

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Draft Meeting Summary
September 7-8, 2000
Seattle, Washington

0053866

Executive Summary..... ii
Welcome and Introductions 1
Announcements 1
Approve June Meeting Summary 2
Update on DOE Office of River Protection 3
Committee Perspectives on "Done in a Decade" Proposal..... 5
 Environmental Restoration Committee..... 5
 Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee 6
EPA Five-Year Remedy Review for Hanford Superfund Sites 8
Committee Updates 10
 Tank Waste Treatment Committee..... 10
 Dollars and Sense Committee 11
 Public Involvement Committee 11
 Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee 11
HAB Chair Transition 12
October Stewardship Workshop 13
Hanford Fire Update 14
 Radiological Sampling..... 15
Draft Advice on Performance Measures 17
Perspectives from Senior TPA Managers 17
Board Updates 26
 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Shipment Update 26
 Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement 26
 Site Contracting 26
 Site-Specific Advisory Board Update 26
 Board Budget Update 27
November HAB Meeting..... 27
Public Comment 27
Attachment 1 - Attendees 28

RECEIVED
OCT 25 2000

EDMC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DOE-Office of River Protection

Bill Taylor, U.S. Department of Energy– Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), gave an update on DOE-ORP activities in light of significant changes recently. DOE-ORP issued a request for proposals on August 31. Contractor proposals must be submitted by October 16. Activities continue to transfer information from the former contractor, BNFL, to the interim contractor CH2M Hill. The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have expressed concerns about dates contained in the request for proposals that do not match Tri Party Agreement (TPA) commitment dates. The contract should be awarded by January 2001.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) members inquired about the short turnaround time between the issuance of the request for proposals and when proposals are due, the rationale for contracting with separate contractors for the design and construction of the facility and for facility operation, access to contractor information, funding, and strategies for avoiding repeat of the mistakes associated with the BNFL contract.

“Done in a Decade” Proposal for Hanford Cleanup

Members of the Environmental Restoration and Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committees reflected committee discussions and concerns regarding the DOE-Richland (DOE-RL) proposal to accelerate Hanford cleanup along the Columbia River and to adjust other site cleanup activities to accommodate this acceleration. Major concerns included implications for work in the 200 Area, the need to address the highest risks, meeting Tri-Party Agreement milestones, identification of cleanup end states, and budget. Members concluded that a focused effort should evaluate HAB values in relation to “Done in a Decade” before the November HAB meeting.

EPA Five-Year Remedy Review for Hanford Superfund Sites

Dennis Faulk, EPA, provided an overview of the EPA Five-Year Remedy Review of Hanford’s Superfund cleanup sites listed on the National Priorities List that include the 100, 200, 300, and 1100 Areas of Hanford. The objective of the review is to determine if the cleanup objectives established in cleanup decisions are being met. When the results are completed, EPA will release the report for public review and comment. HAB members asked for clarification about the scope of the five-year review and the relationship of institutional controls to cleanup levels and future land use,

HAB Chair Transition

The HAB discussed and adopted guidelines for the HAB to solicit nominations and develop recommendations to give to the TPA agencies that will select the new HAB chair. The HAB charged the working group that developed the guidelines with implementing them, including collecting nominations. Marilyn Reeves has served as HAB

chair six years, and her term expires in February 2001. HAB members recognized the significant challenges faced in finding a replacement for Marilyn and her leadership.

Hanford Fire

Pam Brown led a discussion on the Hanford fire of June 2000. A number of agency reviews are underway to assess emergency response procedures and effectiveness. Pam proposed that the HAB hold an evening informational session in association with the November HAB meeting to further discuss the fire.

Advice Performance Measures

The Dollars and Sense Committee presented draft advice to the HAB regarding the development of performance measures for cleanup contracts. Advice #111 was adopted on Friday afternoon by the 13 of 31 HAB seats present. It was signed by HAB chair Marilyn Reeves and sent to the TPA agencies. Since there was not a quorum present at the time the advice was adopted, the advice will be brought before the HAB again at the November HAB meeting for reconsideration.

Perspectives from Senior TPA Managers

Keith Klein, DOE-RL Site Manager; Harry Boston, DOE-ORP Acting Manager; Tim Fitzsimmons, Ecology Director; Chuck Findley, EPA Region 10 Acting Regional Administrator; and Maxine Hayes, Washington Department of Health State Health Officer, participated in a panel discussion to share their individual visions for Hanford cleanup.

Mr. Klein has developed three focused cleanup objectives: restoring the river corridor, transitioning the Central Plateau, and preparing for the future. The plan for achieving these objectives and accelerating some cleanup activities is called "Done in a Decade". Mr. Klein wants to have a solid plan in place before the change in Administration.

Harry Boston noted that the tank waste treatment project has faced substantial set backs in recent months. A broad base of support needed to secure funding for the vitrification facility. He said tank wastes must be safely treated and stored and the tank farms must be closed safely to protect the region. He noted that the path forward is clear, and he is committed to resolving issues between DOE and the regulators.

Tom Fitzsimmons stressed the importance of recognizing the achievements made on site. Ecology sees "Done in a Decade" as a good idea that needs further definition without relaxing regulatory requirements. Ecology wants to draw attention to the greatest risks. Work to negotiate tank farm consent decrees is underway. Mr. Fitzsimmons suggested that the HAB step back from criticizing and look toward contributing creative solutions to problems. He also suggested that the HAB narrow its focus.

Chuck Findley said that EPA's role is to keep the current cleanup schedule on course. EPA is supportive of DOE-RL's vision to accelerate cleanup and strongly supports any plan that addresses the highest risks first.

Maxine Hayes commended the Board for its recognition that public health and worker health is very important both today and in the future. Ms. Hayes said WDOH is supportive of Mr. Klein's vision for cleanup and also supports the work of Ecology and EPA. The role of WDOH is to ensure that public health is protected in all cleanup decisions made across the site.

Merilyn Reeves outlined a number of the unique aspects of the HAB and the Hanford site, including pioneering efforts to launch true public involvement, establishment of the TPA, the existence of two site managers, and the broad spectrum of interests represented on the HAB. HAB discussion

Board discussion followed presentations by the senior managers with a wide spectrum of issues and concerns raised. Discussion primarily focused on the future of the site, ranging from issues about the vitrification contract, to the accelerated cleanup plan, to budget, and to site contracting. The views represented the broad spectrum of perspectives and interests of HAB members and the constituencies they represent.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Draft Meeting Summary
September 7-8, 2000
Seattle, Washington

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

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting was called to order by Marilyn Reeves, Chair (Public-at-Large). This meeting was open to the public and offered four public comment periods: Thursday, September 7 at 11:45 am and 4:45 pm and on Friday, September 8 at 11:45 am and 3:45 pm.

Board members in attendance are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public. Board seats not represented were: Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local/Regional Public Health); Russell Jim, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government); Jack Yorgesen, Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government); and Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force). This is the third consecutive meeting that has been missed by Richard Berglund.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Marilyn Reeves welcomed all participants to the meeting. No new Board members or alternates were introduced at this meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Wade Ballard, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), congratulated EnviroIssues upon award of the new Hanford Advisory Board facilitation contract. Marilyn Reeves added that EnviroIssues contract and staffing changes would be discussed at the October Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Executive Committee meeting.
- Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, announced that Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues, was not able to attend the meeting due to a serious illness in her family. Ruth also announced that Tara Williams, EnviroIssues, is leaving the company.
- Ruth Siguenza announced upcoming HAB conference calls and committee meetings, which included:
 - o September 12 morning Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee meeting;
 - o September 12 afternoon joint ER/Health, Safety, and Waste Management (HSWM) Committee meeting;
 - o September 13 HSWM Committee meeting;
 - o September 14 Dollars and Sense (D&S) Committee meeting;
 - o October 16 Executive Committee conference call to set the agenda for the November HAB meeting;
 - o October 17-18 Executive Committee meeting.

- Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon) announced a meeting on the 200 Area to be led by Moses Jarayssi, Bechtel, on September 11. She encouraged members of ER and HSWM to participate.
- Susan Leckband, Non-union, Non-management Employees (Hanford Work Force), announced that a stewardship workshop would be held in Denver, Colorado from October 25-27. This workshop will include a tour of the Rocky Flats site. Marilyn Reeves encouraged the HAB to send a diverse representation of Board interests to the workshop. HAB volunteers included: Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization); Susan Leckband; Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (local Business); and Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government). Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and John Price, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) also plan to attend.
- Bill Kinsella announced a November 10th conference to discuss how communication research can lead to successful balancing of interests in DOE cleanups across the complex. This is part of the National Communication Association Annual Conference, focused this year on "Engaging Atomic Institutions: Public Participation and Communication Scholarship in the Post Cold War Nuclear Cleanup." Bill invited eight HAB members to participate. He said DOE officials and state and federal regulators would also participate.
- Leon Swenson, Public-At-Large, presented a draft of the HAB self-evaluation for HAB members to review. Board members approved this draft, and all Board members, alternates, contractors, and regulatory staff was encouraged to fill out an evaluation. Completed forms should be returned to Ruth Siguenza.
- Marilyn Reeves recently attended a four-day Cogema tour in France. She made available copies of overheads from 12 presentations to interested HAB members.
- Max Power, Ecology, introduced Dr. Tom Leschine, the chair of a National Academy of Sciences committee that has drafted a report on stewardship.
- Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), announced that overhead photos of the Hanford fire were posted on the wall.
- Marilyn Reeves recognized and thanked Donna Sterba, Nuvotec, and Ginger Benecke, TRI, for their years of service to the HAB putting together meeting packets, and keeping records for the Board. Marilyn announced that this would be their last meeting. Both the HAB and EnviroIssues will miss Donna and Ginger very much.
- Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), said there would be another high-level waste and tank closure meeting in October. Marilyn Reeves noted that it is important that the HAB is represented at that meeting because the bulk of tanks are located at Hanford.
- Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), said a report from the November 1999 Health of the Site conference is now available. Please contact Tim for copies.

