

START

0038097

TPA MEETING - PASCO, WASHINGTON

5/11/1994

TAPE ONE - SIDE A

MP: My name is Melinda Page, and I work with Triangle Associates which is a consulting firm that does facilitation out of Seattle, Washington. I'm going to be facilitating the meeting tonight. I'd like to start by going over the agenda with you all so we're clear about what we're hoping to accomplish. The first few minutes, or about twenty minutes of the program, maybe thirty, are going spent in hearing presentations from the three agencies on the past year Tri-party Agreement (TPA), this year and future yea's TPA, and the budget, especially the '95 budget. And then we're going to, I don't think there will be an interest group presentation, we'll see a little later whether they come in. And we'll have public questions and comments after those presentations on the TPA and the budget. Then once we've finished with your questions and comments on that we'll go an agency presentation on an environmental restoration refocusing. And after that, we'll put you into small groups, probably gathering about ten or twelve people around each table, to talk about ER refocusing and what you think ER should be doing and how it should be refocusing its efforts. So, and then after that, we'll hear from each of the small groups, the two or three priorities that you came us with about ER refocusing. And finally, have some public comments. It's important that you know that everything that is said, all the questions and the comments that you make through the whole course of the evening, are going to be transcribed and will be part of the formal record of this meeting. So I'm going ask you whenever you have a question or a comment to come to the mike so that we can get it on tape along with the answer, if it's a question, and make sure that everything that's noted here goes into the transcript. In addition, we do have someone who's taking notes and will produce a summary of this meeting more quickly that we can produce a full transcript. So if you would like either the short summary or the full transcript

START

you need to let me or one of the people at the table know that. We don't automatically send those out because we hear from people that they don't want to get all that paper unless they asked for it. The thing that I'd like to do now is make sure that you all picked up some hand-outs. There are two hand-outs that are going to be referred to. They are reproductions of the view graphs and sometimes the view graphs are a little hard to see. One is on the budget and one is on the RE refocusing. So if there's anyone that doesn't have those hand-outs if you raise your hand, we'll get them to you before we get started. Everybody have them? Okay. They'll bring them to you. Now it's my pleasure to introduce the people at the head table who'll be making the presentations tonight. Talking about the year that is just past is Roger Stanley, with the Washington State Department of Ecology. Roger's on my far left. And in the middle, Steve Wisen, with the U.S. Department of Energy. Going to talk about the current and future years and also give the presentation on the '95 budget and TPA priorities. And on your agenda it says that Doug Sherwood is from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is going to give the RE refocusing presentation but I guess he got a bug in Portland and has the flu, so we have two people actually going to talk about ER refocusing. Mike Tompson is going to give the presentation, he's with DOE. And then representing EPA, is Larry Gadboy. So that finishes the introduction, we'll go right into the presentations unless someone has a question about how we're going to conduct the meeting. Thank you.

RS: Good evening. Thanks for coming. My name's Roger Stanley. I'm with the Washington Department of Ecology, and I'm its Hanford Project Manager. Been working on Hanford clean-up issues for the past 6-7-8 years. I'm going to start out this evening with looking back at this last year, hitting some of the highlights, not all of them, but just a few of the highlights that we've seen this last year. In our view,

the State's view, basically this last year represents the first year that we have started to see some rather significant progress after, I guess, 5 years of really struggling to get the TPA on the ground. Not that there isn't a tremendous amount, or hasn't been a tremendous amount that's been going on the reservation and between all of the parties. This last year we finally started to see something's show up that are a little more significant. I'm going to go through a few of those. I'm going to start off with a major one that is not a physical thing that I can show a picture of. Our tank waste remediation system negotiations, I know many of you know that this last year we went through a major restructuring of the work schedules that are associated with the clean-up of Hanford's double and single shelled tanks, where we found ourselves at the end of this last March was that the Department of Energy approached us and, basically, asked for two things. First, that EPA and the State agree to delay start of construction to Hanford waste and vitrification plant, that start of construction was scheduled for the last day of March, 1993, and also that we consider major re-structuring of all the work schedules that are associated with the tanks. What prompted them at that point in time, were those milestones for the vit-plant, and also that Hanford's grout program at that point was just about to the point to either sink or swim. I guess, if you want to view it as bad news, this last year, we didn't see the Department of Energy or the Federal Government get the major or the largest tank waste processing plants under construction. We viewed it as bad news, I think, when the proposal first hit us last Spring, not that we didn't know that it was coming. However, in retrospect, going through all the various readiness evaluations, working with DOE and its contractors throughout the late Spring and Summer and Fall actually, there's no doubt in our minds that delay was the best thing to do and it has resulted in a far stronger program. As a result of

our negotiations and as a direct reflection of public concern, the grout program was canceled. It's gone from, I think, funding this last year on the order of about \$36 millions down to this coming year, I think, the funding is at about \$1 million dollar mark, which is mainly residual monitoring and keeping the existing four grout vaults in place just in case of a true emergency situation. With the grout program going down DOE is shifting its emphasis towards glassifying Hanford' low level tank waste. The high volume but relatively low rad portion of the double and single shelled tank waste. So there's a lot of technology development work that is now getting under way and by putting the new emphasis on glassifying low level waste it, basically, puts our emphasis on the high volume tank waste up front so that we can get the waste out of the leaking single shelled tanks at the earliest possible date. It also winds up where we put construction and the operation of the high vit plant out in the 2005 to 2009 time frame, when we need it. Another benefit of the tours negotiations, if I can call them that, is that it allowed us to focus in the near term on pre-treatment of tank waste and the types of facilities and processing that we are going need to pre-treat those wastes. So it gave us a little bit of room up front as far as pre-treatment, and in fact, that was a technology area that we had been called on by a number of different groups including the U.S. General Accounting Office. Another major benefit of our tank waste negotiations this last year that is paying a tremendous amount of physical benefit, on the ground benefit today, is that we were able to incorporate tank waste upgrades and tank safety issues. Prior to that time they had not been in the TPA and that was a principle reason why funding for a lot of those programs, especially tank farm upgrades have to a certain extent, languished for a number of years. So there's a tremendous amount of work that's going on now as far as upgrading the tank farms, as far as tank farm

electrical systems, ventilation systems, monitoring systems, waste transfer systems, those types of things. There's two pictures here. This first one just of an electrical control board out in the tank farm. Of course, there are an awful lot of these out there, and basically, the type of work that they're doing is they go through the upgrade program, it's just to clean them up. Clean the whole thing out. Another area where actually putting specific milestones and work schedules into the TPA is helping us in the instance of tank safety. This is the mixer pump for Tank 101-SY that was installed this last year successfully. Same with this second picture. And actually there's a story that goes along with the 101-SY mixer pump, where the original plan was to put the initial pump in and utilize it for a while during which time DOE and contract staff were going to wind up designing a permanent pump and eventually putting a permanent in place. This pump has been working so well that the plan right now is, rather than design a permanent pump, there's going to be a spare that actually constructed that's going to have the same life expectancy of the original permanent pump but we've managed to get about, I think, a \$7 million savings out of that. Another benefit of the tank waste negotiations that helped us in this last year, and is continuing to help us, is just that we took a new approach to negotiations. Prior to that time the three parties, every time we came up with a change in the TPA, we basically go to the negotiation table, hammer out a draft agreement between the three agencies, put it out for public comment, go through a round of meetings, make final modifications to that agreement and sign it. This last Spring, and especially since we were well aware of the magnitude of the proposal that DOE was going to lay on our table on the last day of March as far as modifications to the tank clean-up work schedules, we knew that probably the only way those schedules were going fly is if the public was with us, the tribes and the major stakeholder groups and the public. So

