

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Revised Meeting Summary, November 4-5, 1999
Richland, Washington

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

Executive Summary	i
New Management Vision for Hanford Cleanup.....	i
HAB Focus on the Tri-Party Agreement in 2000.....	i
Hanford Advisory Board.....	1
Approve September Meeting Summary	2
Meeting with Carolyn Huntoon.....	5
HAB Focus on the Tri-Party Agreement in 2000.....	6
Draft 2000 Calendar and Board Operations.....	6
Nuclear Research Infrastructure Programmatic EIS and the Role of FFTF	11
Update on Previous EIS Public Scoping Meetings	13
Updates.....	21
Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting.....	21
Tank Closure Meeting	22
Stewardship Workshop.....	23

RECEIVED
FEB 07 2000
EDMC

Executive Summary

New Management Vision for Hanford Cleanup

Keith Klein, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland (DOE-RL) manager, spoke about his cleanup vision for Hanford. He wants to make information on cleanup activities more accessible and understandable to the general public. He explained his three priority areas for cleanup: restoring the river corridor, transition of the central plateau, and building economic assets for the Tri-Cities. He also noted that it was important to frame goals in terms of performance objectives and to reallocate resources toward project acceleration.

Cleanup Objectives for the 100 Area

The Environmental Restoration (ER) committee presented a draft letter requesting clarification on former acting site manager Jim Hall's response to the Inspector General's (IG) report whose recommendations for 100 Area cleanup that conflict with Board values. The Board agreed to send a letter to Keith Klein requesting clarification of his position on 100 Area cleanup and the IG report recommendations. The letter also included a copy of Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Advice #23 to further illustrate the Board's values on this issue.

HAB Focus on the Tri-Party Agreement in 2000

The Board agreed to send a letter to senior managers of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies informing them of the Board's intention to increase its focus on the implementation of the TPA, including progress in meeting milestones, and to dedicate two Board meetings in the year 2000 to examining cleanup progress in light of the TPA. The letter also included a request for a meeting between TPA senior managers, the new HAB Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO), the HAB chair, and the two HAB vice chairs to discuss the role of the Board in working with the TPA agencies and supporting Hanford cleanup.

Advice on Key Questions about Alternative Financing for Tank Waste Treatment

The Dollars and Sense (D & S) Committee presented draft advice on alternative financing for tank waste treatment. The original draft advice requested technical assistance for the Board and outlined key questions that the Board believes are important to consider in the various independent and expert reviews to be conducted regarding alternative financing. Following HAB debate and discussion, the adopted advice did not request technical assistance for the Board. However, it did pose a list of questions that the Board would like DOE and the appropriate review panels to consider as they work on the privatization issue. In addition, the advice requested that DOE keep the Board informed about the results of independent and expert reviews.

Management Update from the Office of River Protection

Dick French, Office of River Protection (ORP) manager, provided an update on his five initial initiatives that he began six months earlier when he joined ORP. He also updated the Board on TPA negotiations with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), noting that the

relationship between the two agencies is excellent. In addition, he noted that DOE sees it as a priority to open up its public process, including improving relations with the states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

TPA Negotiations for Tank Waste Treatment

Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology director, updated the Board on the status of TPA negotiations for the tank waste treatment program. The negotiations are on a very positive track. This is significant in light of new DOE managers at all levels of the agency. Each step of the process aims to align milestones with the best-anticipated scenario to ensure that the milestones are achievable in light of the major upcoming decisions, such as the Authorization to Proceed in August 2000. Tom noted that the dialogue has been healthy and that discussions must expand beyond TPA milestones.

Nuclear Research Infrastructure Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility

The Board had a lengthy discussion on whether or not the topic of DOE's Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Nuclear Research Infrastructure and the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) should remain on the November HAB agenda. Board members who proposed to delete the agenda item were concerned that the public comment period for the EIS was closed, discussion of the topic could divide the Board and be detrimental to the future Board working relationships, and that nothing new on the topic could be identified through a HAB discussion and Sounding Board. Other members expressed the belief that discussion of the EIS and FFTF would be valuable because the discussion might help identify common ground among divided interests, the topic would continue to be a negative undercurrent in Board dynamics, and that a narrowly focused discussion could be effective and meaningful. Under the major procedural actions guidance of the HAB's charter and operating guidelines, the two-thirds of the Board agreed to modify the agenda item, but a two-thirds majority could not agree to how to specifically change or delete the agenda item. Therefore, the HAB continued with the agenda item as originally listed on the agenda.

Colette Brown, DOE –Headquarters (DOE-HQ), reported that DOE held seven scoping meetings in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Idaho Falls, Idaho; Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; Hood River, Oregon; Richland, Washington; and Washington, D.C. The public scoping period ended on October 31, 1999. The Board then had a Sounding Board regarding the EIS focused on the question of "What are the key issues and questions that you want to see addressed in the Programmatic EIS on Nuclear Research Infrastructure?" The Board agreed to transmit the list of Sounding Board comments, aggregated by topic, to DOE as input into the EIS scoping process. The cover letter for this list described the HAB Sounding Board process and emphasized that the views expressed do not represent a full consensus of the HAB.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Revised Meeting Summary
November 4-5, 1999
Richland, Washington

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

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 on Thursday, November 4th at 11:45 am and 4:45 pm and on Friday, November 5th at 11:30 am and 4:45 pm.

Board members in attendance are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public. One Board seat was not represented: Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (GAP) (Hanford Work Force).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues, announced that faxes received from Donna Sterba, Nuvotec (formerly TRI), have a new logo. The founders of TRI have incorporated it into the parent company, Nuvotec. Although the company name has changed, the contract staff supporting the HAB has not.
- Louise Dressen announced that the November 9th Dollars and Sense (D&S) Committee meeting has been changed to November 17th to accommodate DOE staff schedules.
- Gail McClure, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland (DOE-RL), reminded the HAB that the reappointment letters sent out last month need to be returned promptly. She requested that they all be returned by the end of October.
- Gail McClure explained that all new Board members and alternates must go through an orientation prior to sitting at the table. An orientation will be held before the December or February meetings. Contact Gail to sign up for orientation.
- Gail McClure distributed the guidelines that govern HAB member and alternate travel and travel reimbursement from DOE.
- Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (DOH), announced that information was recently mailed out on DOH's current process of adopting cleanup criteria for closure of facilities under Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulations. This rulemaking deals with state regulations and is not relevant to Hanford activities. The mailing contained information on public hearing dates, the public comment process, and an explanation of the As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) designation. Public hearings will be held on December 9th in Seattle and December 10th in Spokane. The public comment period will run through December 31, 1999. Contact Debra McBaugh for further information.
- Geoff Harvey, BNFL, offered a tour of the BNFL facilities for HAB members during the lunch break Friday, November 5th. He noted that this was an opportunity to meet with Bechtel, BNFL, SAIC and Duratec staff.

- Ron Izatt, the Board's first Deputy Designated Federal Officer, commended the Board for the great progress it has made over the years and recognized the commitment of individual members for their continued service to the Board.
- Marilyn Reeves announced that the Executive Committee conference call to finalize the December HAB agenda will be on Monday, November 15th at 11:00 am. Shelley Cimon, Vice Chair, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), will lead the call in Marilyn's absence.
- Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), announced that the Health, Safety and Waste Management (HSWM) Committee is going to hold a joint meeting with the Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee the afternoon of November 10th. In the morning, HSWM will meet with Sandy Johnson, DOE-RL, who is now overseeing health and safety issues on the Hanford site.
- Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL, invited any Board members to share any comments they have as to how to improve DOE participation with the Board with himself, Marilyn Reeves, or Gail McClure.

INTRODUCTIONS

- Victor Moore, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental Interests) was introduced as a new Board member representing the Audubon Society. He is a retired schoolteacher. He replaced Rick Leumont, who is now the alternate for the seat.

MEETING OVERVIEW

Marilyn Reeves welcomed all to the meeting and reviewed the agenda for Thursday. Review and discussion of Friday's agenda, including proposed changes to the agenda item on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Nuclear Research Infrastructure and the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), took place after lunch on Thursday. Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, explained that the only major change in Thursday's agenda was to drop the advice from the Public Involvement Committee regarding photo opportunities.

APPROVE SEPTEMBER MEETING SUMMARY

Ruth Siguenza noted that she had received comments and clarifications on the September draft meeting summary from Madeleine Brown, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force); Dan Simpson, Public At Large; Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon); and Marilyn Reeves. Specifically, Ruth will add more information on the discussion of the K Basins cranes and will make corrections to the write-up of the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Transportation Working Group. Changes to the September draft meeting summary will be included in the next HAB packet.

