

START

TPA MEETING - HOOD RIVER, OREGON

0038096

5/9/94

TAPE ONE - SIDE A

NV: Being held in Washington and Oregon and I work with Triangle Associates. We're independent contractors. I hope you all got an agenda when you came. We did delay I'm told to chill out on a regular basis by Greg who says why should I rush things when I want to start on time. Thank you for those of you who did come on time and we will go through these agency presentations hearing from Roger Stanley, from the Washington State Department of Ecology, Roger's on my immediate right; Steve Wisen who's in the middle from the U. S. Department of Energy; and then we will probably, Greg may have a few words to say on behalf of Columbia River United as the interest group perspective on the 1995 budget and TPA priorities and then we'll take some time to get your questions and comments about the budget and the TPA priorities and then we'll go to Doug Sherwood who is on my far right from the Environmental Protection Agency and Doug is going to talk about environmental restoration refocussing. Whoops. Little excitement at the head table. And after Doug talks about ER refocussing, then we'll have a chance to pull together in probably a small group or just take questions from the floor however that wants to work itself out, when we get to that point in the program. Finally, we'll take formal public comment from anybody who came here wanting to put comments on the record. We have someone here Vickie King from Triangle who is taking notes so that we can turn around a very quick summary of the meeting for those of you who are interested and then later the meeting is being recorded and it will be completely transcribed, so there will be a complete record, but that takes a while to generate and sometimes people like to get the highlights faster than the transcript can be produced. So if anyone wants the highlights of the meeting or the transcript, you should let Vickie or me know before you

945287-008

63

START

from the 3 agencies and some of the other departments that are involved with the Hanford clean up and they've come to respond to questions or be resource people to you so when we get to the question and answer part of the meeting if you would indicate if you would like someone from an agency to comment on what you have to say otherwise they'll probably remain silent assuming that you're making a comment nor asking a question. Any questions or comments about moving ahead with the meeting? Great. With that I want to turn the meeting over to Roger.

9413287-0089

NV: Thank you. Want your glasses? Okay as Linda noted my name is Roger Stanley. I'm with the Department of Ecology and I'm its' Hanford Project Manager been working on Hanford issues for 6-7-8 years. I have been asked upfront here to just start out by giving a brief overview of Washington State's view of this last year basically just some of the highlights before we move on to the two main topics of tonight's meeting, budget and DOE's environmental restoration program. Last year I guess a very painful year in many in the sense we went through a major renegotiation of a lot of the provisions in the Tri-Party Agreement, but if you look over the last 4-5 years since the TPA was actually signed, I think last year was the first one that we've really started to see some significant progress after 4-5 years of clearly struggling to get some substance of progress on the ground that can be clearly visible to folks. I am going to start out with what we call our TWRS negotiations. TWRS stands for the Tank Waste Remediation System and where we found ourselves this last Spring was DOE coming to Ecology and EPA and proposing we do two things to lay the start of construction of the Hanford vitrification plant that was schedule for March 31 this last Spring and we also consider major modifications to the entire Tank waste clean up set of schedules. At that time basically what had



upfront and frankly we were weak on that, that aspect of it. Another benefit of the negotiations this last year was that we were able to take the tank farm upgrades and tank safety initiatives and put them under the TPA. Prior to that time, they were not and by doing so it has driven significant funding and has allowed DOE to start upgrade its' electrical systems, its' ventilation systems, waste transfer systems, monitoring systems out in the tank farms. There is a overhead here actually two of them that I was going to have Linda show just as an example of some of the work that they are doing. This is just an electrical control panel out in the tank farms and there are a lot of these types of control panels as they go through and upgrade them the second slide. They're basically just cleaning them out. They're doing the same thing to their monitoring programs as well as their ventilation systems. Anyway, a tremendous amount of work that after many, many years of those tank farms and the various systems gradually getting older and older. They are now starting to go through a tremendous upgrade activity. Another substantial I guess example of progress this last year as far as tank safety issues. You probably heard about tank 101SY, the tank that generates hydrogen and they wound up installing mixer pump just to keep the waste mixed so that the hydrogen gases is actually evolved from the waste in the tank gradually and have essentially gotten past that tank safety problem. I think there's a subsequent one also on actual installation of that mixer pump. There is also a story here the DOE's plans were to install this initial mixer pump and then move to go through final design and put in a permanent pump. This one has been working so well that right now their plans instead of going through a major design effort for a permanent pump they are going to construct a spare at a much less cost. The spare's life expectancy is estimated at actually the same as what they were hoping to gain with a permanent pump and the long and

short of it is, the savings that they're going to reach is about \$7 million that we're going to turn around now and plow back into clean up. As far as the tank waste negotiations, the other, or at least one of the other major benefits was that we just approached the negotiations much more differently than we did in the past. Wherein the past the 3 agencies basically went off and negotiated until they reached a draft agreement and sent it out for public comment, went through a round of meetings, asked people what they thought and made whatever adjustments were necessary and then signed it. This time and starting last Spring just because we knew that there were some really major changes that were being proposed, there was no way we were going to negotiate behind closed doors and wanted to try a new approach to negotiations that so far has worked very well. We wound up forming the Tank Waste Task Force as well as trying to have a higher rate of frequency of public meetings and discussions with the tribes. Just in an effort to try and get concerns to the negotiation table while we were still at the negotiation table so worked much better than it has in the past. Columbia River United was a member and a key member of that tank force. Another turning point that I think helped us a lot or is continuing to help us a lot was that we finally started DOE to get a little bit more serious on its' management systems. Its' own internal management systems as well as its' contractors and we actually wound up negotiating a document called the Cost of Management Efficiency Initiative actually it's in a three-ring binder here, but it's about 15-20 pages long. A separate docket from the TPA that references a number of audits that DOE, DOE and its' contractors, had been undertaken this last year and through which they are basically starting to put in place more contract reforms, more cost analysis efforts to try and squeeze excess costs out of their individual projects, regulatory reforms and procurement system

modifications. Those were only a few examples. Bottom line of DOE trying to make a \$1 billion savings in clean up costs with the same scope on the table over a 5 year period. EPA and Ecology are a signature of that Cost in Management Efficiency Initiative as well as I know that as far as Ecology standpoint we're going through a pretty substantial effort now to go through our own regulations and try and find pieces of them that are overly bureaucratic that can just tie us up and strip them out of there and get rid of them. Also this last year we in addition to the mixer pump and the tank farm upgrades, other areas where we have started to see some substantial progress get under way. One is just I have seen DOE to start to get its' overall infrastructure in place to a much greater extent than we have seen in the past so we start to see DOE move out on site, upgrade their road systems, all the various things that DOE and its' contractors have to do in order to go from that step getting their act together basically to get on to the really major processing plants. Kind of along the lines of getting their overall infra-structure in place, also we've seen progress in the area of getting laboratory analytical systems in place. They completed this facility here I don't know the square footage of that but let's see waste sampling and characterization facility low-level mixed waste laboratory that they have now completed construction of. It's going through the start up phase with sample loads expected this Fall. This lab facility is going to help a lot with liquid effluence treatments facility process control and also things like quality control keeping tabs on lab work that is going to still be done in the commercial sector. There is also a major upgrade of DOE hot cells. I think there is a picture of those. It doesn't really show a whole heck of a lot but as DOE starts to go through its' waste tank characterization program and get more and more knowledge of its' tanks it naturally has to naturally have

far better hot cell laboratory capabilities than its' had in the past.

NV: I would like to ask what a hot cell is?

NV: Hot cell is just since those samples are so radioactive you can't deal with them in a regular laboratory out on a lab counter, you have to deal with them remotely. So that's what that shielding is there, so you wind up with an operator on one side and the actual lab operated remotely on the inside. Liquid effluence treatment facilities is another area where we are starting to see a substantial amount of progress. This is just an overview of a facility called C018 out in 200 East that is designed to accept a number of liquid effluences. Many of which were discharged directly into the ground in the past probably the principle ones, or one of the principle ones, is the process ??? waste treatment from Hanford. Hanford's tank farms. There's another liquid effluence treatment facility that is under construction now well under construction in the 300 area. Do you know when that one might be scheduled to be on line? December of this year for that one. Finally as far as physical progress and I think there is a painting here but the facility is actually out there. This facility is called the 242A evaporator which since so far without the major processing facilities Hanford's as far as its' processing wastes it's still a tank farm operation. They naturally have a continuous problem trying to keep the volumes down as low as possible so this is a concentrator basically and that facility over the last few years has gone through a major upgrade and they were finally able to restart it just recently so it's going to help us a lot in order to make sure we continue to have adequate tank space prior to the time that the major tank waste treatment facilities actually come on line. So now I was a little bit leery about

9413287.0095

throwing these things up on the board just because I don't want people to think that I'm trying to paint a real rosy picture of Hanford. I'm note. Hanford is extremely complex. It continues to be something that presents all of the parties, the stakeholders, and the public with a tremendous list of problems on a day-to-day basis but as far as looking back over this last year in comparison to the previous 3-4, this last year we started to see a few more significant things actually pop up. As a result of our negotiations, I think we actually wound up with a stronger TPA. It's a far superior tank clean-up program and we've actually learned better ways to actually fold in tribal, and stakeholder, and public concerns. We've taken the lessons we've learned during those negotiations then folding them in to our efforts this year and other portions to the TPA.