APPROVE JUNE MEETING SUMMARY

Ruth Siguenza announced that corrections to the June meeting summary were submitted and incorporated into the final summary. Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy (State of

Oregon); Ken Bracken; and Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, submitted minor corrections.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keepers (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), raised concern about the August Environmental Restoration Committee meeting summary. He felt that the summary minimized certain participant's contributions to the discussion. Corrections can be made to draft meeting summaries through the facilitation team by any committee member. Ruth Siguenza offered to correct the August meeting summary as soon as Greg provided his corrections to the facilitation team.

UPDATE ON DOE OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION

Bill Taylor, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), reviewed the events of the last year pertaining to the tank waste treatment project and the privatization contract. The BNFL privatization contract was terminated in the spring, and DOE-ORP is currently working to award a new contractor to complete the design and construction of a vitrification facility to treat liquid tank wastes. DOE-ORP has been restructured to focus on two separate activities: awarding the new contract and transitioning BNFL information to CH2M Hill (CHG).

The draft request for proposals (RFP) was issued in July, and the final RFP was issued on August 31. Currently, contractors are putting together proposals with a submission deadline of October 16. Oral presentations will be given within five days of proposal submittals. DOE-ORP aims to award the contract by January 15, 2001, while Leif Erickson, DOE-ORP, is working to make the award in December.

Regarding the transfer of BNFL information to CHG, Bill said BNFL is classifying some material as intellectual property that DOE must negotiate a price to acquire, such as the pilot melter in Maryland. DOE will review every piece of information and assess the necessity of purchase from BNFL. The process of transferring information from BNFL to CHG has proven more challenging than expected. CHG is tasked with transitioning this information smoothly to the new contractor to avoid further delays. DOE-ORP is working to maintain the 2007 start of operations and 2018 treatment dates that are currently in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). The current start of construction date ranges from April 2002 to December 2002.

Mike Wilson, Ecology, said the outcome of interim stabilization consent decree discussions between DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ), the U.S. Department of Justice, the Washington State Attorney General's office, and Ecology will affect decisions made on the RFP. Currently, the RFP contains dates that are inconsistent with the TPA and Ecology's Director's Determination. Ecology is committed to the TPA schedules. The RFP start of operations date is 2011, which is questionable to Ecology. The RFP does not mention the 2018 date, which is due to its focus on design and construction of the vitrification plant rather than operations. However, Ecology feels there must be a commitment by DOE to meeting this interim milestone.

Mike Wilson said DOE has appealed the Director's Determination that was issued by Ecology after TPA negotiations failed to implement an enforceable milestone schedule for the tank waste treatment program. DOE has also appealed the State's action on double shell tank integrity assessments. The Pollution Control Hearings Board is scheduled to examine both these issues.

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, said successful negotiations for TPA milestones pertaining to single shell tank retrieval and closure were held in August and will drive work for the next six years. Between now and 2006, 10 single shell tanks will be retrieved. High-risk tanks will be addressed first, so the double shell tank capacity of 200 million gallons will be filled with this waste. Another decision was to move away from sluicing and implement two demonstration technologies for specified tanks. Before 2006, DOE will complete conceptual planning for the next retrieval phase. A major challenge is that by 2006 there will be no more double shell tank capacity unless new tanks are built.

Pam Brown asked about affects of funding constraints on tank closure. Suzanne Dahl responded that the current focus is on retrieval, so tank closure plans have not been developed at this time. Pam also asked about the quick turnaround DOE-ORP expected from contractors to submit tank waste treatment proposals, recognizing that BNFL took six months to put together its proposal. Bill Taylor said a lot of information is available to contractors, such as the government fair cost estimate. Contractors have the option to request extensions, but that none have. Results from the two independent reviews of the project are included also publicly available.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), questioned the rationale of having separate contractors for design/construction and operation of the vitrification facility. Paige also asked if the RFP includes consideration for other process or a better solution than the current BNFL technology. Bill Taylor responded that the RFP does not preclude this option. However, DOE-ORP would like the new contractor to use the BNFL design. Ken Niles asked about the status of the DOE-ORP response to HAB advice issued in June 2000 regarding public access to contractor information. Bill Taylor said a letter would be issued from Mike Barrett, DOE-ORP contracting officer, in the next day or so.

David Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), asked for clarification on the start of operations date. Bill Taylor explained that the 2011 date is to ensure full capacity operation of the facility before it is passed from the design/construct contractor to the operations contractor.

Bob Larson, Benton Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), asked about funding for the new contract. Peter Bengtson, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, said the privatization set-aside funds already designated by Congress would be rolled over for the new contractor without requiring additional Congressional approval.

Ken Bracken asked if the double shell tank capacity includes tank stabilization activities. He also suggested that Hanford consider operational closure of tanks, as has been done at

Savannah River. Suzanne Dahl said stabilization, which is to be completed by 2004, is included in the capacity numbers. She cautioned that the term "closure" does not apply until the entire tank farm is empty, so an interim closure status has been proposed.

Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), said there was an agreement between BNFL, DOE-ORP, and CHG on training and transition of employees. In the midst of current changes, efforts to protect workers must not be forgotten.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), asked about confidence in current tank characterization information, and confidence in the level of contingency planning in place. Suzanne Dahl responded that current characterization is based on process knowledge and some actual characterization. Process knowledge evolves continually. Fran DeLozier, CHG, said the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board closed its recommendation on tanks that needed to be characterized based on its confidence in current tank characterization information.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization) expressed concern about DOE paying for BNFL proprietary information from its Sellafield operations because Sellafield was probably a significant factor in BNFL winning the contract in the first place. She was also concerned about the potential for a future contractor to repeat BNFL mistakes in elevating costs so high. She asked how DOE-ORP would ensure that the operations contractor would not blame the design/construct contractor for causing delay or high costs. There is a need for DOE-ORP to review and share with the public lessons learned from the BNFL contract failure.

COMMITTEE PERSPECTIVES ON "DONE IN A DECADE" PROPOSAL

Environmental Restoration Committee

Shelley Cimon reported on the August ER meeting at which DOE presented its plan to accelerated river corridor cleanup. This plan is titled "Done in a Decade." The document lays out a path toward cleanup progress, using the Fiscal Year 2002 (FY2002) budget as a starting point. DOE favors implementing a closure contract in which work scope is clearly defined and will be accomplished by 2012. The estimated price tag is \$ 4 billion dollars. The 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds are excluded from this plan. At the meeting, Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, presented plans for accelerating cleanup of the 100 Area in order to free up lands for other uses. A total of 12 TPA milestones would be accelerated. Ten of these would be completed on schedule, while two others are currently under negotiation.

EPA and Ecology have expressed some encouragement regarding the plan but are concerned about the tradeoffs that may be made between the 100, 300, and 200 Areas. While Ecology is interested in seeing work done faster, it believes that work cannot be

delayed in the 200 Area, including characterization. Stakeholders must be included in the planning process, and the issue of funding must be addressed.

DOE also presented a plan to accelerate 300 Area cleanup. An industrial cleanup standard will be applied, and the work would be completed over nine years. The estimated cost would be \$784 million, with removal of over 150 buildings and remediation of about 50 waste sites. The approach is to address the easiest sites first and proceed to the most difficult, without consideration of risk. This is the first plan to address 300 Area cleanup as a whole and would result in all TPA milestones for the 300 Area to be completed ahead of schedule.

While the regulators are skeptical of potential cost savings, they are encouraged by the coordination between decontamination and decommissioning work with soil remediation work, as has been successful in the 100 Area. EPA is supportive of the industrial cleanup standard, while some ER Committee members want to revisit this decision. An aspect of Klein's presentation on "Done in a Decade" proposed unrestricted public access, but this would not be allowed in the 300 Area with an industrial cleanup standard.

The ER Committee identified a number of issues including:

- discussion of the industrial cleanup standard,
- impacts on cleanup decisions from the new monument status,
- impacts of potentially re-starting the Fast Flux Test Facility,
- tradeoffs if future funding is limited,
- past HAB value statements that the highest risk items should be the highest priority,
- characterization needs,
- the unacceptability of compromising the TPA, and
- the need for discussion of the question "how clean is clean?"

