

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Revised Meeting Summary
November 5-6, 1998
Richland, Washington

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

Executive Summary	i
Announcements Made Throughout the Meeting	1
Welcome and Introductions.....	1
Approve September Meeting Summary	3
Office of River Protection	4
K Basins/Spent Fuel	7
Public Comment.....	9
TWRS – Program	9
TWRS – Vitrification.....	11
Perspectives of Heather Holben	16
Environmental Restoration Status.....	16
Key HAB Policy Issues	18
Public Comment.....	20
FY99 Budget Allocation	21
HAB Committee FY99 Work Plans.....	23
Possible Updates	24



Note: Attachments are numbered according to the order they are mentioned in the summary. The attachments that were distributed at or before the Hanford Advisory Board are not routinely distributed with this summary. If you need a copy of an attachment, please request it from Donna Sterba at Technical Resources International, 509-943-5319, or Enid Reck at Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc., 509-376-5856.

Executive Summary

OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION

The Board discussed the Office of River Protection (ORP), which was created in FY99 appropriations legislation and is intended to be a small, focused, self-contained office responsible for all of the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) program. Three senior executive positions will be created to lead the ORP, including the ORP manager, a tank farms assistant manager, and a privatization assistant manager. The ORP manager will report directly to EM-1 and will be responsible for hiring the remaining staff; the need for 29 additional staff has been identified by DOE-RL. An executive board will be established to provide additional management attention at the Secretarial level. The ORP is not expected to affect the Tri-Party Agreement. The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) supports creation of the ORP and the opportunity it provides to accomplishing environmental goals.

The Board discussed a number of issues and questions surrounding the ORP and agreed to add this to the agenda for the next meeting and to potentially consider input to the 90-day implementation plan being developed by DOE.

K BASINS/SPENT FUEL

The Board heard about the revised Spent Fuel baseline. Improved baseline controls have decreased budgetary needs by \$18 million in the past year and baseline estimates have been aligned with Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board milestones. The FY99 budget is \$173 million, which is \$38 million short of the requested \$211 million. The total cost estimate for the work previously discussed under the baseline is \$1.586 billion and incorporation of transition activities increased the total estimate to \$1.7 billion. The project has been extended by 23 months, with the start date for fuel removal occurring 16 months later than originally planned. Progress is being made on construction of the Canister Storage Building, the Cold Vacuum Drying process, fuel retrieval equipment, and the Multi-Canister Overpack load-out system and all construction is scheduled to be completed by the end of FY99. EPA is continuing to work closely with the project on cost control, schedule commitments, and resolution of issues such as sludge treatment and disposition.

TWRS

The Board was briefed on the agreement between the Secretary of Energy and Washington State to enter into a consent decree on single-shell tank stabilization. A joint agency technical team, including DOE, Ecology and contractors, is developing a work schedule that should be completed by mid-December and will be incorporated in the consent decree upon completion of public review. The TPA agencies are also negotiating an approach to integrating groundwater/vadose zone integration activities in the tank farms with the development of closure plans. The Board also received reports on a General Accounting Office investigation and a House Commerce Committee hearing on Hanford's tank waste program.

The Board discussed and approved the establishment of a Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee to address issues in the next 6-24 months relating to TWRS vitrification, including TPA negotiations, 30% design, regulatory submittals, and negotiation of the Phase B2 contract for construction and operation of a vitrification plant. The ad hoc committee will develop a work plan and work with the Executive Committee on funding needs.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STATUS

The status of the Environmental Restoration Program was reviewed by the Board. Accomplishments since 1994 include the deletion of the 1100 Area and partial deletion of the North Slope and ALE from the National Priorities List, start of full-scale remediation along the River, the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, N Reactor deactivation, C Reactor interim safe storage, and pump and treat systems for five groundwater plumes. HAB advice is needed on future uses for the 200 Areas, including what constitutes a successful cleanup for the 200 Area, acceptable scenarios for groundwater containment and protection, requirements for workers, institutional controls, and implications for technology development. Board advice is also needed on disposal options for difficult wastes, including fuel spacers, failed pumps and equipment, long-length equipment from single-shell tanks, and other highly radioactive materials. Other future issues include what to do with mixed wastes for which there is no effective treatment and technology development relating to the vadose zone.

KEY HAB POLICY ISSUES/ COMMITTEE WORK PLANS

The Board reviewed its activities on key policy issues identified at its workshop in December 1998 and affirmed that it will continue to focus on tank waste vitrification, spent fuel, budgets, managing for results, intersite waste transfers, protection of the River, worker safety, and high-risk facilities in FY99. The Board discussed the need to look more closely at the tribal nation treaty rights and to review cleanup standards, including exposure scenarios, risk assessments, and future land uses.

The Board also reviewed draft work plans for FY99 prepared by each of the committees and identified several additional items for committee consideration.

FY99 BUDGET ALLOCATION

Final numbers for the FY99 budget allocation are not yet available, but the Board learned that EM received all but \$5 million of the \$5.607 billion requested from Congress. DOE-RL's request was \$1.005 billion (18% of the EM request), excluding privatization and its share of national programs. The FY99 budget is now broken into different control points, including closure projects, project completion, and post-2006. An additional \$15 million was allocated for tank farm operations and interim safe storage of the reactors. On the privatization account, DOE-RL was reduced by \$230 million from the DOE-RL request. EPA and Ecology are concerned about DOE-HQ taxes, the vadose zone money from DOE-HQ, shortfalls in the outyears, and the commitment to privatization.

The Smith rider in the FY99 appropriations set a target for PHMC overhead reductions, required use of the savings for additional cleanup, and called for a Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) review. DOE has been doing all of these things for the past 2-4 years. Last year's PHMC's

performance agreements resulted in a \$20 million cost savings. The FY98 baseline for overheads was \$273 million but the actual costs were \$255 million. For FY99, the baseline is \$253 million and there is a performance agreement to pay fee if costs are reduced to \$225-240 million. The Dollars and Sense Committee will continue to monitor the progress on this issue but is pleased with the progress made.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Draft Meeting Summary
November 5-6, 1998
Richland, Washington

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

Thursday, November 5, 1998

The meeting was called to order by Chair Marilyn Reeves, Oregon League of Women Voters (Public-at-Large). The meeting was open to the public. Four public comment periods were provided at 11:45 a.m. on Thursday and Friday, at 4:45 p.m. on Thursday, and at 4:00 p.m. on Friday.

Members present are listed in *Attachment 1*, as are members of the public and others attending. Board seats not represented were: Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental), Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local/Regional Public Health), and University of Washington (University).

Announcements Made Throughout the Meeting

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

- John Wagoner, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), announced that the new President of BNFL is Landon Langley. John has worked with Langley, who used to be with Bechtel, for many years and praised him as an outstanding manager.
- Gail McClure, DOE, announced that Barbara Fox is the new person handling the Board's travel and she can be reached at (509) 376-7052.

AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Norm Buske was introduced as the new alternate to Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force). Don Worden (Public-at-Large) has proposed an alternate, Pat Kenny, who was also introduced.

Marilyn Reeves suggested the goal of this meeting is to define the Board's focus for the coming year, including an understanding of the scope of work and the means by which the Board will address the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) vitrification effort.

Meeting with the Secretary

Marilyn Reeves reported that she, Gerry Pollet, Pam Brown, George Kyriazis, Madeleine Brown, and Shelley Cimon met briefly with Secretary Richardson. Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste

Board (State of Oregon), said she talked about the Columbia River and the need to protect it, budgets, and the groundwater/vadose zone integration project. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), added that Secretary Richardson complained that everyone wants more money, and Gerry reminded him that this is a level budget (in effect, a declining budget). He noted the Secretary has a real sense of ownership of these boards. George Kyriazis, City of Kennewick (Local Government), added that Richardson talked about fighting for DOE budgets, and he believes Richardson will be a strong advocate for DOE's budget. Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), added Richardson was asked to get directly involved in the treatment of the tank wastes. She noted he expressed concern about terrorist threats to fissile materials. Madeleine Brown, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), noted she respects the radiological hazards, but the industrial hazards scare her most. She urged stable funding for reactor cocooning to avoid the cost and safety risks of having to lay off people and bring them back.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), added the Hanford public interest groups met with the Secretary. The money issue was most disturbing since he did not think Richardson would be a champion for adequate funding. Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business Interests), said he felt sure Richardson was working with the Office of Management and Budget to get FY2000 funding.

Health of the Site Report

Merilyn Reeves noted her support of continuing the Health of the Site meetings. The public involvement session in which she participated was very good, and the possibility for cross fertilization exists. She told the group that the Center for Risk Excellence (CRE) and the National Institute of Safety and Health had prepared a draft risk assessment on Hanford and will be working on the groundwater and vadose zone programs. She suggested the Board ask CRE to describe what they are doing and why. Lynne Stembridge, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organizations), expressed her opinion that the conference suffers from being all things for all people and becomes a series of sound bites as a result. She expressed concern about how much money the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) is spending and what they are doing. She did not feel comforted by the Health of the Site, and complained there are federal groups not receiving funding, like the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). Merilyn informed the group that there are letters in the packet from the Savannah River Citizens Advisory Board documenting their concerns about CRESP. Greg deBruler added he went to the CRESP annual meeting and found that CRESP has not done an effective job of communicating their study results. Merilyn suggested that Board members get more involved in next year's conference.

Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs' Meeting

Merilyn Reeves reported on the SSAB Chairs' meeting. She felt the substance and degree of understanding of the overall issues by the board representatives is much improved. She was impressed that Savannah River and Idaho want to discuss equity issues. Savannah River will host the next SSAB meeting on transportation, and both Idaho and Hanford will host one as well. She noted that there is a distinct difference in the way the different Boards are viewed. Gerald Boyd,

DOE-HQ, did a presentation on the round-robin in which five DOE office managers have been meeting at the individual sites. This is the first time a major effort has been made for site managers to understand each others' problems. She felt strongly that John Wagoner has a great deal of knowledge of the other sites that other site managers do not necessarily share. George Kyriazis said he is impressed at DOE-HQ's flexibility and willingness to have more SSAB meetings. Marilyn noted that a new Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management will be appointed by January or February. A letter drafted by Bill Pardue, Oak Ridge, will be sent then to request a meeting with the SSAB chairs as a nationwide representative group. The Board was provided a copy of this letter (*Attachment 2*).

Todd Martin, Hanford Education Action League (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organizations), asked about the breadth of the equity discussions. Marilyn said she did not recall a distinct discussion about it, but thinks the Savannah River and Idaho representatives know exactly what equity means.

Administrative Matters

Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues, said that the extended schedule for Board and committee meetings over the next year is in the packet, along with suggested dates for Executive Committee conference calls. Two errors should be noted: the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Public Involvement meeting and Public Involvement Committee meetings December 2 will be in Portland, not in Richland, and the July TPA Quarterly and Public Involvement Committee meetings will be on July 14.

Max Power, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), noted that affirmations of appointments to the Board will have to be done by the various organizations by the end of December. Nominations will also be solicited for two current Board vacancies: Public-at-Large and University.

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, provided the questionnaire for the Board's FY98 self-evaluation and asked that completed questionnaires be returned to EnviroIssues by November 20. A request was made that a complete set of the comments made be included along with the summary of the results.

AGENDA ITEM #2: APPROVE SEPTEMBER MEETING SUMMARY

Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), asked that the statement on pages iii and 33 that "public participation has been key to the activities conducted to date" identify the speaker.

Gordon Rogers (Public-at-Large) requested that the statement on page iii be modified to say "frustration at the report of the potential dismissal of Bob Alvarez." Page 2 should clarify that Tom Woods is resigning as a representative of the Yakama Indian Nation. He also asked that page 36 be amended to say "Gordon Rogers noted that he has attempted to obtain a Tri-Cities representative on the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) team. When requests were ignored, he asked Martin Bensky to attend CRCIA meetings as an observer."

Marilyn Reeves asked that on page 2 it be noted that Tom Engel, University of Washington (University), will be on sabbatical. Page 6 should be changed to indicate that Shelley Cimon

attended only the San Diego intersite workshop and Susan Leckband, Non-Union Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), attended only the Chicago workshop. Marilyn asked that Beth Bennington be identified as the WIPP representative on page 6. Page 7 should be corrected to note that there were other representatives from DOE's Nuclear Energy program and to state that Paige Leven, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), rather than Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), attended the Chicago workshop. Finally, she asked that page 15 state that Walter Howes is with the DOE-HQ Office of Contract Reform.

Dick Belsey, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), expressed concern that the notes contain information on discussions and presentations on the groundwater/vadose zone integration effort that occurred when the Board did not have a quorum, and suggested that these discussions not be included in the notes. Considerable discussion ensued over the Board's transacting business when a quorum is not present. Marilyn Reeves noted that she was not aware that members would be leaving the meeting, which is contrary to a "no surprises" norm important to the Chair for conduct of the meeting. Several members said they expected the meeting to be adjourned once it was noted that there no longer was a quorum. Others noted that it is common parliamentary procedure that a meeting can continue on an informational basis without a quorum so long as no actions are taken. Marilyn Reeves suggested that the meeting notes reflect the fact that there no longer was a quorum but discussion continued on an informational basis only and no actions were taken by the remaining members, in accordance with the Charter, which specifies "in no instance shall the Board convey consensus policy advice, or characterize its advice as being a consensus of the Board, unless there exists a quorum of at least half of the non-ex-officio members or alternates in attendance at the meeting at which consensus is being determined."

AGENDA ITEM #3: OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION (ORP)

Doug Riggs, former staff to Representative Hastings, provided an overview of the legislative history of ORP. In 1994, a number of disturbing events occurred, including DOE layoffs, the Blush report on DOE management problems, and a new Congress unfamiliar with DOE's cleanup efforts. In this environment, Representative Hastings went to the Congressional leadership and, as a result, a task force was created to review the DOE cleanup program. Approximately 24 meetings were held over the next several years, including several with Board members and the Attorney General, to determine how to restructure DOE's management to more effectively deal with cleanup. The result was a 1995 report that recommended increased authority at a local level, increased accountability, reduced red tape, and stable funding. The task force found that DOE does not have a good track record for managing large-scale projects (e.g., Defense Waste Processing Facility at Savannah River, Pit 9 at Idaho, and K Basins at Hanford). Problems included no clear chain of command, too many managers, and no accountability when things went wrong. The findings of this task force have a direct impact on the tank project at Hanford, which is the biggest environmental problem facing the nation.

Doug explained that the ORP was designed to be a small, focused, self-contained office of top-level professionals. It is not intended to be a second set of DOE officials on top of existing officials, but is to be an office that replaces other managers and staff. The ORP manager will be responsible for hiring the rest of the team and will report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Environmental

Management (EM-1). Both the Secretary and Assistant Secretary have agreed to give top-level management attention to this. The ORP name was chosen because members of Congress understand the meaning of river protection, but do not necessarily understand what the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) is. There has been strong bipartisan support for the ORP in Congress, and members have said that no steady funding will occur without a new approach.

John Wagoner provided an overview of how DOE will implement the ORP. The ORP will be responsible for the entire tank waste program, but not Spent Nuclear Fuel, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration, etc. It will include the TWRS work performed under the Project Hanford Management Contract (PHMC) as well as the BNFL vitrification contract. The Regulatory Unit will be outside its jurisdiction and continue to report directly to John. DOE is creating an executive board to provide additional management attention for the Secretary. There will likely be regular project review meetings with this board because of the numerous important deliverables over the next two years.

John Wagoner explained that the ORP will be an independent office, but it will not be independent of the direction of the vadose zone project. Integration needs to occur in this area, including work relating to past tank leaks. John is responsible for the PHMC and a significant part of that is TWRS; the PHMC will not be split into a separate section. The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) was signed by the manager of DOE-RL, who is responsible for all compliance requirements, including those for tank wastes; creation of the ORP is not expected to change that. He noted that a duality exists in the reporting relationship of this project to the manager of DOE-RL and to the Assistant Secretary and a Memorandum of Understanding is being developed to define these details. Programmatic responsibility will be at the Assistant Secretary level. Staffing of the project will be completed by the end of the year. Individuals both within and outside of DOE are being considered. The structure will include a manager, two assistant managers (for privatization and Jackson Kinzer, DOE-RL, for tank farms), and two experts on project financing. An additional 29 people are needed to staff the office. A report is to be provided to Congress within 90 days on the ORP management plan.

Jeff Breckel, Ecology, noted that Ecology regulates the environment, not management practices, so they did not give input on the decision to create the ORP. Ecology recognizes the importance of DOE's management changes to accomplishing environmental goals and the opportunity that ORP offers to strengthen the TWRS program. Ecology has observed the need for a fully integrated management plan and structure, as well as the large impact of D.C. on the EM program. Ecology has urged DOE-HQ to become more actively involved in the program and both the Governor and Attorney General met with Secretary Peña to urge him to be an advocate for the project. Jeff added that the ORP provides an opportunity to put in place a strong and effective management structure and provides the Secretary an opportunity to ensure that there are adequate resources. Also, the ORP will ensure TWRS a high profile before DOE-HQ. In his opinion, there should be an office vested in the success of the program. Ecology has long sought an integrated management plan that encompasses all of the tank waste programs. If the two current contracts—PHMC and BNFL-- are to work, there must be a seamless relationship between the two. The project needs to be managed at the site with a strong involvement with DOE-HQ. Ecology fully supports the strong ties being developed between DOE-RL and DOE-HQ as a result of ORP.

Board Discussion

Merilyn Reeves said she spoke at the Health of Site meeting on her personal perspective of the risks involved at the site. She said failure of the tank vitrification effort is the biggest risk and she views the creation of the ORP as an opportunity to succeed.