NV: Good evening. The topics that I am going to cover include the clean-up budget and expected accomplishments under the TPA over the next few years. With this being a multi-billion dollar program, I will only have time to really summarize and hit some highlights on this so please bear with me and if you have questions, I'll try and answer those and also in the future if there is enough interest, we'll probably come back and do a much more detailed briefing of the programs. With the programs is talk about the scope and the budget especially as the 95 budget becomes a more clear. I think what is more important that you all have time to talk about your comments and concerns and ask questions. What I am going to start with is an overview of the overall DOE environmental management budget. It's about \$6.3 billion and it's broken out into this pie chart with waste management being 46 1/2% of the budget. That's the management of our radioactive and hazardous waste. That can be further broken down into on going operations 64%, construction that is underway at 22%, and other construction

that's complete but not quite operating at 14%. The next biggest piece of the pie is environmental restoration at 27 1/2%. That's broken out into assessment and characterization of the old waste sites at about 52% with actual clean up being 37.7%. The other major programs that include facility transition at 13.3% and that's the process of bringing our old shutdown production facilities to a surveillance and maintenance mode as they await decontamination and decommissioning. Then there's technology development at 6 1/2% to help the clean up efforts. When you compare the Hanford budget to the total on environmental management budget for DOE you find we're about 25% or \$1.6 billion and this is the break out by major program. By the way you should have, do we have handouts for this? Peter? We have handouts in and I going through this kind of quickly, we would like to get folks handouts so that they have this in their possession if they would like to look at it more detailed later. This chart is intended to show the comparison of clean-up budgets in various states at the various sites. Point I would like to make is this the Washington Richland over here on the left-hand side. We do get the lions share compared to other states in fact we're about double South Carolina or Tennessee. They're at about three quarters of a billion compared to us \$1.6 billion. This is a break out in a little bit more detail by the sub-programs. Not going to go into the detail here. I think the point is over here we show the 94 budget that's our current congressional appropriation. Over here this is the 95 presidential budget that was submitted to Congress. That's in increase of about 11% over what it was in 1994. I'm talking more about these in a second. The 94 budget is adequate to meet our TPA requirements. There is a reprogramming action that is going to be going to Congress very soon. What the reprogramming will do is going to take \$30 million from prior year uncosted activities that we no

943287.0006

9413287.0097

longer need to do anymore and apply it to 94 work in the waste management environmental restoration area. None of the TPA activities will be impacted and will not take in any money from TPA activities. This \$30 million will fund things like the environmental impact statement for the new tanks, ??? documentation for the plutonium finishing plant and another item of what we call payment in lieu of taxes for the 3 counties in the tri-cities area. Once that does go to Congress more detail will be available for you on that. We can share that later when it does go forward. The president's budget for 95 went to Congress in February of this year. One of the issues of that budget was that it did not totally reflect the renegotiated TPA which was signed in January of this year as Roger mentioned. One of the things we need to do because of that was to initiate an effort with ecology and EPA to rework that budget to integrate it to come up with a budget that's going to work to meet the TPA commitments so we've done that and we're just about ready to submit that to headquarters for their consideration in going to Congress for a budget amendment. We expect that to be submitted this month and assuming that that budget amendment goes forward we can share the detail of that with you in the next few months. One of the questions that often comes up is how do we prioritize our work? In summary, the first thing we consider when we put our budgets together is make sure we have safe operations of our facilities, ??? at the tank farms. Second thing that we fund is compliant activity, make sure we're compliant with the Tri-Party Agreement and environmental laws. Then we start picking up not so high priority safety assurance items such as demolition of unoccupied facilities that may pose a hazard to the workers on the site and electrical system upgrades. We then start picking up other environmental and safety compliance issues such as integrated risk assessments systems engineering off-site characterization and support of

the tank waste program and then lastly conduct of operations and enhanced operations. This is where you get into your things like site infra-structure, grants to states and tribes and so on. We do have a number of funding issues that we are trying to sort out in 95. Spent nuclear fuel is rising to the top of our priority list and we're struggling to assure that we are going to fund that and keep that activity on track. The second modular of our waste receiving and processing facility in the current 95 integrated budget, we're assuming we're going to be able to get those services in the private sector rather than have to spend government capital dollars for a facility on site, we'll have to see if that works, that's something to watch. Defense nuclear facilities safety board made a recommendation that we accelerate characterization activities on the Hanford site by 2 years over and above what the TPA says. So if we do that there is a funding issue. And lastly, one of the more significant things that Doug is talk about in his presentation is environmental restoration refocussing. Last year when we negotiated the TPA we added some things to our plate we also recognized that there was some key values from the Tank Waste Task Force and the future site uses working group that needed to be considered in that program so we've undergone or started a process of negotiating a look at that program and depending on how that turns out we'll determine the what the actual 95 budget needs are. One of the ways we hope to cover some of our needs is through the Cost of Management Efficiency Initiative that Roger talked about that commits us to a \$1 billion savings over the next 5 years. The intent would be to apply those savings to clean up. To date we have identified about \$150 million in candidate savings so we will be tracking that on a monthly, quarterly and yearly basis so that's something to keep your eyes on. Now from an accounting standpoint this is how the milestones

9413287.0099

rack up. Under the agreement, complete as of April 94 are 310 milestones that includes both original TPA milestones, new TPA milestones and milestones that have been changed under the agreement, so there is quite a hodgepodge there. There's virtually no part of the Tri-Party Agreement that hasn't undergone change over its' five year lifespan. So that would reflect a lot of change. In the balance of 94, there's 42, in 95, 75, and 33 in 96. We'll probably be adding milestones in these years also, as we renegotiate environmental restoration facility transition and so on. That's a breakout by program too. Where the rubber really meets the road is where we're doing work for the single shell tanks we'll complete this year we'll complete emergency pumping of T111. We'll also complete and when I say pumping of the tanks I mean removing the pumpable liquid from the tanks from the single shell tanks, transferring them to double shell tanks. We will complete four additional tanks this year and we will initiate pumping of two tanks in 95. We will resolve all of our underviewed safety questions on the tanks and we'll significantly improve our emergency pumping capabilities so if a tank is found to be a leaker we can get in there and pump it maybe quicker than maybe what we have scheduled under the TPA. For double shell tanks, we'll begin construction and this is an old tank farm that has been constructed just to give you an idea of what that actually looks like. We'll begin construction of those tanks, new tank farm, this year. As far as low-level waste pretreatment will begin and complete the conceptual design of that activity this year and for most single shell and double shell tanks we'll be issuing 50 characterization reports on the contents in those tanks. The waste receiving and processing facility will be constructed by March of 96 and it will be operational in March of 97. The scope of that facility is to receive, sort, examine, certify and repackage our solid radioactive

943207.000  
000722546

waste. Roger mentioned the waste sampling and characterization facility. That will be operational in November of this year. That supports primarily our liquid effluent treatment facilities and speaking of liquid effluence. We will complete the construction of those 3 major treatment facilities in the 200 and 300 areas and we will then cease the untreated discharge for all our high priority phase one streams by June of 1995. I mentioned the issue of spent fuel. We have spent fueled that is stored in what we call a care area in a couple of basins out there. They are water filled basins. We were scheduled to begin encapsulation of that fuel this year all by the sludge. There has been some issues that have come up. One being a very recent sophisticated seismic analysis of those basins which shows under our design basis earthquake, you could achieve a leak in those basins that's much greater than what we had previously anticipated. We're now looking at how we might mitigate that and it looks like maybe putting a copper dam in there would be at the joints that are most likely to leak would be the resolution of that issue. Cleve Moore's here if you need more information he can talk about that. But as a fairly recent issue that has come up and we're dealing with now. When you look at the fuel you can see hopefully why we need to get in there and encapsulate it because of the condition that it's in. The issue of this water leaking from the basins and getting into the ground water which has been attributed to the ??? contamination. Facilities transition are the actions as I said to take a facility from a shutdown condition to a surveillance and maintenance mode while it awaits decontamination and decommissioning. We'll be negotiating those milestones for facilities like Purex, Uranium Oxide facility. This happens to be Purex. We'll be completing those negotiations by December of this year. The actual decontamination and decommissioning of those facilities will be negotiated by

the end of 96. So that in a nutshell are some of the highlights of the budget and the activities that we will be performing over the next couple of years. So with that I guess Greg will, no? Are we going to open it up for questions? Okay.

NV: You can come back and sit down here if you like.

NV: Okay. Anybody have a question, comment? If you would come to the mike then we'll be able to get your question and the response into the transcript. Otherwise we won't. Thank you.

NV: I have several questions and I don't want to take up an inordinate amount of time so there may be other points in the agenda where some of my questions will be more appropriately focussed and I'm open to being told wait there will be more said about this further on because it's a little bit hard to tell.

NV: I'll tell you. Maybe tell the whole audience. The next piece is on environmental restoration refocussing. So for those of you who have a clue what that means. That's the piece they're going to talk about later.

NV: Now we're focussing on budget and priorities, is that correct? Milestones, budget and priorities. The first question I have would be to ask exactly how does incoming waste, not waste generated at Hanford itself, but the constant incoming waste and the proposed newer types of waste that would be coming in under the what's the agreement I think it's actually originated under atoms for peace or will we ship out certain products to other countries we're obligated to take back spent fuel and waste products and so forth and I'd like to know exactly in terms of priority and

9413287.0101

budget and the physical plant that you seem to be getting ready for here your construction and so forth. How you separate or how you don't separate what is incoming from what has been generated historically by Hanford itself?

NV: Right now and Steve help me out here better if you could I know right now as far as the incoming waste not the tank waste that has been stored there for so many years, nor the solid waste that are out there, or the spent fuels from the old reactors, but incoming waste there's a list of fairly small volumes from DOE sites around the country for example small volumes of waste that are generated by academic research organizations that do wind up at Hanford periodically throughout any given year. And as far as a large waste stream of course we have the defueled reactor compartments from Bremerton. As far as any other proposed major types of waste, those would basically wind up being dealt with on a case by case basis as far as open public debate. You know as those proposals came up in the future. Other than that, it's mainly the TPA focussing on the wastes that are on the site now.

NV: Also let me turn this over to Jay Gustenburg from our waste management division and he might be able to clarify this too.

NV: I am with the waste management division at Hanford DOE.

NV: Let's turn you around so you're looking at everybody. You've probably seen those guys before.