The plan should be examined as a whole, rather than in pieces. Greg deBruler added additional issues raised in the ER discussion he believed were not included in the draft August meeting summary:

- address groundwater contamination before delisting the 100 or 300 Areas,
- ensure that cleanup is proven to be ecologically protective,
- guarantee that the trust responsibilities are not overlooked so that lands can be returned in their original condition, and
- ensure that long-term protection is protective for the life of the contaminants left in place.

Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee

Harold Heacock that HSWM raised similar issues to ER. The TPA is the primary roadmap for cleanup at Hanford, and HSWM believes this must be followed until there is mutually agreed upon changes. Harold shared a list of organizing principals for the 200 Area that were developed by EPA, Ecology, and IDOE. Harold said the highest priority is construction of the vitrification facility. Urgent risks must be addressed, and characterization must continue and be coordinated across the site. End points for the tank

farm must be developed in coordination with the rest of the site. Infrastructure of aging facilities remains an issue to be addressed. We also need to take a long-term perspective at budget issues. Doug added that there is great uncertainty regarding future uses for the 200 Area. The regulators would like to hear from the HAB on what is most important.

Pam Brown asked if there has been an attempt to define end states for the 200 Area. Doug Sherwood said there has not been an effort since the Future Site Uses Working Group. This is an area in which a public policy discussion is needed because future uses will drive decisions made for the 200 Area. Norma Jean Germond, Public-At-Large, agreed that the HAB must focus on the 200 Area in the year ahead. A concern from the Public Involvement Committee on the "Done in a Decade" proposal was that the title was misleading to the public and Congress in implying what would be accomplished. A number of great risks, such as the tanks, will remain after the year 2012. Bill Kinsella echoed Norma Jean's concerns and noted that the term "done" suggests abandonment, a message that DOE does not want to send to the public. Examination of the future should ensure that potential future missions do not impact cleanup, such as possible re-start of the Fast Flux Test Facility.

Dan Simpson suggested that the HAB should support Keith Klein, DOE-RL, in his vision focused on three outcomes: the river, the plateau, and the future. He identified three questions for the Board to ask: To what condition will the River be restored? What criteria will indicate that the Central Plateau has been successfully transitioned? How will the future be served beyond cleanup of the Hanford site?

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), said "Done in a Decade" is a DOE public relations effort. He questioned DOE's intent in distributing copies of "Done in a Decade" containing proposals inconsistent with regulations and asked for clarification about DOE's intentions about engaging the public. Gerry felt it was useless for the public to submit comments to DOE-RL. He outlined specific criticisms of the plan, including:

- Unrestricted public access is not allowed under the industrial cleanup standard or in cases in which highly contaminated buildings are left in place;
- The proposal makes no mention of DOE's 1993 commitment to the Tank Waste Task Force specifying that soil sites would be remediated along the river in exchange for delaying the vitrification facility; and
- There is a need for a clear path forward with the public on this plan, as required by the state Model Toxics Control Act for designation of an industrial cleanup standard.

Todd Martin, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), commented that the DOE plan is confusing and that the public process is unclear. The Board process for examining "Done in a Decade" is also in need of definition, as the plan stretches across all committees and should be looked at as a whole, not in pieces. The Board must have a full understanding of the plan in order to provide valuable input to DOE. Merilyn Reeves that the HAB must decide how to address this issue.

Tim Takaro said characterization of buildings in the 300 Area is needed before tearing them down. Specifically, information is lacking in identifying sources of beryllium contamination that will not be comprehensive by 2002 when these buildings are scheduled to be removed.

Paige Knight said the approach of "Done in a Decade" is backwards because cleaning up along the river first, while contaminants are moving downhill from the Central Plateau toward the river, is counter-productive. This was another point that was missing from the August ER meeting minutes.

EPA FIVE-YEAR REMEDY REVIEW FOR HANFORD SUPERFUND SITES

Dennis Faulk provided an overview of the EPA Five-Year Remedy Review of the four National Priority List (NPL) sites on the Hanford Reservation. EPA will examine effectiveness of remedies and cleanup decisions for all four of these sites together. The review process is not intended to reconsider decisions but to evaluate decisions and make recommendations for possible further action. Cleanup actions are accomplished through Superfund records of decision. Both Superfund and the TPA require this five-year review. NPL sites for which Ecology is the lead agency will also be incorporated in to the review.

The 1100 Area has been deleted from the NPL. The Horn Rapids Landfill is capped and monitoring of groundwater continues. Fence posts must be replaced at the Horn Rapids Landfill. The landfill did not burn during the June fire.

In the 100 Area, soil sites, groundwater sites, and decontamination and decommissioning of buildings were examined. Twenty-eight verification packages have been approved for the 100 Area soil sites, and DOE is currently meeting TPA milestones. For groundwater contamination, technologies in place include pump and treat, as well as in situ redox manipulation. Interim safe storage is complete for C Reactor, and legacy wastes are being removed from buildings. Work is ongoing at F and DR Reactors. H and D Reactors are under preparation to begin interim safe storage. Work towards meeting TPA milestones is ahead of schedule for all interim safe storage work. DOE must install public warning signs along the Columbia River. Pump and treat remediation of groundwater must operate 90% of the time to be effective and is not currently working well enough to address strontium contamination. A better solution should be sought. In situ redox manipulation will continue for addressing chromium.

Soil sites, groundwater, and buildings are the focus activities in the 300 Area. Six verification packages have been approved for the FF-1 records of decision. Institutional controls must be developed. More groundwater monitoring wells have been added, including some near the 618-10 and 618-11 burial ground. Some 300 Area buildings must be removed before soil sites can be addressed, and a strategy for this is under development.

In the 200 Area, soil sites, groundwater, and facilities are under examination. Investigations include a barrier treatability test and a soil vapor extraction test. A decision was made in 1995 to hold off on 200 Area characterization to allow more environmental restoration work to be done in the 100 Area. Currently, five 200 Area operable units are in the Superfund remedial investigation/feasibility study process. TPA milestones covering the completion of all 200 Area investigations by 2008 are in jeopardy. Carbon tetrachloride is a heavy groundwater contaminant that is thought to have sunk deep into the aquifer. An investigation and more characterization of this contaminant plume are needed. The concentration of carbon tetrachloride in the plume has been measured at 4,000 parts per billion, and current activities are not meeting cleanup objectives. Additional groundwater contaminants include uranium and technetium. A treatability test was done at one monitoring well and indicated that the contaminants present are not posing imminent threats to human health or the environment. Removal of plutonium from Building 233-S is progressing slowly. Progress is also slow with the Canyon Disposition Initiative because of lack of adequate funding. Cells 1 and 2 at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility are full, and Cells 3 and 4 have been built.

Public involvement is not a requirement of a Five-Year Remedy Review, but EPA makes the results available for a 30-day public comment period. Consultation with the tribes has also been requested. Beth Bilson said that DOE-RL is in agreement with the EPA findings.

Merilyn Reeves asked if the groundwater expert panel will be consulted regarding the carbon tetrachloride plume. EPA is consulting with the expert panel.

Greg deBruler asked if the five-year review is focused on protection for today, the next ten years, or for as long as contaminants pose hazards. Another concern is the lack of examination of the cumulative impacts of multiple contaminants and their long-term effects. Dennis Faulk explained that the objective of the review is to determine if the cleanup objectives established in cleanup decisions are being met. Long-term environmental protection is the goal. Greg also asked if performance is assessed in light of the Endangered Species Act. Doug Sherwood said chromium is the contaminant that EPA is most concerned with that can threaten salmon and other aquatic species. He explained that the salmon in the Hanford Reach are the healthiest salmon run in North America, so are not a top priority. Greg also asked how EPA is complying with the Clean Water Act and tribal trust responsibilities. Doug Sherwood responded that EPA uses the fresh water chronic toxicity criteria to measure effects to all aquatic species. Chromium was found to be the only contaminant that exceeds these criteria for the Columbia River.

Paige Knight asked for clarification on the TPA milestones covering the 100 Area. Dennis Faulk explained that the only milestone that has not been met pertains to the BC pipelines; it will be re-negotiated. Paige also asked about institutional controls and their relationship to whether lands are designated for restricted use, unrestricted use, or industrial use. Dennis said institutional controls are required for release of all lands that

contain any contamination. Unrestricted use is only allowable if there are no contaminants in place, such as in the Arid Lands Ecology Reserve. Doug Sherwood added that unrestricted use is the eventual goal once all contaminants are remediated. Since the 300 Area will be cleaned to an industrial cleanup standard, institutional controls will always be in place. EPA conducts the Remedy Review every five years, so institutional controls, as well as cleanup standards, will be periodically assessed for their effectiveness.

Keith Smith asked if the PUREX tunnels, which pose great risk to workers, have been reviewed. Dennis Faulk said this will be part of the EPA review but has not been completed yet.

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Ruth Siguenza noted that this is the time of year that HAB Committees normally begin drafting work plans for the year ahead. In October, the Executive Committee will outline a Board work plan.