Gerry Pollet asked about the issue of compliance and its relationship to budget authority and the Integrated Priority List. He said the ORP appears inconsistent with ensuring local authority in determining budgets and asked who will be responsible for allocating the money and making decisions on tank pumping. He expressed concern that when TWRS makes a decision to not pump a tank, the Groundwater/Vadose Zone program has no authority over that. Doug Riggs replied that the intent is not to take resources away from other projects but to give TWRS credibility to succeed. He said DOE is being urged to pick the best people and let them integrate the programs; it was recommended that DOE put these people in one place and cut any unnecessary bureaucracy. The legislation did not specify how budget authority is to be handled. John Wagoner added that no agreement has been reached on this subject. He noted that \$302 million was requested for FY99 for TWRS operations, and there are requirements totaling more than that. Decisions still need to be made whether to allocate any more of the \$1.005 billion to TWRS; Congress did not create a separate budget appropriation for the ORP.

Paige Knight expressed concern that ORP can hire great management but still have workers who are not committed to the project. She commented that ORP is very confusing, and suggested that a chart comparing it with the current structure would be helpful. She also expressed concern with the BNFL contract, and with their handling of public relations, leaks and infractions of basic environmental rules in the United Kingdom. She urged good oversight and public relations and extra funding for the Board.

Norm Buske, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), expressed concern about what would not be covered by the ORP. He said river protection requires looking at the vadose zone, groundwater, and then tanks in an integrated manner. To protect the River, new sources cannot be added, which means no Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF). Norm stated, "John Wagoner described step by step how DOE-RL would continue it's past practices and make ORP fail, thus frustrating the intent of Congress and the American taxpayer. On that basis ORP should not be funded." He does not see that people are serious about taking the steps to protection that will make a difference. Money is still being spent on operational work rather than on effective protection measures.

Wayne Martin, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked if Representative Hastings has succeeded in convincing Congress that the tanks are the single largest problem facing the country today. Doug Riggs replied that members of Congress are becoming convinced of the tanks' importance. Wayne asked that Doug carry back the message that the Board has said this is a legacy left in the region from national security efforts and should be cleaned up as quickly as they made the bomb (i.e., 2 years).

Todd Martin added that the Board serves as a good institutional memory for the cleanup, and that the ORP is not necessarily a bad move. He noted that managerial accountability is not purely a

function of management structure but has more to do with the willingness within the system to hold others accountable. He commented that TWRS was created in 1991 in the name of integration, and that only one DOE Assistant Manager oversaw one contractor working on it but now there are at least 3 entities overseeing half a dozen contractors. He asked how many positions will be dissolved when the 29 ORP positions are filled. John Wagoner responded that the 29 new positions would be an increase in the federal resources to oversee the BNFL contract.

George Kyriazis commended DOE and Congress for making this a priority item, and expressed concern with DOE's ability to manage the project primarily because of the uncertainty surrounding management at the ORP. He commented that 29 more people means another \$6 million per year to oversee the contract and said it is time that this project should be run making BNFL accountable without needing 200 DOE employees to ensure that. Doug Riggs responded that he perceives inconsistencies between Congressional intent and the way DOE is discussing the project office. The goal is to have a small group in the ORP that is talented and focused on the project and is not convinced of the need for 29 people. John Wagoner responded that supervision of the contractor is necessary to ensure the government's requirements are delivered. George agreed, but said the question is not whether supervision should occur, it is how many individuals are needed.

Dick Belsey expressed his belief that communications with projects tied to DOE-HQ has been ineffective. He asked Board members to remember that their advice is for the two regulatory agencies and DOE, which includes DOE-HQ. The Board's task is to find a department within DOE to effectively direct the Board's information to the appropriate parties.

Norma Jean Germond (Public-at-Large) expressed her desire that DOE keep some oversight of the financing and asked John Wagoner the source of funding for 29 people. John replied that funding for federal employees comes from another account, and commented that the government is going to need the right number of appropriately qualified people to carry out its functions.

Merilyn Reeves proposed that this be an agenda item for December and that members should try to get questions focused for that meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #4: K BASINS/SPENT FUEL

Charlie Hansen, DOE, provided a status report on the Spent Nuclear Fuel Project (*Attachment 3*). He said the need for an additional \$18M was eliminated this past year due to improving baseline control. He said progress is being made, performance has improved, and there is a clear direction. Good baseline estimates have been lined up with TPA and Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) commitments. Independent reviews were conducted and critical analyses have been reviewed with the contractor. Negotiations with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have been completed, advancing the start of fuel removal by two months and the end of the project by eight months. A contingency analysis has been done and the contractor is now 90% confident it can deliver the project within the projected costs. In sum, about \$500 million were added to the costs, which can be broken down into critical path schedule extension, refined cost estimates, and contingency.

Charlie said the project has been stretched out by 23 months, with the start occurring 16 months later than originally planned, and fuel retrieval will take longer than planned. There is still no accurate model of how to remove fuel with so many new systems coming on line. Fuel removal from the two basins will be staggered and contingency for weather delays has been added. The total estimate for the work previously discussed under the baseline is \$1.586 billion; most changes are in operations and fuel removal. Contingency (\$98 million) will be managed as a single pot through baseline change control and will require DOE-RL and contractor approval. He said the entire project team supports the baseline estimates. EPA was involved in establishing the baseline, and DOE, EPA, and Fluor Daniel Hanford (FDH) have committed to a continual improvement process. Contract incentives include penalties for failure to meet all TPA milestones, including placing profits at risk if major milestones are missed and reductions in project costs are not achieved. The FY99 budget includes \$173 million rather than the \$211 million needed. They have found ways to cut back expenses to meet this appropriation, but to continue to achieve cost savings, \$21million per year will need to be saved.

Nancy Williams, FDH, gave an update on the progress being made. At the Canister Storage Building, they are six weeks ahead of schedule, and a significant recent success was the completion of the skid for the Cold Vacuum Drying process. They are conducting practice and training on the fuel retrieval system and will move the equipment from the 300 Area and install it in the Basins this year. They are installing the queue for the baskets in the fuel basin. The Multi-Canister Overpack load-out system is being tested now. Fabrication of 30 of the fuel baskets is completed.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, reported a negotiated settlement of the TPA dispute has been reached. This included the change package for Milestone 34 and the framework for project improvement. Everyone is working towards a single schedule, cost and scope. There has been progress over the last month, and EPA continues to work closely with the project to investigate issues like sludge treatment and disposition. There have been meetings on cost control and commitments to a schedule.

Board Discussion

Jim Watts, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), expressed concern about the 36-month training schedule, given the employees are no longer on the site and hiring is being delayed. Nancy Williams explained staff may be coming from other locations on site and not all the details have been worked out. She recognized that training programs are expensive and take over a year. She further explained that a rotational program will be kept alive through the life of the fuel removal activities. Merilyn Reeves suggested the Board follow up on this issue in December.

George Kyriazis noted that John Wagoner made this a top priority a couple years ago and while there is more comfort with the cost estimate, time will tell. Pam Brown commented this project started positively, but has been spiraling downhill. She is encouraged with the current status, but has been disappointed before. She said there still is a management concern and the contractor has not brought in the necessary talent. Charlie Hansen responded that FDH and Duke continue to bring more talent to the project. No big management changes will occur at this stage, as continuity and understanding of the problem is very important. Pam replied that sludge was never part of the project and remains a large and unresolved issue. She suggested that they call it K Basins II so that

people recognize that the scope has changed. Charlie replied that sludge was covered in the December baseline change, and that they have separated the costs from the whole project into construction, operations and cleanup phases; sludge is part of the \$1.7 billion. Doug Sherwood explained the importance of meeting CERCLA objectives during the cleanup of the K Basins; it is not just fuel removal, but they must mitigate the potential for the basins to release contaminants in the future. This requires cleaning up fuel, sludge, debris and water.

Harold Heacock asked the source of the \$1.7 billion and requested a DOE analysis of the cash flow against the rest of the sites' requirements and what will have to give. Charlie Hansen replied that during TPA negotiations, they determined that the spent fuel remained one of the urgent problems to be addressed. They do not know a way to save money or mitigate the risk without continuing on the present plan. A major part of the \$1.7 billion now includes the transition scope of work as well as sludge, water and fuel. A commitment was made to the regulators to continue improvements on the cost and schedule baseline.

Merilyn Reeves noted that Duke testified before Congress that they could do this for \$1.4 billion and asked whether they plan to go back to Congress to explain the difference in cost. Charlie Hansen explained that letters were exchanged agreeing to the commitment and that the contract changes will be made this month. Merilyn suggested an update be included on the December agenda. She asked when and how a way to more effectively manage sludge removal and treatment will be found. Doug Sherwood responded that the projected costs for the sludge and debris are about \$70 million; a meeting is set up to explore other options for sludge treatment. The timing of the sludge treatment also needs to be explored. Currently, it will start after fuel retrieval is complete, but it costs \$10 million per month, so reducing the time by a month could save a lot of money.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government Interests), asked if the engineering and regulatory requirements are at a point that this estimate can be trusted. Charlie said the issues are defined, but regulatory interpretation and implementation is always the difficult part. Because of fast-tracking, the designs were always immature. All of those issues must be resolved in the next six months. Jerry noted that the safety basis may be higher and more expensive when it is developed at the same time as construction. Charlie Hansen responded that they evaluated the risks and considered them low enough to proceed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gai Oglesbee expressed concern that the public is taking a risk and referenced the Board's self-evaluation results relating to public comment. She commented that she attended the Health of the Site meeting and talked to several downwinders and members of the public. These individuals were not happy with the conference. She also expressed concern that the tank waste meeting the previous day was at a DOE building, which made it difficult for the public to attend.

