nomination. The letter was presented to the full HAB and adopted by consensus.

RECONSIDERATION OF ADVICE ON FY2001 PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS

Ken Bracken noted that the full HAB needed to review the advice on FY2001 Performance Agreements since it was adopted at the September HAB meeting without a consensus. Gerry Pollet explained that he wanted to get this advice adopted at the last meeting due to the establishment of performance measures in October for the current fiscal year.

Harold Heacock noted that the issue is that the draft advice was quasi-adopted by the Board and has already been distributed to the agencies. There is a footnote that its adoption was done without a full quorum. He said he did not see what can be gained hashing this over again. Harold said that the paragraph he has heartburn with is under performance measures, item number 2. He feels this is inappropriate, but said he would not block consensus if the HAB decided to go ahead with it. Gordon Rogers stated that he strongly feels the Board needs to be diligent to focus on major policy issues and to avoid micro-management. He said he would not block consensus or ask for a recall, but he believes the HAB needs to limit its advice to policy issues. Susan Leckband indicated that she thought this is rather like being a little bit pregnant. The board has already sent this, so it really does not matter. If the board tries to recall this advice, it will just cause the agencies to look askance at future advice.

The HAB reaffirmed this advice and directed the facilitation team to modify the footnote that documented the lack of a quorum at the September HAB meeting.

ADVICE ON CONTRACTING CRITERIA

Gerry Pollet said it appears the choices regarding the Fluor Hanford contract are to extend or recompete. The purpose of the advice is not to recommend either of these options. Its purpose is to identify the factors that should go into the decision.

Bob Larson observed that DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) has already made its decision about what to do with Fluor and sent it that to DOE-HQ for concurrence and approval this month. He said that these items are really too late, and this advice is not appropriate or applicable any more. Wade Ballard affirmed that the recommended contracting strategy had been submitted to DOE-HQ. Ken Niles said he thought that this raises the question about whether the HAB should proceed with the advice.

Gerry Pollet responded that the HAB needs to send this advice to DOE-HQ. The second half of this advice concerns the decision about contract extension and scope. He said it remains relevant. Susan Leckband said she did not think the advice should go forward. Tim Takaro commented that the HAB was unlikely to affect DOE-HQ. Gerry Pollet thought the HAB might affect DOE-HQ to some degree. Mark Beck noted that even if the HAB cannot affect the decision, it needs to go on record as to what it thinks is important.

Gerry Pollet also commented that he believes the second half of the advice is not too prescriptive or too detailed. It contains principals that ought to be followed. Gordon Rogers suggested that DOE respond to this advice and tell the HAB that it did consider the factors outlined in the advice so the HAB could assess whether issuing the advice was worth the effort. Harold Heacock noted that there

would be a contract negotiation whether the Fluor contract is extended or rebid. With some wordsmithing, the advice would be applicable for either case. Gerry Pollet, Bob Larson, and Harold Heacock volunteered to work on the advice and bring a revised draft to the HAB meeting on Friday.

On Friday, the revised draft advice was re-introduced by Harold Heacock. Jerry Peltier expressed concern that the advice gives DOE specific guidelines. He suggested making the wording more succinct. Ken Niles shared Jerry's concerns and asked if there was agreement to retain the first section of the advice prior to spending time revising it. Ken Bracken asked if the advice should go back for more committee work. Other members pointed out the timing issue with the advice. Wade Ballard commented that he believed that if the HAB wanted to issue advice on this topic, it was important that it be adopted at this meeting. Things are happening right now inside DOE, and advice at this point still can influence the process. He cautioned that if the HAB waits, that may not be the case.

After discussion on minor wording changes, the HAB adopted Consensus Advice #112 on contracting criteria.

UPDATES

Science and Technology

Gordon Rogers said he wanted to call attention to the science and technology display on the wall. Someone told him there was a news report that Congress had blasted DOE for squandering over \$3 billion on science and technology efforts that had not helped cleanup. He countered with a personal observation that quite a number of developments have been applied, particularly in environmental restoration.

