



THE



A NATIONAL FORUM ON ENVIRONMENT,

HANFORD

TECHNOLOGY, AND THE ECONOMY



SUMMIT

CONFERENCE SUMMARY REPORT



Photo courtesy of *The Tri-Cities Herald*, Dorothy Adcock - photographer

Table of Contents

Opening remarks by Secretary O'Leary and Governor Lowry	Page 4
Session 1 (Public Involvement) Summary Report	Page 13
Session 2 (Regulatory) Summary Report	Page 17
Session 3 (Training and Education) Summary Report	Page 23
Session 4 (Technology Transfer) Summary Report	Page 27
Session 5 (Economic Development & Partnerships) Summary Report	Page 31
Closing Statements by Governor Lowry and Secretary O'Leary	Page 35
Order form for Hanford Summit Audio and Video Tapes	(Insert)

Opening Remarks
Secretary O'Leary and Governor Lowry

Secretary O'Leary

First of all I would like each of you to know that I am absolutely delighted to be here. As I said to your Governor this morning "I can't think of a better time to be staging this economic summit." It comes at a time for the state of Washington, as well as the nation, when we are considering issues of how we can revitalize the nation, and more importantly, how the United States can recapture its dominant position in international markets. How can we become number one in world competition again? In my view here at Hanford, what happens in this room today will follow work that has begun long before today. It will show the state and certainly the Tri-Cities area whether we are serious about reclaiming our rightful place in the international markets. And I think I know the answer, I think you do as well.

The other reason I think it is the right timing is because we are, as an administration, focusing on two very profound events, or occurrences, which as you have already noticed is our style. We don't like to focus on one, we like to focus on many. There are a few themes which I think support and give power to what will occur here in the next two days. The first is the theme of reinvention of government. And we like to think at the Department of Energy that we are well on the trail toward reinvention; many of the plans for Hanford and the Tri-Cities area approach that reinvention.

The second is that here in the state of Washington I know there is so much support for NAFTA. Because what the North American Free Trade Agreement is quite frankly all about is removing barriers to trade. And how do nations prosper if they do not trade? And so these themes, I think, underscore what should be happening here. And to get directly to my point of view, the piece I would like to leave each of you with, is the Department's commitment and my personal

commitment as the seventh Secretary of Energy, to stay focused on those issues that are important to Hanford and to the citizens of the Tri-Cities areas and the state.

I want to leave you, and maybe for the first time for some of you, with a clear sense that one of my top priorities is the clean-up of Hanford. Was, is, and shall be. And perhaps equally important to underscore here is that a part of that top priority is to accomplish that clean-up in the most effective, efficient, by that I mean speedy, reliable, by that I mean cost effective, and finally safe way. I would like there to be no more "Mr. Beattys," who lose lives at our plant sites. To me, and to each of us in the room, this is unacceptable.

Clean-up will likely proceed through my lifetime and I am well aware of that, but for those of us in this room, the question really now becomes, is there life after clean-up? And the answer is yes, there is life, and future generations will be grateful to this conference; the beginning of an agreement upon a mutual vision for the future at Hanford after clean up. And that does not in any way detract from the business at hand. But if we are to proceed as partners, and I believe we are partners, then we must share a vision, and my vision for Hanford, I know will be enriched with the conversations and discussions, and by the final deliberations at this meeting.

My vision is that Hanford will really set the tone and be the beacon for the technology transfer that can occur out of the work that we call clean-up. I am so certain that Hanford will be a model, that I think all that we need to do is examine what it means to each of us, and develop a very strategic way to follow through on how to make that happen.

Now, some things are already occurring that, to me, look towards the future. They are small things but they are beginnings. I will talk, first of all, about the scientific endeavors that already exist here, focusing on environment, and on

science, and looking at health effects of clean-up, and clean-up technologies. What we already know is that the market place for those byproducts coming out of working laboratories is as broad and as far as Russia, as Britain, as France, and every area of the country where they are doing the work we have done here, that you have done here at Hanford, in support of national security.