NV: And I think part of the answer to your question is the off-site waste the way we handle that we put out a call every year generators and ask for their prediction, their forecast. These forecasts are notoriously overstated. We

don't generally get the waste volumes that they say we're going to get. I can get you those numbers. I don't have them right now but as compared to the total Hanford picture of off-site waste versus what's on-site, it's very, very small. The driving force for the construction of the facilities is really the on-site waste and not the off-site waste.

NV: How does a thing like MRS ??? transport waste through the states of Oregon and Washington and Idaho and the attempt by DOE, I guess it's DOE, to find an MRS site on the Oregon and Nevada border. The Fort McDermott reservation. I'm a little bit hazy on how all of these things fit into Hanford because I know there is ongoing and continuous waste being generated and transported and I'm a little bit lost how this clean up and this budget fits in with the whole DOE program in our area.

NV: All I can tell you about the ??? side factor. It is relatively small impact. I can answer, I'm not a transportation person, so the question about what you're asking specifically about what's been going on in terms of discussions with other states concerning of transit of waste across state lines.

NV: I'm speaking of a permanent, geological repository which is what the MRS is an interim storage for that.

NV: I'm not familiar with that. I don't know if anyone here is.

NV: That's a storage site that's primarily for nuclear fuel from the civilian nuclear waste program. The waste we're really talking about here at Hanford is waste from the defense production mission and as far as I understand none of that is slated to go to a MRS facility.

- NV: So Hanford's, what you're talking about with regard to Hanford's priority in budget and construction and clean up does not have to do with MRS or the eventual location of a geological repository.
- NV: That's correct.
- NV: Okay.
- NV: There are geological repository and I don't want to make this an issue but there are geological repositories in the works for other things. ??? which is in New Mexico for transatlantic waste and so on but that's a whole different program than what you're talking about.
- NV: There will be high level vitrified waste from Hanford that will have to go to a geological repository but there was no plans for that material to go to a retrievable storage site. It would only be shipped off-site once a repository location for high level waste has been identified.
- NV: So the only incoming are the reactor cores we see going up the river? And the small amount of medical how should I say it radiography type medical waste.
- NV: There's waste that go to the commercial. There's low level waste that goes to the commercial operation on site. Then we also receive a certain amount of low level waste from other DOE sites.
- NV: And can you give me a rough idea of the percentage of this viz a viz, the on-site waste generated by Hanford historically? Like 1% or 2%.
- NV: Less than that, I'll say that. ???

NV: A question was a New York Times article that came out showing the different areas in which certain states were responsible for wastes and I believe that Hanford is responsible for Alaska, Hawaii and the Northwest Region here. Also that's one consideration that I have. If I am wrong please correct me.

NV: Those are commercial low level waste generated in this region.

NV: Another thing why are we unnecessarily spending so much money in transport that maybe unnecessary such as the submarine cores that are coming down with their, their happy where they are, the geographical locations are secure and safe where they are yet we continue to move more and more nuclear waste to a site that's unstable. Very unstable with its' single shell tanks etc. and it just seems to me we're putting all the dynamite in one big pile and waiting for something to happen versus keeping some of the nuclear waste in places where it's safely contained. I would like you to address that.

NV: Yeah. On the commercial side, Washington has had the US Ecology disposal site pretty much in the center of the Hanford reservation for a number of years since the late 60's anyway and only in the last few years shrank the area from which it accepts commercially generated low level radioactive waste down to that short list of states that you mentioned. Hawaii, Alaska and you know 7 states. Prior to that time we accepted those types of waste from the entire US so that has shrunk down so of course has the transportation is at least within a smaller area still towards the Hanford site but.

9413287.0105

- 943207.006
- NV: Still one of the most unstable areas as far as I'm concerned ??? and continued transporting out through the Columbia Gorge ???
- NV: If you want this on the transcript, then we need to mike you.
- NV: The continual transport up and down the Columbia River Gorge just not prove to be a hazard as far as maybe a mistake that can cleaned up by Union Pacific. It would be.
- NV: Our particular situation here with tourism being the main income that we have right now. Our canneries closed, lumber's being questioned right now. We can't any small incident and if the submarine cores coming down here affect us in any way whatsoever not just this community which is centralized on the river and I think we could look at some other alternatives, safer alternatives and maybe more cost effective ways.
- NV: I understand your concern with the reactor compartments that decision was made a number of years ago through the ??? process or through the environmental impact statement process looking at all of the alternatives that were around and the decision came out with Hanford having the available transport system and being an arid site basically.
- NV: I can add something to the Navy program you're talking about. When we refer to the Navy program it's the submarine core and I understand that we are just told to take it as far as DOE is concerned and the Navy is redoing their ER ??? I understand and they are going out to public hearings on the environmental impact statements and I would suggest you keep your eye open for that announcement because they have to publicly discuss that.

NV: I hate to be so stubborn but I don't ??? (tape ran out)

stopped here

TAPE 1-SIDE B

NV: We can certainly take your comments then I think when the EAS or when the EAS comes out that's another opportunity to comment and commenting to your elected officials would be another way to address this issue as well.

NV: ??? (too far from mike)

NV: Is this working?

NV: I'll finish up or attempt to finish up this by asking the Washington Department of Ecology. Can we expect to see you taking a stand somewhat similar to what Cecil Andras at least tried to do with regard to not just laying back and rolling over and playing dead when these things get shipped through our corridor because as you know all we have is you here in Oregon. We don't have the Oregon direct Tri-Party membership and so we would kind of like to see at some point the state of Washington say hey no, no.

NV: I understand that and in fact earlier when you were talking, you started talking about other types of wastes where these different proposals pop up and I don't remember exactly the way you phrased it but it was basically that it was confusing to have these other different proposals keep popping up and I think you come pretty close to hitting the nail on the head with those because I think there is a lack of a cohesive stance or evaluation. I think we have some of the same sense as these different proposals pop up whether it's reactors from overseas or fuels from the Navy or

whatever that we get to the point where we have to develop a cohesive strategy. Any of those proposals wind up having to be debated out in the open so the public if they don't like it can scream and all the various officials that are involved can deal with those comments in order to formulate the policy. You know those things are starting to develop. Jeff, did you want to say something? I'm going to let this guy introduce himself here.

944287 003  
000 282546

NV: My name is Jeff Bruckwell and with the Washington Department of Ecology and I would like to address ??? (speaking too softly) First just to give you some background on the Navy situation. What is presently shipped up here are the reactor compartments which at one time hold the fuel, but no longer hold the fuel. ??? low level waste. There is no Navy fuel ??? from Hanford. That fuel under an environmental assessment is being held at Puget Sound Naval Ship Yard until a full EIS is done and I think that is scheduled for completion in June of 1995. There will be a draft of that EIS being used ??? The Navy is also preparing another EIS to look at a second tier of ships they are going to be decommissioning in the near future. Some of the ships are actually ??? what they're going to do with the reactor compartments. For those, I believe that EIS is due out again sometime in 95 so those are two ??? There are four research reactor fuel which the United States believes it has an obligation to accept back from foreign nations in which it was shipped. That obligation is based on a desire to ??? rich uranium out of those foreign reactors back to the states as weapons potential.

NV: If you keep shipping out is this something that's starting and ending and just trying to clean up past practice. This is a continuous program of shipping in ??? fuel and continuously taking waste back. And the question I'm

getting at I mean you can say until the cows come home you can say well you know we'll have a. Well you can say forever well now there's going to be a separate hearing on that and you can all take your time. You guys are all paid more or less to be here. I'm not saying at this particular hour but basically your jobs depend on dealing exactly these issues. The rest of us go to the meeting, after meeting, after meeting right on our own time, on our own dime. We don't get any DOE money like the Washington State Department of Ecology does. And yet we ask when are you going to say no. Just no. Don't ask us. Don't say well we need to have so many people commenting for and against. When is it going to be a public health issue instead gee maybe we'll get another grant from DOE to be able to build yet another office building at Hanford. I understand that two thirds of the Washington Department of Ecology is moving out to Hanford now. I don't know if this is true, but a huge chunk of it is now moving out to Hanford. It must be cozy. I'm distressed about the money. I'm distressed about the funding and I wonder if it's ever going to stop or just going to be a continuous cycle?

NV: I was just trying to give you folks an idea of some of those decisions that are out there because the state is now looking at those decisions that are pending and saying we think that they all need to be reviewed collectively rather than nickel and dime decisions to send waste to Hanford or to Savannah River in South Carolina, or Oakridge in Tennessee. You know these are national issues. The responsibility for resolving those national issues should be shared nationally and there should not be a disproportionate burden on the Northwest. Right now we're looking at those issues. We're trying to get a picture as to what the expectations are in terms of decisions that DOE is going to have to make in the next several years with regard to these

off-site wastes and to move ahead and we would hope that there would be a national, a full and open, national discussion. Where are we going with this waste? So the public has a chance to air their opinions before any decision is taken place ??? , in particular Hanford. We sure have concerns.

NV: Where does Washington DEQ stand on this? I mean I keep hearing we're going to have another public hearing. Where do you guys stands on this whole issue when are you going to say wait a minute. Are you ever going to say hey stop, quit, no or do you just go and sign more Tri-Party Agreements with the EPA and DOE saying well maybe if we had a little bit more budget maybe we could have another milestone here. When are you going to say no?

NV: With regard to off-site waste, we're in discussions with DOE now on a number of those categories ???, but we told DOE even the ongoing shipments of waste that have been going on for a number of years is that we wanted to ??? back and toss those on the table along with everything else. We need to addressing everything that coming on site collectively. I think you'll see that. Again DOE is a long way from making the decision as to whether to bring those waste to Hanford. You know and we're trying to gather information just like you are as a matter of fact in terms of trying to build a complete picture as to what DOE is looking at. Most of these EIS' that talk about moving former nuclear reactor fuel or Navy fuel to DOE sites across the nation. Another factor that comes into play here is what are we going to do with weapons ??? plutonium. These weapons need to be decommissioned. That's all part of the equation and we think it all needs to be part of a national discussion and DOE should not piecemeal those discussions or those

decisions, but they should be coming back and talking to people in the regions where this stuff might go.