AGENDA ITEM #5a: TWRS PROGRAM

TWRS Interim Stabilization

Roger Stanley, Ecology, reported that Washington State has been very concerned with the slow progress being made on the stabilization of single-shell tanks. The State has stepped outside the TPA framework and told DOE it was going to insist on a schedule that was laid out in a consent decree. The language of this consent decree has been largely agreed upon, short of the actual work schedule. A technical team which includes DOE, contractors and Ecology is working on a work schedule, and expects to reach agreement by mid-December; at that point, the work schedule will be inserted into the already-negotiated consent decree, go for public comment, and then to the courts. At the same time, a TPA change package to remove M-41 would go for public comment as well. The technical team is looking at optimizing the interim stabilization schedule by focusing first on the tanks with the highest risks. If the environmental risk can be reduced early in the overall project schedule, the end date of the entire project becomes less important.

Board Discussion

Gerry Pollet said getting this decree is an incredible accomplishment and should have visible funding results with Congress. Unilateral decisions to not pump tanks are now highly unlikely. He pointed to Tank B-111 as an example of why a consent decree is good, since a decision to not pump was made despite evidence that a 2500 gallon leak had occurred. Tony Valero, Ecology's Project Manager for TWRS storage, explained that the issue of whether B-111 is truly a leaker was still in question, and that monitoring over several months is necessary before such a determination can be made. Gerry responded that DOE signed a document indicating that there was a 58% chance of a leak in B-111, and questioned why an emergency pump-out process is not in use. Dick Belsey added that the issue is not whether to pump, but the incident reaction. Greg deBruler expressed concern that DOE did not bring this tank to the Board's attention when the alleged leak occurred. Norm Buske noted that a 58% change that it is a leaker suggest good odds that it is and urged taking care of it now. Mike Payne, Lockheed Martin Hanford Co., explained that B-111 was already identified as a leaker and it was interim stabilized and the liquid was pumped previously. It is possible that some liquid around the salt well leaked out. They do not yet know how to pump a tank that has already been pumped without potentially putting more waste into the environment.

Emmett Moore, Washington State University (University), asked whether Ecology is beginning to withdraw regulatory aspects from the TPA and handle them separately. Roger Stanley replied yes.

TPA Negotiations on Tank Farms Groundwater/Vadose Zone

Roger Stanley explained that the TPA negotiators are trying to pull groundwater/vadose zone activities into a regulatory process to address vadose zone contamination in the tank farm areas as well as closure of tank farms. This includes pulling together fragmented pieces such as groundwater compliance monitoring, Hanford Tanks Initiative, and the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration project. They are trying to identify near-term corrective actions to control run-on and run-off from tank farms. One of the main activities is to look at the regulatory processes that can be utilized. The tank farms themselves are classified as hazardous waste disposal facilities under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). Addressing groundwater and vadose zone contamination will require dovetailing RCRA corrective actions with overall closure activities for tank farms. They are working with the overall sitewide integration program to coordinate overall characterization of the tank farms.

Tanks Closure Workshop

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Indian Nation (Tribal Governments), reported on a tank closure workshop held in Las Vegas in October. The workshop focused on closure of tanks, which involves steps to reduce liquids in tanks and treat and dispose of the waste. In some cases, this is done in situ and, in others, the liquid will be treated and shipped to a high-level waste repository. A considerable amount of progress is being made with the closure programs (e.g., three tanks have been closed at Savannah River). He added there was a recognition that Hanford's tanks are a lot more complicated.

Board Discussion

Ken Niles asked if other sites' closure activities are setting a precedent and would they also achieve Washington requirements. Mike Wilson, Ecology, explained that Savannah River simply poured cement in their tanks, and now they cannot get approval of their closure. Todd Martin noted that they have been having problems getting approval even after they got pre-approval.

Pam Brown said that the Site Technology Coordination Group task forces on tanks at the various sites are well integrated and have good communication regarding technology developments. Merilyn asked that this be in the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee work plan.

AGENDA ITEM #5b: TWRS—VITRIFICATION

TPA Agreement in Principle

Roger Stanley, Ecology, reported on the status of TPA negotiations on an Agreement in Principle relating to modifications for TWRS vitrification (*Attachment 4*). He explained that the TPA stands as an administrative order under RCRA and the State Hazardous Waste Management Act. Two basic TPA requirements pertain to privatization. The primary path calls for treating low activity waste by 2002, and the alternate path pushes the deadline to 2003. He noted the TWRS program was not rebaselined during the privatization negotiations, and DOE has not complied with either the primary or alternate path requirements. The State fully supports the privatization contract with BNFL, but it is not in the TPA. Ecology's principal concerns include the effectiveness of renegotiating another set of TPA milestones, focusing near-term negotiations on the coming 24-33 month period, the Phase 2 negotiations that are driving tank waste processing facility construction and operations, and adjusting other impacted TPA work. Near-term negotiations should focus on the initial contract and successful issuance of a contract authorization for construction and operation of DOE's Phase 1 tank waste-processing complex. Focus should also be placed on DOE and PHMC activities to ensure timely delivery of tank waste to BNFL. Phase II negotiations should drive tank waste processing complex construction and operations as well as adjust other TPA tank cleanup work elements such as double-shell tank capacity and single-tank waste retrieval. These should not wait a couple of years.

Roger said the TPA negotiators are working on an Agreement in Principle (AIP) between DOE, Ecology, and EPA to govern the negotiations. The draft is designed and they are waiting for DOE

comments. It then will be shared with stakeholders and comments taken before it is finalized. Negotiations will be conducted in an iterative process in parallel with discussion with the HAB, Tribes, Oregon, and public interest groups. Public informational notices will be provided during the negotiations and public comment and meetings will be conducted.

Board Discussion

Pam Brown said the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee is concerned about the integration between readiness-to-proceed and the BNFL contract. The two contracts have different incentives and that may create problems. She said the biggest hurdle is adequate funding for Lockheed Martin. Marilyn Reeves recalled that the readiness to proceed presentations indicated that in order to get the tank wastes ready, they would probably need new tanks. Others may be needed for storage. She noted the Paulson report said if treatment does not happen soon, new tanks will be needed.

Harold Heacock noted that Al Conklin, Washington Department of Health (WDOH), previously said construction could not start until air quality permits had been obtained and that would require 100% design. Gail Laws, WDOH's lead permit writer for privatization, said she has met with BNFL and discussed WDOH requirements and the design issue. The parties are reaching an understanding that WDOH will have what they need. Marilyn Reeves asked if the requirements for the design for air pollution controls will be 100%, and Gail responded yes.

Debra McBaugh, WDOH, noted that the course of work is often changed because of internal schedules and asked if the milestones are unrealistic. Roger Stanley responded that there has not been enough effort to line up the baselines. Russell Jim, Yakama Indian Nation (Tribal Governments), expressed appreciation for the negotiators' work with the tribes. He added that the risk assessment methods developed so far in this country are not adequate to address cultures.

TWRS Planning Group Meeting

Louise Dressen noted that in September the Board discussed how it wanted to deal with the TWRS vitrification effort and made a decision to have a small group of members develop a recommendation. Todd Martin reported on the November 4 meeting on this (*Attachment 5*). The group suggested a Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee, and its mission should reflect the Board's discussion in September. It would address those activities that support tank waste treatment but not include tank farm operations. The committee would be ad hoc in nature and operate for a limited time. It would be reevaluated annually, and membership would be similar to other committees. The committee would identify show-stoppers and call on other committees for help with these. He urged the need to push forward on the work and announced a kickoff meeting was scheduled for November 9.

Board Discussion

Russell Jim asked when the tribes would be involved. Todd said they would be involved as they are involved with the Board and other committees. Marilyn Reeves added that she strongly supports a structure that allows individuals to decide if they participate. She also said the Board has never

made hard and fast rules about which topics are discussed in each committee and the Board needs to maintain that flexibility.

Wayne Martin asked whether the committee would be watching the development of the ORP. Todd Martin responded that they will advise DOE within that organization. Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organizations), asked about meeting in other locations and added that with regard to ORP, the committee should not define its issues according to how that evolves. Todd remarked that they will work with the Executive Committee on the committee's budget needs; a general work plan will be developed at the November 9 meeting. Marilyn Reeves added that she watches the budget closely and is not worried about the money, but is concerned about the workload of members. Ben Floyd, Benton County (Local Government Interests), added that this activity is critical, and money must be found to support it. Gerry Pollet said that cutting additional committee meetings to cover the new committee is not possible, and stated that additional meeting funding is necessary. Marilyn said she would like to see flexibility at the moment, and by March figure out how much money is being spent. Gerry disagreed and said that by March they will realize they have to cut three other committee meetings because of the money needed for the tank waste committee. Marilyn reminded the Board that they had never overspent the budget and have enormous cooperation from DOE in holding budget back.