And I know those market places are existing and I would share with each the fact that just last week the board chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission met in Washington D.C. One of the commitments coming out of that meeting was that the Secretary of Energy and the chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would begin to work in earnest with the Russians (and that is the Russian Federation) on issues involving clean up and health and safety in the former Soviet Union. That to me is a market place that is opening and is opening in a very broad way with the commitment of the prime minister that these things will happen, and that they will happen with vigor in Russia.

Let me go further. I am aware of the fact that it has been discussed this morning that right here at Hanford, at one of our reactor sites, salmon fingerlings are actually being hatched and moved into a natural habitat.

Great idea. Many great ideas will follow, we just need the plan to follow it. What would be the Federal government's commitment at a time when so many people are focused on the stand down of the military, occasioned by the national defense posture being so different now that we

are in a mode of dismantling our weapons? That is not to leave you with a clear feeling that we are not still focused on that national defense, but that we are focused on it in such a different way. Such a very different way. We now require the proxy for building bombs, which requires the use of high technology; which requires the use of super computing; which requires lots of physics applications; which, if perhaps we do our jobs well, requires us to never build or design another bomb. Now that feels good to me. What that also means is that we will, in time, create a protective, intellectual barrier that provides many off-shoots that I think can flourish here in Hanford. And let me talk about what they might be.

As we have examined the opportunities, as a government, and as the people in the private sector, and as economists look at what areas of our economy are really going to spur and drive us into the 21st century, it is clear to all of us what they are. First of all communication, managing and handling data, some of that can flow out of

the work that is already occurring here in the laboratories that support the work at Hanford. I know there is work there. The other support piece that also comes out of the laboratory here involves advanced manufacturing processes.

And what we know from talking with the private sector, who are so interested in the work that our scientists and technologists have produced over the past 40 years, is that those are the technologies the market place of the 21st century demands.



So there are opportunities here. What the government and the Department of Energy now owe you is to be certain that in each process and each technology that we are developing, that we first of all open our doors, that we remove as much of the cloud and barrier of secrecy as possible so that the private sector can know what is being done and look for opportunities. Much of this has happened here already, but we must encourage that through much more openness. We must be certain when designing those budgets that we are focused on the needs of the 21st century, and so express it.

And what that means is that you require a Secretary of Energy who sends loud support of a superconducting super collider, because it represents big science that we must maintain, because that is what made America competitive through the 70's and through the 80's. By betting on the big science and sometimes not clearly understanding the lengthy results and outcome we can be more competitive, because we understand the byproducts of big science.

I have taken as a lay person to really understand that it is my job to talk about these issues. What I have to do is go around with what I call my toys, which are implements that have come out from the work done at places like Hanford that are used in the private sector. And the one I love so well is what I think is called bio-barrier? Which is now in the market places, and let me explain to you what it is, because I think it is such a simple thing.

Thought of out here at Hanford, little pellets, tiny black pellets, that are placed along the walkway where one is planting trees and shrubby. These pellets prevent them from getting into the septic system or the drain system and do it in quite a biologically and scientific acceptable way, without any toxins or pollution. The pellets work slow, so the trees grow for 50 years without any problems under the ground. You can buy these at Target. And I can take them around with me and everybody understands, and my task is done, and my grandmother understands.

Let me tell you where that came from. That came from the tank farms here, where the pellets were first planted to prevent intrusion of the tanks by the growth of trees and roots. And there is example after example of those products that are in the market place, that few people recognize come from the work that goes on here.

Well, the point to be made now is the flip. We must be certain that all of the work that goes on in support of clean up also has the opportunity, not just for casual understanding or by stumbling into by a scientist whose research assistant is paging through the research, but for creating a network so people understand the value of the science and technology that occurs here. We owe you that and I intend to deliver that. I also owe that to this state and to this community.

But at the same time there will be a struggle for budget, at a time when the public will be saying, and many of us in this room are saying, "we want the government to do more with less." So our main issues of technology transfer and plans for the future are that we need to help each other. Because it's not going to happen unless people can either see results or we can all turn into scientists and understand the promise and the hope of that we cannot explain. That in my mind is a major challenge.