NV: Has Washington DEQ made a stand on the Isaiah Project yet?

NV: No.

NV: Is there any Washington Health Department or DEQ representation on the Isaiah project yet?

NV: No there's not.

NV: Is there any target date for that?

NV: That would be a decision that the Governor's office would make and ???

NV: Isaiah hasn't even gotten to the point where it's a DOE proposal.

NV: If we're going to talk about Isaiah someone needs to say what it is. I wasn't sure we were going to talk about it. If you want to keep it going, then you need to explain it for some of the people that might not know.

NV: Basically the Isaiah Project is a proposal to use to finish the construction of the WPPS reactors at Hanford and use them to essentially burn weapons of plutonium material such that it can't be used anymore for weapons purposes and I believe that was the proposal outside of the DOE and locally we're not dealing with it at all.

NV: Even though it's a Washington project?

- 210782146
- NV: No. We have never had. The state has never had DOE either the Richland office or DOE headquarters come to us with any kind of proposal as far as the Isaiah Project.
- NV: So the state of Washington has no input on it even though it is proposed to physically take place in the state of Washington.
- NV: I haven't seen DOE pick up that proposal which they would have to do in order for it to move forward.
- NV: I'm Karen Randolph with the DOE in Richland and on the Isaiah Project. That was an unsolicited proposal which has been submitted to headquarters DOE for action and so far nothing has taken place on it and the local office has not been involved at all.
- NV: Is there a time line on when it will come to consideration?
- NV: I don't know that there is a time line. There's a lot of pressure from the people who are proposing the project, but we haven't heard anything in terms of any date that has been set or anything like that. It's strictly an unsolicited proposal at this point.
- NV: I was going to ask some questions, but I'm going to help Linda Smith ??? so we can get this thing going around. What Linda is basically saying is Battelle has made a proposal and this proposal did go to DC. Last week there was a ??? material meeting in Washington DC to look at the plutonium that is currently stored in the ??? The government for some reason is under obligation for nuclear ??? has decided that they want to do something and they have asked the stakeholders of this country to give input of what they want to do with this plutonium. One of the opinions is to burn

9413287.0113

it in a reactor fuel, where they mix oxide fuel which is the Isaiah Project. I guess what Linda is saying and I have some concern of putting the Northwest, especially the public groups, they've said that it's not a good proposal. The NAS study, National Academy of Science, came out and said that is one opinion as far as cost efficiency. It was kind of a pretty poor opinion. The RAND Report which was another report that talked about it also said that it was a ridiculous idea and that they actually said that we shouldn't even get involved with it and they should table the discussion. According to headquarters, which I was back there on Friday having a meeting with them, they haven't addressed the issue, but as Linda pointed out if the state of Washington was to stand up and say no we are going to bring in any plutonium into this area. Hanford has enough of their own waste and we don't want to start these reactors up and we don't want have another WPPS on the american taxpayer, i.e., the Northwest taxpayer, that would put this thing to rest and I guess what she's saying and a lot of people in the Northwest are saying is why should we go out and spend millions and millions of dollars and the feasibility study or an EIS or national hearings and all this stuff when in fact the people don't want it. There are other alternatives. One of the alternatives which comes up in the RAND Report and the Office of Technology Development Report and also in the National Academy of Science Report is to take this and mix it with high level waste and begone with it. That's it. No more story. It's finished. So I am just kind of backing her up saying that's what she's asking for. The state to stand up, the governor to make the policy and say no Isaiah not here, not anywhere. So hopefully that gives.

NV: Greg, ask the DOE people who Battele the so-called unsolicited proposal, ask them how Battele is currently

connected with DOE at Hanford. Let's make this unsolicited proposal very clear.

NV: Well, I'll be a little direct on this one. I'm not aware of a Battele proposal. I don't know if we have any.

NV: Well, actually it was Battelle Memorial out of back East combined with that shipping company. Can you Karen help me with that? That was the combined group that brought this proposal forward.

NV: It's a consortium and I can't tell you the names of the other people right now.

NV: Some shipping yard, ship yard in New Jersey. Battele Memorial Institute and another group basically brought this proposal.

NV: Science Applications Inc or SAIC I think is one of the members, but Battele at Hanford does not do only DOE work. So this consortium with the Isaiah Project is the other part of Battelle. It's not the Battele organization that is doing the Hanford work or that is our contractor. I'm sorry it's a little confusing but there is separate division between the two organizations.

NV: They just came up with this out of the blue. They didn't have anything to do with the own relationship with a major DOE contractor at a ??? western and current dump site. Just one little coincidence, right?

NV: It was a group of people as I understand it that thought this would be one way of handling the surplus weapons grade plutonium. That's all I know.

NV: ???

NV: I'm not trying to defend it. I'm just trying to say what I know about it.

NV: So just continuing on this line and then I'll get into the questions about budget and stuff. The concern is that if you go ahead and bring this stuff back in that what's going to happen is because the workforce out at Hanford right now has a clean up mission from the Department of Energy headquarters Hazel O'Leary and before that Watkins that the mission of Hanford is clean up. The question comes up if we do go ahead and accept this proposal and if for some reason, and hopefully it never even gets that close, but they decide to start it back, basically what's going to happen is you're going to redirect the direction and now all of a sudden we're going to be back into potentially mixing oxide fuels, back into fabrication, and there's some facilities sitting up there that people are lobbying heavily for to get them restarted and start producing whatever they want to produce. The question comes up of HEU, highly enriched uranium, that is a big question and unfortunately at the phys-el material meeting back East at which DOE is putting on a national forum, they didn't want to talk about HEU and I kept bringing it back up saying wait a second you can take 15 kilograms of this stuff and make it into a bomb. We should be talking about it. Well the question is could it come back to Hanford. Hanford does have a facility to handle it and the people at Hanford are lobbying in Washington DC as we speak to get that facility going so going back to this lady's point. She's concerned about the future of bringing more waste into this area when we can't even deal and focus attentively and accurately and cost efficiently on the clean up mission which we're all hoping will take place. And I'll go into my questions. Steve, you put up on the overhead,

9413287.0115

and if you could put it back up again, it was your prioritization sheet and the last one at the bottom of the prioritization sheet was ER and the top of it was spent fuel. If you could put that up, I would like to ask a question on it.

NV: It is the issues chart?

NV: I think it's the prioritization and it had spent fuel on top. When you put this up, one of the things that you mentioned was that this was a prioritization and that this spent fuel had the highest prioritization.

NV: ???

NV: Moving up on the list of priorities. That is something that has to be dealt with sooner rather than later.

NV: Sooner than later. Okay. Is this reflective of the priorities from DOE. The way this list falls out or is that just the list that was put up and you were mentioning that spent fuels are rising to the top?

NV: It's a list of issues that we have for funding in 95 that we have to deal with. It's not necessarily the sequential list of priorities that we have on the site.

NV: So then I couldn't read this as saying ER is a last, and spent fuel is on top?

NV: I don't think you could say that at all.

NV: Okay, I just wanted to double check since we're into environmental restoration. The other question or comment I have and I would like somebody to comment on it is the 1995

9413287.0117

budget fails to request funds for promised acceleration of clean up and environmental restoration activities to protect the Columbia River and ground water and in this document I'm reading from there is definitely a shortfall in order to meet the request for the 1995 budget requests. In fact, there is a shortfall of about 14% for 1995. The question is would you address this to the public on the shortfall and then the next question would be is how are you going to prioritize the commitments to do the restoration work in the 100 areas and possibly the 300 areas such as pumping and treating N springs and also the uranium plume to make sure that we don't have continual contamination going into the Columbia River keeping in mind that pumping and treating is no short-term process and it's going to take a good 30 years to get some of those hotter spots along the river cleaned up. So if Environmental Restoration has a shortfall, how are we going to do this prioritization to make sure that those "priority ones" that the stakeholders have identified are not cut back and that perhaps tearing down a building is cut back or stopped to make sure that those priorities that the stakeholders have listed, that the regulators have listened to, are saying no we're going on and there will be funding for those.

NV: ???

NV: This was actually Heart of America put together this comment sheet and this comes out of the FY 95 budget request and it's just a comparison sheet.

NV: Hi Greg. Greg knows me I'm Mike Thompson. I'm with Environmental Restoration Program. Last year when we renegotiated the Tri-Party Agreement we went out for like 15 meetings with the stakeholders and tried to find out what their values and in that we negotiated some very important

changes to the Tri-Party Agreement which Greg was highlighting on there. Protection of the Columbia River, clean up along the river, move the waste up to 200 area that sort of thing. Those agreements that we negotiated last year are sound. They are funded in the budgets as we see them. We are trying to prioritize in terms of making sure that our commitments to protect the Columbia River are at the very top of our priority list. The one thing that may fall behind when we look at how we prioritize the work is characterization of new areas on the Hanford site. What we're trying to do in a refocussing which Doug Sherwood will talk about a little bit later is to try to focus our resources that we do have at Hanford Environmental Restoration on remedial efforts and focus those remedial efforts in a way that will help the Columbia River itself. We're looking at negotiating something for the N area, deactivation of the reactor, that is cleaning out the sludges and water in the basin primarily pump and treat or some other remedial action for N springs. Clean up of the source terms eventually there. The work in the Columbia River, the cutting off of vent pipes, that has been completed. We have an engineering analysis in the works for dealing with the out fall structures. We've done some work on spec contamination on the islands. We'll be doing some more. Basically those sort of things are funded and we're trying to maintain those priorities as best we can.

NV: But yet it does have a shortfall of 14% and so going back to it, are you assuring us that the remedial action, or the pumping and treating, that's for N springs is not going to stop because there's a shortfall.

NV: No. We're going to start to pump and treat and the only thing that would stop the pump and treat for the 200 areas and the 100 N areas if we found they were not effective or

efficient. We want to keep that in the utmost part of our funding priorities and I would hope you would help us do that over time.

NV: Greg, the 14% shortfall that you're talking about where does that number come from?