we worked to form the Tank Waste Task Force. I know a number of you are aware of, and basically, the whole idea was to have them on-board throughout the course of those negotiations so that we could continually be talking with the Task Force as well as having separate meetings with the tribes and stakeholder groups but talk with the Task Force throughout the Spring and Summer, take their values straight to the negotiation table, tell them the problems that we were having. The end result is that when we got to a final change package late this last year was that all the major stakeholders were well of what the issues were and flew relatively cleanly. We're using that same process now or starting to, under the Environmental Restoration Program, that Mike Tompson is going to be talking to us about in just a bit, and with the successor organization to the Tank Waste Task Force, the Hanford Advisory Board. Another turning point that we reached this last year was that it was the first year that we've really seen DOE start to turn up the heat on squeezing access costs out of its projects, putting more heat on its contractors, and putting heat on itself frankly, as far its own management systems, trying to get much more efficient. Part of that time, a few changes, but really nothing of major significance this last year, it's started to become more and more clear that DOE has gotten the message. The document that actually laid out most of that is the document that we negotiated along side the changes to the Tri-party Agreement that's called the Cost and Management Efficiency Initiative. It essentially tabulates a fairly long list of the results of audits that started out being audits within DOE's Environmental Restoration Program and then grew basically to be applied to other DOE programs as far as contract reform measures, increased cost analysis as far as projects, more and more scrutiny on DOE and contractor indirect charges, regulatory reforms, whether those are State regulations or DOE orders, and procurement system modifications. Those types of

things. And the list is much longer than that. A number of pretty significant changes with the bottom line commitment from DOE to achieve a \$1 billion savings over a 5 year period. Real savings, not smoke and mirrors with the same scope of work on the table. I mentioned also, that EPA and the State are parties to the Cost and Management Efficiency Initiative. I know from the State's standpoint, we're going through a pretty significant effort right now to comb through, primarily, our hazard waste management requirements to try and spot areas where we can get tied up in the bureaucracy of the whole thing and to try to strip those out. I expect that we'll probably be going through a pretty significant modification of our regulations within about a year's time. Those are some of the process oriented items that really constituted significant progress this last year. I mentioned the 101-SY mixer pump, there is also a number of other areas where this last year we started to see some much more significant progress. The first one doesn't get much air play. I've been noting it in this round of meetings that we've been having around the State, anyway, just because personally, and knowing the magnitude of the major construction projects that we're going to be facing in coming years, DOE and its contractors have to get their ??? infra-structure in place to a much higher level than they have in the past. So we've started to see more office buildings, roads, those types of things that, to my way of thinking, is just basically getting their act together so that once we do get the major construction programs underway they go much more smoothly. Kind of along the same lines as far as getting overall infra-structure in place, we've seen the completion of a lot of improvements to laboratory facilities. This photo is of the waste sampling and characterization facility, the ??? Lab, out in the 200 area. It's just this side of 200 West. ??? Laboratory is a low level lab. State of the art lab. Real nice facility. Construction is complete. All of the lab equipment, or

almost all of it, is in place. They're going through the start-up phase now. We expect operations to take off later on this year. Another analytic facility, this is just an overhead of some of the hot cells and DOE's been going through a major expansion in the upgrade of their hot cell facilities as you can imagine as they start to get more and more knowledge and go through more and more extensive characterization of the double and single shelled tanks. They've got to have lab services that have been brought up to snuff basically. Anyway, those hot cells, the basic upgrading of them is just about complete now. Also, in another whole area that has seen a lot of pressure in the last few years and, in fact, when we put the original Tri-party Agreement in place in 1989, the major difference between the draft agreement that the three agencies reached and the one that we finally signed, was that we added in a substantial number of liquid effluent control milestones and primarily as a result of the fact that the principle public comment that we got was that "you don't have enough in the TPA as far as the liquid effluent control". This is just an aerial photo of liquid effluent treatment facility with the acronym CO-18-H. And nearing completion, set for operations this next year, there's another one, I don't have a slide of in the 300 area that you can see as you drive by it. And finally, I don't think I have a photo of it, there's an artist's drawing of the 242-A evaporator, which the 242-A evaporator basically, a waste concentrator linked onto the double shelled tank system necessary to insure that we've got adequate tank space. Prior to the time that the major tank waste processing systems actually get on the ground. If I remember right, the evaporator shut down just before the TPA was signed. So it's been down for a substantial amount of time. It's been going through a major upgrade also. So anyway, I wanted to show these just because, not to paint a rosy picture of Hanford or progress at Hanford, that everything's going just fine and clean-up is off and

running. We've got a list of issues and difficulties to tackle on Hanford that's a mile high and it causes us no end of problems on a day to day basis, but at least this last year, of the last five, we started to see a few things pop up, whether it's office buildings, labs, hot cells, those types of things, more and more we're seeing. I know that Steve's going to talk about some of the construction that's underway now, some of the things that we can expect to see over the coming year. So just to summarize, the clean-ups still getting off the ground pretty slowly. A project of this magnitude takes a heavy investment up front naturally and it definitely takes a while to get the major projects under construction. But the fact of the matter is that we've started to see some significant progress, and as a result of the negotiations of this last year, we've got a Tri-party Agreement that is much stronger, just as an overall enforceable document and has far superior tank clean-up program in it. We've negotiated changes that pointed in the direction of some of the activities that we're going to be talking about later on this evening. I think we also reached or got to the point where we have far improved public involvement process which the writing was on the wall back then and it's clearly on the wall now, that the only way we can truly keep the TPA whole and keep it with public support, keep the funding coming to the site is if the tribes and the major stakeholders and the public are all with us. So with that, I'll go ahead and close. I'd be happy to answer any questions with you. We'll move on.

SW: Okay, I'm going to talk about the clean-up budgets and I'm also going to talk about expected accomplishments under the TPA over the next couple of years since this is a multi-billion dollar program, it's difficult to get into any detail so I'm going to do my best to summarize. As I've done in other locations where we've held these meetings this last week or so, I've offered that some later date we could

come out and conduct a workshop and spend a few hours and bring the program folks out and talk in much more detail about the scope of the programs and the actual budget associated with those programs. So I'd appreciate any feed back you have on that, whether you'd like to see that happen or not. We also have a number of program people tonight to help answer questions that you may have on the details, so we'll do our best in that area. To start with, there's a overview of the DOE environmental management budget. That budget is about \$6.3 billion dollars and the pie chart in the middle shows how that budget is broken up with 46.5% of that budget going to waste management activities. That's the management of our hazardous and radioactive waste. That can further be broken up into operations at 64%, on-going construction at 22%, and construction that's complete but not yet operating at 14%. The next biggest piece of the pie is development and restoration at 27.5%. That's further broken up by 52% being applied to the characterization and assessment of rural waste sites, and 37.7% going to the actual clean-up of those waste sites. Other pieces of the pie of note are facility transition at 13.3%, that's a process of taking out old, former production facilities from a surveillance and maintenance mode to the minimum surveillance and maintenance mode while they await the de-contamination and de-commissioning. And then technology development at 6.5%. Another view of the ER budget is to compare what we're getting to the national budget for clean-up. We're at about \$1.6 billions compared to the \$6.3 national budget. So that's about 25% of the overall environmental management budget. Another way to look at is by state and how much each state is getting. The State of Washington at Hanford receives the lion's share of the budget compared to other states. In fact, the next closest states are South Carolina and Tennessee. They get about half of what we get at about three-quarters of a billion dollars. This gives you a little bit more of detail of the