Dick Belsey added that Board members are currently strained, and structures to support them are critical, especially analytical and technical support. There is also little support in the current budget for new things that come with the new mission. Ben Floyd Said that TWRS is the number one priority, and that existing resources should be used to meet the priority items. Pam Brown said the structure makes sense. Betty Tabbutt agreed that independent technical assistance was necessary. Jim Watts said that the Board should go ahead and establish the ad hoc committee and use it as an illustrative example of why more money is needed. Paige Knight supported going forward, noting that this will be the Board's point of unity. Gerry Pollet expressed concern with resources, and said he was not willing to just go ahead. Marilyn Reeves suggested having the Monday meeting, and letting the Executive committee look at budget issues. Wayne Martin asked Alice Murphy, DOE, if additional funds could be requested from DOE if cost estimates were done, and she replied the potential exists, but site funding and compliance problems are a current issue.

Marilyn Reeves asked about the mission and objectives of the TWRS committee. Betty Tabbutt expressed concern about DOE's lack of acknowledgment that TWRS is a serious concern, and that the public involvement piece required by federal law was not being adequately addressed. Neil Brown, DOE, responded that DOE will have three to four senior level employees at the TWRS meeting as a sign of its commitment. Alice Murphy added that the Board is valued and gives good advice, causing DOE to do a lot of thinking. Wayne Martin reminded the Board that its role is to advise, and providing advice and counsel to the TPA is the primary value of it. Gerry Pollet added that the Board exists not only to advise DOE, but to advise Ecology on what to do when DOE will not listen. Randy Smith, EPA, commented that the tank waste has been the single most difficult and most important issue to address and the Board's challenge is to stick with this issue, focus DOE, the contractor, and Ecology to make this work, and think about fall-back positions. He said when DOE fails to listen, there are any number of other people who can force change.

Action on Agenda Item 5b - Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee

After further discussion on the funding for the new ad hoc committee on tank waste treatment and its relationship to other committees, Merilyn Reeves asked if there was any disagreement with the work scope for the committee. Hearing none, she directed that this ad hoc committee should proceed to look at the overall strategy of TWRS and determine when the Board needs information and needs to prepared advice.

Norm Buske asked for five minutes to talk with the board about issues concerning the balance in the Hanford situation. He explained that he was staging a terrorist attack on the HAB and represented the neighbors of Hanford, the river, and the earth. His demands included ending the FFTF proposal and holding DOE accountable for how funds are being spent. He wants the HAB to place stiff demands on DOE which will lead to aggressive cleanup and changes at Hanford.

AGENDA ITEM #5c: TWRS VITRIFICATION

John Wagoner began by noting that the General Accounting Office (GAO) did a report on TWRS at the request of the House Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the Subcommittee conducted a hearing on October 8. Louise Dressen said that full copies of the GAO report have been distributed at committee meetings and were also provided at the back table.

William Swick, Assistant Director of GAO, explained that GAO is a Congressional agency that evaluates federal programs. GAO has worked for the House and Senate authorization committees and the Oversight Subcommittee during the 30-day period before the BNFL contract was signed. Their objectives included providing an understanding of the approach has changed from the original strategy, the impacts on schedule, cost, and savings, the new risks that DOE is assuming, and DOE's project oversight. GAO found the current approach is substantially different from the initial strategy. Competition is eliminated and DOE is heading towards building more permanent facilities. The design phase has been extended and the start of construction and agreement on pricing has been delayed. DOE has agreed to support BNFL's debt under certain conditions. The completion date was extended to 10 years, and costs have doubled to \$8.9 billion in constant FY97 dollars. He pointed out that the costs have doubled but the savings claimed have increased. GAO has a lot of concerns about the numbers and the assumptions used, particularly in regards to cost growth. Technical and managerial issues similar to those found on Spent Nuclear Fuel and Pit 9 may also have an impact on cost and schedule. Regarding risks assumed by DOE, financial risk is the most significant. Privatization was originally intended to shift risk from DOE to the contractor, but the new debt support agreed to by DOE has a large liability associated with it. It is difficult to determine the extent of this liability if BNFL defaults on its loan. This approach has the same practical effect as a loan guarantee, for which statutory authority is normally required. He said that effective oversight is critical to the project's success, but DOE does not have a good track record of oversight on large projects. While DOE has taken steps to implement lessons learned, it needs to ensure that it fully implements its project management and oversight plans. Congress may consider an additional project review at the end of the design phase.

John Wagoner added that the Oversight Subcommittee, in addition to being briefed on the GAO report, heard from the investigator who had visited the site during and after the Congressional

review of the report on the vitrification contract. Key points raised during the hearing included concerns regarding financing, the risk balance between DOE and the contractor, initial issues raised by the Regulatory Unit on BNFL submittals, staffing needed, and alternatives if privatization efforts fail. A commitment from the Secretary to put in place any necessary staff was made. Other witnesses included Gerry Pollet, Under Secretary Moniz, Assistant Secretary Owendoff, Walter Howes, DOE-HQ, and Tom Crimmons, President of BNFL, who has since resigned for unrelated reasons.

Gerry Pollet commended GAO for the job they did of explaining how the risk has shifted from the original concept of privatization that the contractor puts up private money and that means the contractor is at risk; the contractor also gets a significant rate of return on that money and the government pays the interest on the debt. He said that with this contract, the contractor secures the debt of \$3.2 billion for capital and operational costs and another \$3.2 billion for interest and financing costs. The risk of default is shifted to the government. He commented that the contract locks in a before-tax profit of 60% (\$1.9 billion), including an improper payment of \$680 million for BNFL income taxes. Federal Acquisition Regulations say it is improper to pay income taxes as an element of cost. He said that BNFL may not pay \$680 million in taxes, but the contract locks in a pre-determined amount and that may mean an additional windfall. Another focus of Gerry's testimony was the claimed cost savings of the contract. Gerry expressed frustration that DOE has only compared the contract with a Management and Operations (M&O) contract and has refused to do a comparison with a fixed-price, incentivized contract. Gerry testified that alternative financing mechanisms must be examined, saying that \$3.1 billion could be saved by replacing private financing with a fixed-price, incentivized contract. There was a commitment to review alternative financing mechanisms within six months. Gerry said Chairman Barton commented he was very concerned about the open-ended nature of the costs in this contract and alternative financing mechanisms need to be evaluated. He has suggested a lump-sum payment to BNFL would be a better option.

Doug Riggs also provided copies of the testimony given by Representative Doc Hastings at the Subcommittee hearing (*Attachment 6*).

Board Discussion

Russell Jim commented on GAO's remarks that the highest risk is financial, and said that this risk stems from compliance risks. He stated that compliance should include treaty rights. He also expressed concern to Mr. Riggs that the Yakamas were not notified regarding the ORP, and that the Yakima Indian Nation has the most to lose since it is their homeland and wintering ground. He also expressed frustration with the lack of information being shared with the tribes and noted that the Yakamas are equal to other regulators.

Todd Martin asked if the DOE comparison between fixed price and traditional M&O contracts was a realistic option. Bill Swick responded that a comparative analysis between M&O and cost-plus fixed fee contracts has been done, but DOE is not engaging in these types of contracting mechanisms anymore. Performance-based financing is more common. The M&O approach is 100% government funding, and the BNFL approach is 100% private financing. Looking at

combinations of public and private financing would be more realistic. The goal is to reduce the net effect of the cost of capital.

Harold Heacock asked if the current schedule to process waste is realistic and if GAO examined the validity of the previous schedule. Bill Swick responded that the original concept was probably not as realistic as it needed to be. He is unsure if the current schedule is realistic, but it bears watching.

Betty Tabbutt expressed concerns regarding the semantics of private and public financing, and explained her own idea that the public is taking the risk in this situation and that it should therefore be viewed as public financing. This contract is not privatization in her view. She noted that the GAO report says if the lenders declare BNFL in default and accelerate the due date, DOE will terminate the contract and everything will be covered. She asked what kind of oversight DOE will have over finances with the lenders. Bill Swick explained that the reason it is called privatization is that it involves privately generated loans. It does not avoid government financing, but affects when the government pays. Doug Riggs noted that current contract is for the design phase, which is only two years, and that gives an opportunity to make changes. DOE's approach has changed tremendously in the past two years and he expects that DOE and its contractors will have a better idea of how the project will be financed in another two years.

PERSPECTIVES OF HEATHER HOLBEN

Heather Holben, the Senior Editor at the Richland High School newspaper, addressed the Board and commented that she has lived in Richland for five years, and decided to attend the intersite workshops in June to get answers to questions she had about the site. She praised the workshops, but felt a lot of problems were left out. She was frustrated that only the students were taking notes, but felt that including students was an excellent idea. There should be more tours of the plants, newsletters should be sent to the schools, and teenagers should be added to the Board or establish a separate student board.

Merilyn Reeves asked her opinion of the Lego block workshop, and Heather responded that it made the issue come alive. Jerry Peltier added that the end solutions being discussed deal with only a small part of the waste. Ken Niles noted they are still waiting for the report for the intersite workshops, and he had heard there is turmoil within the League of Women Voters about issuing the report.

Paige Knight commended Heather for her commitment and enthusiasm, and noted that the Board should discuss the possibility of having students involved in the Board. Merilyn suggested sending the Lego board to schools.