NV: Comes from the FY 95 and it's, let's see Environmental Restoration is slated to be only 14% of the 1995 Hanford clean up budget \$1.6 billion and just 11% overall and then it up above it says there's a shortfall. Basically I'm citing something that Jerry Pollitt put together and he's the budget man.

NV: The 14% is the ER funding is 14% of the overall budget.

NV: It's their piece of the pie, the ER piece of the pie is 14%. That's not a shortfall.

NV: I think that's what Jerry was saying.

NV: I think in all fairness in the FY 95 budget that there the budgets are very tight and the only way that we are going to meet our commitments, all of our commitments, in that year is if we become a lot more efficient in the way we do business at Hanford which is one of the things that we signed up to in the negotiations that we would do a cost efficiency initiative and the shortfalls that were identified in the budget, I think a lot of those would have to come out of that more efficient ways of doing business and channelizing those efficiency savings back into real clean up.

NV: That leads.

NV: Someone might want to, someone who was at the Seattle meeting, might want to try to characterize what Heart of America was saying. I think.

NV: I think also what Jerry was saying was it appeared that you know comparing of the 14% of the ER budget at Hanford to the total budget is different than at the national level where it's a greater percentage. I think that might be a function of the various sites at Hanford you've got a much bigger waste management program, more mature program, and that is taking a bigger share of the budget, where ER is growing bit by bit each year and the question is, is it going to be growing enough? And I also think there has been issue with certain productivity challenges to the various programs that have been imposed by headquarters, both on the waste management and Environmental Restoration side and I believe that Jerry felt that the ER program was taking a bigger hit for those productivity challenges than maybe the waste management side.

NV: That leads into the next thing. Mike you were talking about cost efficiency. In the ADS coming out, there was a \$19 million slated for low-level waste form. In that \$19 million on a conference call, we found out, this is with help from Todd Martin from HEAL, that in that there's about \$2 million slated for the grout program and Roger you just briefly mentioned something, just real quickly, about the grout program. One of the things that we have requested is in the ADS's you can't really find out where the money's really going. There's \$19 million there and then we found out that about \$2 million, \$1.5, \$1.7 nobody had an exact number on it, was going to the grout facilities and the question we asked was, well grout has been discontinued and most people know how to make cement, it doesn't take a genius to make grout, you use it making pools, but yet

942287-012  
21078746

9413287.0121

they've shut the facility down and yet they're still going to spend \$1.4 or \$1.5, whatever that number is, million next year for nothing. I mean literally there's four people that are on that program used to be 18. I have asked a request for a breakdown of where the money's going to be spent and one of the things they mentioned was on a deficiency, and I was asking, the question was, is the deficiency because they were not in compliance or something because of the state requirement. Then the next question came up, if it was and the grout program has ceased is there any way we can get the state to eliminate the deficiency and take that \$1.5 million and put into ER and shut the. I mean, they're not doing anything, the trucks aren't running, the cement mixing plant, there's nothing going on, so how do we spent \$1.4 million on it and I, if anybody here can answer that I would love to hear something.

NV: I'll give a shot. I don't know all the details, but I did talk to the grout people data to get up to speed a little bit on this and it is about \$1 million. They are putting together a detailed response to your questions. That million dollars would go to keep the grout program in a standby mode. If it would be necessary to get it up and running, it would be a standby condition up until the time that the new tanks are built, so it would be a contingency or emergency capability. So that's just maintaining it in a readiness mode and I guess the question is, whether you would have to address corrective actions or notices of deficiencies. If you are going to maintain a readiness condition, do you still need to do these things? How serious are they? I'm not sure Roger knows of what those might be, but the main thing would be to make sure you're ready to start up, if in fact you would need the facility. At this point, we're not projecting that need because we're going to be building new tanks on schedule.

200702046

NV: The reason why I brought this up and I don't want to take anymore of the public's time, but thinking about how Hanford has always done business in the past when a toilet seat can cost you \$500 and a drill can cost you \$1,000, I mean everybody knows there are lots of cost override and things, I hope I get this information very shortly because I don't know how many people here know what a cement plant looks like, but you know cement plants close down all the time, and people go on vacation and in fact I worked in a grout facility when I was in Alaska, and we shut down for a few weeks. The facility needed no maintenance whatsoever and we went away and came back, started the trucks up and went on with business. So I'm just to make this short. I hope there's a justification for \$1 million being spent there because I have a feeling that it is the traditional way of doing business and not the cost effective way of doing business.

NV: Who did you ask for the cost study?

NV: The grout manager actually there's four people left, the grout manager is preparing the document to send to me and I hope it comes in 2 pages and not 36 pages or 500 pages for a justification.

NV: Was it Rudy Carrone or George Sanders?

NV: It was Rudy.

NV: Okay. We owe you that information and when I get back I'll talk to him.

NV: I mean if we can save a million dollars you know shut it off and if there is a requirement that the deficiency is because of the state and the state realizes that there's no need to

it maybe the state can resolve the issue and we can put the money some place else. Thanks.

NV: Just for your information too. There were permitting activities associated with the grout program and we've recently sent a letter to the state asking to cease those permitting type activities or resolving notices of deficiencies and so on.

NV: General comments ??? (too far from mike)

NV: ??? (too far from mike)

NV: I would like to continue with some questions on budget. You had a pie chart or a series of pie charts on one of the overheads and just doing a little bit of math it comes out that 10.4% of the total Hanford budget is being spent on environmental remediations. That sound about right?

NV: It's about 14% on Environmental Restoration Program in general.

NV: Well, I was just going by the pie chart doing math.

NV: Put the pie chart back up.

NV: Well, 10 or 14% I'm not that concerned. The issue is that's not very much going to actual environmental clean up and I'm kind of concerned about that because it's mine and everybody else's taxpayer dollars, you know. I mean, I don't make a lot of money, but the thought of all this money going for nothing, you know, doesn't really sit well with me or anybody I know and when I look at all this renegotiation going on every few years of the Tri-Party Agreement, the question I have is how many more iterations of this thing do

we have to have before we get some actual clean up instead of a lot of planning and meetings and building facilities that won't be used and paying money for them not to be used like we just heard and I want to know, 1) why do we have only 10-14% being spent on actual clean up and I haven't really heard about much clean up that has actually taken place to date; and also is this the final Tri-Party Agreement before we go into clean up mode, what's going on? That's my question.

NV: I'll take a shot at that. First of all, as far as is it the final Tri-Party Agreement? No way. That TPA is the living document. It's going to be modified as we bump into problems for years and years and years. We're not going to get a TPA that is set in stone and then is just implemented. It's not that easy.

NV: My question was how many TPA's do we have to have before we get into environmental clean up mode?

NV: Okay.

NV: Because we're not there yet.

NV: I'll give some examples of clean up that at least my own view I think were at least starting to see more significant things show up than we have in the past. This last year we've started to see some still fairly small things, not major processing plants but we were starting to see some things. Plus when you talk about only 14% of the budget going to environmental clean up, that's a bit confusing because you have to remember that we're talking about the Environmental Restoration budget which means, basins is not in there, d and d of the old facilities is not yet in there, tanks is not in there. All of the waste management

activities are not in ER budget, so first of all, you have to understand the scope of the ER program and you know what that 14% is actually being directed towards. There are budgets for all of the major pieces and I think Doug has a slide actually that shows all the different pieces of clean up.

NV: I think that's one of the major issues with ER refocussing is when are we going to see real clean up? And that's one of the reason we're coming out and asking for your advice now. We're about to finish 11 major waste site investigations and we think we know what we would like to do with the waste that we're going to generate by cleaning these sites up and we have learned an awful lot by investigating a very large group of sites at Hanford right now. What we're saying is, we don't need to investigate a lot of other sites to figure out what to do with these wastes. We think we have some pretty good answers on what we should do and we should move forward more rapidly with the clean up actions. So I think we're not stopping and renegotiating this time. We're renegotiating and we're trying to prepare for a day very soon when we're going to be doing clean up.

NV: Okay. That really concludes the question I have. I did want to just make a couple of statements along with some suggestions. When I look at the budget as I've seen so far, I see a budget of I don't know is it one and one half billion dollars, something like that annually. And when I look at the breakdown, I still see these huge black boxes of tens of millions of dollars or maybe even fifty millions of dollars and I would like to see as a taxpayer, a breakdown that's a lot finer. I think it's too coarse. I would like to see instead one budget item being \$50 million, I would like to see it broken down into less than \$5 million. I

9413287.0125

mean if it's \$1 million a piece maybe have 15,000 items that might be kind of long, but I think \$50 million black box is a little bit too coarse for me as a taxpayer and I would like to see more. I would also like to see for instance how much of that breakdown is going for overhead. In other words, management. How much of it is going to actual clean up. How much of it is going to construction. How much of it goes to Westinghouse. How much of it goes to the other inter-government agencies, etc. I would like to see that kind of breakdown too. And I think it would be worthwhile that once we could get that budget together if it could be published in some of the major Northwest newspapers. Maybe some of the minor ones, like The Hood River News because I think that a lot of people would really like to know that information and I think we might have some more interest from the public if we could get better information like that.

NV: ??? do you want to comment on that?

NV: Yeah sure. That information is available. We publish it at what we call the activity data sheet level and so that would get into much more detail and we are trying to improve the process of getting that information out and getting it out in a more timely manner. Earlier in my presentation, I mentioned that with just a few minutes here, it's really difficult to get into any detail at all on such a large budget so maybe at some later time we can get the information before hand and then sit down with you and walk you through it so that we can talk where the program is and as to the scope in the details of that budget.

NV: Okay.

NV: Jim Peterson here from our Budget Division could maybe add to that if he would like.