Tank Waste Treatment Committee

Todd Martin said the committee met informally to discuss the status of the tank waste treatment program. Frustrations were expressed about the current situation. The current delay raises key issues of tank capacity, budget, risks, and infrastructure. The committee will meet in October to examine recent changes at DOE-ORP and reconsider its approach to tank waste treatment issues. David Johnson said an important issue raised in the informal discussion was the need to examine both retrieval of tank waste and building new tanks. Previously the discussion assumed a choice could be made between the two activities. The potential of running out of tank space before a vitrification plant is built is an important issue for the Board to track. Harold Heacock said examining this issue must recognize the reality that the budget will remain flat for at least the next five years.

Leon Swenson expressed concern about the HAB Committee structure and how information must be shared more effectively across committees, specifically on cross committee issues. Merilyn Reeves agreed and noted that the Executive Committee would examine this at its October meeting. Susan Leckband suggested that a separate committee examine all aspects of tank farm issues because the scope is so large.

Max Power commented on Ecology's public involvement plans for the tank program. Ecology recognizes that Hanford stakeholders needed to be consulted and that valuable direction can be provided from a group similar to the past Tank Waste Task Force. Ecology has invited key stakeholders to participate in a focused workshop in October to discuss the principals outlined by the Tank Waste Task Force, what has been learned since, and what needs to be re-examined. Ecology is concerned about how to engage the broader public in these discussions to obtain broader input. The workshop will be held in Lacey, Washington. Max said the agenda will be developed in the weeks ahead with input from invited HAB members.

Dollars and Sense Committee

Gerry Pollet said his committee's work plan is focused on examining new contracts. This includes upcoming decisions on contracts for tank waste treatment design and construction; Fluor Hanford; a potential closure contract, and tank farm operations, currently CHG. Harold Heacock said the committee will also look at tank infrastructure funding and how tank waste treatment will be funded in addition to the rest of the Hanford cleanup budget, about \$1.2 billion per year. Limited funds will be available given the current DOE-Environmental Management focus on smaller closure sites, such as Fernald and Rocky Flats. On the issue of funding for building additional tanks, Pam Brown said with the government owned/contractor operated approach to the vitrification contract, more flexibility exists to build more tanks than with the BNFL privatization contract.

Suzanne Dahl outlined the tank capacity situation explaining that the TPA M-46 series of milestones negotiations concluded that new tanks would not be needed if corrosion protection measures are implemented to maintain double shell tank integrity, if interim stabilization of single shell tanks proceeds, and if vitrification is moved forward. These negotiations account for about one million gallons of tank capacity.

Public Involvement Committee

Ken Niles said a new committee work plan was adopted in June. Issues for the year ahead include an review of the TPA community relations plan, HAB information dissemination through the Internet, and following Ecology's public involvement efforts on tank issues. Marilyn Reeves noted that the HAB annual progress report should be available on the Hanford web page because it is a valuable tool and is frequently referenced.

Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee

Pam Brown said the committee will review DOE's new plan "Done in a Decade". Other issues the committee is following include:

- the project management plan for pre-1970 transuranic waste,
- implementation of Integrated Safety Management at Hanford by DOE and its contractors,
- progress at Plutonium Finishing Plant,
- progress in the Spent Nuclear Fuel project towards meeting the November 2000 TPA milestone to begin fuel movement out of the K Basins,
- the Hanford Solid Waste environmental impact statement, and
- lessons learned from the Hanford fire.

Pam noted that once pre-1970s transuranic waste is retrieved, it becomes post-1970 transuranic waste and is eligible for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

In reference to the Spent Nuclear Fuel TPA milestone, Doug Sherwood explained that DOE-RL was required to provide notification of possibly missing the milestone 110 days

prior to the milestone date. DOE sent a letter at this notification time period stating its confidence in meeting the milestone. EPA is interested in seeing successful start of fuel movement that can be sustained rather than a rushed effort just to meet the milestone.

HAB CHAIR TRANSITION

Leon Swenson and other HAB volunteers have drafted a process for HAB involvement in the selection of a new Board chair. Max Power, Dennis Faulk, Peter Bengtson, Marla Marvin, and Gail McClure also participated. The proposal incorporates sections of the HAB Charter and HAB ground rules pertaining to the chair. Leon asked the Board to review and adopt the guidelines. The process calls for the Board to consider nominated candidates and submit a recommendation to the TPA agencies that actually select the HAB chair. Nominations should include a statement of willingness to serve from the nominee and any other requirements, such as monetary reimbursement or compensation. The Board agreed that Leon's subcommittee would collect the nominations and present them to the Board.

Merilyn Reeves noted that the work of the Board Chair can be accomplished by any current Board member or alternate and that the cooperation and assistance of the facilitation team is invaluable. Merilyn said she is pleased that Ruth Siguenza and EnviroIssues will be working with the new chair. Ruth's familiarity with the Board's history, personalities, issues, and her understanding of government is extremely valuable. Merilyn also noted that the liaisons for each TPA agency have made her successful. An indication of the success of the HAB is that the State of Washington dissolved its own Hanford board at the time the HAB was convened. When the new HAB chair is installed, he/she should discuss with the agencies how they can work together rather than the Board spending time developing a job description now.

Merilyn Reeves reminded the HAB that her term ends in February 2001. The Board should have a new chair in place by that time. She suggested the option appointing an interim chair if a permanent chair is not found by that time. One factor that could delay the appointment of a permanent Chair is DOE-HQ approval. A possible amendment to the HAB charter could permit an interim chair to serve, and Merilyn recommended that the Board examine the Charter. Wade Ballard said it would be helpful to the TPA agencies if the HAB made a consensus recommendation for the next chair to the TPA agencies. The TPA agencies are responsible for appointing the Chair, but HAB assistance is welcomed.

Susan Leckband asked about the possibility of paying a Board Chair. Jerry Peltier pointed out that the first HAB chair was paid. Wade Ballard explained that DOE-RL is holding discussions with DOE HQ on what the guidelines are for compensating a chair. DOE-RL hopes to have this issue resolved very soon. Merilyn Reeves noted that the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) in Idaho received an e-mail from DOE-HQ specifying that individuals appointed to SSABs as consultants or experts are considered "special government employees." In this case, the HAB chair could be appointed as a consultant or an expert that would make him/her eligible for payment as a special government

employee. Wade said this is an option that DOE-RL has considered. He assured the Board that DOE-RL would update it as information becomes available.

Bob Larson asked for clarification on the Board voting process for selecting a chair. Leon Swenson clarified that each Board seat would get one vote. Consensus would need to be reached among the alternates and the members for each seat.

The Board adopted the guidelines presented by Leon Swenson and his working group. It also appointed Leon as the head of the chair selection subcommittee. Board members who participated in drafting the guidelines included Dave Watrous, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business); Norma Jean Germond, Gordon Rogers, and Ken Bracken. Agency staff that participated were Max Power; Dennis Faulk; Gail McClure, DOE-RL; Marla Marvin, DOE-RL. Peter Bengtson also participated. The Board asked these volunteers to continue their work in the chair selection process. Ken Niles and Paige Knight also volunteered to participate in the chair selection subcommittee.

OCTOBER STEWARDSHIP WORKSHOP

Susan Leckband outlined a number of recent stewardship workshops she has attended with Pam Brown and Max Power. In October, the SSABs will host a workshop at Rocky Flats in Colorado. On behalf of the HAB, Susan will contribute the following materials at that workshop: the Oregon Office of Energy video on Hanford, a bibliography of planning documents on stewardship, the 1999 HAB Progress Report, selected pieces of HAB advice, and selected agency responses to HAB advice. Dennis Faulk and Max Power are also developing a 15-minute presentation on stewardship at Hanford for the workshop. One issue to be discussed at the workshop is long-term funding for stewardship activities. At Hanford, wastes are stored in a form that can be readily retrieved, if needed. However, there is not a separate stewardship budget at Hanford at this time.

Pam Brown reported on the Environmental Law Institute workshop. One lesson learned from the workshop was that Hanford has a good working relationship with its local and regional EPA offices; other sites do not. Other SSABs have convened specific committees focused on stewardship, and the HAB should do so as well. In order to secure adequate, continued funding for stewardship, cleanup records of decision must address stewardship.

Max Power reported on a stewardship workshop he attended at the Grand Junction, Colorado DOE office. The costs and commitments faced by leaving contaminants in the ground are beginning to be recognized and incorporated into long-term decisions. A significant issue is how to maintain records so information can be retrieved and understood by future generations. Computer systems change, and information between systems may no longer be retrievable. Another issue is accountability for monitoring and record keeping. A draft report from DOE will be out in about a month on stewardship. This was compiled in response to a lawsuit, so it is not considered a decision-making document. Dennis Faulk said institutional controls and stewardship are important issues for the Board to address in the year ahead.

Tim Takaro asked if the DOE-RL budget for fiscal year 2002 includes a line item for stewardship. Wade Ballard responded that it does not. Each program must continue to fund stewardship and institutional control measures out of its own program budget. The stewardship budget line item for the Hanford site will not begin until 2047. At all DOE sites, there is consideration being given to begin stewardship funding now rather than lumping the costs at the end of cleanup.