sub-programs. The '94 number here is our actual appropriation. The '95 number is what the President submitted in his budget to Congress. Overall the increase from '94 to '95 is about an 11% increase. You can also make some comparisons of the various major programs to the total budget. At Hanford, our waste management budget is about 63% of the budget, facility transition 19%, environmental restoration 14%, and technology development about 4%. In '94 funding situation looks pretty good. There is a re-programming action that is about ready to go forward to Congress. This re-programming action doesn't affect the TPA. It doesn't take any money away from the TPA, but what it does do is it takes prior un-costed funds and applies them to '94 waste management facilities in transition activities. That's about \$30 million dollar re-programming and it'll cover things like the environmental impact statement for the new tanks, it'll cover the ??? documentation for the plutonium finishing plant, it will also cover payment in lieu of taxes for the Tri-county area. The '95 budget was submitted to Congress in February of this year. That budget did not totally reflect the re-negotiated TPA that was signed in January. So as a result, DOE along with EOA and Ecology got together to determine how that budget needed to be re-structured to meet the TPA requirements. That activity is complete and we're expecting to very soon go to headquarters with that re-adjustment of the budget for Hanford and then we'd hopefully see a budget amendment that would be going to Congress sometime in the near future. When that happens we can share with you the details of how that budget is broken up because it's different then the information that you may have received in the past. When we prioritize our budgets the first thing that we consider is the minimum safe operations at our facilities. The second thing that we consider is make sure that we're in compliance with the Tri-party agreement and other environmental laws. And then we go back and we start

9413206 277

picking up some of the other safety assurance activities, like demolition of old, unoccupied facilities that may still pose a threat to our workers. We, then, go further down the list picking up other environmental and safety compliance activities and lastly we address the conduct of operations and enhanced operations. Also, in this category you'd find things like site infra-structure, grants to the states and tribes. We do have some funding issues that we're wrestling with in '95. The first one being spent nuclear fuel projects. That's raising up on our priority list. Requiring additional funding to cover. The waste receiving and processing facility. We're hoping we're going to be able to privatize that facility and save of some capitol dollars up front rather than having the government build and operating a facility. Go out to the private sector for that service. The Defense Nuclear Safety Board has recommended that the characterization activities be accelerated two years ahead of what the TPA requirements are so that would take additional funding to do that. Then lastly, a subject that we're going to talk about more later, is environmental restoration refocusing. When we negotiated the agreement last year we added some things to our plate and we also heard some new values from the Tank Waste Task Force, and we'd also like to incorporate additional values from the ??? working group. So depending on how, and we also agreed to re-negotiate or re-focus the Environmental Restoration Program to deal with those values by September of this year. And depending on how those negotiations come out will determine what the actual budget situation and needs are for that program. While we mentioning the Cost Management Efficiency Initiative, that's one way that we can fund some of our issues and, like you've said we've committed to a billion dollar savings over the next 5 years. We're making quite a bit of progress in identifying savings in the next year or so. A little a bit about what we're going to be accomplishing in the next couple of years, this column here

shows just from a number standpoint the milestones that will be completed or have been completed by major programs. Of the 310 that have been completed to date under the Tri-party agreement include milestones that were included in the original Tri-Party agreement, includes new milestones that we've added under negotiations. It also includes milestones that have been extended through change requests. You see in '94, we've got 42 milestones, 75 in '95, and 33 in '96. And actually those out year number will probably increase as we go through negotiations and add new milestones to various programs. Where the river really meets the road is in physical accomplishments and in '95 or '94 we will have pumped 5 single shelled tanks, that is removing the pumpable from the single shelled tanks and moving them over into double shelled tanks. And that includes the emergency pumping of tank T-111. In '95, we're going to start pumping two more tanks. We're resolving all of our energy and safety questions and actually we'll be improving significantly our capability to go in and emergency pump these tanks if we find any leaks. In double shelled tanks, we're going to start construction of a new tank farm this year. We're going to be starting and completing the conceptual design for the low level waste pre-treatment facilities for these tanks. And we're also going to be issuing a 50 characterization reports for both the double shelled tanks and the single shelled tanks. I mentioned waste receiving and processing facility, that was the actual second module for this project, the first module which will receive, exam, certify, sort and repackage our solid radioactive waste, actually start construction this year, and operation beginning 1997. Liquid effluents, Roger mentioned a little bit about the C-0-18 project. Overall though, in '95 we're going to be ceasing the untreated discharge of all our high priority phase one streams. This happens to be 300 area, with the 300 area process trench just north of that area so we'll be ceasing discharge there

9413286.2076

and any liquid effluents from the 300 area will be treated in a new treatment facility. The three major projects in both the 200 and the 300 area for that treatment. ??? is one the issues that we're dealing with. Spent fuel from any reactors store in these basins, they have been known to leak and have contributed to tritium contamination in the ground water. There are Tri-party agreement dates to start encapsulation of that fuel this year. There's probably going some delays to that because of some recent issues that have come up. Most recently new sophisticated seismic analysis was done of those basins and under a design basis earthquake you could have separation at construction joints which would increase significantly the amount of water that would be leaking from those basins into the soil. We're now looking at how we would resolve that issue. And there's also another issues associated with the onyx exchange columns that are used to treat that water and the potential for hydrogen generation. So that's a new one also that we're looking at. So the condition of the fuel as it sits in the basin right now. Another activity you'll be hearing about and something we'll be negotiating is the actual facility transition as I mentioned, that's a process of taking our old shut-down facility, like Purex Plutonium Plant, and bring them into a surveillance and maintenance while they await de-contamination and de-commissioning. This happens to be Purex. And by the end of this year, by December, we will have finished the negotiation for those facilities transition milestones and in December of '96 we will have completed the negotiation for, including milestones in the agreement for de-contamination and de-commissioning of these facilities. So that is kind of hitting the high spots. Turn it over to Melinda and I guess we're going to have some questions now, is that right?

MP: Right. If you would come to a microphone to ask your questions then we'll be sure to have it on the record. And

I assume there are some questions. It's so clear there's not a single question. No?

NV: I'm Gordon Rogers, a local resident. I wanted to ask Steve if the consequences of this design birth basis earthquake impact on the cave basin has been calculated or estimated by anyone and what the impact is on the level of contaminates in the Columbia River.

SW: I don't think we've gotten that far yet. We do have a person here from that program. Clive Moore, is there anything you want to add to that?

CM: As Steve said, I'm Clive Moore, I'm with the Spent Fuel Program. Excuse me, Spent Fuel Project at Hanford. The seismic issues that the gentlemen was talking about and Steve was talking about earlier has resulted in an expectation of a very much larger leak at the construction joint that brings where the basin is and where the old ??? are at. And what we're doing right is we're going back in and evaluating what the release would be to the facilities, to the ground column, and also, out to the potential for the Columbia River. We should have that evaluation done here shortly. We brought in a team of external hands, 2 Hanford experts, we're working with P&L, and we're looking at about a 2-month time frame to get the total package put back together. We will have a defined answer for you. We're treating it as an unreviewed safety question, in fact, there was a press release that was released today calling it an unreviewed safety question. And we have the top people that we have available to us not only within Westinghouse but within P&L working on it.

NV: The follow-up question is the design basis earthquake the same one that would apply say to the supply system reactors and FFTF? Yes. Thank you.