NEW MANAGEMENT VISION FOR HANFORD CLEANUP

Keith Klein, DOE-RL manager, spoke about his vision for Hanford cleanup. He wants to make information on cleanup activities more accessible and understandable to the general public. The challenges at the site include uranium fuel, solid and liquid fuel, disposal sites, billions of gallons of liquid waste, contaminated groundwater plumes, spent fuel at the K Basins, and the high-level waste tanks. Mr. Klein also described his three priority areas: the river corridor, the central plateau, and the future economic well being of the Tri-Cities.

For Keith Klein, the restoration of the river corridor includes spent nuclear fuel, 900 waste sites that are not located on the central plateau, reactors along the river, contaminated groundwater plumes, and approximately 150 contaminated buildings along the river. He sees potential for significant acceleration of cleanup in these areas.

Major projects in the transition of the central plateau include deactivation of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), retrieval of buried transuranic (TRU) waste, cleanup and disposition of the canyons, management of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), storage of spent fuel and vitrified glass logs in the Canister Storage Building, and disposition of other 200 Area facilities. Mr. Klein believes that those in Washington, D.C. understand the funding needs and budget situation at Hanford. He feels the next year is crucial to demonstrate clear focus on goals and measurable results so investors and stakeholders can see increased cleanup progress. In addition, he wants to reallocate resources toward project acceleration. If his vision is successful, Mr. Klein believes that Hanford cleanup could be completed ahead of the schedules in the TPA.

In reference to building economic assets for the Tri-Cities, Keith Klein highlighted the activities of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) facility, and the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project as examples of opportunities for the Tri-Cities to become national and global leaders in cleanup technologies. Because Hanford cleanup employs over 30,000 people (10,000 directly onsite and 20,000 related jobs), workforce transition is a major issue.

Keith Klein shared his optimism for reaching his vision in each of these three priority areas. He believes these goals are attainable because Hanford workers have already done it; the community and stakeholders want it; the regulators want it; fuel and disposition pathways are defined; we have significant resources; it's the right thing to do; and we have to.

Pam Brown asked Keith Klein about the long-term 100 Area cleanup in light of the 1999 Inspector General (IG) report, which challenged currently designated cleanup levels. Klein responded saying that he knows of no changes to current cleanup standards. Ken Niles commented that in the past, delays have prevented progress, but he is encouraged by Mr. Klein's approach of asking, "Why can't we do things faster?" Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) (Local and Regional Public Health),

supported Klein's idea that the expertise at Hanford could greatly benefit the rest of world.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization) raised concerns over the amount of budget advice the HAB has issued given that the HAB has not been well-informed enough on DOE decision-making processes to be effectively involved in them. In the year ahead, Gerry hoped the Board would be sufficiently informed to advise DOE on ways money saved from reductions in program overhead could be applied to restoring the river. Mr. Klein responded that DOE is encouraging Fluor Daniel Hanford's (FDH) elimination of middle management to put more money toward actual work. Spent fuel is an example of such a success.

Gerry Pollet encouraged Keith Klein to personally review the comments from the tribes and environmental interest groups that rejected the industrial cleanup designation in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan and EIS. Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) (Local Business), suggested that Mr. Klein also review public comment in support of the Land Use EIS's final ROD.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, asked Keith Klein how he planned to include the diversity of interests at Hanford, such as workers, stakeholders, and contractors, in his vision so it could be shared and embraced by all. Klein noted said the vision was developed with FDH, Bechtel, DOE and Environmental Health Foundation staff. He felt the vision was a product of teamwork, consistent with the vision of the Office of River Protection (ORP). Mr. Klein shared his belief that clear communication of management goals and inclusion of workers' best interests are crucial to success.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organization), asked Keith Klein about his perception of worker morale. Klein said that while management and contractors have come and gone, the actual work of the workers has remained constant. He noted that some workers have noted changes in the current management, but it is too early to judge. Paige also asked Dick French, DOE-ORP and Keith Klein how they are approaching Congress for budget allocations. Mr. Klein commented that both of them are worried about the separation of their programs and competition with all other DOE sites for Environmental Management (EM) funds. He noted that it is important to communicate to taxpayers and investors that more cleanup money spent now will save money in the long run.

Todd Martin, League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organization), was encouraged by Keith Klein's vision for accelerating cleanup. Given that there is not enough money to fund all cleanup activities, Todd asked what cleanup activities will be left out as a result of project acceleration. He pointed out that the HAB wants to see near-term progress and that K Basins work must continue to move forward. Madeleine Brown and Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), both commented on the importance of communication between management and workers to extend Mr. Klein's vision into the "trenches". Tom

Schaeffer, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), noted that HAMMER is a true partnership, and the open door policy between workers and DOE management is a significant improvement from a worker perspective.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force) asked about the logic of accelerating reactors cleanup but not TRU waste retrieval. He noted that the HAB had advised last year to accelerate TRU retrieval now in order to save money later. He expressed concern that contractors earn more money under the Performance Expectation Plans, which are more subjective, than under Performance Agreements, which are more objective. Keith Klein explained that it is up to the contractors to develop innovative ways to meet and exceed cleanup goals.

CLEAN UP OBJECTIVES FOR THE 100 AREA

Gordon Rogers, Public At Large, discussed the ER committee's draft letter requesting clarification regarding former acting site manager Jim Hall's response to the IG Report which made recommendations for 100 Area cleanup that conflict with Board values. Mr. Hall's response letter was handed out to Board members. Beth Bilson, DOE, clarified that Mr. Hall did not agree with the IG's first recommendation that called for DOE to petition the regulators to re-evaluate the 1995 interim ROD to achieve consistency between cleanup objectives and projected land use. Mr. Hall did concur with the second recommendation that called for DOE to challenge future cleanup objectives that are inconsistent with projected future land uses. The letter was adopted with the inclusion of a copy of HAB Advice #23 and excerpts from the Future Site Uses Working Group report that further clarify the Board's values on this issue.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE UPDATE

Meeting with Carolyn Huntoon

Merilyn Reeves described the meeting between the HAB Executive Committee and Assistant Secretary Carolyn Huntoon, DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) on September 20th. She said the discussion went well, and committee members were articulate in expressing the diversity of concerns and interests represented on the Board. The Executive Committee had prepared a Statement of Principles to present to Carolyn Huntoon. Susan Leckband said that she was impressed with Ms Huntoon's sense of commitment. Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said he was impressed by the quality of dialogue between Ms Huntoon and the stakeholders. Pam Brown felt that Ms Huntoon should be made aware of the obstacles to Tri-Party Agreement negotiation progress stemming from certain individuals at DOE-HQ. Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), expressed his concern about the disruption caused by the recompetition of DOE contracts. Bob Larson, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government) and Gerry Pollet noted that Ms Huntoon had clarified that the law requires that DOE recompute contracts.

HAB Focus on the Tri-Party Agreement in 2000

Ken Bracken introduces a draft letter from the Executive Committee to the Tri-Party Agency (TPA) senior managers expressing the HAB's intention of to increase its focus on the implementation of the TPA, including progress in meeting milestones, and to dedicate two Board meetings in the year 2000 to examining cleanup progress in light of the TPA. The purpose of the letter is to highlight the HAB's interest in the agencies successfully meeting TPA milestones. The letter also included a request for a meeting between TPA senior managers, the new HAB Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO), the HAB chair, and the two HAB vice chairs to discuss the role of the Board in working with the TPA agencies and supporting Hanford cleanup. The HAB adopted the letter.

Draft 2000 Calendar and Board Operations

Merilyn Reeves expressed her concern with the amount and frequency of information distributed to Board members, largely by fax. She would like to find ways of streamlining this process. Ruth Siguenza explained the five basic types of information sent out by the facilitation team: meeting agendas (faxed to all Board members); HAB correspondence (faxed to Merilyn, Gail McClure, EnviroIssues and selected committee chairs and issue managers 1-3 times a week); EM reports (faxed to Executive Committee members); conference call information, including background information, scheduling information, and cancellations (faxed to appropriate committee members); and other miscellaneous communications (faxed to appropriate Board members). The HAB leadership and the facilitation team welcome any ideas on how to more effectively distribute information to the Board.

Merilyn Reeves drew Board member's attention to the draft calendar for the year and the list of assumptions that were the basis for its development. The HAB agenda-building process begins six weeks prior to a meeting with an Executive Committee conference call to identify meeting topics. Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice of HAB meetings must be published 45 days in advance in the *Federal Register*. Merilyn also noted the importance of giving a minimum of 15 days notice for committee meetings. She also strongly recommended that no more than 10 committee meetings per HAB committee be held each year. Gerry Pollet expressed his concern about the 15-day notice requirement for committee meetings requesting an exception to allow shorter notice for "special meetings". He also raised concerns about security and access issues for meeting rooms in the Bechtel building and in the basement of the Federal Building.