AGENDA ITEM #7: ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STATUS

Doug Sherwood gave a brief history of the Environmental Restoration (ER) program (*Attachment 7*). From 1989-91, only three cleanup actions were done, including isolating contaminated sediments in the process trenches and the carbon tetrachloride vapor extraction project, and over \$700 million was spent. The Future Site Uses Working Group (FSUWG) was formed to develop a framework and context for what will be done in the future. Values that came out of that included

reducing the money spent on characterization and increasing it for cleanup, protecting the River and getting on with cleanup, dealing with groundwater contamination, concentrating waste management activities in the Central Plateau and using the land wisely, involving citizens in future decisions, cleaning up Arid Lands and North Slope, reviewing the cleanup program to make milestones reflect public values, hastening cleanup along the River in the 100 and 300 Areas, coordinating decontamination work in the 300 Area with cleanup, and directing more money to groundwater cleanup. This led to the ER refocusing modification of the TPA.

Doug said there has been a lot of success since 1994. One of the first was completion of the 1100 Area. This was the first National Priorities List site deletion in the DOE complex. A partial deletion of the area north of the River has also been done and full-scale remediation along the River has started. The biggest success of the Board was its help with the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) to ensure a place to put waste from cleanup along the River. N Reactor deactivation and C Reactor interim safe storage were completed this year. Pump and treat systems are going on five of the most important areas of groundwater contamination.

As to the future of the ER program, Doug said cost savings can be achieved within individual programs, but successes and efficiencies between programs are needed to continue cleanup. A lot of integration issues are coming to the forefront. There are several areas that are on track for making decisions on cleanup along the River. The remaining sites proposed plan is out for comment now but those are not areas where a lot of additional HAB involvement is needed. Construction of an expanded ERDF facility is going forward. There is a problem with conducting decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) concurrent with soil cleanup due to lack of funding. HAB advice is needed on future uses for the 200 Areas, for which the FSUWG identified six options. This raises questions about the risk assessment scenario to be used since neither MTCA nor CERCLA guidance includes scenarios for waste management for the foreseeable future. Board help is needed on what constitutes a successful cleanup for the 200 Area, including acceptable scenarios for groundwater containment and protection, requirements for workers, institutional controls, implications for technology development, etc. There will also be some very difficult wastes to address, including fuel spacers, failed pumps and equipment, long-length equipment from single-shell tanks, and other highly radioactive materials that could be disposed in a burial ground or ERDF if they are first treated. The question for the Board is whether to treat them, generating secondary liquid and solid wastes, and then place them in an unlined burial ground or look at other disposal options such as the canyons, which were originally constructed to contain highly radioactive materials.

Doug said another problem area is what to do with mixed wastes. For example, 1500 drums of contaminated material was found in the 300 area for which there is no effective treatment today. Other needs include technology development relating to contaminants in the vadose zone, including characterization of overlapping plumes, techniques to evaluate the nature and extent of contamination and the physical and chemical properties of unsaturated soil, and technologies to prevent moisture infiltration, control the chemical environment to reduce mobility, destroy complexants, and address specific wastes. Other needs include consensus tools for fate and transport analysis, models for direct contact, site intruders and historical control, surface barriers, and remedy performance for deep contamination. The key requirements are to issue the remaining cleanup decisions for the 100 and 300 Areas by December 31, 1999, issue the 200 Area cleanup decisions by December 30, 2008, and complete all CERCLA cleanup by the end of 2018.

Madeleine Brown said that the ER Committee feels successful in the 100 Area but is uncomfortable with putting highly radioactive materials in ERDF. She said the Committee has concerns that the ER program is not as frightening as other big efforts in Hanford's budget and suffers as a result. The Committee is continuing to focus efforts on protecting the River. She suggested that when the TPA was laid out 10 years ago, not as much was known about the risks, so there may be a need to revisit the milestones. She confirmed that the Canyon Disposition Initiative is in the Committee's work plan and noted the Committee will have to shift its thinking to the 200 Area.

Board Discussion

Gerry Pollet asked if there are plans to dispose of greater-than-Class-C waste in ERDF. Doug Sherwood said no. Gerry also noted that surprise that a comment period has begun on the 100 Areas remaining sites ROD because he thought there was an agreement for a more in-depth dialogue on N Area. He said that MTCA does not allow site-specific risk assessments and every site has to use certain fundamental inputs for risk assessments; there is a policy agreement being developed by Ecology that says if a site-specific risk assessment is used, then there must be public input on realistic exposure scenarios, such as Native American usage of the River now and in 50 years. This is more complicated because the National Marine Fisheries Service is being asked about the biological impact on salmon and this relates to ecological risk assessments.

Greg deBruler added that Columbia River United commissioned an Oregon State University study to look at the hypothesis that sturgeon are not reproducing because of contamination. He noted that the 100 Area has only been cleaned on the surface and there is a need to talk about what will be acceptable cleanup. He referenced a recent WDOH study that found concentrations of strontium in the River just a few feet offshore. He also noted that the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement says Hanford has a mixed low-level waste disposal facility, which has not yet been sited, and makes a 20-years projection of future missions for the DOE complex. He said there are a lot of surprises coming because we do not know where the waste is and suggested looking at CIA satellite reconnaissance photos taken over the past 30 years to identify lost sites.

Pam Brown commented that the land use planning process has been moving along and the consensus of the various parties is that the 200 Area should be designated for heavy industry in the future and that definitions will be useful for the waste issues. She also asked about funding for the Canyon Disposition Initiative. Doug Sherwood responded that the project has not gotten the funding yet but there still is some money in ER and Facilities Transition for it. There may be some matching funds from EM-50. He said the project is in the characterization phase and looking at the issues raised by the Board last year.

Jerry Peltier said he does not believe the site will ever be cleaned up. Contamination sources can be eliminated, lowering the risk to the environment and people, but contamination will always exist and the 200 Area will never be used for anything in the next several hundred years except waste management. For this reason, he observed the vadose zone is a very important issue for the ER Committee.

Emmett Moore asked what is being treated in the pump-and-treat systems. Doug Sherwood responded that the contaminants are carbon tetrachloride, TCE, and chloroform in the 200 West Area, uranium in the plume in the southeast corner of the 200 West Area, chromium in two systems along the River, and strontium-90 at N Springs.

Russell Jim commented that he has heard a consistent misunderstanding of treaty rights. He said there is no cleanup process but DOE is just moving things along (e.g., contamination is being removed down to 15 feet but it goes down 30-40 feet; putting materials in ERDF). He noted that CERCLA only requires the ERDF liner to last 30 years. He said the Native Americans do not accept using the 200 Area as an industrial site and the thought of not cleaning it up is incomprehensible. He asked that the wording in the FSUWG report be reviewed and objected to institutional controls, noting that the tribe's culture has withstood the test of time and the U.S. government has not. Norm Buske added that sacrifice zones are a crime against humanity and the planet, and are intolerable.

AGENDA ITEM #8: KEY HAB POLICY ISSUES

Louise Dressen reviewed what the Board has done with the key policy issues it identified in the December workshop (*Attachment 8*). She noted that the Board has made several changes in the way it conducts business, including focusing on one or two topics at each meeting, incorporating more discussion in the meeting agendas, and initiating occasional Wednesday evening informational sessions. Since the December meeting, the Board has produced four pieces of comprehensive advice (compared to as many as 6-7 pieces per meeting previously). Two pieces dealt with the FY2000 budget, one with intersite waste disposal, and one with the FY99 performance agreements. The Board has used numerous forms to share stakeholder values, including the statement on tank waste treatment capability in February, perspectives from interest groups on tank waste vitrification, a letter on corrective actions for the spent nuclear fuel program, and participation by Board members in intersite workshops.

Louise provided a brief synopsis of what the Board has done on each of the key policy issues. TWRS vitrification and Spent Fuel were discussed at almost every Board meeting since the December workshop. Ensuring adequate budgets was addressed in most of the Board meetings and four pieces of advice have been issued since November on this topic. Marilyn Reeves noted that one of these addressed the compliance gap in the FY2000 budget. Louise noted that management for results was covered in a number of meetings, with the focus on performance agreements as well as alignment of the 2006 Plan, the Contractors Integration Report (CIR), the EM integration effort, and the Waste Management PEIS. Efforts on intersite waste transfers included participation in the National Dialogue pilot workshops, the June intersite workshops, the Low-Level Waste (LLW) forum in Nevada, and meetings with other Site-Specific Advisory Boards. The Board also issued advice on unregulated, offsite waste disposal. Marilyn Reeves noted that the latter got a quick response of agreement from DOE-HQ. Gerry Pollet added that the HAB's advice prompted two other SSABs to take action. Regarding protection of the River, Louise said a lot of activity has occurred with respect to the groundwater/vadose zone/CRCIA. Key documents are coming out soon and this will be a key issue in the upcoming year. Worker safety was addressed in a major piece of advice in December but there has not been a major thrust on this since then. TPA compliance is a

thread through many of the issues the Board has discussed. Finally, high risk facilities were not addressed at the Board level although the committees continue to track these.