NV: ??? (too far from mike)

NV: Thanks Steve, I'm Jim Peterson with the DOE Richland budget office and we mentioned activity data sheets ADS's. The ones that reflect the president's budget are in the reading rooms and the closest one to here is at Portland State University. However, Steve mentioned we were talking about this workshop. We were just looking at some of the data that we have other there that does breakdown to in some cases \$400/500,000 levels for various activities going on and I really think that that would be good stuff to share, Steve, when we get to the point of having a budget workshop because there's a lot of detail there and takes a long but you really come to understand the program when you get into that level of detail and I don't know why we can't share that after the reprogramming goes forward to Congress and so we can show you what we're actually going to be doing.

NV: Okay. Well, for those of us who live here in Hood River, that's an hour and one half drive each way to get to Portland State and just for point of reference. Last Fall to prepare for another one of your meetings and tried to find some documents and I could not find one reference librarian in the entire Portland State University that knew anything about any Hanford documents. I searched through the library microfiche myself. I found a few documents on Hanford in the government document section, all of which were at least four years old and I couldn't find anyone there who knew anything about this Hanford reading rooms, so perhaps, you could talk to people at Portland State and make it a little bit more accessible and also for those of us who are here in Hood River, and I think you must think of us as

9413287.0127

some kind of stakeholders, since you have so many meetings here. Make some of that a little bit more accessible to us because that isn't accessible. And just to close, I would just like to say something to have DOE people pass back on up to headquarters. I think a lot of the comments I've heard from some of the other members of the public tonight on other Hanford issues, we might have gotten a little off tonight's topic, but it points out that we're really getting everything piecemeal and without a national radioactive materials policy, energy policy of some sort, we're just going to keep getting into this kind of gridlock and a lot of people going to a lot of meetings and not a lot getting done. Please pass that back to Washington. We need a national policy. We got to, you know, Clinton, he's got to show some kind of leadership on this. I don't see zip coming from Clinton. I mean, when it comes to leadership on energy or nuclear materials policy, we got to have something on that, or we're just going to keep this gridlock going.

NV: From the state of Washington standpoint, we share your exact concerns as far as the need for that overall policy. That's the kind of dialogue that Jeff Breckwell was talking about. That there's an increasing recognized need for that kind of a dialogue at that level.

NV: Another form of these major policy issues can be discussed would be the newly formed Hanford Advisory Board and I now Greg and Ralph Patt are involved in that board and that's a collection of quite a diverse set of stakeholders in the Pacific Northwest that talk on key Hanford issues. So if you talk to those folks, they're the ones that really run those meetings and are the ones who advise DOE and EPA and Ecology from a major policy standpoint.

NV: We'll take one more question and then move on to the presentation on Environmental Restoration refocussing.

NV: Thank you. This does have to do with budget concerns so I will try to make it as quick as possible. I was trying to think back of the reality of it all and a situation which might throw people into considering how devastating this might be at a reasonable rate. The Columbia River travelling at approximately 6 knots down to the mouth at a reasonable contamination from a tank explosion or a multiple tank explosion or several leak into the river, I have severe questions concerning how effectively we can contain 6 knots of river right down to the mouth. I have questions about the irreversible damage to two states or the border of our states and headquarters how can they understand that from there with so many things going on when we're sitting in the middle of it. Also not only the environmental impact that it would have but the thousands of lives we currently have invited to come, and I have said this before and I'm beating my head on the wall, about international tourism that we ask and attract to come to this area, and then continually say we're going to do another EIS for you folks in another year or so. The future effect on communities survival and what's at stack. I don't think those items are thought too much, or get so much into the budget end of it etc., but it has to do with budget and priority. Quickly I will move on, Jeff has been a help, 2 1/2 years ago I think I met him down here at the care corner helping out and the terms he's been using and other people in the middle management positions that you're in and I respectively say that, are we should, we hope, in answering Linda's questions, and when are we going to turn around and say we will and we can. These are a concern to me. A real specific concern. There are 2,000 other considerations which we have within our country alone waste sites and if I'm wrong please correct me and educate

9413287.0129

me. I think we have a severe lack of priorities on who presides over decision making. What's the difference between DOD and DOE? Well, those acronyms are given me an ulcer. When you tell me also that the Department of Defense or Navy can come in and tell you what they're going to do, regardless of what the people said at any one time. So let's consider who's really running the ballgame. Let's distinguish the line of authority and deal with it. Is there focus and direction? I have heard about 100 people speak on that question. National internal risks. Where are the priorities? Internal defense spending. We're getting into Korea now. We're spreading ourselves so damn thin how can they possibly get up enough money and help you do the job you're trying to help us do. I don't understand that. The global issue also. Are we tapping into all the possible international resources to gain effective progress in our technologies and cooperation from these countries? As desperate as the future looks for us and our children, we tend to think of America the Great and I think it is the greatest. That's why we're all here, but globally are we doing the most we can to work with other countries that are as desperate as we are to find solutions and technology and to take care of this. Lastly, time's running out, Thanks.

NV: Let's hear from Doug Sherwood on Environmental Restoration Refocussing and then we'll have some time after that to get specific comments from you about that program.

NV: You all have a handout on this Environmental Restoration Refocussing. I'll get them if someone, oh here we go. Okay. Would you like him to put it up on the board too?

NV: These will all have kind of a pretty design to them. They got a little hot in the car and so they'll look like they have a little bit of design to them. I'm here tonight to

discuss the Environmental Restoration Program, but first what I would like to do is discuss the various parts of the Hanford program. I know you've seen the budget discussion now and if you can relate these different areas to that budget discussion that you just heard. What I would like to do is go through the various aspects of Hanford's site mission and then focus on the Environmental Restoration Program and what work is in that program. Earlier Steve showed a budget breakdown that had waste management. If you think about waste management, you think about ongoing operations of solid and liquid waste and the Tank Waste Remediation Program. Those are really the two main programs that deal with waste management. They are the active management of wastes that are being generated on the Hanford site right now. If you go out and characterize a single shell tank or a double shell tank, you'll create waste. That waste is managed through that program. The second major area is the former nuclear facilities. That's

TAPE TWO-SIDE A

NV: ??? in the Tank Waste for Remediation Program. Those are really the two main programs that deal with waste management. They are the active management of waste that are being generated on the Hanford site right now. If you go out and characterize the single shell tank or a double shell tank you'll create waste. That waste is managed through that program. The second major area is the former nuclear facilities. That's facilities that were formerly in operation and have not been taken to a safe and stable state or decontamination and decommissioning.

NV: ??? so what you're talking about is.

9413287.0012

NV: Transition of that facility from operation to decontamination and decommissioning. That was another part of the budget. The science and technology portions on this side. Those are primarily jobs done by Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory. Some of that work would be covered in the technology development budget Steve talked about earlier and others would be other government research that would be done for EPA or could be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or any other branch of the government. The site support services are simply the support services required to operate the site. And the special initiatives are those initiatives we're looking at to hopefully do a better job in clean up and make a more cost efficient program at Hanford. The part I want to concentrate on tonight is the Environmental Restoration Program and that's really the part of the program that deals with clean up of old past facilities located at Hanford. This is program that simply cleans up the waste problems we have here. These are examples of facilities and programs that are covered in each of those budgets so if you hear the fast flux test facility you will recognize that that's in former nuclear facilities area. This is just kind of a key to get you in tune with which facilities are associated with which budget items. Where the Environmental Restoration Program those are the sites that have been taken to the point where they're ready to be decontaminated and decommissioned and the primary facilities that have already been moved into that program are the reactors along the Columbia River, the ancillary buildings around those reactors and then the waste sites that we're dealing with currently under the CERCLA and RECLA clean up actions. In terms of how the regulations work with these various programs, RECLA programs, the programs that manages ongoing hazardous waste activities, those manage those active waste programs and the facilities that were previously permitted. So it would be the solid and liquid

waste, the tank waste for mediation system, the nuclear facilities, and other on site waste treatment programs like the grout program or the rap facility which is being developed for ??? waste. The last part again is the past practice part or the CERCLA and RECLA clean up action. In general terms we have five types of work going on in the environmental restoration program. Those are clean up we consider those to be clean up of waste sites and clean up of old nuclear facilities which contain radio nucleoid and other contamination. Waste site characterization which is the characterization of the problems that we have to clean up. Hazard stabilization and elimination, this is another important part of the ER program but it's not one that is mandated by environmental regulation. We have many old facilities at Hanford that pose a danger to Hanford site workers. Those have to be either maintained in an appropriate condition so they don't represent a hazard or they need to be removed and torn down. The last two areas technology and infrastructure and program management. Those are the supporting parts of this program that we need to keep those other activities going. In terms of the original Tri-Party Agreement, the Hanford site was divided into 78 operable units. For those of you who are not familiar with what an operable unit is. It's a group of waste sites that can be effectively assessed, characterized, and remediated as a group. So we have divided the site into source operable units which are groups of waste sites and ground water operable units which are essentially ground water plumes of contaminates in the ground water at Hanford. To date we have started work on 27 operable units and we have completed a record of decision for the 1100 area which was 4 operable units very near the city of Richland. In terms of the site wide breakdown, this is just for your review and since you have a copy I'm not going to go through it. But as you can see most of the waste sites are located in the