Gordon Rogers and Ken Bracken highlighted the importance of time critical, meaningful agenda topics for HAB and committee meetings. The TPA agencies have a responsibility to clearly define their expectations and identify important topic areas for Board consideration. Board members expressed the hope that future discussions between HAB leadership and TPA agency managers shed new light on time critical topics for the Board.

The HAB discussed the number of full Board meetings proposed for 2000. Gerry Pollet expressed his view that the proposed six meetings were inadequate to cover the significant issues the Board faces in the next year. Other Board members felt that six meetings, or even fewer, were sufficient, and pointed out that HAB meetings must use members' time and TPA agency staff resources more effectively. Ken Bracken commented that as a volunteer, it is a significant challenge for him to adequately prepare for committee and Board meetings. Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health), pointed out the inconsistent attendance of some Board members, suggesting that if meetings are not engaging and time efficient, there should be fewer meetings. Paige Knight noticed that lack of higher-level DOE staff at meetings. Marilyn Reeves said the HAB will have six full Board meetings and one budget workshop in 2000. She stressed the value of focusing the majority of time at HAB meetings to one major issue. While the HAB will take up other topics, such as the Hanford Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Management EIS and the K Basins project, Marilyn noted that it is confusing and a waste of time to jump from topic to topic in a short period of time.

Max Power, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), noted the significant issues that are emerging from the current lack of progress. He also observed that while TPA agencies are responsible for giving the Board feedback on the HAB's role, communication must work in both directions. Pam Brown asked about the future of public involvement under the new DOE management. Pete Knollmeyer assured the HAB that no changes were planned regarding the Board and that DOE-RL plans to be more active in setting HAB agenda topics. He said that DOE values Board advice.

Leon Swenson commented on the process used in the FFTF Sounding Board, especially the three-minute speaking limit, and how useful it would be to incorporate this into future Board discussions to foster more focused discussion and more concise responses from Board members.

Advice on Key Questions about Alternative Financing for Tank Waste Treatment

Gerry Pollet introduced the draft advice from the D&S Committee as a follow-up to HAB Advice #95. The DOE response from Carolyn Huntoon denied the HAB's request to nominate experts to the independent review panel. Gerry believes that the HAB still needs to request technical assistance on this issue. The draft advice requests that DOE provide the HAB with technical expertise to keep it on the privatization process. The draft advice also includes a list of questions regarding funding and contracting for the vitrification plant. Board members discussed the definition of technical expertise and the value of obtaining it in light of the fact that the expert and independent panel results are expected to be available in the spring. Gordon Rogers noted that the congressionally mandated review was not under the control of DOE-Environmental Management (EM), so it was not in the Board's scope. Gerry clarified that the advice is not targeted at gaining HAB access to influence the Panel, but to have access to technical expertise so the Board can be informed during the decision process and can assess the review panels' studies. Pam Brown expressed concern about the underlying message of HAB distrust of

the expert panels this advice would carry. She reminded the HAB that it had been told it could submit questions to the expert panel. Gordon Rogers, Dan Simpson, and Susan Leckband questioned the need for the Board to seek outside expertise to review the expert panel's conclusions. The HAB agreed to drop the request for technical assistance from the advice.

Merilyn Reeves raised concerns about the complexity of the list of questions and what a DOE response might look like. Todd Martin suggested that the advice ask for continued dialogue on these and other issues. Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government), asked about the industry standard for profit, concerned about the fairness of the advice asking about this. Merilyn Reeves and Ken Bracken observed that because this is a sole source contract, it is pertinent to look at the profit levels.

Board members discussed to whom the advice should be addressed in light of the fact that DOE-EM is not responsible for the independent panel reviews. Pete Knollmeyer suggested that if the advice were sent directly to Secretary Richardson, DOE, it would reach the appropriate individuals. The HAB agreed to send copies of the letter to Carolyn Huntoon, DOE-HQ, and Dick French, DOE-ORP. The Board approved the advice containing key questions of HAB concern regarding independent reviews of alternative financing and contracting issues and asking for continued dialogue on these issues.

MANAGEMENT UPDATE FROM THE OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION

Dick French, DOE-ORP manager, observed that in the last six months, he has learned a great deal about the federal processes and procedures necessary to successfully run his program. He reviewed the five initiatives he began six months ago and the progress made on each.

Dick French's first initiative was to build a separate identity for ORP. ORP now is consolidated in the 2440 Stevens building. The second initiative was to completely separate the DOE-ORP budget from the DOE-RL in the hope that more funds could be brought to the site for the two separate cleanup offices. This initiative has not yet been completed. Mr. French is currently recruiting for a Chief Financial Officer. The third initiative was to obtain delegated decision making from DOE-HQ. This process has been slow. Mr. French described a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed by Assistant Secretary Huntoon, that described the separate functions of DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. Implementation of this MOU is ongoing. The fourth initiative was to finish the hiring of ORP staff; this is 80% to 90% completed. The fifth initiative was to gain direct contracting authority for ORP over its contractors. Currently, DOE-RL retains this contract authority for all projects on the Hanford site.

Dick French also updated the Board on TPA negotiations with Ecology. He hoped that the resolution of the negotiations will result in setting some aggressive goals, such as making glass by 2005, earlier than the current 2007 target date. BNFL is approaching acceleration of goals with innovative ideas. French felt that safety issues have been

resolved, so the focus must shift to integrating the schedules for tank waste retrieval and vitrification plant operations. Mr. French has created a Project Integration Office (PIO) to focus on integration and coordination of the entire operation. The PIO is being staffed with both DOE-ORP and contractor staff to improve efficiency.

Dick French has asked the Lockheed Martin Hanford Company (LMHC) to announce its buyer for the tank farm contract by November 27. This is difficult time for LMHC workers. He would like to see things to continue to move forward to ensure a smooth, quick transition.

Dick French observed that relations are excellent between ORP and Ecology. However, Mr. French pointed out that the goal of producing glass by 2005 is meaningless if there is no funding to make it happen. He described some of the incentives for the contractor to being workscope forward and save money. For example, if LMHC brings in \$30 million of unfunded work scope forward from next year, it is entitled to an extra \$5 million, as an incentive for exceeding this year's goals. He also noted that he believes BNFL understands that DOE must accept its contract, or BNFL will not be authorized to build the vitrification plant.

Mr. French told the HAB that the finance package must be together by August 2000. There also must be confidence in the supplier, and he noted some past commitment and follow through problems with BNFL. BNFL has not kept up with the hiring schedule, and the 30% design requirement has not been met. DOE-ORP is working to enforce schedules to ensure that the project does not fall behind. ORP is also considering a path parallel to the BNFL contract, but this depends entirely on progress with BNFL.

Bob Larson asked about how TPA negotiations will be viewed by Congress. Dick French responded saying DOE is prepared to answer questions on why privatization will bring success to the project. One of the main issues is the current privatization contract in comparison to a Management and Operations contract. He expressed the concern that Congress has a history of allocating less funding than requested.

It is a priority for DOE-HQ and Dick French to open up the public process and improve relationships with the states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Mr. French noted that Carolyn Huntoon has worked closely with DOE-ORP and DOE-HQ to open these lines of communication.

Pam Brown noted that the work this year has been impressive and highlighted the work in the U Tank Farm as an example. Paige Knight asked about Dick French's perception of worker morale. Paige referenced a worker survey completed six months ago which indicated improvement in worker morale in contrast to the low morale of two years ago.

Ken Bracken stressed that establishment of a technical baseline is critical to program success. The problem is determining a target date, such as 2005 or 2007, and progressing forward from this point. Ken commented on the importance of tracking short-term accomplishments.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), thanked Dick French for participating in the Health of the Site conference and noted his appreciation for Mr. French's candor in communicating the potential for a catastrophe in the tank farms. Tim has been encouraged by Mr. French's ability to use this risk as a driver in discussions with DOE-HQ. Mr. French responded that this risk has made Hanford a national issue because it is a matter of when, not if, a catastrophe will occur. The issue is a shortage of money. Hanford is the largest cleanup occurring in the world. Publicity communicates the risks here. Tim asked if Carolyn Huntoon understands the potential for a tank collapse. French said yes but it is not at the top of her list of concerns.

Merilyn Reeves noted that the Board has always been interested in the DOE budget process, a topic in much of the HAB's advice. Dick French said he welcomes and supports Board involvement in the budget process. Merilyn suggested ORP provide an informational forum on funding issues so the HAB and others can better understand these issues. Her concern was regarding ORP intention of hiring its own Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and the implications of how the two site CFOs will work with a single Board in the budget development process.