Board Discussion

Russell Jim discussed a presentation on treaty rights that was made to the Environmental Management Advisory Board by a nationally renowned judge from Oklahoma who is a Native American. He suggested that the Board consider inviting the judge to speak on treaty rights or watch the video that was prepared on his presentation to help in understanding the differences between the federal, state, and tribal governments. George Kyriazis suggested having a meeting at the Yakama Indian Nation. Louise Dressen added that the tribes could be asked to give a presentation on the history of their treaties. Greg deBruler commented that the tribes are fundamental to the process, noting only one tribe was present at the meeting. He also discussed CRCIA, noting the team is growing and will probably include 16 representative organizations. He said if the groundwater/vadose zone reports coming out in December do not align with CRCIA, the CRCIA team will develop its own plan.

Pam Brown noted that the Waste Receiving and Analysis Plant is up and running because of stakeholder input. Norma Jean Germond remarked that the important issues in her mind are TWRS, Spent Nuclear Fuel, the vadose zone/characterization, budgetary issues, public involvement, and land use. She noted that the Public Involvement Committee will be working on a process for following up on agency responses to Board advice. Norm Buske commented that if the Board is interested in protection of the River, it needs to start at ground zero since the current understanding of characterization technology is wrong. The technology methods come from the 1950s and 1960s and needs to be updated, our understanding is wrong and we need to start over. He agreed with Greg deBruler and Russell Jim that tribal participation is critical. The HAB should also watch high risk situations, and worker impacts should include the past.

Betty Tabbutt added that incorporating tribal recommendations and input is important. She noted the difficulty in respecting treaty rights and asked the tribes to educate the Board on near-term decisions that will preclude meeting those treaty rights. Leaving the tanks in place does not meet treaty rights but some kind of action must be taken. Madeleine Brown noted that TPA compliance and worker health and safety permeate all of the Board's work. Her biggest concern is with high-risk facilities such as the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and canyons. Dick Belsey asked to add worker health and safety with the focus on extending the Integrated Safety Management System Plan to include a communication feedback mechanism, consistent with DNFSB Recommendation 98-2.

Gerry Pollet observed that intersite waste transfers are a big issue for the upcoming year. He also suggested having a workshop that focuses on exposure scenarios, current and future risk under those scenarios, and future land use questions, especially for areas along the River, and noted that DOE is pushing to base cleanup standards on a limited recreational use scenario. He suggested including emergency response under the high-risk facilities issues, noting that the commitment to corrective actions were never completed. Gordon Rogers suggested the need for a review/resurrection of cleanup standards.

Norm Buske added that whistleblowers are an important issue and need to be separated from worker health and safety issues.

George Kyriazis recommended an ad hoc group be formed to work with DOE and the tribal nations on a structure for the September SSAB Chairs meeting. Pam Brown added that the National Energy Communities Alliance will also be meeting in the Tri-Cities around that time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gai Oglesbee commented that if the Board does not know what goes on at Hanford, it cannot achieve resolution and protect the workers. She noted three incidents that have happened and that need to be watched and commented that too many Americans do not want to know about environmental damage even though they suspect pollution is a problem. They often wait until it affects them before getting involved. She referred to an atomic bomb survivor who was at the Health of the Site meeting and who had just returned from educating the Navajo Nation. With his personal experience, she commented that he would be an excellent spokesperson for health issues. She read from an incident report which outlined safety hazards for workers and how management handled the situation. She commented that DOE has not produced satisfactory results; but rather frustrated employees, who are for the most part critical of intervention. She also said the public is not involved in the Board like they should be.

Sonja Anderson expressed frustration with the amount of taxpayer dollars being spent at Hanford and questioned the usefulness of this expenditure. She noted that records from as early as October 1946 revealed that drinking water was contaminated with plutonium and fission products from Hanford. She described how she responded to a federal court order and provided 119 documents proving that contamination and was laid off nine days later. The Department of Labor told Kaiser to rehire her but they did not. She said it is time to stop wasting time studying whether or not contamination has occurred and begin a sincere environmental cleanup effort.

Sue Hobart said she is a chemical engineer who began her career at Hanford as a process engineer at PFP and B Plant, and has also worked in water treatment at nuclear power plants. She urged the Board to compare the presentation on Spent Fuel given at the August DNFSB meeting with the one given to the Board at this meeting. She commented that systems engineering has not been applied to the project and said it is time to stop analyzing the problem and start dealing with it.

Bernice Mitchell expressed her opinion that the Board is an expensive misnomer to keep the public pacified and to be a scapegoat for DOE. She suggested that the Board report not to DOE, but to elected representatives.

AGENDA ITEM #9: FY99 BUDGET ALLOCATION

Bob Tibbatts, DOE, explained that final numbers for the FY99 budget allocation are not yet available, but would be worked out the following week. EM received all but \$5 million of the \$5.607 billion requested from Congress (*Attachment 9*). DOE-RL's request was \$1.005 billion (18% of the EM request), excluding privatization and its share of national programs. The FY99 budget is now broken into different control points, including closure projects relating to Rocky Flats

and Mound, project completion (facility stabilization, spent nuclear fuel, and advanced, non-defense reactors), and post-2006 (TWRS, ER, Waste Management, and facility stabilization). An additional \$15 million was allocated for tank farm operations and interim safe storage of the reactors. On the privatization account, DOE-RL was reduced by \$230 million from the DOE-RL request. Science and technology was increased by \$27 million at DOE-HQ, with an unknown amount to come to DOE-RL. Program direction was reduced \$9 million but DOE-RL's share is currently unknown. Uncosted reductions were \$71 million for defense EM and DOE-RL's share is expected to be \$20 to \$25 million.

Doug Sherwood said EPA concerns include what DOE-HQ taxes will be and when the vadose zone money will arrive and its scope of work. Mike Wilson added that the contractors have apparently listened before submitting their proposals this year. While the budget this year are close to the request, the outyears may be way short. Ecology is also concerned about the commitment to privatization; the set-asides are very inadequate at this point.

Kevin Ensign, DOE, provided a handout addressing PHMC overhead and service center costs (*Attachments 10*). He noted that the Smith rider in the FY99 appropriations set a target for overhead reductions, required the savings be used for additional cleanup efforts, and called for a Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) review of the PHMC for compliance with cost accounting standards (*Attachment 11*). DOE has been doing all of these things for the past 2-4 years. Target-setting requirements have been in place since FY95, and last year's PHMC's performance agreements resulted in a \$20 million cost savings. Accounting requirements guarantee that all savings are given to direct programs. DOE has also funded an on-site DCAA office since FY97 to audit the PHMC. DCAA has agreed to accelerate its established 3-year audit program to complete all overhead audits by the required March 31, 1999, date and this will delay other planned direct cost audits. Kevin said that the FY98 baseline for overheads was \$273 million but the actual costs came in at \$255 million, a savings of almost \$20 million. For FY99, the baseline is \$253 million and there is a performance agreement to pay fee if costs are reduced to \$225-240 million; the performance agreements also include a \$400,000 penalty for any shifting of any unapproved costs. He noted that this may be difficult because the easy cuts have already been made.

Chuck Potter, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government Interests), provided an issue manager perspective, noting that overhead and service costs have been an issue for years but that has now been dealt with and DOE has committed to continuing reductions. The Dollars and Sense Committee is monitoring the progress on this issue. He complimented DOE for its patience on this issue.

Board Discussion

Susan Leckband asked what determines the impact of complex-wide requirements. Bob Tibbatts replied that DOE-RL will determine which scope will not be done, based on the lowest priorities for each program. Gerry Pollet commented that disagreement exists on this issue.

George Kyriazis said it is time to stop comparing PHMC performance with that of Westinghouse Hanford Company and he commended DOE for the FY99 performance agreement. Paige Knight asked what overheads are being reduced and Alice Murphy said these include general and

administrative areas, accounting, procurement, the chief counsel's office, coordination efforts for Environmental Safety and Health, and infrastructure areas.

Gerry Pollet noted that Congress is convinced that the FY98 budget figures disclosed to them and the public for indirect services are \$40 million lower because of accounting changes. This has resulted in the DCAA being called in to do a review. He said that the profit payments on the indirect costs must be disclosed as part of the cost of the indirects to avoid additional Congressional action. He noted that the \$255 million in FY98 for indirects is a fourth of the site budget and said GAO concluded that one of the reasons there is not enough money for vadose zone integration work is that on top of the 25% of the budget for overhead and indirects, there is another 25% for administrative support. He added that while there was an actual cost savings of \$21 million for overheads and indirects, the budget disclosed to the public already had an approved accounting change that accounted for a \$35 million differential. Kevin Ensign responded that in FY97, WHC's indirects included about \$18 million in fee on these; in FY98, fee on indirects was not included in the budget but could be earned only if the PHMC reduced overhead costs. In addition, the switch from WHC to PHMC meant certain costs associated with the enterprise companies were no longer being recorded in the service centers and an apples-to-apples comparison showed these to account for another \$17 million. Alice Murphy added that DOE has always tried to be honest and upfront about accounting changes. She pointed to the handout that shows the \$35 million, including \$17 million for the accounting change and \$18 million for the enterprise companies. It is her belief that Congress is satisfied with DOE's cost monitoring, as is DCAA. She explained that most of what is call overhead is for infrastructure support such as office space, laboratory analyses, cranes and rigging, etc. George Kyriazis added that Hanford is a nuclear reservation and has specialized controls. The indirects at such a site are extremely expensive. He also asked for information on layoffs in FY98 in the indirect area.