9413287.0133

100 and 200 areas with the bulk of the waste sites being in the 200 areas. In terms of where we started investigation I think you can begin to see a trend here that initially when the Tri-Party Agreement was signed there was a clear emphasis to go out and investigate waste sites that were bordering the Columbia River and which were in the 300 area and the 1100 area near the city of Richland. In addition that was kind of the over arching priority that we initially started with, but we focussed on those liquid disposal sites that were more likely to contaminate the ground water and move contaminates into the Columbia River. The sites in the 200 area that were selected as a priority were on the basis of we knew those sites had contaminated the ground water and had significant ground water contamination that resulted there. In addition to the operable unit investigations, the three parties agreed to undertake clean up actions where those clean up actions were obvious. In other words, we didn't have to do a long investigation to determine what the potential clean up options were or what we should do as far as a clean up program for those sites. So these actions are called expedited response actions and they're really quick clean ups that really made sense. They're not a major effort, the ones that are expected to be completed in a rather short time, but the main reason for initiating them was because it was the right action to take and didn't require a lot of investigation to do so. This is simply a location map of those expedited response actions sites. When the original agreement was signed, there was one part of the Environmental Restoration Program which was not covered under the RECLA and CERCLA clean up portions of our agreement. Those were the decontamination and decommissioning activities. Those activities have continued over the last 5 years essentially since the agreement was signed. Five years next week I guess. This is just a summary of the activities that are ongoing on the

decontamination and decommissioning program. Again, here's a some more examples of those activities. Now I would like to move into the last set of activities that are covered under the Environmental Restoration Program. These are the radiation area remedial actions that is to contain the spread of windblown contamination that may come from active or inactive waste sites. It's a program where they go out and stabilize and remove radioactive particles when they've bound to migrated outside of the radiation control areas. The underground storage tank program is much the same as you've seen in your community where they have removed fuel tanks from service stations because they potentially leaked and released gasoline or diesel or other fuel to the soil. The asbestos abatement program is a program to limit the spread and release of asbestos particles to the air. As you will recall, the last time this group of individuals I guess was here was during the Tank Waste Task Force process. We came to Hood River with a set of change packages I believe it was last November to discuss. One of the issues that the public, as well as the Tank Waste Task Force, brought to us last Summer during our negotiations was the fact that there were efforts that the public would like to see us start on and move forward on more quickly. In every case, those were clean up actions that were directly a part of the environmental restoration program. For the most part those were clean up actions that either dealt with ground water clean up or clean up to support actions near the Columbia River. These are just a list of those actions. These are actions which we're not looking at a major refocussing effort. We are looking at some changes in the decontamination and decommissioning milestones because those were only postulated as a result of the negotiations. The remainder of these activities are all related to clean up actions that would either speed the release of land or speed the clean up of lands on the Hanford site. This is the

9413287.0135

945287.036

remainder of the list. I would like to cover a little bit more in general what we feel the refocussing of the Environmental Restoration Program really is. We've not stopped any investigations or any activities that are currently ongoing. What we're just asking for is a way to establish priorities based on the values we were given from the Future Site Uses Working Group and the Tank Waste Task Force which were groups of stakeholders with a diverse set of interests that were all interested in cleaning up Hanford. They're consensus opinions formed the basis for our ER refocussing effort. The main focus of the program is to get to near term clean up near the Columbia River and to coordinate decontamination and decommissioning activities with those waste site clean up actions. The importance of this is that if you just clean up the waste site problems or you just clean up the facilities, you still can't use the land for anything but managing wastes because you have not cleaned up all the problems. Up until now, we as regulators were simply looking at the waste site clean ups because that was what was important to us and we had not really taken the cue from the stakeholders that hey just because it's a regulatory requirement doesn't mean it's the only thing out there that's important. The importance is if you can use the land for other uses or clean it up for other potential uses, then you have achieved something. You haven't just cleaned it up to meet the regulatory requirements. You've cleaned it up for another use. As I stated earlier in a response to a question. This is really a time when we're getting close to making clean up decisions. We're getting all of the data from the original investigations along the Columbia River and in the 300 area. We have a lot of information now on how we think those sites should be clean up and we're ready to move forward and to do that we want to effectively integrate the remedial actions with the decontamination and decommissioning projects and to do that

9413287.0137

we think we need to emphasis clean up over continued investigation of some of these sites. So we're really talking about reducing the amount we're spending to characterize waste sites and increasing the amount we're going to spend on cleaning them up. I will tell you right up front, I do not like the words 500% increase in funding for ground water remediation. I don't know that anyone of us could point to 500% and say we're doing 500% more right now. I think the important point here is there is a significant increase in ground water clean up activities. The exact funding for that is kind of not known. We do expect that this will result in more clean up actions along the Columbia River and more investigations of the river itself. We're looking to have a flexible geographic approach to try and clean up the areas identified in— Hanford's Future Site Uses Working Group Report and concentrate on those areas along the river. In order to clean up those areas along the river though, we need to have a place to put the waste. We need to move it to in our minds when you're sweeping your floor you move everything to the middle and clean it up. That's really the plan here. We're moving things away from the side, away from the Columbia River and hopefully isolating them in the central plateau and that's the fifth ??? on construction of the environmental restoration disposal facility. We had comments in Seattle that people were concerned that facility was being built to accept waste from outside of the Hanford site. That is not the case. This facility and its' permitting strategy that was developed by the state and EPA is to handle waste solely from the remediation of sites at Hanford. Again, I think I've discussed the reduction and characterization activities and decommissioning projects. Be glad to take any questions you have on Environmental Restoration and get your comments on Environmental Restoration refocussing. Thank you.

NV: Comments? Questions?

NV: This may be more properly addressed to the Future Site Uses Working Group and if so I will hold it for whenever we have a public meeting on that.

NV: We have a member standing back there in the back.

NV: Anyway, my question was with regard to the arid shrub step area that is one of the last examples of that type of unitary ecology. I understand that there is a push by local farmers to have that converted over to irrigated farm land in the future as opposed to being kept as a wildlife and ecological reserve. I believe this just North of the river you can correct me if I am wrong on that. I would like to know if EPA, DOE and the Washington Department of Ecology, I hope are standing as one tri-party group to keep that as an example of such shrub step ecology.

NV: For the record, I think ??? (too far from mike, can't hear)

NV: I can never tell who's the alternate and who's the member.

NV: There's really a couple step process that we have to go through here first. First we have got to get the sites cleaned up that's the first step we have to get to. Then in order for that land to be released that's means released from federal ownership, requires the determination by the Environmental Protection Agency called a surface determination. And I am sorry but I can't think what that acronym stands for. But it's basically the same process they're using at defense facilities for releasing bases in the base closure program to other uses. That is going to take some period of time. The issue on future land uses really not one that EPA has control over. That is one that if the land is transferred from DOE it would be transferred

to GSA, Government Services Administration, General Services Administration, and they would really have the say the way the land is dispersed. Or the first say in how the land would be dispersed. For it to be released for any other beside government ownership is going to take some time. Yes.

NV: ??? (cannot hear, too far from mike)

NV: Naw, I think you're one of the greatest organizers. Thank you. Just to get back to prior history if I can and maybe where we find our priorities or if we have them and where our national government comes from as far as decision making. I can't believe that we ever had an EIS to begin within Complex 21 and where we were going to put a weapons facility on top of something as explosive as Hanford to begin with. I don't know if that makes any sense to you. Does that. I guess I should reword it. How could the Defense Department, we're the priorities with the Defense Department, and how could they possibly think of building a weapons manufacturing plant in Richland when there was such a grave problem to begin with to create more problems.

NV: ??? (too far from mike)

NV: No. No. I'm going back about 3 years ago.

NV: We're talking about the reconfiguration of the.

NV: I just wanted to make that comment sorry I didn't. That's where my feelings sort of warms up what I'm going to say. I have probably forgot what I'm going to say. Concerning what was just discussed in reality real quick because we've had two earthquakes in Portland. Every time I discuss with someone at DOE about earthquakes and how they're now, how

the technology's going what progress we're making in containing. This is why I brought up Complex 21 because back then in the 12 hours of testifying, a scientist stood up and said look why are moving it, why are we doing this, that and the other, we just need to contain it. You know monitor it and contain it and then we can deal with it as technologies arrive. Now we're here 3 years later and still wonder about who's running the ship and where the priorities are coming from. Well that's just a general question.

NV: ??? (too far from mike)

NV: I guess I could take it as a comment.

NV: Well you brought up a seismographic in the budget. We're regressing now. In budget you brought up the seismographic situation earthquakes and I've discussed it and no one's given me an answer as how we're dealing with the possibility which would be devastating with so many single shell tanks vulnerable to a seismographic situation. What are the new technologies that you are using for the double wall tanks that are going up? Give us a reality check on what might happen to the ground water and the purging of all this nuclear.

NV: The question is how is the possibility of earthquakes ???  
(too far from mike)

NV: Yes. What's being done about it?

NV: Just in general as far as the tank clean up program. The whole focus of it is to get away from the situation where you have mobile contaminates that are in a situation where you've got a lot of leaking tanks and to be able to process those wastes so you can stabilize them. Lock them down so

they can't go anywhere. So that they are stable. I mean that's the whole focus of glassifying radioactive wastes that are currently in the tanks.

NV: How many years is that going to take in other words? I don't understand with EIS studies and public involvement and everything else. How long would it take all this high-level glassification structures built? ???

NV: Safe and contained. I don't see that there is any safe containment and I question it how many years whether it's a decade or so we're going to have to wait around and wonder when all of it's contained. It is 30 years maybe by that time and how many earthquakes could happen within the next 30 years. There's a scerario.

NV: Right now the end of the processing that estimate of the end of the processing is 2028 for the tank waste that would be for glassifying. A long, long time.

NV: ??? (can't hear)

NV: Well, I mean we can't do it in a day. It's going to take a long time.

NV: Are there, wait, wait, we've got to get you on the mike.

NV: My name is Mike Baine. I work in the division that deals with the tanks and part of our strategy is to get the liquids cut: of the single shell tanks as soon as possible. And we are that's not an activity that's going to take through 2028 or that timeframe. The other portion of the strategy is the newer double shell tanks and the older double shell tanks are designed to withstand, designed basis earthquakes, for that area. So the strategy is to move the

waste into containers of double shell tanks that will withstand the earthquakes to where you won't have a problem and to date we of all the waste that was in the single shell tanks there's about roughly four and one half millions of liquid waste yet to be moved out of those tanks. There's a large amount of sludges and other debris but that debris is not mobile and won't move if the tank leaks.