- MP: Okay. Any other questions about TPA, past, present, future in the '95 budget?
- SW: I would like to mention also that, I didn't cover the environmental restoration accomplishments or expected accomplishments because Mike Tompson is going to be covering that in his presentation. So that's another big piece of the pie here that we don't forget.
- MP: So why don't we move right into that and see if we can stimulate some questions?
- NV: All these people here to sell environmental restoration.
- MP: If anyone wants to sit down, there are chairs right front. Up close and personal. No? Okay.
- MT: Glad to see such a good turn out tonight. First of all, I'd like to pass on the apologies for Mr. Sherwood from the Environmental Protection Agency who was going to give this talk tonight. He appears to have come down with the flu after having several days of road trip and requested that I come and give this presentation for him tonight. We've been working, the three agencies together, on trying to do some re-focusing of environmental remediation. I'm with the Department of Energy with the Environmental Remediation Project, acting Division Director for a couple months until Bechtel comes on board and we get re-organized at DOE. So I hope I can answer all of your questions. Many of you tonight are from the Hanford community so when I talk about how the missions of environmental restoration or the site itself, it may not be what you would envision after looking at the organization charts. Some of these charts are put together for those who aren't familiar with all the details of Hanford and we try to package in such a way that's easy to understand. But the first is that environmental

restoration program is one of many of the Hanford missions that we have here. One of the problems and levels of concern that many of the stakeholders have as they look at the budget like Steve just put up on the board. At Hanford, I believe, environmental restoration program is only about 14% of the total budget and that becomes a concern because they think that's the only clean-up we're doing when in fact most of the money is really put towards clean-up. The tank waste remediation system, liquid effluents, the management of the waste, all of that is considered clean-up. So there's more to clean-up than environmental restoration at Hanford and this slide tries to point that out. That at Hanford we have the solid liquid waste work. We have special initiatives like the cost savings initiatives, economic development, former nuclear facilities, that is taking the old processing plants and trying to transition those to a cheap to keep, if you will, mode. Tank waste remediation system (TWRS). Most of you are familiar with. Site support, the things you need to do to keep the site running. Science and technology, the Bechtel kinds of things that we do here, Westinghouse also, there's some of that. The multi-program laboratory that's particularly Bechtel. And then, environmental restoration, or environmental remediation as we're sometimes called which is generally remedial actions in the assessment work to lead to that, plus de-commission, de-contamination of facilities. We have about 100 facilities in our program right now. And then there's things like Asbestos abatement and maintaining the rad areas. trying to reduce those down. That sort of thing. So, that puts in perspective what environmental restoration does. This is basically more of the same. I won't go through this since it's the same thing that we had in the other pictorial. Kind of thing we do at environmental restoration. We have the 8 old production reactors plus end reactor that's in our program. The buildings and facilities that are associated with those

shut-down facilities. And then you've got all of the old burial grounds, French drains, trenches, cribs, in other words, the waste that is in the ground now from old operations for the 50 years of the operations at Hanford. If it's not being actively operated or if it's in the environment now chances are environmental restoration has that part of the program here at Hanford. Back when the original TPA was signed, essentially it covered two things. ??? That is the hazardous waste requirements for operating facilities and the hazardous waste requirements for things we did in the past. And that's been evolving slowly over the years. Environmental restoration projects, we like to think of it as being composed of 5 major pieces of work. And that's the assessment and the clean-up of activities, of waste characterization being assessment. Hazard stabilization and elimination technology and infra-structure and program management. So when ER looks at the money that it has which is roughly \$200 million dollars a year, we try to put it in to these 5 boxes to try to manage back and forth between them. Original TPA, we had about 1500 waste sites. We grouped those into 78 operable units which flow over ??? operable units, 74 were source units. There were 15 retro-closure land disposal units and we've initiated work on 27 of the operable units and we've gotten one record of decision for an NPL site. That's the 1100 area just north of the town of Richland. And we have 4 retro-closure plants that have been written. So there has been a fair amount of work that's been going on in trying to assess where we are. A lot of folks would like to see a lot more on the ground clean-up. And when you look at the original TPA, we started in say the 200 areas where there are 43 operable units, 794 waste sites, 10 retro-closures. Up in the 100 areas where the reactors are you can read the numbers. The 300 area and 1100 area. We tried to focus around the river and we tried to do a little bit of worst first, which is a standard approach under the hazardous

9413286.2080

waste law. And by 1991, we figured out that that wasn't quite the best way to do it. So this is where we are now. And if you look at the numbers are the operable unit designation ...

TAPE ONE - SIDE B

MT: ... along the Columbia River ??? original concepts and there's also some significant work going on in 200-BP-1 and 200 East and some of the source and ground units around the site. This reflects some of the negotiations we did last Summer. But basically what this slide is trying to show is that we are indeed doing a lot of work around the river and not really that much around the 200 area although we are expending a fair amount of money there. Other negotiations in 1991 in ??? , we decided we that we had enough information that we could go forward with some real clean-up on the site. We picked 3 expedited response actions at that time. It's the carbon-tetrachloride, where we put about 1000 metric tons of carbon-tetrachloride through the soil column. I believe we pumped out about 10 - 12 tons, so far, out of the ground. The 618-9 where there were ??? drones buried near the 300 area. In the 300 process trenches where we found that most of the contaminates in those process trenches you saw in the slide that Steve towards the end of his talk. Most of the contaminates were in the very top part of that trench and that if we could take those contaminates out we could still use that trench for the interim to dispose of liquid wastes until such time that the liquid waste treatment facility is on line. And in that way, reduce the amount of contaminates that go into the Columbia River. And since then we've thought it was such a good idea we've picked three more. All of those have been completed. And then as one of the TPA milestones that we missed which was the completion of the low level analytical laboratory, we, as part of the dispute resolution, agreed to

do an extra response action at ??? Springs where there's concern about strontium 90 getting into the Columbia River. So just to give you an idea of where those expedited response actions are, again if you look most of those are fairly close to the Columbia River. The one that's not is in the 200 West area that's carbon-tetrachloride. And clearly, when you've got 1000 tons of a solvent in the ground you should be doing something about it so we decided to start there. For the stakeholders, it wasn't very clear that a lot of the things that environmental restoration did, did not fall under the original Tri-party Agreement which was hazardous waste. In the D&D, surveillance and maintenance of over 100 facilities, major safety improvements and upgrade projects to eliminate safety risks. The big part of the program. We've recycled 900 tons of steel, 12,000 cubic yards of concrete. So it's a significant part of our program and because it's not under the TPA umbrella it doesn't get a lot of publicity. Accelerated D&D in surplus facilities 24 buildings since '89. We think we'll have about 65 facilities over the next 5 years. We've completed the environmental impact statement for the eight surplus reactors. Talks about removing those from the river and bringing them up to the 200 area for burial. And then the shut-down plan for the end reactor is also part of our program. We're responsible for radiation area maintenance. We try to shrink the radiation areas on the site, stabilize the surface sites, remove the underground storage tanks, (most of the cities today you'll see gas stations where they're doing a "yank-a-tank" program, they pull the underground storage tanks out of the ground. That's part of the program here.) and asbestos abatement program. These are the sort of things that don't get a whole lot press that we wanted the stakeholder to understand what we were doing. Last year, which I call the "Summer of Hell", we re-negotiated a good bit of the Tri-party Agreement. That came out as Amendment 4 of the Tri-

