



Meeting Minutes  
U.S. Department of Energy and Oregon Office of Energy  
Bi-Monthly Interface Meeting

November 5, 1997  
Portland International Airport, Conference Center, Portland, Oregon

Apprvl.:   
George Sanders, U.S. Department  
of Energy

Date: 1/26/98

Apprvl.:   
Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon Office  
of Energy

Date: 1/26/98

Attendees:

M. Blazek	OOE
G. McClure	DOE-RL
N. Myers	BHI
F. Miera	DOE-RL
R. Morrison	FDH
K. Niles	OOE

**RECEIVED**  
JUN 25 2002  
EDMC

**AGENDA**

**DOE/OREGON MOU BI-MONTHLY MEETING  
NOVEMBER 5, 1997**

- I. Introductions
  
- II. a. TPA Activity Status & Update - George Sanders  
b. Process for Future Monthly TPA Updates - RL/Oregon
  
- III. ATSDR Health Assessment Activities at the Hanford Site - Sanders/Miera
  
- IV. Discussions on Near-Term Public Hanford Meetings Scheduled for Oregon State - Blazek/Niles
  
- V. Status Public Involvement Activities at Hanford - Randolph/McClure
  
- VI. Status on CRCIA and Vadose Zone Efforts at Hanford - Sanders/Miera
  
- VII. Establish Future Meeting Dates
  
- VIII. Follow-Up on Action Items from September 1997 Bi-Monthly Meeting - Blazek/Miera
  
- XI. Closing Remarks

The meeting opened with a proposal by the DOE that the two agencies adopt an informal regimen for the conduct of the bimonthly meetings. Oregon concurred with this approach.

M. Blazek expressed Oregon's interest in a meeting between John Wagoner of the DOE and Governor Kitzhaber and that it now seems appropriate to conduct such a meeting. G. Sanders stated that the existing memorandum of understanding between the DOE and Oregon created a good stepping off point for the two agencies to interact on issues such as transportation of wastes and upcoming budget issues.

**Action:** M. Grainey to continue pursuing possible opportunities for John Wagoner to meet with Governor Kitzhaber.

G. Sanders relayed that guidance from the DOE Headquarters concerning consent order modifications and negotiations was approved in June 1997, which will control a number of aspects related to new or renegotiated commitments. The most significant requirement contained within the guidance is that commitments which have the potential to increase life cycle costs require concurrence by the Secretary for the Department of Energy.

G. Sanders then provided a briefing on current negotiations and disputes being conducted under the Tri-Party Agreement.

#### **Spent Nuclear Fuel**

Negotiations have been on going for over a year to establish milestones for the removal of K Basins spent nuclear fuel stored near the Columbia River and for its' interim deposition in the 200 Area. A risk assessment of the Spent Nuclear Fuel Project technical baseline schedule, indicates that commitments made in the M-34-00A change request (for which tentative agreement had been reached in April, 1997), for initiation of fuel removal could not be met using the current baseline. Continuing concerns over unresolved technical issues, recent project scope increases, and the quality of project safety analysis documents are the primary reasons for an anticipated schedule slippage of about 14 months. Resumption of negotiations with Ecology and EPA are at an impasse, until such time as a new baseline is formally submitted by the PHMC and a change order approved by RL. The new baseline is required for the negotiations so that the parties can determine dates to assign to commitments, both enforceable and target dates. DOE is targeting submittal of a revised M-34 change request prior to the end of December.

#### **Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)**

Negotiations have also been ongoing with the State of Washington regarding the Transition of the PFP facility. The DOE and Ecology were very close to developing an Agreement in Principle which would set the groundrules and scope of negotiations for establishing a series of M-83 milestones and target dates. One issue which has developed is the budget, the program will not be able to be as aggressive as was hoped. In relation to this issue the EPA and Ecology have expressed that Hanford's waste tanks are the highest priority and not the PFP. Currently, a two phase negotiation approach is being considered. Phase

One would take credit for work being performed to comply with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. Phase One would include a commitment to return to negotiations at a future date to develop Phase Two facility transition requirements. The national Environmental Impact Statement on Plutonium disposition will be critical to final PFP disposition decisions. At present the DOE and Ecology are still committed to a March 1998 completion of negotiations. Budget considerations are still a significant issue since at present budget levels the PFP facility is functioning at a minimum safe level and would require an additional \$20 to 30 million per year to really make progress. As a result one proposal of the "2006 Plan" being evaluated is a one year delay to PFP transition activities.

#### **Tank C-106**

The DOE has appealed the Director of Ecology's negative final determination, to the Pollution Control Hearings Board on the extension of TPA Milestone M-45-03A, initiate retrieval for SST 106-C. The DOE feels that a schedule extension, which was denied by Ecology, is justified for critical safety reasons. Specifically concerns about recently identified "steam bumps" have delayed waste retrieval efforts. Ecology's stated position is that these issues could have been dealt with sooner and more effectively.