NV: Hi Doug. Thought you needed a little beating up tonight. They've had a really rough week. I just have a couple thoughts on looking over the 7 points as far as potential near term outcomes of refocussing and maybe giving you a little bit of feedback. First thing that hits me is what we seem to be seeing happening here is a refocussing in terms of changing what to do, looking at different priorities and changing the list of what to do, but what I don't see happening that might be even wiser and save us as taxpayers a lot more money in the long term is changing how to do it. Looking more closely at the actual processes involved at Hanford. Doing more with less as a value and I don't see what's going on here actually incorporating that value. It's not changing how things are doing or going to be done. An example of that would be less paperwork. I, unfortunately at the Hanford advisory board meeting, which I was with these gentlemen in Seattle last week for two days, and that's what I was commenting about. They did get a lot of heat at that time. But a lot of these type of informational packets were handed out like you got tonight, and I tried to get a word in edgewise at that meeting, but couldn't and hoped to lodge an official complaint. It's a total environmental waste of paper which of course affects us down here on the river. That's one of our key priorities. Is using recycled and unbleached paper products and as environmental agencies I would hope that that would be something you're moving towards. It seems that the only

9413287.0143

time we see recycled paper products are in official documents that are printed for the public and so it seems to be more a image perception rather than actuality. This is not as bad as some that were handed out at the meeting, but everything that it says in here could be put on one or two sheets of paper instead of being on 24 point huge print and especially when we're seeing the same thing on the screen. So that's just a little example of the type of thinking we need to get to if we're really going to solve the problems out there and to go a little bit further on that point. When we again look at this list, we see reduced characterization activities that require high cost analytical support. Characterization is at least an action. It's something going on with the waste that will help in the clean up and I realize a lot of it may not be really necessary and maybe expensive, but at least it's an activity, and I think maybe we should be looking at the passing of paperwork that the majority of Hanford employees are involved in and I don't know has a study ever been done on structural reorganization at Hanford. I know that the navy at one point came in on one of their facilities and cut their workforce in a quarter I believe and was able to actually improve efficiency. We see that happening with private corporations all over the country and although we would want to protect jobs at Hanford, it doesn't seem like the most efficient place and if we look at the number of office employees and opposed to the number of people actually working on clean up. I don't know, does anybody here have those figures?

NV: Office employees versus people like hands on?

NV: Right.

NV: Probably not.

NV: I think it's well over three quarters.

NV: As far as the handouts tonight, people in Seattle asked for them, so we made them for tonight. Now you've asked us not to make them.

NV: That's why I was trying to warn you what was coming there. I apologize but it's an example.

NV: Part of the characterization issue is we've done a lot of this high cost characterization now for a lot of these sites. It's not that we're going to cut it out. It's that over the last four years, we've characterized five of the 100 areas in fairly significant detail.

NV: But has anybody characterized the office employees functioning? I guess that's more important to me. The root of the way the whole system works. It seems like massive amounts of money could be saved there.

NV: EPA's regulations apply to a lot of people but not much to office workers. Sorry.

NV: Okay, anyway a little feedback there. Other things as far as values reacting to this. Living down here from a local standpoint, decommissioning of old facilities is just something that I don't see as a real high priority in most instances. It's very expensive, especially if you're talking about moving old reactors away from the river. Just doesn't seem to make sense at this point, doesn't threaten health and safety and I don't see the 100 area as being an area where people are going to be windsurfing and fishing in the near future, or I would hope not anyway. So just as a value, that doesn't seem as important to us down here.

- 9413287.0145
- NV: It seems that in some cases, the piping and some of the buildings are as contaminated as some of the waste sites we have.
- NV: Right. And if they do pose health and safety problems great but if they don't I'm just saying leave them where they are.
- NV: It's going to take years to plan to move the reactors. They are still the single most important hazard, if you will, in the 100 areas. I would make one exception to that and that's the K Basins where we have stored nuclear fuel near the river, but that isn't in this program. But of most concern to us in the long term is those reactor blocks that contain alot of carbon 14 and those will take a long time to deal with.
- NV: ??? (too far from mike)
- NV: Well no I'm just saying a building or some old structure doesn't threaten health and safety taking the idea that gee we better start at the river and move back isn't necessarily what people here would place as a high priority. Decommissioning old facilities can be very, very expensive.
- NV: Address the risks first.
- NV: Right. Especially to the river and the ground water again. And just a quick final comment that on the second bullet here Columbia River investigations and remediation. Based on the presentation from the Hanford advisory board meeting which Mike went through again I would just, for people here, remediation of course is just a response to what is found from the investigation and we're pleased that this is a priority and that this is going to be ongoing, but again as a word of caution, please make sure that the check system is

in place and that contractors other than Battelle are used for the data collection and the review of the information once it's gathered.

NV: Okay. Other comments?

NV: A couple questions based on a few things that were said recently. I guess first a real quick one. Gentlemen from the Tank Waste Division mentioned that the tanks were being designed for specific designed earthquake and I would like to know what on the Richter Scale what they're being designed to withhold? The maximum.

NV: I'm pretty sure the number is .25g.

NV: Excuse me.

NV: I believe the number is .25g ground acceleration. I don't know the correlation to the Richter Scale.

NV: I think that would probably be something that the public would relate to more. If there's anyway we can get that information.

NV: Does anybody from the Westinghouse site know the correlation?

NV: I would like to make a point. I'm a geologist, but I'm not a seismic geologist, but using the Richter Scale is not really the best way to go because Richter Scale depends on how far the reading and what the gentlemen mentioned is much more important. How, say for a tank, you want to know the movement back and forth at that particular area is. If you got a tank full of liquid and it's moving back and forth very rapidly, you could destroy that tank and you could have

a very great leak and so whether it's a 6 point or 6.5 or 7.0 doesn't really matter, what we're concerned about.

NV: Well let's assume it's at the epicenter. That would cut through all this. We can get an answer.

NV: Well again geologists now aren't really using Richter Scale. Richter Scale is in the public's viewpoint, but what we're really looking at is the ground velocity and so what he's talking about and none of us could really give you, we're all struggling on how to handle Richter Scale right now because Richter Scale is in the public's mind as the only way to talk about an earthquake and it's really improper. Geologists are fighting trying to figure out how to define earthquakes now, but from an engineering point of view and from the tanks and KE Basin and things like that, we're really more concerned about the velocity that the ground would be shaking.

NV: Okay, I understand, but to give the public some kind of idea of what that means assuming that the earthquake epicenter is on top of Hanford, what kind of range of values from the Richter Scale are we talking about?

NV: 7.

NV: 7, okay. But I realize that is only an estimate. Right.

NV: Maybe the question back is how could be that translated? Is that what are you asking a question or you just.

NV: No. I got my answer. Thanks. The second question has to do with your presentation. You had a slide up there, you don't have to put it on, I'll just get the ??? information here. It was about some non-radioactive hazardous materials, carbon tetrachloride, hexanoic acid, sodium

dichromate, etc. I guess I don't have a handle on how much of the non-radioactive hazardous material that there is at Hanford. What state is it in? Is it contaminating the ground water? What kind of risk characterization EPA has put on it? Also is remediation of that as a special waste separate from the radioactive waste? Is that currently being cleaned up? Is that on hold? How much priority is being put on that?

NV: Okay, in terms of total waste volume at Hanford I think that the number I've heard for non-radioactive hazardous only waste is only about 1% of the total waste on site. One entire NPL area, the 1100 area, is an equipment and maintenance area. It's a bus lot. It's a mechanics garage and shop for all of the vehicles at Hanford. That was our first priority. It's very near the city of Richland's well fields and we're working on remediating that area now. There is one other major location with hazardous only waste. That's called the non-radioactive dangerous waste landfill and that's currently being closed under the state's RECLA regulations and there has been significant investigations going on out there. The carbon tetrachloride is a problem in 200 West area. It is clearly mixed with radioactive constituents. There was about 1,000 metric tons of carbon tetrachloride disposed to the soil from the plutonium finishing plant. To date we've removed about 20,000 pounds of that so far. The other sites that you mentioned are smaller sites where actually in one case drums were disposed and in another some liquids were disposed, but in no way does the hazardous waste problem make up a real big part of Hanford. As mixed, hazardous and radioactive it makes up a very big part.

NV: Okay, thanks.

94329-018

9413287.0149

NV: Just one final comment. Following up on a comment someone else made I guess this would be going out to all the various government official and that is I really think it's important to get a variety of contractors involved in the process of clean up. Because I think when you have one contractor like we have now with Westinghouse and as we've had throughout the history of Hanford with you know various other Fortune 500 defense contractors that have come and gone and taken taxpayer money and have not produced anything. There's really not as much as a incentive to clean up or to use money efficiently when you're not having to operate under the free market system which seems to be a real priority in other parts of our government and I think that if Westinghouse and you know some of these Battele some of these other folks really had to compete for the contracts we might get more clean up because as long as it's not in their best interests to clean up, to clean up fast, to clean up efficiently, I don't see how anything is going to change from the status quo. Thanks.

NV: I guess I might comment that starting July 1, Bechtel will be responsible for Environmental Restoration work at Hanford so we are changing out and getting a new contractor in to do that work so Westinghouse will still have the waste management, but the Environmental Restoration work will be done by Bechtel and we have a Bechtel person here tonight. So.

NV: Have they had any past involvement with Hanford?

NV: Not with the DOE operations I don't believe. They did some work with the construction with WPPS and in fact were they involved with FFTF? I think they were involved with construction at FFTF.

NV: We've also gone along those same lines. We're seeing more and more activities from DOE and DOE headquarters on contractor reform. Basically tightening up their contractors whether it's with Westinghouse or Bechtel or other folks, but they're starting to take some steps in that direction. Also just this last year, we're starting to see a number of initiatives where DOE is looking at whether or not to bring in private firms to tackle individual projects. We're starting to see those pop up on the map, so it's gradually coming in.

NV: Additional comments from anyone? Questions? Okay.

NV: Is any structure safe?

NV: Do you want that on the record?

NV: Shirt manufacturers.

NV: Okay. Thank you very much for coming and those of you who want to receive the full documentation of this meeting need to let us know. We're not mailing it out automatically.

stopped here.

943297-069

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT BLANK**

0210.887112