9413286-2082

party Agreement. And there were some significant improvements, I think, to environmental restoration approach at Hanford that came out of that. I'm very please with everything the Department of Energy signed up to in that agreement. What we did is we put a significant amount of new work on top of the old base program. Now the new work, we were very careful when we negotiated it, the three parties went to the stakeholders 15 time through the negotiations to try to communicate back and forth the values that the stakeholders had so that we could be assured when we come out of the negotiations we had a product that reflected the values of the people that we answer to. So we feel that the negotiated settlement and Amendment 4 meets the values of the stakeholders however, the original base program that we put that on top of, does impart and doesn't impart. And what we're going to try to do in the re-focusing of the environmental restoration programs is to: 1) Hold sacred what we've negotiated last year, because we feel that's the right thing to do unless the stakeholders tell us otherwise, but mostly to try to bring what was in the base program into alignment with the stakeholder values that we heard over the negotiations last Summer. So, anyway, back to what we did last year. We included some D&D milestones and commitments in the agreement. Mostly those things that would be critical path for clean-up. If we found that something was critical path for clean-up we were able to bring that into the schedule of the Tri-party Agreement. We agreed to clean-up the Waloop Slope. It's sometimes called the North Slope. And the ??? by October of this year. We're going great guris on that. That's just about half of the acreage of the Hanford site. In terms of contamination, it's a very small, in terms of contamination compared to the rest of the site. But it is important because it's the old buffer zones that are north and east of the river in the arid land ecology reserve. We want to be able to clean those up, show some progress and make that land available

for other uses, whatever that may be. And then we selected the 100-N as a pilot project to try to get out of the box of ??? surplus atomic energy act and try to manage a geographical clean-up of an area so it makes sense so you can coordinate all these laws that aren't by themselves coordinated to come up with the right kind of approach for spending resources cleaned-up in a timely and efficient and a safe manner. What we're pulling into that is the de-activation of the end reactor. In other words, getting all of the radio-nuclides and hazardous wastes out of the building that we can get to. To get the fuel basins cleaned up and bring that to a cheap-to-keep condition. We're also bringing in the expedited response actions for N-Spring. And we're trying to put on hold some of the environmental clean-up actions that aren't as important to off-site migration of contaminants as the N-Spring situation is. And we're also looking at making a decision on what to do with the two cribs that are source terms for N-Springs. So we're trying to do that in a good, coordinated manner. There's milestones for the design and construction of waste disposal facility. Essentially, we would like to build a waste disposal facility in between the 200 areas that would be solely for Hanford generated past practice waste. We would build that facility in such a manner that it's a staged approach. We're not going to build one very large facility at one time, that we will look at year to year projections and try to build just enough that we stay ahead of what we're digging up in the 100 to the 300 and 1100 areas. So that waste disposal does not become critical path to our ability to do clean-up at Hanford. So there's some milestones on that. And we'll be coming forward in the near future with a public interaction plan on that one. There's some treatability tests in the burial ground in the 100 area to help us to decide what the waste acceptance criteria will be in the disposal facility. We consolidated all of the 300 area operable units so that we could make a decision on what

to do in the 300 area. in stead of piece by piece. We have some milestones for ground work. We're pumping treat systems in both the 100 and the 200 areas. The concept being that we would like to be able to contain the major radioactive and solvent plumes in the 200 area. Contain that so that you don't have as much migration through the ground water pathway out and then expend resources in the clean-up along the river. And to do that, we have to start working on the ground water fairly shortly. And then we decided to look at the Columbia River when we went to the stakeholders, it became very clear that the 2 things that they really wanted us to do action on in environmental restoration were to do whatever we needed to do to protect the Columbia River from contamination from the Hanford site and that means to do some work on the ground water. So these sort of things are coordinated together. And that also includes some pipeline work from the old reactors. We cut off some vent pipes that were sources of contamination and we have an engineering evaluation cost assessment of what to do with the old pipelines themselves that'll be coming out fairly shortly. So with all of that what is the re-focusing effort of environmental restoration? Again, what we're trying to do is to align the base environmental restoration program with the values and goals that we've heard from the stakeholders. The people that we work for in the Pacific Northwest. We want to take a fresh look at the environmental restoration program, the base program, and try to bring that into alignment with what we negotiated last year and what we found were the values, principles and goals out of the stakeholders. Examples, okay, it's a way to prioritize the work essentially, not to walk away from something but to put the prioritization in such that we do things like take care of the Columbia River. What we hope it'll do is improve the near term remediation and de-commissioning progress. In other words, shifting dollars and resources from the characterization activities to

9413286-2086

remediation and de-commissioning. The standard approach to hazardous waste clean-up is you do a lot of characterization up front until you get a high level of confidence of what you're going to do, you write a record of decision which is a binding document, then you go forward and do the clean-up. Well, we feel, we being the Department of Energy and the regulatory agency, they can kick me if I'm speaking out of turn, but I think we feel that there's enough information from the 50 years of work at Hanford plus the 5 or so years of work that we've been doing in environmental restoration, particularly in the 100 area and the 300 area, that we could make significant clean-up decisions now. And what those significant clean-up decisions means a very high burden of resources. That's not just dollars but that's drill rigs and disposal capacity, engineer's time, the time of the union workers that we have. That sort of thing. And we would like to focus our resources on remediation and get away from the characterization and get on with clean-up. So that's the bottom line for what we're trying to do with RER or re-focusing of environmental restoration. I think that pretty well sums up what we're trying to do there. So, Larry, would you have anything else to add from EPA?

LG: Well, I think you've done an adequate job of adjust what we're after within the ER re-focusing. I would point out that what we were negotiating last Summer was, as Mike mentioned, a new batch of work on top of what we have existing. What we're doing in the ER re-focusing is now we're going back to everything that was in the previous TPA and looking at that in the light of the values and what we were negotiating this past Summer and Fall and see how that needs to be re-vamped to make a more coordinated overall picture. So everything within the TPA is being looked at to see if it's consistently moving us along the proper clean-up path. Roger, do you have anything to add or clarify? No. Okay. Do we have any questions on environmental restoration

that we can help you with tonight?

MC: My name is Max Crater and I'm a resident of the Tri-Cities. ??? used to operate different facilities or programs ??? identify the number of programs and sub-programs. I want to focus on the tank waste remediation system. In that you list tank safety, waste retrieval/treatment, ??? waste vitrification plant (HWBP), and I think, the previous speaker indicated that the facility was priority number one as far as approaching the Hanford site. And each of the three activities, I think, are very dependent upon learning what they're going to process, what they're going to treat, what they're going to handle. They already know the physical properties, chemical composition, which falls into the tank characterization effort. Now, I was going to ask the question if you had available the budgets for characterization, for FY '93-'94, the projected for '95 but I think, my question has changed with your latter statement that you want to redistribute funds from characterization to remediation and other activities which, you know I can understand, but I just don't see how you can progress on tank safety, retrieval, treatment and that without understanding what you have and what your treating?

LG: In the point of clarification, is the statements that I was making about getting on with the clean-up and getting away from the characterization and getting more into the remedial action part focuses on the environmental restoration program which is a separate from the tank waste remediation system. What's going on within the walls of the tank and the building of the HWVP and the whole cycle, is outside of the environmental restoration program. The part of the program that I was speaking to tonight is essentially what's in the dirt, what's in the soil, the contamination that's in the ground water. That sort of thing. The same philosophy probably would not hold for the tank wastes that we're

9413286.2088

trying to do with environmental restoration. We've done significant amount of characterization in the soil and in the ground water over the 50 years prior to now plus the 5 years of investigations we've done and we feel that in the 100 area and the 300 area, that we have adequate characterization now to get on with the significant amount of clean-up. But we have the base environmental restoration program which says that we have to do 6 operable unit work plans a year and we have to finish characterization by the year 2005. What we would like to do is switch our resources, money, people, everything, from the characterization to get on with the clean-up of what we know we can make decisions on and to be able to do that we would like to de-emphasis the characterization part, which means that the requirements to do 6 operable unit work plans a year plus the requirement to have all that characterization by 2005 is probably not a good requirement to put on us now. It's a little different.

MP: It might be helpful if someone commented on the tank waste characterization.