#### **Single Shell Tank Stabilization**

The DOE would like to refocus the Single Shell Tank Stabilization program to address and support final tank disposal needs. A letter has been sent to Ecology requesting negotiations on the program to address a 1 to 2 year extension. This renegotiation is necessary to be able to better apply available budget resources to final disposal needs.

#### **Tank 103-C**

Milestone M-40-07, commence operation of a vapor treatment system in tank 241-C-103, is in dispute. Issues involve the organic layer present in the tank and other safety related issues.

#### **Waste Management**

G. Sanders informed the representatives from Oregon of a good news story at the Hanford Site. Tri-Party Agreement Major Milestone M-17-00B was completed. This milestone required the "implementation of best available technology/all known, available, and reasonable methods of prevention, control, and treatment for all Phase II liquid effluent streams at the Hanford Site."

#### **Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF)**

It was stressed that a lot of energy is being generated by public interest groups and individuals over the recently developed Tri-Party Agreement changes to FFTF milestones, soon to be out for public review and comment. The State of Washington and RL have reached tentative agreement on the proposed change request. Public meetings are also planned. M. Blazek pointed out that Paige Knight and Greg DeBruler believe that they potentially have many interested people wishing to attend the public meeting(s) and that Hood River is a priority along with Portland for meeting locations. M. Blazek also went on to point out that the DOE is likely to receive a lot of public scrutiny on the production versus cleanup issue.

**Action:** G. Sanders to investigate the possibility of one versus two meetings in Oregon with responsible DOE management and will provide a response to M. Blazek.

#### **Tri-Party Agreement Budget Matters**

G. Sanders reviewed some of the potential budget issues facing the DOE in the upcoming years from 1999 to 2003. Among the issues are the increasing costs of dealing with the spent nuclear fuel in the K-Basins, the continued stabilization of single shell tanks and potential vadose zone monitoring needs.

#### **200 Areas Soils Remediation Strategy**

The U.S. DOE, U.S. EPA and Ecology have signed the tentative agreement on the proposed changes to the Tri-Party Agreement dealing with the 200 Areas Soils Remediation Strategy. These changes will reorganize the characterization activities in the 200 Areas for a more efficient approach. The public comment period will also begin in the very near future.

G. Sanders inquired about the adequacy of reporting TPA status in this form. M. Blazek responded that it was adequate for the State of Oregon's purposes.

#### **Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry (ATSDR) Assessments**

The DOE is faced with a potential \$12.8 million impact in Fiscal Year 1998 related to support of the ATSDR's proposed assessment activities. Several stakeholders and the Hanford Advisory Board do not feel this activity should be funded out of existing cleanup funds, a position the Health Effects Subcommittee does not share. ATSDR staff have also declined to entertain any reduction in scope of their activities.

#### **Solid Waste Scoping Meeting**

Oregon is expecting a low turnout at the public meeting to be held in Pendleton on November 13, 1997. Oregon's real concerns lay with the content of the Environmental Impact Statement which Oregon will comment on by the December 11, 1997 due date. M. Blazek discussed Oregon's concerns that meaningful public meetings be utilized and not just go through the paces in order to meet a requirement that a meeting be held. To this end it was stated that Oregon's primary interests will be in transportation, safety and emergency preparedness areas which the meeting may not adequately address.

**Action:** G. Sanders to discuss these comments with Jay Augustenborg of the U.S. DOE.

**Action:** The U.S. DOE is to assign a representative to the Oregon Waste Board.

#### **Public Involvement**

G. McClure discussed and provided a public involvement six month look ahead, a public involvement policy and a public involvement desk reference (Attachments 1, 2, and 3). It was requested that all future public meetings involving the State of Oregon be coordinated in future bimonthly meetings.

**Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment and Vadose monitoring.**  
A brief status was provided on the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment program. Ecology was dissatisfied with the recommendations for follow-on work to this program which were provided in July. RL management has directed that groundwater protection be addressed in an integrated program. M. Blazek requested that Oregon be included in this effort. F. Miera stated that this should not be a problem, as the effort is to be within the oversight of the HAB's ER Committee.

**Weekly Budget Briefings**

M. Blazek asked about possible attendance at weekly meetings in which Alice Murphy provides a briefing to the EPA and Ecology. G. Sanders responded that this seemed appropriate.

**Action:** G. Sanders and F. Miera to inquire about Oregon's attendance at the Alice Murphy weekly briefings.

**Next Bimonthly Meeting**

The next U.S. DOE and State of Oregon Bimonthly Meeting is to be held on January 26, 1998 at 2:00pm. Duration of meeting to be 3 hours.

**Action:** M. Blazek to develop a final name for future Bimonthly U.S. DOE and State of Oregon meetings.

**Action:** F. Miera to seek DOE Headquarters representative's attendance at the January Bimonthly meeting.

**Action:** G. Sanders to pursue the conduct of a Tri-Party Agreement training session for State of Oregon representatives at a future date to be determined.