Environmental Management Advisory Board

Todd Martin explained that the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) met about three weeks ago and is in the process of planning its work for the next two years. Currently, EMAB is largely focused on the DOE Office of Science and Technology. EMAB is really a corporate board for the Environmental Management program and Carolyn Huntoon, DOE-HQ. At the meeting, Todd suggested EMAB look at the current headaches plaguing Carolyn Huntoon. EMAB is not addressing her top 10. EMAB should focus more on program work. The high-level waste program would be a good place to start. There appeared to be a lot of energy on EMAB regarding the high-level waste program. However, Todd reflected that the energy might not be positive for Hanford because there is a sincere belief that Hanford does not know how to do anything. Harry Boston is cognizant of this. EMAB provides a very effective means of getting to decision-makers. Todd would be happy to pass along suggestions from the HAB on what it would like EMAB to address.

Tank Closure Workshop

Todd Martin and Wade Riggsbee attended the recent tank closure workshop. Other workshop participants from Hanford included Bill Taylor, DOE; Joe Cruz; CH2M Hill contractors; and Ecology staff. It was the fourth annual workshop where all the sites with tanks get together and talk about closing them. Hanford's message is almost the same every year: we still have all the waste in our tanks

with no way of getting it out or treating it. The Oak Ridge presentation was excellent and identified many lessons learned from small-scale retrieval and treatment efforts, such as how you make equipment work. Participants were shocked at the costs for single shell tank retrieval that are in the M-45 milestones. It bolstered the continuing theme of Hanford taking money away from other sites.”

Wade Riggsbee noted that there is a lot of technology being demonstrated at other sites. Hanford's program is so much farther behind that we do not see the transfer of technology here. We need to continue to track and flag technologies that could be brought here. Wade explained that it was impressive to see technology moving forward and that West Valley is vitrifying waste and storing it. However, there is no where for that treated waste to go.

Todd Martin added that one of the things interesting about the Oak Ridge work is that they have deployed many new and innovative technologies, most of which were developed at Hanford. Essentially, these were the toy scale technologies that Hanford had parked out in the garage that just happened to fit their tank situations. Hanford put all the money in and did a lot of the development work. Others have actually used it in the field.

There is a fundamental problem with these closure workshops. At the end of the recent workshop, DOE-HQ put up a chart identifying the major challenge at each site. Only one site that was facing an actual closure issue. Most of the other sites needed to get their technologies to work. At the end of the workshop, Todd pointed out that they should have a treatment workshop, because that is what the sites are currently focusing on. As long as these sites are competing for funding, the sharing of information and resolution to technical challenges will be difficult.

Stewardship Workshop

Susan Leckband reported she attended the recent SSAB stewardship workshop with others from Hanford, including Harold Heacock; Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen); Dennis Faulk; John Price, Ecology; and Jim Dailey, DOE-RL. She distributed the recommendations that were developed at the workshop. The expectation is that the SSAB chairs will send these recommendations to Carolyn Huntoon. In order to do this, workshop participants would like each of the SSABs to ratify these recommendations. One of the biggest challenges is funding for stewardship. There is a suggestion that this funding be off-budget, which means it would not be subject to annual appropriations which fluctuate year to year. and would not come out of the cleanup budget. Susan presented information about Hanford at the workshop and our long-term stewardship efforts under the Superfund program. She also offered to share the information she brought back from the workshop. Susan was energized by the workshop. She noted that even as we are considering building new facilities, long-term stewardship must be part of that equation early on. None of us wants to take money away from cleanup, but stewardship is actually part of cleanup.

Dennis Faulk suggested the HAB could consider adopting the workshop recommendations at the December HAB meeting. Susan Leckband noted that the HAB probably cannot make changes to the recommendations. Changes may be made at the next SSAB chairs meeting.

Dennis Faulk noted that he did not think we have done a very good job with institutional controls and stewardship around the nation. He commended DOE for trying to get its hands around this national

issue. EPA is investing a lot of time in figuring out how to do this, such as the new guidance from EPA Region 10 and the institutional control plan requirement in the 100 Area record of decision. Max Power agreed with Dennis. He added that stewardship is actually broader than Superfund.