Susan Leckband asked about specific issues Dick French would like to see the Board focus on in the next year, especially in light of the two HAB meetings that will be focusing on the tank program. Mr. French said he would like HAB advice on DOE's agreement with BNFL. He would also like to see the Board involved in the planning process, PIO activities, and program policies because he believes the Board can make strong contributions in these areas.

In his comments on the tank program, Todd Martin presented his original four "Laws of TWRS" (Tank Waste Remediation System) and a new, fifth law. His point was the importance of making real progress in stabilizing and treating Hanford's tank waste.

Gerry Pollet asked Dick French about alternative financing analyses. Mr. French explained that the purpose of the analysis is to explore what to do if the BNFL contract fails, not to examine which financing and contracting method is the least expensive.

TPA NEGOTIATIONS FOR TANK WASTE TREATMENT

Tom Fitzsimmons, Ecology Director, gave the Board an update on the status of TPA negotiations for the tank waste treatment program over the telephone. He apologized for not giving his update in person. His presence was needed in Olympia, Washington to deal with the impending lay off of between 80 and 100 Ecology staff in his agency's air quality program as a result of the recent passage of Washington Citizen's Initiative 695.

Tom Fitzsimmons said he believed that the TPA negotiations were on a very positive track. He appreciated the HAB's advice from its September meeting urging Ecology and DOE to break the negotiations impasse. The current negotiations are especially significant in light of new DOE management and the relationship between DOE-HQ, the

Secretary of Energy, and Hanford site management. Each step of the process is intended to align TPA milestones with the best anticipated contractual scenario to ensure that milestones are achievable and aligned with the major decision making points in 2000, such as the Authorization to Proceed in August 2000. The parties are close to a final agreement. Tom appreciated the HAB's frustration with the length of time it has taken to reach this point.

Gerry Pollet asked about the implications of the Statement of Principles signed by Secretary Richardson and Governor Lock at the Governors Meeting in Denver. He expressed his organization's shock at seeing that the State of Washington had signed an agreement saying that treatment of only 10% of the tank waste by 2018 was acceptable. Tom Fitzsimmons responded that the Statement of Principles was restating the commitment to the TPA goals that serve as the minimum expectations to be met. He noted that Dick French has strongly advocated plans to exceed these goals. Mr. Fitzsimmons was very encouraged by DOE's focus on getting the whole job done. In addition, Mr. Fitzsimmons explained that the State of Washington had made no commitment to accept out-of-state waste at the Governors Meeting in Denver.

Merilyn Reeves shared the Board's plan to dedicate two meetings in 2000 to the TPA. She noted that four years earlier the HAB chair (herself); the vice chair; the DOE Deputy Designated Federal Official; Randy Smith, EPA, and Dan Silver, Ecology met to discuss the Board's role in advising the TPA agencies. Merilyn and the two HAB vice chairs would like to have another meeting of this kind, possibly before the December HAB meeting. Tom Fitzsimmons said we would welcome this type of meeting to renew dialogue and interaction between the HAB and the TPA agencies.

Jeff Luke asked a question about the different perceptions between DOE and the regulators regarding the alternate path for privatization. Tom Fitzsimmons explained that this has been a major point of contention regarding Agreement-in-Principle that surfaced last July. Mr. Fitzsimmons said there is a plan to discuss options if the vitrification plant project does not succeed, but that consideration of an alternate path does not relieve DOE of its 2007 and 2018 commitments. He also noted that the negotiations dialogue has been healthy and that agency discussions must expand beyond TPA milestones.

NUCLEAR RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMMATIC EIS AND THE ROLE OF FFTF

Discussion of Possible Agenda Changes

Ruth Siguenza described the Executive Committee process that resulted in inclusion of the topic of the Programmatic EIS on DOE Nuclear Research Infrastructure and the Role of FFTF on the November HAB agenda. Ruth explained that the Executive Committee discussed the issue in its two meetings in September and agreed that it should be an item on the November HAB agenda. Volunteers designed the session on a conference call. The session included a short presentation on recent EIS scoping meetings, a Sounding Board, and a facilitated discussion to see if the HAB could find any common ground regarding the questions and issues that should be addressed in the programmatic EIS.

The product of the session would be the results of the Sounding Board that expressed the diversity of opinions among HAB members on this topic. Board members were given the opportunity to include brief perspective statements on the EIS in the HAB packet for the November meeting. The draft session design was discussed at the Executive Committee conference call that finalized the November HAB agenda.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), recommended that the EIS agenda item be deleted from the November HAB agenda. He noted that many people have already submitted public comments, the public scoping period has already ended, and that because of the sharp differences of opinion among HAB members regarding this topic, an attempt to discuss the topic may be detrimental to the Board. Leon Swenson and Harold Heacock agreed with Jerry and expressed their concern about the potential for discussion of this topic to further divide the Board. Charles Kilbury noted that cleanup work is not affected by FFTF, so it should not be a HAB concern. Gordon Rogers said that the FFTF discussion was outside of the Board's scope because the HAB is chartered to advise DOE-EM. He expressed his belief that the HAB should not be spending time on this topic.

Other HAB members shared a different view. Ken Niles commented that there was value in discussing the divisive topic and searching for possible common ground. He also expressed the concern that if FFTF is not discussed, it would continue to resurface and divide the HAB. Todd Martin agreed that the FFTF issues has been and will continue to be a divisive undercurrent for the Board. Todd suggested that the discussion be shortened and clearly focused. Jim Trombold agreed. Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large; Susan Leckband; and Dave Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization) stressed the value of listening to each other's views and searching for common ground on key issues.

Merilyn Reeves said that changing the agenda was a major procedural issue under the HAB's charter and operating guidelines. Therefore, a two-thirds majority (requiring 16 votes) vote would be needed to change the agenda item. The Board voting actions were as follows:

- Vote to change the FFTF Sounding Board agenda item – 18 in favor (passed)

The following votes were taken to determine how the agenda item was to be changed:

- Vote to delete the FFTF Sounding Board agenda item – 14 in favor (failed)
- Second vote to delete the FFTF Sounding Board agenda item – 14 in favor (failed) or
- Vote to hold FFTF Sounding Board only – 0 in favor (failed)
- Vote to hold FFTF Sounding Board followed by Common Ground discussion – 8 in favor (failed)
- Second vote to hold FFTF Sounding Board followed by Common Ground discussion – 9 in favor (failed)
- Vote to hold FFTF Sounding Board on Thursday, with discussion Friday – 1 in favor (failed).

The HAB could not reach a two-thirds majority on any of the alternatives discussed for the agenda item, so Jerry Peltier explained that if a two-thirds majority could not be agreed upon for how to change the agenda item, it had to remain as originally listed on the agenda.

Ruth Siguenza outlined the guidelines for the discussion on the DOE Programmatic EIS on Nuclear Research Infrastructure and the role of FFTF. Individuals who signed up to speak at the Sounding Board or submitted statements for the HAB packet were given three minutes to speak to the focus question of what issues should be addressed in the development of the EIS. Following these statements, each HAB seat that had not had an opportunity to speak would be offered three minutes to do so. The purpose of the Sounding Board was to share different views and to attempt to find common ground on the HAB regarding what questions and issues should be addressed by the EIS. Ruth emphasized the desire to reserve the public comment period for the public, not Board members and alternates, and that each speaker during the public comment period would also be limited to three minutes. Before the Sounding Board began, Todd Martin reviewed the existing HAB Ground Rules as well as his own unique interpretations of each rule.

Susan Leckband noted that that Greg deBruler, Columbia River United (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest), was video taping the Sounding Board. Board members then discussed the appropriateness of a HAB member taping the proceedings. Greg explained that his intention of videotaping was to compile the contrasting views from the public scoping meetings and the HAB meeting to send to DOE to give a flavor of the concerns and the issues, the divisiveness and the non divisiveness" of the programmatic EIS issues. He had taped public comments at the Portland and Hood River EIS scoping meetings. Greg offered to make copies for any Board member and agreed to provide a copy for the HAB's records. A number of HAB members expressed concern about a HAB member taping the meeting for the purpose of editing the tape for another use. Susan Leckband, Jerry Peltier, and Harold Heacock expressed concerns over the possibility that such editing could mischaracterize individual comments. The issue of editing was of great concern. Ken Niles, Paige Knight, and Gerry Pollet said that the meeting could be videotaped since it is an open public meeting and that the issue of misrepresentation of statements due to editing was a separate issue. Marilyn Reeves ruled that any one had permission to videotape the proceedings since the HAB meeting is an open public meeting.