NV: ... I didn't see the break down of all levels, but I would like to understand that '93-'94 and projected '95 budget is in the TWRS for tank characterization.

NV: Okay.

MP: We need you on a mike. Get a highlight on the tape, okay.

NV: Max, I've got that detail broken down. I don't have it totaled. If you'd like to spend a few minutes now or later we can go through that.

NV: I want to add, I don't have budget figured for '93, '94, '94 as far as tank characterization but in the broad sense the

reverse it true from what Mike was talking about where in the tank characterization program and especially with construction of a high vit plant now pushed off a ways so that we have more time to focus on pre-treatment and also on tank characterization, there has been a substantial increase in characterization efforts and there will be in the next few years. So we've got that time and in fact, the tank characterization program is not increasing from numbers of core samples that are being taken at the tanks, but is also a program that has been design under what they call the DQO process. The Data Quality Objective. So that it's much more attuned to the needs of individual users. So if sampling is under consideration at a particular tank and DOE and its contract staff know pretty much the type of waste that is in that tank, they can pull the different tank waste organization as far as the pre-treatment people or the waste retrieval people and get a much better understanding of the waste characterization needs before they can actually go into the tank. So we're seeing not only an accelerated rate of work, but I think, work that is much more finely tuned to the actual needs of the program. Budget figures, we'll have to the out of Mr. Peterson here.

MP: Other questions for the whole group before we break into small groups? Go ahead.

WC: My name is Walt Claret, from Kennewick, Washington. I'm also on the Hanford Advisory Board as a Westinghouse alternate. The environmental restoration contract that's going Bechtel. The turn over is July 1. Is this going to have an impact on the milestones that's been clearly identified where the responsibilities lie between what's still Westinghouse and what's Bechtel? And do you foresee any delays or any problems with the turn over?

SW: When the Department of Energy decided to go with the

environmental restoration contractor we made commitments to the regulatory community that would not impact the Tri-party Agreement milestones and in turn, the regulatory community, if I can speak for them, assured us that they would not give us any relief on the milestones because of the turn of the contract. That's solely a DOE responsibility. At this point in time there has not been identified to the Department of Energy any milestones that would be impacted solely due to the turn over from the Westinghouse to the Bechtel community.

NV: Okay. So you don't foresee any change, Steve? ??? Springs. There was four different options on the environmental impact statement, I believe. One was pump and treat. We've taken a good look at not doing the pumping and treating and getting to the root problem which the two cribs itself before we spent \$27 million dollars just to pump and treat for the small amount of strontium that's gone into the Columbia River.

NV: I'll try to be mindful that we're still in negotiations on that but in the end pilot project, the part that we signed up to for the overall management of the "N" area, I think it's fair to say that we've come to agreement. That there is a characterization program that's built into the source terms, the 1301 , 1325 cribs to try to figure out what the vertical distribution of the contaminants are. And that we would use that information to decide on what to do with the waste, there's something like 8000 Curries of radioactive material that were dumped in those cribs. So we're trying to look at what the vertical distribution is of those and how well that's tied to the soil problem. So there is agreement, I think I can say at this point, that we will characterize and decide what to do with the source terms there. Because the Department of Energy stopped discharges to those cribs, to beat our own drum or whatever, we stopped

discharges a year ahead of the Tri-party Agreement milestone. A significant amount of flux of strontium 90 has been reduced from those facilities because you stop the movement of water through the vater zone to the soil column to the ground water. However, there is still, and will continue to be, a significant plume of strontium 90 in the ground water, about 1500 pp Curries per liter on the average, I think. The agencies are through the agreement for the M-14 Settlement. There are three objectives that we have already agreed to do. Okay, which are not under negotiation. We've already agreed to do this as a settlement. The first is to reduce the flux of strontium 90 to the Columbia River, and I think we all feel that that means we will do something pro-actively. That just shutting off the flow, although it's helped, has not done enough at this time to meet that requirement. So we have to do something there for an expedited response action. But there's also two other requirements. And those two other requirements are to evaluate treatment technologies and also to look at the effectiveness of those treatment technologies to be able to decide what an alternate clean-up level might be, other than drinking water standards. With those three objectives in mind, I think we have to look at taking some water out of the ground there, running it through a treatment system to see how well those treatment systems work. So there will have to be, in my mind, I hope I'm not speaking too much because they're still under negotiations, in my mind we do have to look at treatment technologies. We have already signed up to do that. It's just a function of when, how, and what the specifics are. And I think we're coming very close to an agreement on that. However, I'm reluctant to announce what that agreement is here because we haven't finalized it yet. We will, I hope, within the next week.

NV: Okay. So basically it's still being looked at?

NV: Yes, sir.

NV: My concern is that we just pump and treat and the cribs just sit there and the small driver that is there now really isn't worth until we get to the cribs itself. Okay, thank you.

NV: The outer ??? and North Slope was originally to be scheduled to be turned over in October, is that still a good schedule? Are we still going and meet that turn over the lands?

NV: Well, let me clarify the commitment that the Department of Energy made in Amendment 4 of the Tri-party Agreement. What we agreed to do was by October of '94 to complete the clean-up of those lands. There is no commitment on the part of the Department of Energy to turn those lands over to anyone by that date. There are several things that may happen in terms of what happens to that land, but that's out of our hands at this time. There may be a congressional action through the Hanford HEIS, and they go back to the GSA as normal federal lands do. So there's several things can happen there in terms of what the final disposition of the land is. But what the Department of Energy signed up to would be to complete the clean-up efforts by October of '94 and we're going great guns on that right now. And the Waloop Slope or North Slope we're just about completed the first excavation and examination of the major landfill up there. I'm happy to report that we didn't find any surprises there. We do have some petroleum contaminated soils that we have to deal with and a minor amount of hazardous waste perhaps, but no major surprises. We'll be trenching another series of landfills up there to see if that holds true throughout all those burial grounds up there and we're going through the well decommissioning and plugging and we hope to finish everything up there by

October of '94 plus the AL. Right now I don't see anything that would indicate that we will not be able to meet that requirement. We have found one well where there appears to be some hazardous materials in the well casing itself. But we have all indications that well is plugged and the materials at some in the past that were dumped into it were probably contained within the well casing but I think we can handle that surprise without too much of a problem. So I think we will meet that, Okay.

NV: There isn't a real scheduled date to turn over the time it's just a clean-up in October? Okay. Thank you. Excellent clarification. I attended one briefing on the low level waste classification and basically, what they were saying is they were going to bring in two suppliers to make glass but yet they had no specifications for what was required of the glass with constituents that it would contain. Is that still the case? That they're bring in two suppliers just to make glass for the low level waste as a more or less a development? And how can we do that unless we really know what we needed and then approximately tell our suppliers ahead of time?

NV: ... Our plan is to use commercial glass firms to see if they have an effort that will do the job in need. We went out for request for proposals for people to run tests on simulated wastes. Those proposals are currently be evaluated. We hope to write a number of contracts probably more then two. Maybe two to five to test different concepts, to let those contracts, the first in June and have the tests underway by the Fall. We have some preliminary product criteria of what we think we need to meet. They are not finalized. They'll have to be worked on more because part of it has to go with the assessment of how they'll perform in the ground for long time periods. But they're some preliminary criteria that we'll try to meet.

NV: Okay. So there is no firm specifications right now, it's just....?

NV: Not that's been firmly approved, no.

NV: Thank you. Back to Mike.