Tim Takaro announced that the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) had been refunded and has been charged to address issues of stewardship. Susan Leckband also announced that the national DOE long-term stewardship plan was issued on October 24 and is now out and available for public comment for 120 days.

Betty Tabbutt wondered if there was much discussion at the workshop about integrating the natural resource damage assessment process into stewardship planning and decision making. Susan Leckband recalled that they had discussed public involvement but not damage assessments. Dennis Faulk remembered that the issue was raised, but not discussed. Betty expressed concern that the two issues should be considered together. Greg deBruler agreed.

Jim Trombold asked for clarification of the definition of stewardship. Susan Leckband explained the definition used at this particular workshop. Long-term stewardship was the implementations of institutional controls after whatever remedy is implemented for whatever wastes you are doing. After you have done all you can do to remediate that waste, it is that left-over waste that is being babysat. It includes post-treatment care.

Gerry Pollet stated that he was very disappointed at looking at the workshop recommendations. He pointed out that regardless of what DOE does nationally, Washington State's Model Toxics Control Act addresses institutional controls and long-term stewardship issues which are not reflected in these recommendations. He was concerned that DOE's process is an after-the-fact process, not an iterative process involving meaningful public input and assessment of the effectiveness of stewardship measures. He expressed concern that the likelihood of failure is incorporated into the remedy. Jerry Peltier agreed noting that he is not a big supporter of institutional controls.

Ecology Workshop on Tanks

Max Power gave an update on the October 26 stakeholder workshop on tanks sponsored by Ecology. The purpose of the workshop was to talk about where we stand on tank waste treatment and to re-evaluate how well we have been served by the results of the 1993 Tank Waste Task Force. The Ross and Associates facilitation team is preparing a summary of the meeting to share with the HAB and others. Workshop participants felt that the Tank Waste Task Force values and principles are still a valuable guide, but may need a little refining and development in more detail. Some people are concerned that the tank waste treatment project is too large, too costly, and may never succeed in its present form. Workshop participants also discussed what might happen if a new treatment contract is not awarded in January 2001 as planned. Ecology wants to use everything it can to get a contract awarded as planned. Workshop participants also discussed the issues surrounding getting all of the tank waste treated, not just the first 10%, including funding issues and realistic timeframes.

Harold Heacock contrasted the situations at other DOE sites, such as Rocky Flats, Mound, and Fernald, with that at Hanford. Hanford is different given the existence of the TPA and regulatory agency offices at the site. Hanford has longer term problems and land management issues.

Jerry Peltier raised the issue of tanks wearing out before all the tank waste can be treated. He asked what plans are being developed to address these risks. Max Power explained that under the interim stabilization consent decree, the tanks identified for pumping have been reprioritized so that the high-risk tanks and wastes are pumped first. Ecology is also working with DOE to improve DOE's double shell tank integrity assessment work. Operations and maintenance activities clearly need to be integrated and balanced with treatment activities.

Paige Knight said she would like to see more regular and substantive updates on progress towards achieving TPA milestones. Greg deBruler noted that if we do not look at the long-term performance and stewardship implications of the decisions we are making, we will never be able to evaluate whether or efforts are successful.

Jim Trombold noted that by 2018 the remaining 90% of tank waste will not be vitrified. It is in already old tanks. He predicted more safety and public health and environmental problems from the remaining 90% of the waste. He wants to see the HAB educated on how this issue will be addressed. If the public is injured or harmed or the workers are by the other 90%, it won't matter how many glassified logs we have. Jeff Luke agreed and requested that the HAB work to understand the entire picture of the tank farms, including what is expected to be left in the tanks, such as the sludge.