HANFORD FIRE UPDATE

Pam Brown noted that there have been no official reports released on lessons learned from the June fire. A report from DOE is expected in three weeks. It is likely that lawsuits will be filed concerning the response to the fire. Pam read a summary of the fire incident. Seven federal, state, and local agencies were involved with the fire that started on June 27 from a car accident. Federal resources were summoned, because the fire was on federally controlled lands. Assistance was requested of the state. As the fire moved toward Richland and Benton City, assistance from outside of the state was requested. The fire burned across the Hanford Nuclear Reservation with a total of eleven homes burned. In total, over 100,000 acres of shrub steppe lands were burned. The fire moved very rapidly, posing great challenges to fire fighters. The fire came very close to the HAMMER facility and the Fast Flux Test Facility, but did not burn these areas. Pam commended Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (WDOH), for her excellent work in the response activities. HSWM will review reports on the fire as they are released. Pam proposed an evening session during the November Board to discuss these issues in greater detail.

At a recent committee meeting, HSWM identified a number of concerns:

- planned response if the barrels filled with uranium in the 300 Area had caught fire,
- DOE Emergency Operations Center staffing, including the reluctance of Center staff to leave and get adequate rest between shifts,
- transition from emergency operations to normal operations across the site,
- difficulty in maintaining accurate fire location information during the response.

Said there are three investigations going on led by DOE-RL, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the General Accounting Office. There are delays in completing these reports because of the numerous forest fires across the country. Fire fighters were on the scene of the Hanford fire 10 to 15 minutes after the emergency call. Their first priority was directing traffic away from the accident scene, located on a busy highway, then to begin fighting the fire.

Jim Mecca, DOE RL, responded to Pam's comment on the transition back to normal operations, saying that it took over 24 hours to implement the plan developed for the transition. All buildings were examined to ensure that conditions were safe for workers to return. The team that developed the transition plan took about six hours to develop it. Skeleton crews were maintained to keep facilities operable during the event.

Radiological Sampling

Debra McBaugh provided an overview of WDOH radiological sampling procedures during the fire. She noted that WDOH does ongoing sampling that is more comprehensive than emergency sampling procedures. All emergency sampling information was posted on the WDOH web site as it became available, but the general public could not easily interpret the raw data.

Debra McBaugh explained that uranium exists at natural levels and produces radon that is detected as gross alpha or gross beta when samples are measured immediately after collection. Normal sampling procedures allow weeks to pass for the natural occurring radon to deteriorate so measurements more accurately reflect any contaminants present. During the fire, the samples were measured immediately to assess whether or not it was safe for fire fighters to remain fighting the fire or to determine if there was a need to evacuate the local population. The sampling results concluded that it was safe for fire fighters and citizens to remain. The measurements posted on the WDOH web site reflected naturally occurring radon levels. Debra also explained that negative values found on the WDOH web site reflect natural radon levels that are below the “normal” levels. The “normal” values are determined from averaging readings taken over time to establish what amount of radon normally exists.

Debra McBaugh also explained what WDOH calls the “minimum detectable activity”, which is the lowest level of contamination that can be detected from a sample. A complicated equation is applied to determine this level, but Debra explained simply that the larger the sample volume, the lower the “minimum detectable activity.” The lower the “minimum detectable activity”, the more accurate the values measured are. This is significant to the Hanford fire because samples taken during emergencies are at lower volumes than normal sampling activities, so are not as accurate.

Elevated levels of plutonium were found in samples taken during the fire, but WDOH is unsure of the reason. Levels were below regulatory concerns, but still raise questions. Debra McBaugh said WDOH must make a decision on how much time and resources it will commit to identifying the plutonium source with respect to balancing other priorities. John Erickson, WDOH, suggested that a good place for resources to be spent might be to prepare for the next emergency. Present practice scenarios apply to radiation exposure emergencies, but not fire combined with radiation emergencies.

David Johnson asked for clarification on the elevated 200 West background levels posted on the DOE web site. These values were 1,000 times higher than normal background levels. A DOE staff person responded that these elevated gross alpha and gross beta levels have returned to normal.

Ken Niles recognized the importance and challenge in presenting and effectively communicating technical information to the general public. He also said interference from DOE-HQ in releasing information to the public during the fire must be addressed in

fire response reports. Mark Beck, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), added that information must not be withheld from the public; it should be disseminated to allow the general public to make individual judgements about a situation. The uranium drums were an example where DOE should have released information to the public about the fire approaching the drums.

Jerry Peltier asked if cuts to Hanford overhead funds reduced resources for the Hanford Fire Department to fight the June fire. Risk reduction measures, such as firebreaks along roads, are activities that potentially would be reduced or cut due to a reduced overhead budget. Jerry asked if the fire could have been prevented if adequate resources had been available to the Hanford Fire Department. A DOE staff person participating in the meeting via telephone agreed that resources are limited to fight fires at Hanford, but that resources are brought in from outside to assist when needed. Unique circumstances contributed to the fire getting out of control. The Hanford Fire Department response cannot be blamed for the situation.

Tim Takaro asked for an update on the biological monitoring done of fire fighters involved in the Hanford fire. Debra McBaugh said test results have not shown any problem areas or trends.

Gerry Pollet announced that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service fire report was released today, but that the HAB was not informed. Thomas Skinner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), apologized for not getting this information to the HAB. Marla Marvin made copies of the summary of report findings available later in the meeting. Gerry also asked if fire reviews will examine the lack of public notification, as required by law, when contaminants were released. During the fire, background levels were found to be 1,000 times above normal, but the public was not notified. Gerry was also critical of DOE for posting average values of samples taken over nine different locations during a 10-day period but did not post site sample information. A DOE staff person who joined the meeting by telephone explained that the averages are the only information available, because the samples were combined to increase the sample volume (see Debra McBaugh's explanation above). The elevated measurements were temporary. More recent samples show that background levels have returned to normal. Another issue raised by Gerry was that Highway 240 was re-opened at a time when a nearby contaminated area was burning, putting the public at risk. Information should have been disseminated through the Joint Information Center that would have prevented the highway from opening at this time. Gerry suggested that EPA request assistance from the U.S. Department of Justice to examine these instances where public notification was required but not made.

Greg Perkins, Fluor Hanford, said a study was done in the 1970s and reviewed again in 1988 that examined the risk of exposure to fire fighters if the BC Crib burned. The conclusion was that fire fighters would be exposed to 7 millirem if the crib burned. However, during the fire in June, fire fighters kept the fire away from the BC crib.

DRAFT ADVICE ON PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The draft advice from the Dollars and Sense Committee was developed outside of normal committee procedures, but was reviewed and approved by the Dollars and Sense Committee over lunch on Thursday before presentation to the Board. Harold Heacock introduced the advice. The advice addresses how performance goals and measures are developed. Bob Rosselli used plutonium stabilization as an example of an objective performance measure (# of items stabilized) that can be used to drive a contract. Comprehensive performance measures are used to evaluate more subjective issues, such as Integrated Safety Management implementation or openness. The advice is time critical because DOE-RL will develop FY 2002 performance measures in the months ahead.

HAB members discussed the following issues:

- DOE consultation with regulators in the development performance measures,
- DOE's role in defining stretch and superstretch incentives for contractors,
- Use of the annual budget public meetings as an avenue for public input into performance measures, t
- Independent cost validations for each project,
- The role of comprehensive performance measure (e.g., openness), and
- Contractor accountability for indirect costs.

Advice #111 was adopted by the 13 seats represented in the room at the end of the discussion on the draft advice. It was signed by HAB Chair Marilyn Reeves and was sent to the TPA agencies. However, since a quorum was not present at the time the advice was adopted, the advice will be revisited at the November HAB meeting for confirmation from a full quorum of the Board.

PERSPECTIVES FROM SENIOR TPA MANAGERS

Keith Klein, DOE-RL Site Manager, said a challenge he faced when arriving at the Hanford site over a year ago was overcoming the impression that a lot of money was being spent at Hanford site without many results. Mr. Klein said he reviewed past HAB advice and confirmed that stakeholders want to see progress in cleaning up the site. Three focused cleanup objectives were developed: restoring the river corridor, transitioning the Central Plateau, and preparing for the future. In order to move forward with this vision, DOE-RL has developed a proposal called "Done in a Decade." Mr. Klein highlighted the numerous accomplishments of the last year, including: successful transuranic waste shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), planning for uranium shipment to Ohio, a quadrupling of the volume of plutonium stabilized, gains made in the packing and storage of plutonium materials at the Plutonium Finishing Plant, increased activity at the Central Waste Complex, steady disposal materials disposed at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility, and approaching success with the Spent Nuclear Fuel program.

The increasing compliance gap remains a major issue. Baseline planning assumptions for Hanford cleanup estimate that the budget must increase by at least \$2 million each year to meet outyear TPA milestones. Planning assumptions also rely heavily on funds transferred to Hanford from across the DOE complex as other DOE sites are closed. The "Done in a Decade" planning effort has re-examined these assumptions and developed a plan that has results and shrinks the Hanford land base in the next ten years. Accomplishments of the plan include interim safe storage and cocooning of reactors, remediation of 100 Area sites, and acceleration of TPA milestones for the river corridor. Mr. Klein noted that groundwater contamination issues and the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds are not addressed under this proposal.