Now I want to talk a bit about the past and tell you where I think we need to go. First of all, as I focus on the reinvention of government, I tell you that I really had gotten this message long before this week. One of the things we have been focusing on at Hanford I think will make sense to you for the short term, for the near term, and certainly for the future, is freeing up the leadership of the Department of Energy here on-site to actually do its work. Since the day I arrived on the job, I have tried to discharge the responsibility to the person who is right on the ground. That does several things. Number one, it puts the leadership right here in the Tri-Cities in the best position, to move the work that needs to be done today without Washington on its back and without checking and rechecking.

But more importantly, it puts that leadership in position to make decisions and to communicate out of this community exactly what this community wants as we focus on the future. The things that are being focused on today, I think are the correct things.

The first piece of it is public participation, and once again when I hit the door I kind of had a sense there wasn't a whole lot of that going on or there hadn't been a lot going on for the last 12 years, and most likely much longer than that. We did a few simple things in the beginning; moved the doors from the office of the Secretary and tried to make it easier for visitors to get in.

But we finally got right down to the nitty and the gritty of things, which is to say, quite frankly, that you can not be a partner in a community and close the doors to; first of all, information and honest dialogue about the work that occurs today; second, and more importantly close the doors to the plans for the future. Now, some people have gotten there well ahead of others. Those in this community who have been concerned about the quality of life, as neighbors to our facilities, have been in dialogue with us for a little longer than most of you.

I think that has been appropriate and I hope that the lessons learned from early-on involvement from the Keystone-like process will re-enrich what will occur here today. The issues regarding regulation might sound a little scary to some people because it may sound as though the plan is to peel off the regulations that are so important to insure that the health and the safety of the community.

The folks working in our facilities will be at risk because we will want to peel that away. I don't think that is the approach any of us are after. I think we are after the alien regulations that tie us up, that keep us much too long coming to conclusions, and we want to find a new way to reach consensus which doesn't always mean that we must run a process that takes five or six years.

I think that would be very important to all of us as we go forward and make ourselves more entrepreneurial, if you will allow me to use that term. Which means to do it correctly and to do it considering all points of view, but for goodness sakes do it in a hurry, because time marches on and our competitors have found a way of doing it much faster. I often think of the Japanese and MITI, even though the government in the private sector sits in conversation and in assignment and assessment and determines what the future of the nation will be.

And I am not suggesting that we go that far, but I am suggesting that part of the public participation effort as well as examination of the regulations will allow us to work more closely in tandem so we are not losing time on a market place that is moving rapidly or with a group of competitors who have understood that time is of the essence. The other point to be focused on, in my view, is the work that must occur in groups and workshops and focus on the economical development piece.

All of us know that it is very easy to talk about this and its very easy to walk around with the toys that have been produced over the last 10 to 20 years, but the real challenge to every one and every site where there is a DOE complex and where there is a Department of Defense complex, is: "where are the opportunities to replace these high quality jobs; where are the opportunities to challenge great minds and every community?"

I will tell you this, I don't know of a community that has had this many people come to an economic summit, but what I think has got to occur here is we have got to get very quickly focused, not only on that vision but the steps that it will take to make that vision a reality. And you have got to charge me, as the representative of your federal government and you have got to charge the governor as the representative of your state government to get on with taking that vision and assigning to it real goals and putting people on it.

That is the critical work that must come out of today. And I am not suggesting to you that I am naive enough to believe that that work can clearly be accomplished today. I think that those of us that clearly want to participate and those of us that have something to bring to the table had jolly well sign up today. Because in South Carolina and North Carolina, and my old town of Newport News, Virginia, which has been supported by the defense efforts for so long in a community just like yours, who thought we were safe because the business of the national defense would always keep us going; they are meeting and they are thinking and planning too.