Executive Committee Meeting and New Facilitation Contract

Ken Bracken reported that the Executive Committee met on November 1, 2000, Wednesday afternoon. It chose not to establish a meeting calendar for all of 2001. It wanted to establish the meeting schedule together with the new HAB chair. We also want to work with the new chair to examine how effective are we as a group and what options or opportunities there are to organize ourselves, including a different committee structure. The Committee did agree that the next HAB meeting will be in February 1-2 in the Tri-Cities. There may be a meeting in March to talk about the DOE budget and a HAB meeting on April 5-6, also in the Tri-Cities. We also noted that the April meeting provides a key timeframes for a mid-year update on the TPA.

Ruth Siguenza outlined the new staff assignments under the new facilitation contract. She is the project manager and will be working with the full Board, Executive Committee, Public Involvement Committee, and Tank Waste Treatment Committee. Amy Grotefendt will be working with the Dollars and Sense Committee. Penny Mabie will be facilitating the Environmental Restoration and Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committees. Tammie Holm is staffing EnviroIssues new Hanford Project Office. Neither Pat Serie or Louise Dressen will be facilitating under this contract. However, Louise Dressen is a senior advisor under the contract for internal EnviroIssues staff and for the current and new HAB chairs.

The Executive Committee discussed HAB expectations for Board and committee meeting summaries. Ruth Siguenza indicated that she wanted to hire a notetaker in the Tri-Cities that could meet these expectations and to respect the value the HAB places on supporting the local economy. The general consensus was not to change the current meeting summary format or level of detail.

The Executive Committee also talked about the amount of paper that HAB members and agency staff juggle. Ruth Siguenza explained that the facilitation team, with the Executive Committee's concurrence, would implement some processed that would result in halving the size of the HAB packet for December due to a change in how correspondence is handled. The facilitation team will be sending weekly lists of correspondence to the Executive Committee. Members of the Executive Committee can request copies of any correspondence, and the full list of correspondence will be available in every HAB packet. Anyone can telephone, fax, or e-mail a request for any piece of correspondence to EnviroIssues at any time. Copies of correspondence can be picked up at EnviroIssues Richland office or can be faxed or mailed out. However, all correspondence will not be copied and mailed out with the packet. Consensus advice and all agency responses to advice will automatically be included in the packet. In addition, key letters identified by members of the Executive Committee or the facilitation team will also be included. Ruth assured the HAB that the current process is that all of the facilitators read all correspondence. That internal process is not going to change.

Keith Smith asked how much of that information could be transmitted electronically. Ruth Siguenza responded that the facilitation team is using e-mail more in HAB communications, but that at this time, correspondence is not available electronically. The team is looking in to the possibility of scanning correspondence. Tammie Holm is in the process of updating telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses, as well as asking people about their preferences for receiving information.

Ken Bracken noted that EPA had committed to review the kind and volume of information it send the HAB as correspondence. Max Power said he thought Ecology could also do that. He also expressed a hope that we could find a way to track TPA milestones and cleanup progress in a way that is more transparent and easier to access than the current voluminous exchange of letters. About a third of the letters in the last packet were "we've met this milestone" or "no, you haven't met that milestone" or "we agree you've met that milestone", or "we don't agree, you haven't met that milestone" kinds of correspondence. He thought that we could track those things in a single form that would be much more useful to anyone trying to track that information. Paige Knight noted that web pages and e-mails could provide a valuable and easily accessible forum for information sharing.

Hanford Strategic Plan

Wade Ballard mentioned that part of his responsibilities within DOE is to look at ways to streamline processes and procedures and address other internal issues. DOE is also looking at the documentation needed to track this information. The heart of this document hierarchy is the Hanford strategic plan.

Jim Dailey noted that it has been about four years since DOE last issued the Hanford strategic plan. There are a several reasons to update the plan. This effort has just begun. He encouraged HAB members to look over the display of the strategic planning concepts in the hall. Jim was looking for early HAB input into the contents and issues that should be a part of the new strategic plan. He is also looking for ideas on the process to develop the new plan. Jim is currently proposing a focus group to discuss the initial concepts and then to obtain further input at a future HAB meeting.