MP: I'm going to have you move into small groups after we give a bit an explanation of what we'd like you to do in the small groups once you get there. And that is identify questions, concerns, comments that you have in particular about environmental restoration and this re-focusing. But also anything else that's on your minds about the budget and the priorities and the TPA activities as you see them going on. And then as you work in your small groups if you will please have someone who's keeping track of the comments and ideas that come up, and then the last ten minutes or so of your work together I'm going to ask you to pick the two to three most important points that you want to report out. We find that reporting out can get pretty tedious if you report every single thing that was said in your small group. So the challenge is after you spend 20 or so minutes together, to step back and take a look at what came up and agree on what it is that needs that the whole group needs to hear from you that was on your mind as a smaller groups. And we've also got a lot of program people here tonight who are supposed to scatter themselves among the tables. Would those of you who came here having been asked to be available as resource people raise your hands so I know where you are? One, two three. Okay. So if you all, we have more? Good, many, many more. Okay. So, could you keep your hands up, the resource people so that the others of you could join some tables here and make sure that you're distributed? And then I'm going to ask the people who are along the back to come and join some tables. Ideally, there'll be about ten of you at each table so it may take some shifting around.

Is that Steve? What you're going to report out to the whole group? Ready? You're ready? How about the other tables? Are you ready with two or three items to report out?

NV: (Unheard comments from the floor)

MP: Okay. How about this group? Steve, is your group about ready? You about ready to report out? A couple of items? You guys want to come back up front? Or just sit there? Yeah. Larry, are you ready to come back up front? Yes, I know. So let's get a... We have a chance for each group to tell the others what it was that you talked about. What you came up with in the way of issues. Can we get a volunteer to start? Okay. We need to have the other groups quiet. Hello. Don't start till everybody... Hello, hello, hello, hello. Attention to the speaker please.

NV: The first thing we address was a question about whether land use is a ??? question and whether or not future plans allow for residential uses. For example, along the river. Is it already designated that those kinds of level of clean-up are built in and plans are made for that? And the answer's that went along is that there are still questions on there has actually been no consensus reached. There were recommendations made by the future site land use with some general, what we might call agreements. But that no consensus was arrived at. And there's some questions about what kind of technologies can be applied and certainly in some locations. But we were able to clarify for the questioner some of the processes involved in arriving at a record of decision. The other question was when was the budget approved? Steve was able to help to understand a little bit about the budget process and how the 10-1, it can be approved but the final decision may not come until the end of the year or even early in the next year. And that they're now working on the '96 budget. So the whole

process is pretty drawn out and it requires a lot of future projection. And then one questioner, someone who's currently serving on the Hanford Advisory Board, was asking could new priorities that were established or preferred or recommended by the Advisory Board be elevated within the existing budget process, seeing as it has been established in the past and we're working under some of those constraints. And the answer is essentially yes. Although, Steve clarified that is was pretty tricky and difficult process and would probably require some extraordinary circumstances to pass through the congressional process that would be required for those changes to be made.

MP: Thank you, great. Thanks a lot. Let's move on around over her. Maybe we should start cheering and applauding like the folks next door. Hey. We'll make it sound like we're really having fun like they are, right?

NV: Our group came up with essentially two questions. First question is how do you prioritize funding from one program to another program when it is needed? And I think the example that the gentleman gave was in one program we fund an "E" priority instead of funding a "B" priority in a different program. And question number two is what is the criteria for the prioritization of the ER re-focusing and who established it?

MP: Yes. Oh, okay. Does somebody want to take a shot at answering those two questions? Okay.

NV: On the re-focusing of the environmental restoration program, what we tried to do is in the past we had several stakeholder involvement opportunities, the future site use working group and also the stakeholders who helped us through the negotiations last Summer. We tried to utilize their values and goals to develop criteria to help us decide

9602 922 16

what we need to do for the overall program. So we're using those opportunities in the past to guide us and we're also taking this to the Hanford Advisory Board through the last meeting and the meeting coming up next month. The last meeting we talked a little bit about the old values and goals and what they told us was bring us a rock. Tell us specifically what you want to do. Don't try to spoon feed to us back what the values were that we told you before. We want to take the specific actions that the agencies want to do and then we'll tell you as to whether they meet the goals and values of what we've heard in the past from the stakeholders and what they would like in terms of interpretations or new values that the Hanford Advisory Board may wish to come up with.

MP: She's not sure she got the first one answered, I don't think.

NV: No. Are you saying then that you do have a criteria, or is that ever changing when the values changes? Or when someone brings you a new value, do you change the criteria? I mean, do you have something written that says I'm going to do this?

NV: Criteria for what?

NV: For the prioritization.

NV: Oh, for the prioritization of the ER re-focusing. In terms of prioritization within the environmental restoration program, like the rest of the site, we try to take care of the safety of the public and the safety of the workers utmost and first. And then after that, we look at compliance with existing Tri-party Agreement milestones. And then after that, we look at what would be nice to do. And generally by the time we've taken care of the safety and

the Tri-party Agreement milestones the what would be nice to do is generally below the line. So we're trying to realign the Tri-party Agreement milestones so that we can do what the stakeholders have told us they would like us to accomplish in terms of clean-up on the site. That's the real mission of the re-focusing effort. Specific, hard criteria for each individual thing that we do?

NV: Do you have criteria that you ???

NV: Yes. The gentleman's showing me something here. Okay.

NV: I think part of what we were getting at is the follow-up was the presentation showed "A" through "E" Hanford priority criteria. And a person asked the question how can you fund "E" priority activities when you haven't gone through and completed all of your "A" priorities? And the specific example given was, how can you go out there and be building a raft facility and cleaning up potential problems, drums of wastes that haven't leaked to the soil yet, versus leaving waste that's already out there in the soil, i.e. some of the ER areas, and how can you go do wrap and the same time you haven't finished cleaning up all your ERs? So I think the questions was focusing on do you do all of you "A"s first then you "B"s then you "C"s, and the answers is obviously not. Because we do fund some of the "E" activities, the grants, and the post reconstruction and what not.

NV: Well, you may not know enough or you may not have the technology to get in there and do all of your environmental restoration right now, so you have to be focusing on the stuff that you know how to do and that you have scheduled to do. But, I think you're right also, that you don't do "A", "B", "C", and just go down that list like that. There is a trade off between those and you have to have an integrated program to get all the work done.

- MP: So was the sentiment of the group that it should be different? Or was it simply a question?
- NV: It was simply a question.
- MP: Okay. All right. Great. Did we get, I'm lost. Did we get the budget answered? No. Jim's still there. Great.
- NV: It appears that Steve answered what I was, he took the words from my mouth is what I'm trying to say Diana, about the integration process and how that was worked with tasks forces involving Westinghouse, DOE, Bechtel folks to come up with an integrated program that works for the entire site covering all of the needs such as adequate sampling capabilities, that sort of thing. It was simply integration.
- NV: An analogy you might use is that the bottom of the list you see some of the infra-structure things but if you're trying to run a rail road you got to have a rail road track. And I usually consider a rail road track as part of the infra-structure, so that's part of what you need to operate the rail road and, we have pieces of the infra-structure that you're going to have to have on the site, roads, electricity and so on to do that entire program. So you can't just do one without the other. Part of this stuff goes hand and glove.
- MP: I need to stop for a minute and ask if there's a Sara Harns here. No. Okay. She has a message that was brought to us now from 5:45 this afternoon. Okay. Go ahead, come to the mike please.
- NV: For the most part of it we are associated with ??? I did drag someone here from ??? so that's a little refreshing. We have two general areas. One was confusing application

913206-2099

9413286.2100

of the environmental regulations. And we had several instances of this. One was how can you write an RFS on a clean site? And that was to do with ??? Another one is how can DOE be both a PLP and a trustee at the same time. Another one was a record barrier design life is essentially 30 years, but DOE also has responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act to perform ??? which is a totally different design life. How are these things being integrated? The other general topic we had was social legislation and how are these things being rolled into the decision making process. And specific examples of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act we have areas out there that are supposedly of real religious significance. There's also the American Indian Great Repatriation Act. These are not environmental types of legislation but they do affect what goes on. There's an executive order on environmental justice that just came out in the last three months. And a lot of that has to do with how are you impacting the poor or the minorities in you area? And we know from reading the paper that rent control has been an object here in the Tri-cities. They had a meeting, I think, it was Elaine Braves with people. And it was, well, you know, DOE is bring these people in, what are they doing about that. Well, they an executive order here that DOE should be responding to them. I don't know.