So we have got to take the best minds that we have here and get on with it. That is what in my mind is the real challenge of what has to occur here. Everyone in this room must keep us focused on the business of clean up and I think if you kick us to do it better, faster, and safer you are right on, and I am open to that. If you are not doing that, then you haven't done your job well. Now how would I like you to do it? I would like you to do it with a little smile, some collegiality, and I promise I will give it right back to you.

But we must stay on that mission. But finally, while that mission is being accomplished, if we don't see the visions for the future and the opportunity to take this talented community, that has for so long suffered blow after blow; if we don't understand where the government was going and what it meant, and boom and bust; if we don't partner together to change that for the future that I see as clearly as my president does; then we have lost the best opportunity we will ever have.

I committed to this and I am committed to you. I have the luxury of traveling with a very fine team of people that we have assembled in Washington D.C., some of whom you already know. I will tell you that we are yours, I cannot reinvent you, but you can reinvent yourselves and I will be your partner in doing it.

The people who know me well say that I take direction well. Direct me, I am your instrument. I'm pleased to be here.

It was in March I promised to come. I have described the ensuing months as ten years, and I am delighted to be here. But it lets you know in my mind how quickly we have to move, because that is why I am here; in light of the things that have been accomplished in the Tri-Cities area on behalf of the United States government; and in light of the fact that today we celebrate peace; and in light of the fact that I have been afforded the opportunity to be the Secretary of Energy in the history of this nation to stand in favor of a continued moratorium on nuclear testing.

Those are gifts you have given us, in light of the fact that the President of the United States stood this summer, for the first time since John Kennedy, to also continue a moratorium, we owe those things to this state.

So I pledge and I commit for the President and this Department of Energy and for Hazel O'Leary personally, I will work with you in the two days we have to be together. I commit, far more importantly, to stand in support of the staff of people who are partners in this peace. I have every confidence that with the right energy and a clear vision and a set of goals to follow through, that the task while it may be bumpy, can be accomplished and that is what I have come here to do. To get on with it. Thank you very much.

Governor Lowry:

Thank you Booth -- Governor Gardner -- for your continued commitment to our state and our country. And to Governor Dan Evans for your continued commitment to our state and country. This is, of course, a wonderful example of the tremendous bi-partisan approach we have in our state, and I believe in our country, to those issues that are important to us, in that we have these two outstanding public servants, Booth Gardner and Dan Evans as co-chairs. I thank you very much. They are also able to be re-elected easily, there all kinds of things I need to observe them on, you know. And thank you to all the participants, and the observers, and all of you who are here on this very exciting, first ever, conference of this type.

Barry Mitzman and Susan Hutchison, and all the participants and all the observers, thank you for your important participation. And of course, thank you to the outstanding Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, who was every bit as great as I thought she would be. I thought that was a tremendous presentation Secretary O'Leary. Thank you.

Secretary O'Leary and I discussed this Summit last March, when she came to Washington to discuss her commitment to both the clean-up mission and the even broader mission here at Hanford. And when she came she really made, I thought, an excellent presentation which I found very convincing, regarding her commitment and this administration's commitment to federal responsibility of cleaning up Hanford. We face this situation because of the tremendous contribution by the Northwest, especially this part of the Northwest, made to national security initiatives.

It was a tremendous contribution. And now that the mission has changed at Hanford from military national security to the national security of clean-up and the environment, and our economic development and technology transfer, the Secretary's conversation with me made me feel very

good about this Administration's commitment to carry forward with that very important national objective. She said at that meeting that she would be delighted to come as a co-sponsor of this important event. Of course she has carried through with that just as she said she would.

I would like to give credit to where the idea of this important summit first came from. It was from the community here in the Tri-Cities; the business community; and the board community; the community leaders; the environmental community; and importantly from the legislative leadership of this area, Jim Jesernig, and Val Loveland, and Lane Bray, and Curt Ludwig. House Energy Chair, Bill Grant had contacted me and asked me if I would ask the Secretary, I did ask the Secretary and she enthusiastically said "yes that is a great idea."