Gerry Pollet asked if DOE planned to respond to anyone who makes comments on the plan, and if so, what form those responses might take. Jim Dailey indicated that at this stage in the process, DOE is inviting individual comments. There is no formal outline or document available at this point to put out

for formal public comment. Jim asked for HAB input on the process of developing the strategic plan. Wade Ballard said DOE intends to respond to comments. Paige Knight emphasized that it was important for the HAB and members of the public to be able to see the impact of their comments and suggestions.

Susan Leckband suggested that regardless of the fact that there are two field offices at Hanford, she wants to see that both of them and their issues are included in any plan that is labeled "strategic" for the Hanford site. Wade Ballard indicated that DOE-RL has begun to talk with DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) to see how that can happen. Pam Brown said she thinks it would be useful to know how the last strategic plan was used and to get a sense of how this one might be used. Wade Ballard clarified that DOE is not asking for comment on the last strategic plan. He clarified that the strategic plan is going to be a primary document for us that forms the basis, from a technical and procedural perspective, from which DOE builds all of its management and technical plans, including the ways DOE interacts with contractors. Leon Swenson asked if the strategic plan address the issue of long-term stewardship. Jim Dailey responded DOE is adding the stewardship issue to the new strategic plan being developed.

Paige Knight asked how the new strategic plan is different from the Hanford 2012 plan and vision. Wade Ballard explained that Hanford 2012 is like an executive summary of the strategic plan. DOE is developing Hanford 2012 in parallel with the strategic plan. Jim Dailey will be the person that pulls all of these pieces together. Dan Simpson recommended that the HAB develop consensus advice on the strategic plan at some point. Jim Trombold remembers that the strategic planning effort four years ago energized a significant portion of this board.

Wade Ballard explained that DOE has made certain assumptions that in fact, things will be divided along the lines of river and plateau. Those assumptions have implications for organizational and contractual strategies that DOE is not ready to talk about yet. Wade noted that the different plans for accomplishing these things are in differing stages of evolution.

EPA Multi-Media Inspection

Gerry Pollet asked EPA to explain the large reduction in the multi-media inspection fine from \$300,000 to \$25,000. He expressed his consternation and questioned the legality of using fine money for an economic development purpose. Gerry also expressed concern that the HAB is not being informed in a timely manner about significant events, such as the recent airborne release in the tank farms. Gerry recommended that at the beginning of every HAB meeting, members be informed of any significant events or new information. Wade Ballard responded that the HAB was welcome to request information, and DOE would attempt to identify the best people to provide the requested information.

Dennis Faulk said he would like to talk to Gerry Pollet off line about the multimedia inspection fine. He explained that when EPA or any regulator fines an agency, it does so because of a behavior that is occurring that is unacceptable. What EPA has seen between the multimedia inspection and now is a change in behavior. DOE has realized it has some waste handling problems, and it is addressing those.

Shelley Cimon noted that the Executive Committee will be talking about communication issues. She requested that the HAB table further discussion of these issues. Jeff Luke wondered if the HAB should

have a DOE-ORP representative sitting next to Wade Ballard to assist in responding to questions about the tank farms. He asked that this be explored.

Reuse of Contaminated Lead and Other Materials

Gail McClure announced that she had a press release that Abe Greenberg brought to her attention. It concerns the re-use of contaminated lead. She also announced the availability of another article from DOE concerning the release of materials from DOE facilities containing residual radioactive contamination. The proposed policy is now open for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Meyers explained that he had worked at the Hanford site since 1962. During his last six years, he worked in the tank farms. He remembered being told to get every drop out of the tanks, which was an almost impossible task. He expressed concern that from that time, we were trying to restore the site to its original state because of the requirements of the TPA. We need to clean up all of the liquid waste to protect the river and the public water supplies. We should do everything possible right now to do this. He felt that the vitrification plant should be a parallel effort that does not delay other efforts. He said that right now, we should be getting all of the liquid wastes out of the ground that are hazardous to the river. He suggested an alternate approach that he has shared with the DOE-ORP, DOE-RL, Ecology, and Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson. None of their responses has been satisfactory. We need cost information and a risk assessment, neither of which would take a long time. We need to share this information with the public. If we had taken this approach 12 years ago when I first proposed this approach, we could have done this by now instead of facing the monstrous situation we have now. He emphasized that we should consider the question of what DOE would do if the river had too much contamination in it today. Whatever the answer to that question is, is what we should be doing right now.