TAPE TWO - SIDE A

NV: Well, if we're going to have cheering and clapping here perhaps we should start providing door prizes like they are next door. Maybe a sample from the tank waste or something. Our main issues were: There was a desire for accelerated visible de-contamination and de-commissioning of the buildings, particularly along the Columbia River in the 100 area. It was noted that this could be easily done and be relatively cheap. One issues there is that the buildings aren't actively contributing to the spread of contamination.

Our Second issue dealt with the determination of the end uses of the site. It was noted that this isn't complete and it needs further work so that clean-up standards can be set. Trail blaze our Future Site Uses Working Group report is the current authority and the Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement will further identify land use but further work needs to be done. Also, it's noted that Congress can take action on the Columbia River Corridor. A third issue dealt with the roles of government agencies and contractors on the site. There were questions about the role of the Corps of Engineers in the Ermac contractor. It is noted that the Corps is providing direct support to DOE management and characterizing and remediating all of the work at the Wallop Slope in the 1100 area. But as far as their long term roles, if my notes are right, that the long term roles are depending on performance. One issue was will the new Ermac Contract create a more competitive contracting environment on the site. And if my notes are correct it was thought that that would indeed be the case.

MP: Okay. So that didn't seem to be questions that needed to be answered by folks at the front. You seem to have handled it.

NV: I think that ???

MP: Okay, great. So that's good. Thanks a lot for doing that and what we're going to do now is see if there's anyone that wants to come forward and make any more comments in the control group about concerns that you have, things that you think need to be looked at, final closing comments. ??? All right, Chip, take the mike. Did you want to say something?

NV: It's basically been already been covered by our group but personally I would like to see more de-commissioning work

that's by the river itself. The reason being yes, it doesn't really contribute to the effluents going into the Columbia River but visibility right now is so important to the Hanford site. I personally believe that those reactor building can be torn down for a less than the estimates actually give. I feel the Corps of Engineers put them up there. Let the Corps take them down.

MP: We'll pass that along. Good. Okay. Next comment?

NV: I want to comment on how much nicer it is to come to a meeting where you can actually understand what everybody is saying. ??? This might be a silly question to all of you learned people but to me it's not. I would like to know about ??? the importance of the clean-up and everything that's going on here. ??? is there any research going on anywhere for use of this waste? For positive use of this waste? There is?

GR: I'm sorry. I have a little hearing problem. I didn't understand the question.

MP: It's ongoing for the positive use of the waste, is there, besides just the clean-up, is anyone researching uses for the waste?

GR: There are a number of interesting possibilities. I think one of the most important is the recovery of certain radioisotopes from the stored waste for use in medical purposes. Both diagnostic and curative. There are some very interesting proposals being developed by the various technology people on the site for just this purpose. I am not a total expert in this field but there are some really fascinating prospects here for major improves in both diagnostic procedures and in treatment mechanisms for various forms of cancer. Some extraordinarily interesting

91326218

results have been obtained by medical researchers who have been supplied with various radio-isotopes by the DOE programs, primarily one at Hanford. Depending on how you want to classify waste, most of you heard of the Iazola Project. Use of the plutonium, both from surplus stocks, a major portion of which exist at Hanford, and from the dismantlement of the nuclear weapons stockpiles. This is an extraordinarily controversial subject apparently, if I read the newspapers correctly. But in a era where we see increasing problems in maintaining hydro-electric generated power in this area, and despite many people's feelings that conservation will solve all of our future needs, a number of us, and I am certainly one, would think it very advantageous to make use of that plutonium to recover its energy value. For the moment, that's about all I think I could say about use of the waste.

MP: Would you say your name, too, please? Say you name on the mike, so they know.

GR: Oh, I am Gordon Rogers, a member of the Hanford Advisory Board and these are not to be interpreted as Board positions, they are my own as a private citizen.

MP: Other comments about the researching the uses of waste? No. Okay. Go ahead.

NV: I'm reminded that we had one question come up in our group that we didn't have the answer for maybe someone can help. It is when is the change in the budget to address the spent fuel program? And what is the future of the spent fuel contracting support? Can anyone address that?

MP: ???

NV: Maybe an open question?

NV: I think the budget that DOE is pulling together right now and has just submitted to headquarters, we don't have those figures, but the K-basin or the spent nuclear fuel program is so new that they're just starting to address. ??? funds ??? I don't think we have any of those budget figures. Probably not going to see those for a while but it's just starting to happen. The actual program itself, how many people are working on the spent nuclear fuel program now?

NV: In the project itself, and one of the things that we take great pride in is calling it a project because we believe a project has a defined end where a program goes on forever. But in the project we have somewhere in the order of 350 people. And the majority of those are working at the K-basin to the tune of 250-275 people operating to maintain the basins themselves.

MP: And the question was about the future of the contractor?

NV: Yeah, what kind of contractors ...

NV: I didn't hear.

NV: ??? contractor ???

NV: Oh, what we've done with the project, as far as the solutions go, we brought in one of the organizations now that reports to John Fulton, who is the Project Director. The project has been elevated within the Westinghouse-Hanford Company at the direct report to the President of our Country, or rather Company. One of the things that we're doing is with that project organization we brought P&L in. There's a gentleman by the name of Jerry Efridge who has the charter to go out and find whatever international or domestic technologies are available. We have open discussions right now with the Canadians, The British, we're

9413286.2104

doing some discussions with the French. This afternoon we were looking at some of the sludge and viewing capsulation technology at the British Nuclear Fuels, Limited has and the successes that they've done and try to bring that type of a work slope over to our basins and see if they can help us out. So we're look at various options. A lot of those will depend on what the preferred option is with the EIS (the Environmental Impact Statement). And then what we'll do is try to use whatever technology is available to us to do that as opposed to inventing it ourselves. Did I answer your question?

MP: He's nodding yes and looking like no.

JW: This is another question for Clive before you get away. My name's John Wagoner and I work for the Department of Energy. This question was left by a Mr. Al Bolt earlier. Since the canning or over packing of end reactor fuels is an interim or stop gap measure, as the canned metallic fuel is very likely unacceptable for disposal at the Elko Mountain Repository, when will DOE address the ultimate treatment for final disposal of the end reactor fuel?

CM: I can tell you what we're doing right now, John, as far as the activities that we have in place. We have, not only within Westinghouse and P&L, studies going on for the various options that we have available to us for the interim storage whether it's dry storage, wet storage, over packing the field. The DOE also has an independent group that they've brought in from the outside to evaluate the alternatives. I cannot comment any farther on past what the interim storage is because that's where our first priority is right now as far as to stabilize the fuel, get it into an interim storage capability so that one of the Yucca Mountain or where ever it does, that we are able to shift it down there.

MP: We were trying to get Mr. Wagoner to the mike and he declined so at least someone got you there, right? Okay. Other questions or comments? Great. Thanks a lot for coming. ???

End of Recording

9413286.2106