Gordon Rogers said he supports reductions in overhead and indirects, and agrees with the commitments to abide by DCAA audit procedures, but expressed concern about getting into micromanagement.

Chuck Potter questioned the amount of money designated for federal employees. Alice Murphy noted that the money for the 29 ORP employees would come out of the \$60 million for federal employees, so DOE has requested an increase in the program direction budget for those. These are not part of overhead and indirect costs.

Merilyn Reeves said she believes in equity – if this site is going to have Congressional action on a portion of its budget (e.g., overheads), all the sites should have that same cut. Putting restrictions on one site in the complex sends a mixed message. She said we want to see cost effectiveness, but once it gets into the political arena, there are so many opportunities for misunderstandings. Gerry Pollet added that the legislation started out as a 30% cap for all the sites, but the opposition was very strong and the compromise was to look at Hanford only.

AGENDA ITEM #10: HAB COMMITTEE FY99 WORK PLANS

Pam Brown provided an overview of the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee work plan for FY99. This year the Committee has identified issue managers for each of the major topics

and these issue managers have identified the issues within each of those topics to be addressed in FY99 and this list was provided in the Board packet. The next step is for the Committee to lay these out month by month. The Committee is considering conducting a waste management workshop at the December Board meeting to inform people of the nature of the wastes at the site. This would be a refresher to prepare for the national EM integration initiative. This will also help in developing a better understanding of the transuranic (TRU) waste on site, particularly the buried TRU-waste. The Committee will be watching the Spent Fuel baseline and looking at the unresolved technical issues, completion of the safety baseline, improvements in project management, and the sludge issue. There have been some good meetings recently with Paul Kruger, DOE, and Bob Shoup, FDH, on health and safety issues. The Committee will also be looking again at PFP and tank farm operations issues.

Madeleine Brown referred the Board to the ER Committee FY99 work plan in the packet. She said the input from the Board discussions that morning on the ER program will be incorporated in the work plan and the Committee will be working to understand what decisions are coming. She noted the Committee is also working on advice on PFP baselines and TPA milestones.

Norma Jean Germond referred the Board to the Public Involvement Committee FY99 work plan in the packet. She noted that the Committee will be working on a process for dealing with responses to the Board's advice..

Gerry Pollet provided a draft FY99 work plan and schedule for the Dollars and Sense Committee (*Attachment 12*). The Committee has identified four major areas for its work: (1) how does the money get to Hanford, (2) how does the money get prioritized and allocated, (3) results versus HAB values, and (4) special issues. He said he expect to bring draft advice on the ORP management plans to the December meeting.

Emmett Moore suggested that the public involvement committee should also look at the Board's own public participation.

Merilyn asked the facilitators to review the work plans and compare them for overlapping issues, schedules, etc. for further discussion in December.

Chuck Potter expressed concern about the number of committee meetings and suggested that the Board consider more joint committee meetings.

AGENDA ITEM #11: POSSIBLE UPDATES

HRA-EIS/CLUP - Tom Ferns, DOE, reported that the draft final Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement/Comprehensive Land Use Plan (HRAEIS/CLUP) is undergoing review at DOE-HQ and has received half of the necessary signatures. He anticipates that it will be released within the next month.

Contamination Incident (Fruit Flies) - Paul Kruger updated the Board on the fruit fly event that happened in mid-September. He noted that FDH has provided daily updates to most of the workers on the site for a period of time. Bob Shoup, FDH, reported that contamination was found on

September 28 in a mobile office south of the B Plant during routine daily surveys. An extensive survey of Hanford was conducted to determine the extent and source of the contamination. Isotopic analysis revealed that strontium-90 was the primary contaminant in samples from insect traps, food garbage, dumpsites, mobile offices and some construction shops. All the contamination was in the 200 East Area except for a couple places in the 200 West Area and a spot was recently discovered at the US Ecology site south of the 200 East Area. However, its location in dumpsters led to finding some of the contamination also in the Richland landfill. The basic operating premise is that any off-site contamination is unacceptable, and protection of the health and safety of the workers and the public is the number one priority. Actions taken related to this event include: bioassay analyses done on workers, which turned out negative; removal of 210 tons of solid waste from the Richland landfill and disposal in the 200 East area low-level burial grounds; spraying to eradicate insects; putting traps all over the site, including the boundary, to ensure that contamination is contained on-site. FDH is continuing to pinpoint the source and assisting DOE in working with the City to resume refuse hauling to the landfill. A report and lessons learned will be issued related to this incident. Causal information is preliminary and when a positive determination of the source is complete, FDH will recommend procedures to strengthen work control at the source and will strengthen emergency preparedness and environmental, safety, health and quality processes.

Norma Jean Germond asked whether the sources of contamination been identified. Bob Shoup replied that the source appears to be a glucose-based fixative used at B Plant that has attracted the fruit flies, but they are looking at other sources. Chuck Potter commented that the focus should not be solely on fruit flies, but on birds and rodents as well, noting that these are already contaminating areas. Bob Shoup responded that this is part of the routine monitoring at the site. George Kyriazis asked if this related to increased sensitivity of today's detection equipment. Debra McBaugh responded that the amounts found in the flies can be found by any of the equipment that they are currently using. Emmett Moore asked about gamma emitters, the lifespan of a fruit fly, and whether other insects were found. Bob Shoup said they found weak cesium gamma emitters; fruit flies have a life span of 14 days; and, in addition to them, DOE has tested gnats. None but the fruit flies were contaminated. Debra McBaugh added that WDOH has been active with this as well, observing the process at the landfill and advising the City as well as checking the traps at US Ecology, where no contamination was found.

EM Integration Approach - Jay Augustenborg, DOE, informed the Board that the five field managers have come up with a new process for integration opportunities and has recently briefed the National Governors' Association on it. An integration executive committee is in place and is comprised of Assistant Secretary Owendoff and five field office managers. A core team that includes EM-30, -40, and -50 and a couple contractors supports this group. The heart of this is the 12 program area integration teams that are charged with sharing information that might offer opportunities for cost savings and efficiencies. The teams are led by people at the field office or center of excellence for that area. DOE-RL has the lead for the high-level waste, deactivation, and science and technology teams. Jay is on the core team and his task is to keep track of all the issues as they apply to Hanford. He explained that the Center for Risk Excellence supports the program area integration teams.

Pam Brown noted that Carol Sohn, the DOE lead for the high-level waste team, is receptive to stakeholder input but Pam expressed concern that there will not be the same access to the leadership

of other teams. She also commented that one of the options for high-level waste is for Idaho to send their vitrified glass logs to Hanford but that is against Board advice.

Jeff Breckel commented that this issue was discussed at the National Governor's Association (NGA) task force meeting. The states were unified in liking the idea of examining ways to do things more efficiently, but their concern was that stakeholder input comes fairly late in the process. He noted there were 110 proposals for improving efficiency. Jeff also said there is concern that the integration is occurring within a series of teams but needs to be happening across the teams and across the individual sites as well. Jay responded that some of the 110 proposals are short lived, and that he committed to Jeff that the field managers would meet on a quarterly basis and he would meet with Jeff and a representative of the Board as well after those meetings to say what progress is being made.

Gerry Pollet emphasized the concerns about public involvement and noted that money may be being spent on evaluating some of the 110 proposal that are fundamentally unacceptable to the stakeholders. Jay Augustenborg responded that an extensive public involvement plan will be developed once they meet the following week to figure out which proposals are still on the list.

Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration - Mike Graham, Bechtel Hanford Inc. (BHI), reported that the Groundwater/Vadose Integration project has started three working groups on policy, long-range plan, and systems assessment. DOE-HQ was scheduled to be at Hanford the following week to work with DOE-RL and BHI on the long-range plan, which will lay out the mission, key decisions and milestones, and the assessments required to make those decisions. During the week of November 20, the expert panel will meet to review the Science and Technology plan. A draft of the long-range plan will go to DOE-HQ on December and will be issued for public review from January through February 1999.

Paige Knight noted that the project has said there would be public, tribal and regulatory consultation but she has not yet been contacted. Norm Buske commented that DOE and the contractors still do not get it on the groundwater issue, and are not answering his questions concerning scientific studies conducted in 1993 and 1994.

Attachments

1. Attendees List
2. Memo from Marilyn Reeves to Hanford Advisory Board: SSAB Chairs Letter
3. Briefing on K Basins/Spent Fuel
4. Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order - TPA Negotiations on TWRS Vitrification
5. TWRS Ad Hoc Committee
6. Statement by Representative Doc Hastings before Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
7. Environmental Restoration Program Progress
8. Hanford Advisory Board - Key Policy Issues
9. DOE Richland Operations Office Update on FY 1999 EM Budget
10. WHC/PHMC Overhead and Service Center Costs
11. Defense Authorization Act Sec. 3138
12. Dollars and Sense Committee FY99 Work Plan