On Thursday, **Joyce Olson** noted that she is a former mayor of Pasco and also thanked the HAB for coming to Pasco. She is currently the District Director for Representative Doc Hastings. She wanted the HAB to know that Doc is acutely aware of the need for strong public involvement and support for Hanford cleanup. She mentioned that this year, the Congressional delegation worked to secure additional funding for K Basins; stabilization of plutonium at the Plutonium Finishing Plant, reactor cocooning, and the River Protection Project. Doc knows that none of this would have been possible without broad public support. He appreciates this board's support and technical advice on these important issues.

On Friday, **Joyce Olson** returned with a letter from Doc Hastings to Bill Richardson. She had brought the issue of compensation for the next HAB chair to Doc's attention. He was concerned that there was not yet a written decision regarding the compensation issue. Doc requested that DOE provide a written determination to the HAB as soon as possible. She hoped this would help the HAB.

HANFORD HEALTH AND SAFETY

Pam Brown opened the presentations by noting that this was a very important day for the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee because it is bringing the HAB an issue it feels is very

important. The nature of the work that is done at Hanford is very hazardous. Workers are involved in cleaning up; tearing down, and decommissioning facilities that are contaminated with radioactive and chemically hazardous materials. Workers ability to work safely and to have good communications with each other and management is very important. As we look at accelerating cleanup, it is important for the HAB to appreciate the risks associated with the work that is being done.

Integrated Safety Management involves managers and workers early in the work process. During the past year, there have been many teams of people who have verified the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) with DOE and each of the contractors on site. The next step is to be sure that the system is being effectively implemented in the field. The goal is to have ISMS contractual performance measures developed for 2001. The next phase of work for the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee is to look into how ISMS is implemented, how employees concerns are handled, and how contractors are held accountable. “

Joe Richards provided an overview of ISMS. All workers contribute to the protection of the environment, themselves, and the public. There needs to be a balance between documentation and instructions and getting the job done. ISMS provides a formalized, documented process of procedures focused at protection of the public, the environment and the worker. In ISMS, the concept of worker involvement in the work control process is critical. Workers work with management and supervisors to identify job hazards and to develop work control processes that mitigate these hazards. ISMS is a never-ending process. At each stage, feedback and improvement are part of the process.

Keith Smith introduced a panel of workers by noting that this was a great moment for him, and a chance to prove something he has advocated for many years: when you get the workers involved in their own safety in work planning, you get results. The basic ingredient is unfettered, two-way, meaningful, and complete communication between management and the people who do the work. When the union negotiated its last labor agreement with Fluor, we talked about assigning a union safety representative to work with Fluor's Environment, Safety, Health, and Quality organization. We tested this out, and it worked so well that we now have safety representatives for each contractor. We have also been included into the employee concern process. It is much more cost effective to resolve issues in the trenches. The workers represented on today's panel have saved the contractors and DOE several times their annual salaries every year because ISMS is not only the right thing to do, it is good business. Keith took great pride in introducing the panel of Mike Stoner, a millwright with the river corridor project; Rich Layman, an insulator at the Plutonium Finishing Plant; Steve Mackey, a construction worker with Fluor Federal Services; Robert Hickman, a construction worker; and Doug Shoop, DOE-RL.

Mike Stoner observed that a good safety program has been a long time coming. He has worked at Hanford for almost 18 years, and one of his biggest heartaches has been safety programs that came and went. The ISMS safety program will stay, regardless of contractor changes. This is the way it should be. We are still testing the system, and we hope it does stay.