A study was completed on the 300 Area in which acceleration of 300 Area cleanup is estimated to save between \$500 million to \$1 billion in life-cycle costs. The focus of work in the 300 Area will be on tearing down buildings and remediating contamination below the buildings. The plan also calls for continued characterization in the 200 Area that will identify the most urgent risks and determine what activities can be delayed to accommodate accelerated cleanup in the 100 and 300 Areas. Accelerated cleanup will free up lands along the river and reduce mortgage costs making more funds available to address the rest of Hanford cleanup. One example of an activity that will be delayed is developing the capability to address remote-handled transuranic waste, which will slip by about five years. Mr. Klein said the acceleration plans begin in fiscal year 2002.

DOE-RL wants to have a solid plan in place before the change in Administration. DOE-RL faces important decisions pertaining to contracts that will affect DOE's plans. A closure contract, like what has been implemented at Rocky Flats in Colorado, is favored by DOE-RL to combine river cleanup work. The Bechtel environmental restoration contract expires in July 2002. This is the area that will be the focus of structuring a closure contract that will result in completed work in the next ten years. To accomplish this, end states must be clearly defined. Mr. Klein said support from Congress, stakeholders, and the general public is crucial to pursuing this course. DOE-RL plans bring information to the public throughout the planning process.

Harry Boston, DOE-ORP Acting Manager, said a major challenge he faces in taking is maintaining the momentum in the tank farms. The tank waste treatment project has faced substantial set backs in recent months. A broad base of support, reaching beyond the regional constituency, is needed to secure funding for the Hanford vitrification facility. Mr. Boston commended regional Congressional legislators for their work in Washington D.C. to build this support. He urged HAB members to contact legislators to encourage this work.

Mr. Boston said tank wastes must be safely transported and treated for storage in a safer form. If nothing is done, contaminants will end up in the groundwater. The tank farms must be closed safely to protect the population and ecology of the region. He noted that while the issues are complex, the path forward is clear. Mr. Boston identified a number of "30-day Objectives" when he took the leadership at DOE-ORP one month ago. DOE-ORP successfully issued the RFP for the design and construction of the vitrification

facility. It is also working to make a decision on extension or re-bid of the CHG contract. The vitrification project is estimated to cost over \$1 billion per year. Relations between DOE-ORP, EPA, and Ecology are at a low point, but Mr. Boston said he is committed to resolving issues, including negotiating the new tank waste treatment consent decree.

BNFL has lost \$30 million in incentive fee and over \$1 billion of work by losing the tank waste treatment privatization contract. At this time, DOE is paying BNFL product by product. DOE has obtained BNFL's completed 17% design. DOE-ORP estimates that the loss of time caused by the BNFL failure will push start of construction from July 2001 to April 2002. The biggest challenge faced in the process is meeting nuclear regulations. Hot start of operations is projected to move back from the 2007 TPA date to 2010 or 2011. If the 2010 or 2011 date is met, DOE-ORP does not anticipate problems with meeting the 2018 TPA milestone date at which point 10% of tank waste will be treated. Mr. Boston explained that the 2011 date is the point of the transition of the facility from the design and construction contractor to the operations contractor.

Tom Fitzsimmons, Washington State Department of Ecology, asked Laura Cusack, Ecology, to introduce the recently appointed project managers for Ecology: Suzanne Dahl, tank waste disposal; Rick Bond, transition; Melinda Brown, tank waste storage; John Price, cleanup; and Fred Jameson, waste management. John Price will work with the HAB Environmental Restoration Committee, and Fred Jameson will work with the Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee. Mr. Fitzsimmons shared a slogan printed on stickers and bumper stickers that was recently developed by the Ecology public involvement team: "Got Vit?"

Mr. Fitzsimmons said the working relationships between agencies are very important. He commended Mr. Klein for his focused, disciplined leadership. Mr. Klein and Mr. Boston have very tough jobs in securing funding for Hanford cleanup activities. Mr. Fitzsimmons stressed the importance of recognizing the achievements made on site. Ecology sees "Done in a Decade" as a good idea that needs further definition without relaxing regulatory requirements. Areas needing further definition include what will be left in place, institutional controls, and long-term stewardship. To Ecology, the plan leaves the big environmental challenges on site, and there is great uncertainty on how these will be addressed. This is a major state concern. Ecology's focus has been to draw attention to the greatest risks. The state has used the waste importation issue as leverage to ensure DOE's commitment to progress in the tank program. DOE-HQ agreed to hold any off-site waste destined for Hanford until the new vitrification contract is in place. Work to negotiate tank farm consent decrees is underway. Ecology is looking to the existing interim stabilization consent decree for single shell tanks to uphold the some of the TPA schedule dates for the tank program. A second consent decree will be developed because the TPA is not working effectively for tank waste treatment. The federal courts enforce a consent decree and that takes the tank program out of the TPA. If progress is not visible today for meeting a milestone out in the future, Ecology would like the authority to address the problem today, rather than waiting until the milestone is missed. Action in the near-term can correct the path so that milestones can be met in the long-term.

Mr. Fitzsimmons made some suggestions to the Board to increase its effectiveness in advising the TPA agencies. HAB contributions are valuable to Ecology. The Board should take a step back from criticizing and take a step forward toward contributing creative solutions to problems. Mr. Fitzsimmons also said the Board should narrow its focus and examine fewer issues more thoroughly. Long-term stewardship and *Paths to Closure* were examples of issues the Board should focus on. *Paths to Closure* is important because it puts Hanford cleanup into context with DOE sites nationally. Hanford cleanup cost estimates in *Paths to Closure* are 10 to 20 times higher than other DOE sites.

Chuck Findley, EPA Region 10 Acting Regional Administrator, is quickly learning the breadth of issues faced with Hanford cleanup and is committed to maintaining operations at the EPA's Richland office. His background includes extensive regulatory experience. EPA's role is to keep the current cleanup schedule on course. The TPA is a schedule unlike any other compliance he has encountered because of its specificity in identifying milestones in both months and years. EPA is supportive of DOE-RL's vision to accelerate cleanup and strongly supports any plan that addresses the highest risks first. Specific cleanup issues to be addressed include groundwater cleanup, the Superfund cleanup planning process, the Spent Nuclear Fuel project, and budget limitations. Money must be spent efficiently. Mr. Findley advised the Board to work with the regional congressional delegation to secure funding for the site.

Maxine Hayes, Washington Department of Health State Health Officer, thanked the Board for inviting her to speak and commended each individual for their commitment to the HAB. She also commended the Board for its recognition that public health and worker health is very important both today and in the future. Ms. Hayes said WDOH is supportive of Mr. Klein's vision for cleanup and also supports the work of Ecology and EPA. The role of WDOH is to ensure that public health is protected in all cleanup decisions made across the site. Emergency preparedness, emergency response, and monitoring of air emissions for radiological contamination are other WDOH responsibilities. Ms. Hayes recognized the WDOH staff people who work regularly with the Board: Al Conklin, John Erickson, and Debra McBaugh. WDOH is committed to working with the Board to provide technical assistance.

Merilyn Reeves outlined a number of the unique aspects of the HAB and the Hanford site. The Hanford site was the first to launch true public involvement and set the standard for other DOE sites. Hanford was also the first site to establish a regulatory agreement, the TPA. Merilyn pointed out that Hanford is the only site that has two site managers. The HAB is the only Board in the DOE complex that brings together a full spectrum of interests and has the ability for organizations to name individuals to fill their own seats. Among these seats, another state is represented, which is unique only the HAB. The Hanford site has a unique relationship with its EPA office, and the HAB is the only Board that has participation from a state health department. Merilyn said the HAB is comprised of "seasoned veterans and experts," many of whom have participated since the earliest public involvement activities that preceded the Board. A major challenge the

Board continues to face is how to reach the public outside of the constituency represented by the seats on the HAB.

Pam Brown asked Mr. Boston if the RFP includes incentives for treatment of increased volumes of tank wastes. Mr. Boston explained that performance is incentivized in the RFP. Detailed questions should be directed to Leif Erickson, the RFP author. Pam also asked when DOE-ORP expected to make a decision on the CHG contract. Mr. Boston said negotiations will begin in the next 30 days. Pam shared concerns from earlier Board discussion on the "Done in a Decade" plan, including groundwater contamination, release of land, retrieval of remote-handled transuranic waste, and the possibility the that title "Done in a Decade" could mislead the public. Mr. Klein said the plan's focus is on long-term stewardship and on demonstrable accomplishments that can be presented to Congress. He said DOE struggled with the title "Done in a Decade" and welcomed HAB input for further defining increments of progress. DOE sees the need to defer some activities, such as remote-handled transuranic waste, in the hope that future accomplishments will be more effective.