Update on Previous EIS Public Scoping Meetings

Colette Brown, DOE –Headquarters (DOE-HQ), reported that DOE had held seven scoping meetings in Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Idaho Falls, Idaho; Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; Hood River, Oregon; Richland, Washington; and Washington, D.C. The public scoping period ended on October 31, 1999. In addition to the comments received at the hearings, responses have been collected through e-mail, regular mail, fax, and telephone messages.

Wanda Munn asked if there were any significant issues raised in the hearings that could expand the scope of the EIS. Colette Brown responded that a no action alternative will be added that contains permanent deactivation of FFTF. DOE is also considering commercial light water reactors for some of these missions, in addition to the reactors previously identified. DOE also heard many comments requesting better justification of future irradiation needs. Ken Niles asked if DOE would consider scoping comments

received after the October 31st deadline. Colette responded that comments received after October 31st will be considered as best as DOE is able. Greg deBruler asked if the EIS includes an additional mission for Plutonium-238 that has not been disclosed. Colette assured the HAB that there are no other Plutonium-238 missions than those specified for this EIS. While there are other national security uses of Plutonium-238, there is a sufficient domestic inventory of Plutonium-238 to meet future demand for these national security uses. Any Plutonium-238 produced as a result of this EIS would be used for the space program.

Sounding Board

The focus question for the Sounding Board was: *What are the key issues and questions that you want to see addressed in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Nuclear Research Infrastructure?*

Gordon Rogers, Public At Large. I have already submitted my comments on this PEIS. I have no additional topics or comments to offer. Thank you.

Ken Niles, State of Oregon. Doug Huston, author of the Oregon comments, will summarize them as a possible starting point for people to consider for scoping comments.

Doug Huston, State of Oregon. We provided our comments at both the Portland and the Hood River meetings. They were provided yesterday because it may provide a nucleus around which some people's thoughts could coalesce and come up with some others. I am going to quickly summarize them. In our comments we said that the Programmatic EIS should include a detailed examination of DOE's projection for irradiation needs, a broader selection of options to include other DOE private sites, modification of existing reactors and accelerators to meet the stated needs, a complete examination of the costs of restarting FFTF, including the costs of restart operations, shutdown and decommissioning, thorough examination of all the potential impacts of FFTF operation on all current and projected Hanford Cleanup operations. If you read the letter further, there is more detail on these comments. This is just a high level summary. If you have any questions, I would be glad to respond to them.

Dan Simpson, Public At Large. I have prepared a statement that is explicitly supportive of FFTF. This is separate (from the one in the packet for the seat). I will make the input separately and not comment at this time.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon. We have a statement in the record. Just for purposes of looking for the common ground, I will state the things we want to see examined in the PEIS. We do want to agree with the things that Oregon State has said so far. I would like to add waste production, waste import, reactor safety, (there is a thing that says it is for public health and safety, I would like the reactor safety to be up there), cost analysis (which is one of the things that Ken mentioned, a full open cost analysis), all other alternatives mentioned, as a ditto. In the Notice of Intent, one of the points it says it is going to address is environmental justice. I would like a twist to this: the

environmental justice of adding more burden to Hanford. And then the last one I would like to say is I would like to see scoped is something about the tension between cleanup and production, because we have gone into a cleanup mode, and this is a production mode, so an analysis of this tension. Tie this back into cumulative affects of adding a production mission to a cleanup site.

Pam Brown, City of Richland. A common concern of individuals who both support and suppose the restart of Hanford's Fast Flux Test Facility is the disposition of waste that would be generated by the reactor. The EIS should identify all waste streams, evaluate the disposition alternatives, and assess their environmental impacts on the region. Of particular interest, is whether these wastes can be accommodated at Hanford without impacting the ongoing Hanford cleanup. One of the wastes that must be examined is airborne radionuclides that may be released from the reactor. Non-radioactive waste streams associated with FFTF operation include solid hazardous waste, processed wastewater, and solid and liquid waste. Disposition of these wastes should conform to state and federal regulations. Solid waste that is regulated as dangerous or extremely hazardous waste should be identified. Disposition plans for the material should be explained and material destined for disposition at Hanford should be evaluated for environmental impact to the site. The EIS should consider whether any transuranic or high-level waste will be generated and where this material will be dispositioned. Information from a preliminary analysis of FFTF operations that has been provided to us indicates that the small amount of waste that will be generated, which would remain at Hanford, will be accommodated. It would not impact other site activities or impair cleanup progress. However, it is important that these assumptions be verified and documented in the EIS. I also think it is important that the regulatory framework for operation of FFTF be identified and who the regulatory agency would be. I think this analysis is extremely important to be made available to the people of this region. I am confident in the results and am not concerned about the operation of this facility in the community in which I live or I would not be building a house. Thank you.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest. Dave Johnson and I are going to use our time using some slides. Number one, study the impact of not meeting the commitment accompanying the TPA of 1995 to use the funds saved from shutdown for cleanup. These funds were transferred out of the EM baseline and the impact is \$32 million a year. Here is that change shown, \$32 million. This is very clearly tied back [to the focus question]. I'm saying study the impact of not meeting the commitment to use the funds saved and what those funds could be used for, which has clear environmental impacts that we all care about. Meeting the compliance gap, that was part of why it was in the TPA that way. The cost to Hanford cleanup through 2006 is \$256 million. That should be studied and what the environmental impact of that is...Look at the effect of adding waste on a level funded budget. These are figures from Jeff Breckel...far more waste than previously discussed or shown in FFTF materials. What is the impact on the level funded budget from 2006 through 2010? PU-238 does produce liquid high-level nuclear waste if you process it here. What is the impact of adding that to the tanks? Study the impact of it leaking from the tanks. Here is the June 1998, 1999 DOE strategic plan document showing FFTF waste to tank. This Board adopted a principle later that relates

to this, but for a different EIS. DOE in its EIS should factor in restrictions on new waste from any source, going to facilities non-compliant have potential of uninvestigated releases. What is the impact of additional releases on the inadequate budget of the site? That should be studied. [Three minutes were up.]

Madeleine Brown, non-Union, non-Management Employees. I want this EIS to think about Hanford. Hanford workers clearly want to restart the reactor. I see profound and beautiful sense in turning swords to ploughshares. I take a different spin on environmental justice. Hanford workers like the opportunity, not only to save the planet that their Cold War efforts have dirtied up, but also to save souls. Two kinds of work: saving the planet and saving souls. We'd like to do both. I think this is a piece of environmental justice, where contamination has been done, and we can do well. I do think we need to understand the needs very well. We need to look at these waste streams very comprehensively. I can coalesce around Oregon's points. The socio-economic considerations should remember that Hanford has a future. Keith Klein wants to look at the river, the plateau and the future. This would be the future of the Tri Cities, clearly a piece of this.

Jim Trombold, Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility (via phone). Things that effect environmental health are certainly pertinent to the EIS. First of all, about our fascinating discussion yesterday, I'd like to say I think it is embarrassing to go on over anymore HAB meetings to say this important thing hasn't been discussed even though the advisory board may not shine much light on the decision made by DOE, I think that it is real to say that there has at least been some discussion. It is certainly healthy for an advisory board and those that said we wouldn't change any minds are certainly right. But I don't think the only reason to talk is to change minds. I think there is some benefit working as a group and a team as an advisory board to understand different perspectives and that people can agree to disagree. I understand that there's a sense that this place will die and not have a future if there's not production. I guess I have a more positive feeling about preventative medicine and the terrific horrendous volume of cleanup of material. We have told officials that jobs are very important for generations to come to get the cleanup and the restoration completed. And I think those are honorable and productive jobs. I understand the sense that there is more future if there is production. On the question of medical isotopes, I get it wrapped up in disliking cancer. I'm an internist. I take care of cancer patients. My brother is an oncologist, director of a cancer center. No one likes cancer. We will need isotopes in the future. From my expert information, there is currently not a shortage. The cleanest and most efficient way, according to the National Institute of Medicine, would not be to make that a by-product of the Fast Flux Facility. And there will be other productions online we don't even know about, and I don't know what they are as far as plutonium for space. I think one of the problems that we have to put honor and maybe triple the jobs in good scientific, preventative medicine, and environmental restoration and not put a downside on not having production. The job is preventative medicine, cleaning up the nuclear waste material we have.

Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council. TRIDEC has submitted extensive comments directly to the Department on the scope of the EIS. We've also

included in the packet a statement discussing some of these issues. If you go back and look at the Department's Notice Of Intent, it is a very comprehensive, good piece of work. It identifies, not only specific issues that need to be addressed in the EIS, but also identifies four alternatives to be considered. If there are other alternatives that should be evaluated, I don't really know of any that should be beyond those that are included here. I believe that if the comprehensive EIS is made of the impact areas that are included in the draft statement, that this will be a place to get into the public a factual set of evaluations that can be debated as to their adequacy and accuracy. But these appear to cover all of the potential issues that need to be considered. I'd say let's get on with the EIS, and if there are additional items that came out in the hearings, include them.

Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health. I have nothing to add.

Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco. At the moment, I am not prepared to be loquacious.

Norma Jean Germond, Public At Large. I am interested to see that the PEIS includes the plutonium production process. I want to make sure that there is a clear understanding in that EIS as to where the neptunium-237 offsite powder would be processed. I am assuming now that is probably at Savannah River, but I'd like that to be clear. Where will it be fabricated? Will that be at Hanford, or not, and if so, do more buildings or mechanism have to be constructed to do that? I would like to know if the chemical processing facility will have to be at Hanford also. If they would be please go through the process of fabrication, so we have a clear understanding of what's coming and where it will be manufactured. And then we understand going through FFTF... I think that front-end waste stream is important too. We need to see that thorough process written up in the scope.

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments. Most of my comments will revolve around socio-economics, and I believe that most of them have already been incorporated in e-mails I have forwarded to Ms. Brown. For the Board's information, I think that many members of the technical community feel very strongly that one of the things that needs to be looked at is the total neutron needs of this nation over the next two decades. That's a pretty broad thing to have to look at, but that's the only way to evaluate whether or not this particular facility has a real place in what we have to do in coming years. Obviously with respect to definitions of radioisotopes, not only for medical use, but also for commercial and industrial use, we simply have to know what kind of neutrons we have available to us and where we're going to get them if we don't get them from FFTF. Costs of FFTF need to be compared with the costs that would be required to build the structures necessary to meet that same isotopic need over the next two decades. Our educational institutions need to be surveyed to assure that what their graduate students need in the way of facilities where pure research and advanced activities can be performed. We need to be sure that those things are available to us and if not at FFTF, where. Conservative estimates of how much money would be saved both by the federal government in social security payment and Medicare and for the general populations in similar kinds of patient treatment where medical isotopes are utilized instead of other traditional treatments. There's a cost savings that is extremely large and

probably should be looked at. I am very pleased to hear that all alternatives are being considered, other than that I have no additional topics. I would request that when those of us who are talking about these things think of them. I would hope that when you're talking about medical isotopes you talk about manufacture rather than production, because production, in the context that they use at Hanford, so often means production of weapons material. One last thing for the members of the Board, I have copies of the Science News issue of October 23rd, which Dr. Schenter referred to yesterday. You've heard repeated reference to a medical institution that says there is no shortage of medical isotopes.

Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce Tribe. We don't have any prepared comments at this time. If and when we do, we will submit them directly to the Department of Energy.

Gary Miller, City of Kennewick. We have no prepared comment.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington. I was a bit confused when the EIS focused so much on FFTF because this was supposed to be a Programmatic EIS and felt that a better defined needs statement to point out that this is not focusing on FFTF is needed. The Notice Of Intent, it appears that this is an attempt to force the site specific EIS into a PEIS format. I think the Notice of Intent needs better definition. I agree very strongly with Wanda Munn in that the particular neutron needs of the nation need to be better defined. That should be part of the scoping process. I would ask that a more comprehensive identification of alternatives for meeting those needs also need to be added. At the current time, because of what I think is the directive PEIS, or the more like a site specific EIS has not occurred. Finally, I would support the comments previously about the costs analysis. The costs analysis needs to include a cost analysis of the impact on waste streams or the impact that waste streams have on current structures, including management structures in all of the possible alternatives. For example, if you looked at the Hanford management structure, I don't think we have a lot of time to give to this currently. It looks like our management is fairly fully engaged. In any event, this type of evaluation needs to be made as part of the economic analysis.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters. I do not have issues to add. I do sense that we can agree on some topics that should be part of the scope of this EIS. But I would make a warning that we have to be very careful that that does not include any assumptions.

Robin Klein, Hanford Action of Oregon. We have a list of items of concerns and deficiencies in the EIS that we will submit. Many of those are things that have already been mentioned. I just wanted to highlight a couple. We want to make sure that any companion facilities and waste streams that are generated or through additional processing are considered in this EIS. There is a compelling need demonstrated for new production missions, that that is considered in this analysis. We would also like to see that we have independent nuclear safety oversight of these activities and a cost analysis...identifying the impacts of any additional spent fuel storage.

Ken Bracken, Benton County. Benton County does not have anything to add at this point.

Jack Yorgesen, Grant and Franklin Counties. We are interested in enhancing the jobs of the whole area. And would like to see the development of FFTF.

David Watrous, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council. I believe that the PEIS is quite adequate. I would like to see flow charts with the alternatives produced as part of this for visual understanding. The rest of my comments are particularly devoted to the socio-economic aspects of the Oregon statements that talk about the detailed examination of DOE's projections for irradiation needs, should include future visions, not just what we see today. I agree with Wanda's comments on neutron needs totally. It should look at a broader spectrum of options and these options should be constrained options, not everything that anybody can imagine. A complete examination of costs, total costs across the program. Whether it is FFTF or a brand new accelerator, as was described yesterday, as costs exceeding national product. [Also should include] a thorough examination of costs of all the potential costs of operation on current and projected operations nationally, not just at Hanford. We're looking at a national program with a national need, and we need to look at this entire process as to what it will do for us on a national basis.

Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health. I want to concur with something that Madeleine brought up, that we have concern in addressing the regulatory issue because at the other power plant that is on the site currently, we have a lot of responsibility in both emergency response and environmental monitoring. So I'd like to have that evaluated for FFTF, which would be a DOE facility.

David Johnson, Heart of America Northwest. Not too many years ago, a reactor, such as the FFTF, would have been the only way to make significant quantities of isotopes that are produced by neutrons. That is no longer true. I want to show you a specific type of accelerator-based neutron source that is a much better way to make medical isotopes than to restart FFTF. It can make all the same quantities and types of isotopes that are proposed in the FFTF. In addition, it can make isotopes that cannot be made in the FFTF. It will cost less to build and to operate, produce far less nuclear waste, and will have dramatically reduced safety issues. One of my main points to the Hanford Advisory Board in searching for common ground is not to put all your eggs into the FFTF basket. It may end with nothing if you say, for example, that the accelerator can't do the job. It is important with this particular accelerator-based neutron source to properly identify and accurately evaluate it in the Infrastructure PEIS. I am not talking about an expensive spallation neutron source, I am talking about an accelerator-based neutron based facility that is already designed and is called the FMIT facility. An accelerator facility based on this design can make all the same types and quantities of isotopes that are proposed for FFTF. To demonstrate, I'll show you the estimate of the volume requirements to support missions in the FFTF reactor. Note that the highest volume requirement to support medical isotopes is only 34.6 liters. This corresponds to a volume of a cube about thirteen inches on the side. It's really very small. Yesterday, Ken Dobbins, during public

comment said the FMIT facility had an irradiation volume of only half a liter, the size of a pop can, and much smaller than the requirement of 34.6 liters. That assertion is not correct. The main point for the common ground is to allow the possibility that there might be an accelerator for the Board to say, if you don't get the FFTF, the accelerator might be a good thing too. There is a high flux region of about a liter. It is also noted that there is an auxiliary test volume of 8,000 liters, that has somewhat lower than the highest neutron flux. This corresponds to a cube about two meters on the side, which is clearly much larger than the required 34.6 liters. Hence, there is more than enough volume to meet the requirements for isotope production.

Jim Cochran, Washington State University. I think the rest of the Board has made some significant headway toward some common ground.

Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board. My Board turned in scoping comments. I am really pleased to hear Colette talk about what she heard from the hearing and the expanded look for the scoping for the EIS, and I don't have any further comments at this time.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees. I agree that we need to explore the EIS as fully as everybody has intended. I have one other thing I would like them to look at. I would like the risks associated with the possible lack of availability of medical isotopes that are totally dependent on foreign sources.

Tom Schaffer, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council. Just wanted to pledge our unwavering support for the restart of FFTF. Both for the lives it will save and for the economic development of the Tri-Cities.

Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades Council. A couple issues that I did not see on the EIS would be issues as applied to Tri-Cities economic development, as it applies to cost considerations for economic development that is being done by the government with the downsizing of Hanford. A project of this magnitude could actually redevelop this community as a worldwide cancer center. When you look at other implications, I don't see that addressed in the EIS.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland. I have submitted all my comments in writing at the various hearings. I have identified those comments that are pertinent to our city. The only one I was going to make, Pam Brown has already clearly made, which is a concern of the community, and that's the waste streams, and therefore I defer.