Richard Layman commented that he has worked on site for 17 or 18 years. He started out working in the 100 Area for 15 years and then moved to the Plutonium Finishing Plant. This safety system works. He said that the thing he likes is that there is a lot of employee involvement. Field employees can sit down with middle and senior management. This results in a lot more trust within the workforce. The

trust we have built with management is growing , and accidents have fallen off significantly. This was unheard of in the past. It can only get better. We have room for improvement, but this system works.

Steve Mackey represents the building trades workers in construction from the 300 Area to spent nuclear fuel. He has been working on site for the last nine years as a steamfitter. He has been a safety representative for a year. I threw my name into the hat to be a safety representative reluctantly, because I knew it would be hard in the beginning. It was, and there were many days when he first started that he really wanted to quit. Steve said he was glad he did not quit because the new safety system has opened up lines of communication, and people are starting to listen to each other. He feels that 80% of the site's problems are due to lack of communication. Steve added that you always bring up what you are proud of, but there is still room for improvement.

Robert Hickman noted that he was part of the team that worked at 222-S a few years ago. He remembered that when they started out, they were not really on the road to success. If you did not have a project to work on, that meant a layoff. At the start of the project, we had a couple of skin contamination incidents. We stepped back to reevaluate. We were concerned we would loose our jobs. Instead, we were asked how we would like to do this work. Management asked for our input, and we did not really know what to think. During this time, we were involved in the planning and were allowed to build the tools we needed to make our work more efficient and safe. We had confidence that when we actually went in to work, we were using the safest ideas possible. It is a common sense thing. If you want to know how to put a piping system in, you do not ask a carpenter. Robert explained that it gave the workers a lot of pride and ownership when their opinions were valued. We worked as a group. We agreed to work four, 10-hour days per week. We met the program's goal, under budget and ahead of schedule. There were no injuries, and we decreased our exposure. In face we came in way underneath the anticipated exposures for the work.

Keith Smith reflected that before ISMS, the workers on the panel would be sent home while some engineers who had no idea what the hazards were would sit in a room somewhere and try to design the tools these guys would use. The tools would often come back unusable, because they were not appropriate for the work requirements. Meanwhile, the project would be delayed, and these workers would have been off work for months or sometimes years. This is a remarkable improvement.

Doug Shoop, DOE, introduced himself as the senior technical advisor who is the DOE-RL lead for ISMS. Over ver the past 12 months, we have conducted seven ISMS verifications for both contractors and DOE to make sure that we had the management systems in place to support ISMS. Each one of these verifications took many months to perform, involving 30-45 people, including folks from other sites. The second phase of verification ensures that not only is the documentation in place, but it is being implemented. Hanford is unique because we involve stakeholders and workers in the verification process. We have now verified all the prime contractor systems. Now we are fixing things that did not work quite right. On December 5-6, there will be a national ISMS workshop for 600-700 people to share lessons learned. The workshop is open to the public.

Doug Shoop explained that one of the most significant challenges is to ensure all operations are conducted in accordance with approved ISMS system descriptions. Contractors are expected to operate to that system. DOE will provide the oversight for those systems. Feedback mechanisms are used for continuous improvement to make annual ISMS updates meaningful. Doug noted that there

are have pockets of excellence and pockets of mediocrity. If the work culture will not embrace what we are doing, it will not last. Doug said that we need to improve flow down of ISMS and safety requirements to subcontractors. They all have those processes in place, but they are not as efficient as DOE would like. We also need to get additional stakeholder involvement with ISMS.

Ken Bracken said that he was very impressed with the workers on the panel and their willingness to come to the HAB and take the time to talk about their work and the safety program. He thanked them for coming. Ken recommended that the HAB get more regular reports on Hanford's safety culture similar to those it receives on the TPA. Norma Jean Germond agreed. She expressed the hope that the workers on the panel would continue to succeed, and if there were problems that they would doggedly pursue resolving them. Steve Mackey assured the HAB that the safety representatives will continue to be straight shooters. Keith Smith noted that one of the advantages of these workers is that they were selected by their unions, not by management. They have the autonomy that any steward would have to raise issues without fear of reprisal.