Ken Bracken agreed with Mr. Fitzsimmons comment that the Board should focus on fewer issues. He asked what it will take to resolve the issues and conflicts between regulators and DOE that have been so evident in the last year. While the HAB has offered advice on resolution of some of these issues, it does not have a clear understanding of the status or causes of these conflicts. Although the high priority to get the vitrification plant up and running is clear, the path forward to accomplish this is not. Regulating the tank waste treatment program by consent decree is sad because it means the TPA has failed. The authority and accountability is not clear for the tank program because responsibility is shared at many different levels. Ken would like to see a path forward that allows the authority to be held locally. In response to Mr. Fitzsimmons encouragement to the Board to be more creative, Ken challenged the state to develop more creative methods of enforcement.

Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco (Local Government), commended Mr. Klein's vision but was skeptical of how it could be accomplished. He commended the accomplishments of Mr. Boston's first month with DOE-ORP and encouraged Ecology to get out of DOE-ORP's way. He also expressed appreciation to Ms. Hayes for the work of WDOH.

Norma Jean Germond appreciated comments made on the need for DOE-HQ to get out of the way and asked how much approval DOE-RL and DOE-ORP need from DOE-HQ to accomplish their work. Mr. Klein said this is not an easy answer because the system in Washington D.C. requires checks and balances for work and funding. DOE-RL does not see itself faced with an overwhelming amount of "mother may I?" requests demanded by DOE-HQ. Norma Jean echoed concern about the title "Done in a Decade" and offered a suggestion for a different title: "What Can be Done in a Decade". She also asked about the rationale behind hiring two separate contractors for the design and construction and the operation of the vitrification facility. She asked what DOE-ORP will do to ensure that the operations contractor cannot walk away by blaming the design contractor for problems. Mr. Boston said DOE-ORP will not allow this to happen. The design and

construction contract includes start up. DOE-ORP will hold the design and construction contractor accountable. It will also have CHG fully involved in the testing operation of the facility. The hot commissioning phase will be comprehensive. DOE-ORP is confident that the contract balances the risk between the contractor and government effectively.

Ken Niles asked EPA and Ecology if they are willing to re-negotiate TPA milestones for the 200 Area in order for DOE to move forward with "Done in a Decade". Mr. Fitzsimmons said EPA and Ecology must align visions and work plans. He said the current conflicts between Ecology and DOE have keep very strong pressure on moving through transitions and sticking to existing commitments so the vitrification plant and other key projects do not fall behind schedule. The major point of conflict is based in differing definitions of compliance. Is compliance judged by missing a milestone or by a high probability that a milestone will be missed? Mr. Fitzsimmons said the enforcement tools available to address a missed milestone are limited to fines and penalties. However, if enforcement allows addressing milestones that are going to be missed, this allows flexibility to apply creative solutions to the situation to avoid missing the milestone. Ecology views the HAB as a valuable participant in this discussion. Compliance issues must be addressed before current TPA milestones are adjusted. Mr. Findley said risk reduction is the top priority in the tradeoff decisions that will be made. Work in the 100 Area must not compromise 200 Area work that poses greater risk to the public and the environment.

David Johnson noted that the potential for tank leaks must not be overlooked while DOE is focusing on river corridor cleanup and the vitrification plant. Delays faced in getting the vitrification plant on line mean the tank wastes will remain a risk, and the potential for leaks from double shell tanks becomes greater. There is a need to examine building new double shell tanks to address capacity issues since there will be no more storage capacity in existing double shell tanks by 2006. The need to examine building new double shell tanks in parallel with the vitrification plant is now a reality. However, flat funding means there may not be funds available to address both issues. Prevention of leaks must also be examined because in 2018, 90% of the tank waste will remain in the tanks. There are currently no plans to address this remaining waste. It is possible that the greatest risks are posed by the remaining 90%, rather than the 10% covered by the 2018 TPA milestone. Mr. Fitzsimmons agreed with these concerns. Mr. Boston agreed that the vitrification facility and new tanks are issues that must be examined together. He said the decision point has not been reached yet on whether or not to build more double shell tanks, and DOE-ORP is working to demonstrate the public that this will not be needed.

Tim Takaro said the term 'done' in "Done in a Decade" implies that there will be no public health problems remaining after 10 years. However, this perception is not true. The problems faced at Hanford are part of an international context because similar problems faced in other parts of the world are greater without the relatively extensive resources available at Hanford. It is important that the knowledge and experience gained at Hanford is exported to other parts of the world.

Susan Leckband appreciated Mr. Fitzsimmons' focus on long-term stewardship. Susan said open communication is needed between DOE-ORP, DOE-RL, and the work force. The workers are getting the work done. Workers throughout the site need to fully understand the context of the contributions they are making on a daily basis to the mission of the Hanford site. At the worker level, this is not clearly communicated, and the message is confusing. Susan recommended that Mr. Klein and Mr. Boston must get out on the site and talk directly to workers.

Jerry Peltier commented that DOE managers have a great opportunity to build the certainty and consistency today that will guarantee the future. Accountability is lost when DOE is constantly re-organizes and re-structures contracts. These activities are very costly to taxpayers. Decisions facing DOE, such as awarding the vitrification contract and extensions of the Fluor Hanford and CHG contracts, can build the consistency needed to carry the Hanford site in to the new Administration. Jerry urged DOE to ensure progress continues on site.

Jeff Luke, Non-union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), thanked Mr. Klein for his commitment to moving ahead with transuranic waste retrieval because it poses great threats to the budget. Jeff asked Mr. Fitzsimmons for his comments on the TPA milestones dates that slip in DOE plans. Mr. Fitzsimmons said Ecology reviewed the draft RFP and concluded that the approach was consistent with the TPA. The construction date was adjusted, but the operations date remained at 2007. Ecology is concerned that the 2009 TPA date for full capacity operations allows slippage to 2011. If full commissioning is not completed until 2011, there is concern about meeting the 2018 date to treat 10% of the tank waste. Ecology feels that additional work must be done to address the remaining 90% of tank wastes remaining after 2018.

Shelley Cimon said that the Board is motivated by fear that decisions are made behind closed doors. Open dialogue is important between TPA agencies and the Board. Shelley noted that DOE plans do not address the most urgent risks, such as the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds. Shelley agreed with Mr. Fitzsimmons suggestion that the Board focus more and suggested that the Board re-structure so HAB contributions are more informed and valuable to the TPA agencies.

Paige Knight said she has a personal commitment to work toward seeing progress in Hanford issues in her lifetime. She fears that her work will not accomplish these goals. Paige said she would like to support "Done in a Decade", but the plan does not address the highest risks. Putting off the greatest risks increases the risks to the public and the environmental health of the region, specifically the Columbia River. Paige encouraged continued participation of high-level agency officials at HAB meetings. She expressed fear that we are too locked in to what was left by BNFL and asked what DOE-ORP will do to ensure that the new contractor does not repeat what BNFL did. Mr. Boston indicated that DOE-ORP will closely monitor the new contractor and will require quarterly deliverables to monitor progress. This reflects an important lesson learned from BNFL. Mr. Boston agreed to share lessons learned by DOE-ORP with the HAB at a future meeting.

Dan Simpson supported Mr. Klein's vision because it is outcome based. However, Dan commented that more definition is needed on the specifics of the vision. Dan noted that *Paths to Closure* is accurate in addressing the obstacles and complexity of the challenges faced at Hanford.

Jim Cochran, Washington State University (University), noted the costs involved with contract changes at Hanford. He said partnerships become more complicated and involve greater numbers of parties when contracts are re-assigned. He asked how DOE-RL would re-configure the Spent Nuclear Fuel work, now done by Fluor Hanford, if a closure contract is developed to replace the Bechtel contract. Mr. Klein said the closure contract will not affect moving spent nuclear fuel. Mr. Klein agreed that changing contractors is disruptive. The closure contract is intended to assign one contractor to complete the work to attain end state goals. This will provide needed continuity, while allowing flexibility to the contractor for accomplishing work. He recognized that the work in the Central Plateau is more complicated. Mr. Fitzsimmons noted that success or failure is measured in smaller increments.

Jim Trombold welcomed the emphasis on public health and stressed the importance of educating the public beyond the region on the urgency of issues faced at Hanford. He thought the HAB could support Mr. Fitzsimmons creative approach to enforcing compliance and echoed the concern raised earlier on the need to address the 90% of tank wastes that will remain after 2018. He suggested renaming "Done in a Decade" to "Focus and Finish".

Gordon Rogers encouraged DOE-RL to continue its planning effort. He noted that risk prioritization is critical, regardless of funding constraints. Science and technology research and development is necessary to find more effective remediation methods. The most urgent matters should be funded, such as groundwater plume remediation, remote-handled transuranic waste, developing alternatives to tank sluicing, and soil characterization in the vadose zone. The systems assessment capability, a model under development by the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project, is vital to work in the 200 Area.

Todd Martin encouraged Mr. Boston to stay on course, but was skeptical that Hanford would obtain a vitrification facility on the current path. This is the fourth or fifth attempt for the Hanford site to obtain the capability to vitrify tank wastes. Each failure has been the result of costs that are too high. The current path assumes that high activity waste will be shipped to Yucca Mountain, which requires one pre-treatment facility and two vitrification facilities. Costs are high to meet this requirement. To minimize life cycle costs, the facilities that are built must maintain high productivity for a short period of time, requiring the facilities to be very large. Costs for such a sizable facility are high. If the assumption change, it is possible for the high costs of vitrification at Hanford to decrease significantly. For example, if treatment and storage of high activity waste remained on site, rather than assuming shipment off-site, the pre-treatment facility could be eliminated. Todd suggested that the HAB convene an ad hoc Committee to focus

entirely on the "Done in a Decade" proposal between now and the November HAB meeting to the Board can provide meaningful feedback to DOE-RL in November.