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation. We have no comments at this time. We do intent to meet with independently with the management of FFTF to discuss issues.

The facilitators compiled the list of Sounding Board comments by general categories. The Board reviewed and discussed the major points. Greg deBruler requested an addition to the list, but since he was not present during nor did he participate in the Sounding Board; the request was denied. Individual Board members were invited to work with the facilitation team to correct or clarify their own individual statements on the list. Gordon

Rogers, Susan Leckband, and Leon Swenson suggested that the list be sent to Colette Brown, DOE-HQ. Other HAB members suggested having a discussion focused on finding common ground within the list. Ken Niles identified three major points of common ground from his perspective that could be highlighted in the transmittal letter, specifically, the need for the programmatic EIS to address waste generation, costs, and national irradiation needs. While the Board discussed the possibility of including areas of common ground in the transmittal letter, it decided against doing so. The HAB agreed that the transmittal letter for the Sounding Board comments should explain how the programmatic EIS issue was put on the Board's agenda, describe the Sounding Board purpose and process, identify the focus of this specific Sounding Board, and note that the views expressed do not represent the consensus of the HAB. Board members empowered Marilyn to approve and send the transmittal letter and attached Sounding Board comments.

UPDATES

Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting

The Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs meeting at Hanford was attended by Marilyn Reeves, Shelley Cimon, Ken Bracken, Harold Heacock, and Pam Brown. Pam Brown gave an excellent presentation on the Hanford Site Technical Coordinating Group (STCG), on which has three seats held by HAB members. Gordon Rogers and Pam Brown are very actively involved. Pam will make copies of her presentation available to Board members. Pam believes her presentation encouraged other SSAB members to get involved in their respective STCG's. DOE-HQ staff have given assurances that funding would not be taken away from the STCG's that have a lot of support from the labs and subgroups under the various national level focus areas.

Marilyn Reeves noted that the highlight of the meeting was the site tour, especially the visit to the B Reactor. The site visit made Hanford issues "real" and helped other SSABs understand the depth of issues the HAB is involved in. Meeting participants expressed the wish that they had toured other sites when the SSAB's were formed to get a better understanding of the overall DOE complex. Marilyn also noted that a number of SSAB chairs will soon step down.

The SSAB chairs discussed the proposed process of choosing and approving board members through DOE-HQ. On behalf of the HAB, Marilyn Reeves challenged the current process of approval through DOE-HQ because in the case of Hanford, the HAB is made up of organizations, not individuals. She noted that the entire Nevada board had been recently rejected by DOE-HQ for unknown reasons.

Ken Niles asked about the status of the national Transportation Working Group. Marilyn Reeves and Gail McClure reported that the SSAB chairs had responded negatively to the idea, but no conclusions were made at the meeting.

Tank Closure Meeting

The third national tank closure meeting was attended by Ken Bracken, Doug Huston, Todd Martin, and Wade Riggsbee, Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, and two DOE-ORP staff participated. Ken Bracken reported that this national tank closure meeting is the only forum in which participants from the four sites in the country containing high-level waste (HLW) meet to focus on HLW issues. The four sites are Hanford, Savannah River, Idaho National Environmental Engineering Laboratory (INEEL), and West Valley. Representatives from the National Academy of Sciences, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and state regulators also attend this meeting. Ken noted that the attacks on Hanford from other sites have changed considerably. There is an increased understanding of the magnitude of the issues at Hanford by other sites and their advisory boards.

The NRC is working on resolving the incidental waste issue. For example, 95% of Hanford's waste volume is incidental. Savannah River and INEEL also need an NRC determination regarding their waste. NRC was to have made this decision last December, but it has yet to be made. This decision has potential policy implications for all sites with HLW. Ken Bracken noted that Suzanne Dahl made an impressive presentation on site closure. He recommended that Suzanne make this presentation to the HAB or to one of its committees. Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), attended DOE-RL's presentation on schedule funding and observed that funding has been dropped for closure this year. There is a need to integrate closure activities, such as engineering and planning, with the ongoing vitrification process. However, in the middle of the process, the funding has disappeared. This means closure activities are put on hold and run behind the vitrification activities. Pam Brown said that the tank closure funding was an issue raised at the last Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee meeting. The Committee was assured that tank closure will be funded.

Savannah River has an EIS out on its tank system closure. It also has an environmental assessment (EA). Citizen and stakeholder groups have questioned why it did an EIS. No technical issues were added as a result of the EIS. The EA addressed technical issues. The ITP process is called the salt disposition process is used for low-level waste (LLW). There is a draft Request for Proposals that will soon go out regarding treatment of the salt waste stream. Savannah River believes that the process will be in place by 2009 or 2010. It needs this process to treat its LLW. It is competing for funding with INEEL and Hanford to get these facilities.

INEEL needs to address treatment of 1.3 million gallons of acidic waste. It also uses a petroleum industry washing unit to clean the insides of tanks which has given good results. Hanford can learn from INEEL experiences.

West Valley regulators are concerned about the residual waste in the tanks, and DOE's activities. One year ago, one tank containing HLW was being emptied and the contents vitrified. West Valley had planned to complete this task and then deal with cleaning the pipes at the bottom of the tank. Over the course of the year, DOE discovered settling at a more rapid rate than had been anticipated. This is another example of lessons learned

regarding methods of dealing with HLW issues. The complexity of HLW issues increases exponentially in complexity when you begin comparing West Valley to Savannah River and then Savannah River to Hanford.

Stewardship Workshop

Susan Leckband reported on the Stewardship Workshop she attended at Oak Ridge, Tennessee with Greg deBruler, Dennis Faulk, Max Power, and Barbara Harper, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government). Jim Werner, DOE, and EPA gave presentations on long-term stewardship. Jim Werner spoke on the Dynamic Nature of Long-Term Stewardship. Susan shared one of Jim's figures and expressed concern that it indicated an end point for stewardship. EPA discussed examples of stewardship, including accelerated paths to closure at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Oak Ridge is the first site to focus on long-term stewardship. Susan suggested that closing sites can be used as models for stewardship implementation. Susan urged HAB committees to look into the issue of stewardship.

Greg deBruler recommended that the Board focus on stewardship now to be sure DOE is focused on future protection needs from residual contamination. It has been suggested that a long-term funding mechanism be established, separate from the cleanup budget, for stewardship. One for obtaining this money was to tax the Department of Defense.

Dennis Faulk encouraged the HAB members to visit other sites. He stressed the need to develop a national emphasis and policy on stewardship. The term stewardship was formerly called institutional controls, which are required in DOE RODs. While public involvement for stewardship has not been considered in the past, it would be valuable for the Board to get involved in the development of long-term stewardship plans. Susan Leckband noted that there is no definition of stewardship that is applicable to every site.

Max Power said there is an opportunity for the Board to comment on DOE's stewardship report. Another report will be issued next August focusing on the costs of stewardship for those sites that will be shifting from cleanup to stewardship by 2006. Most sites have not addressed the costs of stewardship. Max also noted the importance of intergenerational transfer of information. Communicating the importance of stewardship from generation to generation will be a challenge. Susan Leckband reported that there are 109 sites across the country in need of long-term stewardship.

Health of the Site Conference

Tim Takaro gave an update on the Third Annual Health of the Site Conference that was held in Richland on the two days preceding the November HAB meeting. There were about 160 participants, including high school students, members of the public, tribal members, and HAB members. Conference discussions addressed the following topics: tanks, environmental exposures, the elk herd, human subject testing, diseases and former workers, results from the Hanford Medical Monitoring Program, and the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS). Tim noted that Joe Richards, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) (Tribal Government); Todd Martin; Shelley Cimon; Mike Wilson, Ecology; and Doug Sherwood, EPA, played important roles in

moderating discussions and participating on panels for the conference. Tim also noted that the HAB's feedback on the value of the conference would be greatly appreciated. Marilyn Reeves proposed that Tim draft a letter in which the HAB could endorse the annual conference.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Schenter, a Richland resident, represented the National Association of Cancer Patients and the Nuclear Medicine Research Council. He spoke on the importance of medical isotope production for cancer patients. He offered Board members brochures from the organization he represents. The executive director of the Nuclear Medicine Research Council, Vicky Hobson, has argued strongly for the restart of FFTF. Cancer patients are stakeholders in production of medical isotopes at FFTF. Bob read a letter to Senator McCain from a mother, whose child had died from cancer, urging the restart of FFTF. Bob also referenced a five-year-old Institute of Medicine (IOM) report that recommended the production of medical isotopes. He said the lead author of the IOM report supports the restart of FFTF. Bob strongly supported the report of an expert panel forecasting the future demands for medical isotopes. He requested that this report be entered into the record. The IOM report urged DOE to produce radioisotopes to meet forecasted commercial and industrial needs.