Paige Knight asked how pockets of mediocrity are identified. The answer was that the workers identify them. They focus as a group with management to resolve issues. Steve Mackey explained that all of the safety representatives have the ability to walk into any manager's office. Ten years ago, we could not imagine that workers would get this involved in their safety. Steve commented that "this is just amazing." Keith Smith confirmed that there are no restrictions. There are no prescribed lines of communication. Mike Stoner cautioned that it is unfair to identify an issue and bypass communications with the people responsible for making the necessary corrections. It is important to let people have an opportunity to fix their own house. However, the safety representatives do have the ability and the commitment to move issues on to other levels if that should become necessary.

Jim Trombold emphasized that the HAB members in the room are very committed to worker safety. He noted that the workers on the panel represent us, the taxpayers, in doing the real work at Hanford that is contributing to the safety of our environment. Progress is made only because of the work the workers are doing. Jim asked the panel members to tell their coworkers that the HAB, as public citizens and taxpayers, really appreciate what they are doing on a daily basis.

Joe Richards wrapped up the discussion with the observation that from the standpoint of protecting workers and their efforts in protecting the environment, the whole objective of ISMS is to reduce risk. It is not sufficient to say that we have had a million man-hours with no injuries. We do not want to lose sight of the health and safety system. There are many areas people are very concerned about, including funding. These systems are not perfect, but that is why the continuous improvement part of the system is so important.

Pam Brown added that each month the Fluor contractors and union representatives have a meeting called the President's Zero Accident Council. Any time there has been an injury, the president of the appropriate company is required to explain what happened, what kind of analysis has been done, and what the company is are doing to ensure that something similar does not happen again. The meeting provides very open communication and a tremendous opportunity to learn about what is going on on site.

**ATTACHMENT 1 – ATTENDEES
HAB Members and Alternates**

Mark Beck, member	Norm Dyer, alternate	Al Conklin, ex-officio
Ken Bracken, member	Norma Jean Germond, alternate	Debra McBaugh, ex-officio
Pam Brown, member	Abe Greenberg, alternate	Joseph Richards, ex-officio
Shelley Cimon, member	Doug Houston, alternate	
James Cochran, member	Robin Klein, alternate	
Greg deBruler, member	Jeff Luke, alternate	
Harold Heacock, member	Todd Martin, alternate	
Charles Kilbury, member	Wade Riggsbee, alternate	
Paige Knight, member	Dave Rowland, alternate	
Robert Larson, member	Daniel Simpson, alternate	
Susan Leckband, member	Keith Smith, alternate	
0000Victor Moore, member	John Stanfill, alternate	
Ken Niles, member	Art Tackett, alternate	
Jerry Peltier, member	Amber Waldorf, alternate	
Gerald Pollet, member	Dave Watrous, alternate	
Gordon Rogers, member		
Leon Swenson, member		
Margery Swint, member		
Betty Tabbutt, member		
Tim Takaro, member		
Jim Trombold, member		
Agency, Contractor and Support Staff		
Jay Augustenborg, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Greg Edwards, ATG
Wade Ballard, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Michael Hughes, BHI
Beth Bilson, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Sue Kurtz, BHI
Clifford Clark, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Jim Dailey, DOE-RL	Fred Jamison, Ecology	Robert Potter, BHI
Tom Ferns, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Tom Wintersap, BHI
Mary Goldie, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Fran DeLozier, CHG
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	MaryAnne Wuennecke, Ecology	Carolyn Haas, CHG
Hector Rodriguez, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues
George Sanders, DOE-RL	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Penney Mabie, EnviroIssues
Steve Wisness, DOE-RL		Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP		Gloria Cummins, FH
		Jannell Hales, FH
		Jeff Hertzell, FH
		Greg Perkins, FH
		Janice Williams, FH
		Barbara Wise, FH
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
		Ed Aromia, WMH
		Lily Blackford, WMH
		Dale McKenney, WMH
		Dick Wilde, WMH