Pam Brown said the HSWM Committee would like to ensure that there is time reserved to discuss the Hanford Integrated Safety Management System at the November HAB meeting since that topics has been pushed off previous Board agendas this year.

The Board discussed Todd's suggestion to create an ad hoc committee to discuss Board concerns with "Done in a Decade". People who would like to serve on such a committee will be identified at the joint HSWM and ER meeting scheduled for September 12. Board members expressed concern that the HSWM and ER would be adding "Done in a Decade" to already busy work plans, rather than completely separating the issue to ensure it is a thorough, focused effort. Todd clarified that the purpose of a focused effort would be to identify Board values and compare them with "Done in a Decade". While a full analysis of the plan's content could not be completed between now and the November Board meeting, the identification of Board values and a plan of attack could be done. Marilyn Reeves noted that the HAB has said in the past that work along the Columbia River is important. "Done in a Decade" is indication that Mr. Klein has listened to the HAB. HSWM and ER were assigned to develop a strategy for the Board to work on the "Done in a Decade" plan. Dennis Faulk suggested that public involvement and budget issues should be a part of this strategy. Individuals from all HAB Committees should participate.

Paige Knight suggested that all HAB committees take a break from their regular meetings and join together to work on "Done in a Decade". Paige also suggested that the Board take time to restructure its committees. Marilyn welcomed this concept. Gerry Pollet warned that it is premature for the Board to delve into "Done in a Decade" because there are significant unknowns, such as the costs and tradeoffs involved with accelerating river cleanup. Heart of America Northwest and other organizations are fighting the industrial cleanup standard for the 300 Area. Marilyn Reeves and Todd Martin clarified that the purpose of the Board work on "Done in a Decade" would be to identify issues, such as those raised by Gerry, with the recognition that there is not sufficient information at this time for complete analysis. Once the issues are identified, the Board can begin to discuss these kinds of issues in more detail. Susan Leckband noted that DOE-RL will submit a budget proposal to DOE-HQ in January 2001. This is why Mr. Klein is requesting Board input.

Betty Tabbutt asked the regulators for their perspectives on what the implications of "Done in a Decade" are for the TPA. Dennis Faulk said the values identified in the plan can be brought forward to begin making changes to the TPA. The process of modifying the TPA is expected to begin in the January or March 2001. Board input would be valuable. Max Power said it is important for the Board to define how it will engage with TPA agencies regarding TPA changes.

Ken Bracken noted that this is an opportunity for the Board to develop and communicate its values. The Board must not lose this opportunity. Charles Kilbury said if the HAB

does not get involved, DOE and regulators will move forward and make decisions without input from the HAB. Paige asked if DOE would extend the public comment period for "Done in a Decade". Marla Marvin replied that the comment period can be extended. Marla explained that the purpose of distributing the document was to get discussions started, and this has been successful.

BOARD UPDATES

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Shipment Update

Mark French, DOE-RL, announced that the two shipments of transuranic waste have been made from Hanford to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. A third shipment is scheduled for September 23. No shipments will be sent during the winter months.

Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Michael Collins, DOE-RL, said the DOE-RL is working to incorporate DOE-HQ's extensive comments on the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement. Comments from DOE-HQ were more significant than expected, and DOE-RL expects a delay in releasing the document for public comment. The previous release date was to be November 10. The document release could be delayed by up to six months.

Site Contracting

Wade Ballard said the Bechtel contract expires in July 2002 and must be recompleted. DOE-RL is talking about awarding a closure contract to replace the Bechtel contract. Wade said Jim Owendoff, DOE-HQ, favors a closure contract for Hanford. The Fluor Hanford contract expires in October 2001, and DOE-RL is deciding to either extend the contract or re-bid it. DOE-HQ has reviewed Fluor's performance over the last four years and will also offer its advice. DOE-RL has submitted a draft procurement strategy to DOE-HQ, which proposed to develop new baselines for work based on the River, Plateau, Future vision outcomes presented by Keith Klein. The baselines established will reflect the contracting strategies. Referring to "Done in a Decade", Wade said the tradeoffs involved in accelerating river cleanup consider the site as a whole, rather than piecemeal. While no decisions have been made at this point, DOE-RL is looking at a cost plus incentive fee concept. The contractor would have the ability to earn more fee if the schedule is accelerated or the work is completed at lower cost. Wade welcomed HAB input to continue through the contract decisions ahead.

Site-Specific Advisory Board Update

Norma Jean Germond attended the August Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting at Pantex. She reported that presentations examined groundwater and fire problems faced there. Norma Jean shared the Oregon Office of Energy video on Hanford with the SSABs. A final decision on a spring 2001 SSAB workshop on groundwater has not yet been made. This workshop would be held in Nevada. Norma Jean also learned of a technology workshop held annually that brings together groundwater experts and

hydro-geologists. Gordon Rogers participates on the Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG), and said the STCG is aware of this workshop.

Merilyn Reeves said she has not signed the statement of common values developed by the SSABs. Her objection to signing the statement was because the cover letter did not specify the purpose of the statement. Originally, Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson asked the SSABs to develop this statement. Once this request is noted in the cover letter, Merilyn will sign the SSAB statement. She said she hopes the SSABs will have the opportunity to present the statement to the Secretary. Merilyn announced that the Federal Advisory Act charter for the SSABs has been renewed for the next two years.

Board Budget Update

Gail McClure said a more detailed budget summary will be discussed at the Executive Committee meeting in October. DOE-HQ has sent the HAB an additional \$40,000 for travel, which was added to this year's HAB budget. This year the HAB will have some leftover funds that will roll over in to the next Fiscal Year. These funds can be used to pay for HAB travel to the October stewardship workshop. All HAB members should submit any current or outstanding travel vouchers as soon as possible because the fiscal year ends at the end of September. Gail also urged HAB members to request travel authorization before travelling on HAB business.

NOVEMBER HAB MEETING

Merilyn Reeves announced that the November meeting will be in the Pasco. The HAB Vice Chairs, Ken Bracken and Shelley Cimon, will lead the meeting, as Merilyn will not be in attendance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

David Sanders, Tri-Cities resident and HAB Sound System Manager, made a number of suggestions to the Tri-Party Agencies, including allowing truck access to Rattlesnake mountain to fight fires; establishment of a Hanford area emergency radio station, similar to those used at Snoqualmie Pass and in the Umatilla area, to improve communication during emergencies; and increased use of the media (radio, television, newspaper) to educate the general public on Hanford issues.

ATTACHMENT 1 - ATTENDEES

HAB Members and Alternates

Mark Beck, member	Victor Moore, member	Norma Jean Germond, alternate
Ken Bracken, member	Ken Niles, member	Abe Greenberg, alternate
Pam Brown, member	Jerry Peltier, member	Doug Huston, alternate
Tom Carpenter, member	Gerald Pollet, member	David Johnson, alternate
Shelley Cimon, member	Merilyn Reeves, member	William Kinsella, alternate
James Cochran, member	Gordon Rogers, member	Jeff Luke, alternate
Greg deBruler, member	Thomas Schaffer, member	Todd Martin, alternate
Harold Heacock, member	Patrick Sobotta, member	Daniel Simpson, alternate
Charles Kilbury, member	Leon Swenson, member	Keith Smith, alternate
Paige Knight, member	Betty Tabbutt, member	Tom Zeilman, alternate
Robert Larson, member	Tim Takaro, member	Al Conklin, ex-officio
Susan Leckband, member	Jim Trombold, member	John Erickson, ex-officio
Gary Miller, member		Debra McBaugh, ex-officio

Agency, Contractor, and Support Staff

Wade Ballard, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Mike Hughes, BHI
Beth Bilson, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Wayne Glines, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Fran deLozier, CHG
Al Hawkins, DOE-RL	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Carolyn Haas, CHG
Keith Klein, DOE-RL	Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Fred Jamison, Ecology, EPA	Tara Williams, EnviroIssues
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Marsha Berry, FH
Harry Boston, DOE-ORP	John Price, Ecology	Gloria Cummins, FH
Bill Taylor, DOE-ORP	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Ron Hanson, FH
	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Jeff Hertzell, FH
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Greg Perkins, FH
	Chuck Findley, EPA	Tony Umek, FH
	Larry Goldstein, EPA	Barbara Wise, FH
	Doug Sherwood, EPA	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec
	Maxine Hayes, WDOH	Donna Sterba, Nuvotec
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
		Wayne Johnson, PNNL
		Ginger Benecke, TRI

Members of the Public

Doug Riggs	John Abbotts, UW	Doug Mercer, UW
Lisa Lusk, GAO	Tom Leschine, UW	
John Stang, Tri-City Herald	Elaine Faustman, UW	