Laurel Piippo, a Richland resident since 1951, urged the reopening of FFTF for medical isotope production for cancer treatment. As a cancer survivor, she is grateful to modern medicine for developing an alternative to radiation treatment that has debilitating side effects. Laurel said possibilities for using medical isotopes should explore treatment of other cancers, in addition to non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, which medical isotopes currently treat with great success.

Ken Dobbin, a City of West Richland Councilman, warned of the HAB losing credibility with the public because of its plan to discuss the programmatic EIS addressing the possible restart of FFTF. He expressed great concern about the inclusion of inaccurate information in the HAB packet. Ken strongly recommended dropping the FFTF discussion from the HAB agenda and suggested that the Board invite a technical expert to provide information on the issue. Ken shared a *Science News* article that discusses the shortage of medical isotopes. Ken said the accelerator alternative could not match FFTF's production capability. Ken prepared a rebuttal to the inaccurate information in the HAB packet that he made available on the back table.

Debbie Neilson, a West Richland resident, shared her concerns about misleading articles on the impacts of starting FFTF, including issues concerning plutonium-238 and nuclear research. She thinks misinformed statements are being made and are taken out of context to mislead the public. This does a disservice to the EIS process and to the people of this region. One area of misinformation is on waste generation of the proposed FFTF missions. Debbie has been familiar with FFTF for 14 years. Restart and operation of FFTF will generate waste, but the quantities are small and compared to previous operations, will be in compliance with state and federal laws. Hanford can easily contain

these wastes that will not be sent to the underground double shell tanks. Low-level liquid waste will go to the F-1 treatment facility. A 35-year mission will produce a very small amount of waste. FFTF can safely manage the missions with small waste streams small and no threat to environment.

Dan Rovira, a Pasco citizen, has been involved in the FFTF project for 17 years. He does not agree with statements on the inadequacy of FFTF to produce quality medical isotopes. He used Iodine-131 as an example of how chemical processes at FFTF will be able to produce a high quality, diverse source of medical isotopes.

Tom Burke, a resident of Kennewick, has worked for 30 years in nuclear facilities with a focus on reactor safety issues. Tom pointed out that the references to accident in Japan regarding mixing of solutions are incorrect and that there is no parallel for such an accident happening at FFTF. Safety studies on FFTF have concluded it is highly improbable that such an accident could occur at FFTF. There is enough fuel today to run FFTF for 21 years, and any further fuel needs could be met by domestic fabrication efforts, such as the United States Navy.

Stan Scott, a resident of Richland, has worked at FFTF for 25 years, including work on medical isotope studies. He was a member of the OE expert panel on medical isotope production. He pointed out that the 1995 Institute of Medicine Report has been frequently misquoted. The report author urged the restart for FFTF in a letter to the Secretary of Energy following the publication of the report. Stan suggested that DOE conduct a cost benefit analysis for FFTF operations and the savings to Medicare and Medicaid from those medical isotopes produced. This savings should be measured in quality-adjusted life years. He requested that the Board ask DOE to include this kind of cost analysis in the programmatic EIS.

Gai Oglesbee has been a resident of the region for over 40 years. She pointed out that atomic energy was originally intended for peaceful purposes. The United States and Britain are the only countries using plutonium-238 in munitions.

Don Segna, Advanced Nuclear Medical Systems and the National Academy of Cancer Patients, pointed out that cancer is the biggest killer for those under age 65. He advocated including the privatization of FFTF as an alternative in the programmatic EIS.

Sol Guttenberg, a resident of Kennewick, addressed a few points of inaccurate information contained in the HAB meeting packet. He recited a quote by Secretary Richardson on the dangers of transporting hazardous materials as a result of FFTF restart. He said this quote was not substantiated and that DOE has an impeccable safety record of transporting radioactive material across the country. He said that FFTF also has a clean record on meeting safety regulations. He said FFTF releases no radioactive material to liquid pathways and has no releases to the atmosphere. The proposed mission for FFTF restart does not pose any danger. Sol refuted the statement of possible terrorist dangers from importing German MOX fuel. He identified this as an unfounded scare tactic. He strongly supports the restart of FFTF.

Peggy Scott, a resident of Richland, has worked at FFTF as a reactor operator and a mechanical engineer. She responded to an item in the HAB packet saying FFTF restart poses great risk (30%) to the general public of a radioactive release and that this article used this number out of context. Peggy also quoted a 40% figure for increased exposure of radiation to the public compared with facilities that are regulated by EPA and NRC, which was refuted, saying exposure would be minimal. In response to concern about the waste that would be produced by FFTF (8.5 tons of spent fuel) and the lack of safe disposal methods, Peggy referred to the Yucca Mountain EIS as a viable option for safe storage of these wastes. She stressed the importance of factual information for the Board to effectively participate in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

ATTACHMENT 1: ATTENDEES**November 4-5, 1999****HAB Members and Alternates**

Richard Berglund, member	Norma Jean Germond, alternate	John Erickson, ex-officio
Ken Bracken, member	Doug Huston, alternate	Debra McBaugh, ex-officio
Madeleine Brown, member	David Johnson, alternate	
Pam Brown, member	Jeff Luke, alternate	
Shelley Cimon, member	Robin Klein, alternate	
Jim Cochran, member	Rick Leaumont, alternate	
Greg deBruler, member	Todd Martin, alternate	
Harold Heacock, member	Wanda Munn, alternate	
Charles Kilbury, member	Nanci Peters, alternate	
Paige Knight, member	Wade Riggsbee, alternate	
Robert Larson, member	Ross Ronish, alternate	
Susan Leckband, member	Thomas Schaeffer, alternate	
Gary Miller, member	Daniel Simpson, alternate	
Victor Moore, member	Stan Sobczyk, alternate	
Ken Niles, member	Stan Stave, alternate	
Jerry Peltier, member	Jim Trombold, alternate	
Gerald Pollet, member	Dave Watrous, alternate	
Merilyn Reeves, member		
Gordon Rogers, member		
Leon Swenson, member		
Margery Swint, member		
Elizabeth Tabbutt, member		
Tim Takaro, member		
Jim Watts, member		
Jack Yorgesen, member		

Agency Staff and Contractors

Wade Ballard, DOE	Rick Bond, Ecology	Mike Hughes, BHI
Doug Chapin, DOE	Dustin Nielson, Ecology	Steve Liedle, BHI
Ellen Dagan, DOE	Max Power, Ecology	Joan Woolard, BHI
Dick French, DOE	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Geoff Harvey, BNFL
Glen Goldberg, DOE	Tony Valero, Ecology	Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues
Al Hawkins, DOE	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Mary Jarvis, DOE	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Tara Williams, EnviroIssues
Sandra Johnson, DOE	Helen Brownell, EPA	Janell Hales, FDH
Keith Klein, DOE	Craig Cameron, EPA	Jeff Hertzfel, FDH
Pete Knollmeyer, DOE	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Deborah Iwatate, FDH
Gail McClure, DOE	Doug Sherwood, EPA	Sheila Little, FDH
Felix Miera, DOE		Janice Williams, FDH
Karen Randolph, DOE		Barbara Wise, FDH
George Sanders, DOE		B. French, NTR
		Chris Chamberlain, Nuvotec
		Lori Ramonas, Nuvotec
		Donna Sterba, Nuvotec
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
		Terri Traub, PNNL
		Mark Triplett, PNNL
		Sandi Murdock, SAIC
		Ginger Benecke, TRI
		Sharon Braswell, TRI
		Chuck Carlisle, TRI
		Lucy Love, TRI
		Dick Wilde, WMH

Members of the Public

Don Segna, ANMS	Paul Alley	Jim Knight
Joyce DeFelice, Congressman Hastings' office	Susan Becker	Debbie Nielson
Andres Aebi, Hanford Information Network (HIN)	Allyn Bolt	Gai Oglesbee
Rob Davis, HIN	Jim Bucky	Dan Royira
Carrie Jones, HIN	Linda Burke	Robert Schenter
Debbie Martin, HIN	Tom Burke	Peggy Scott
Fawn McNeely, HIN	Jim Grow	Stan Scott
Mike Plahuta, HIN	Sol Guttenberg	John Swanson
Doug Riggs, HIN	Ron Izatt	
Todd Ungerecht, HIN		
Laurel Piippo, Richland		
Corky Mattingly, Senator Murray's office		
John Stang, Tri-City Herald		
Ken Dobbin, West Richland City Council		