And so that is where the credit for this outstanding idea comes from. And why did that come from this community and from that legislative leadership in this area? Well there is real reason for pride here in the Tri-Cities. This community has shown courage as it has gone through very difficult economic transitions, very difficult times, but it never gave up. I always said if we work together we can move forward for what is good for the nation, what is good for everyone involved and that means what is also good for the economy.

And so that is really where the idea came from; the Tri-Cities' community is a model to do that which is something important for the entire nation. We have, of course, tremendous pride in our state and in the Northwest, I tend to say our state because it is a great honor to be Governor, but our beautiful states that surround us, Oregon, Idaho, all of those that are participating, our great friend and neighbor Canada, all of those that participate, it is really a Northwest effort.

And there are participants here today from Oregon and many other places. But we have tremendous pride here in our area of this great

country, of the beauty of our environment, the open thinking of our people, and our willingness to commit ourselves to change and to meeting the challenges of the day. I served for ten years in the United States Congress, I was in Washington D.C., Madam Secretary, from 1979 through 1988. Often when they introduce me they say then I went from that to become a college professor: actually, I lost an election, and went from that to become a college professor. But I lost that election in 1988 after being in Congress for ten years. I cleaned out my office in Washington D.C. and all of those mementos and things you get over ten years being in Congress, and cleaned that out and I loaded it into my 1979 Ford Fairmont and drove back home in the same car and with the same spouse I went to Congress with.

I was sort of down in the mouth a little bit, for those of us that are legends in our minds, getting beat, is a character building thing. And so as I loaded up my car I was a little bit down in the mouth and started driving west, at about the time I got to Minneapolis/St. Paul I was not feeling quite so down in the mouth any more. I came across the Dakotas, into Montana, and I was feeling pretty good. I came up the Rockies feeling good, and over the Rockies and down to Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, I was really starting to feel pretty good. I crossed into the state of Washington and I felt great.

And that of course, is because we have such a wonderful, wonderful place to live. A wonderful place to live for the reasons I have already mentioned, because of the willingness of our people to move forward to the challenges of the day and

because of the high importance we put on our natural resources, our environment, and on our quality of life.

It is not, we recognize here in the Northwest, it is not the environment versus jobs, it is the environment and jobs. We know that for real quality of

life we have to have both of those. And we know that nothing is more important to quality of life than a high quality job. A job for the 21st century. A "family-waged" job, that is an important component of quality of life. We know that both of those must go together. But that is of course a challenge and a reason that participants are here within this conference. Because

we know that both of those go together well. So when we look that, we look at the panels in the subject areas.

When we look at the challenges facing our participants and our observers during this conference, when we look at economic development and technology transfer, what a tremendous opportunity we see to advance the quality of life for everyone. The United States is the world leader in environmental clean-up technology. Other nations, our friends in the Asia/Pacific countries, in Japan and others, and our friends in Europe, look to the United States to develop the technology to clean up the hazardous waste all over the world. We are the world leader and they are looking to us for leadership.

What an opportunity and responsibility we have to move forward, when right here in the Northwest we have leading innovative environmental technology firms. We have 500 firms in the state of Washington alone that are developing



environmental technology with \$3 billion in annual sales. That is a doubling of both those numbers in the last five or six years. In Oregon there is another number somewhat similar to that. We have here in Richland a greater percentage of Ph.D.s and advanced degrees per capita than any place in the entire world. We have tremendous abilities by which to move forward for what the world is asking us to do: to lead in the technology transfer and the economic development of environmental clean up.

The discussions within the panels today and tomorrow are very important. I hope within those panels we will discuss the way we give opportunities to that entrepreneurial, pioneer spirit. We have resources developing new ideas and these allocations of resources that are so important to meeting the responsibilities of the federal government here on this national priority. It is very important that some of those resources be set aside for these new technology firms for their great abilities to move ahead and develop those things that are going to make us the clear leader of the world.

So I hope that those two panels really, really discuss those. Of course regulatory reform is politically important, Representative Jay Inslee, had a conference not too long ago. A hearing that went through the procurement practices of the DOE and those problems with it. I mean clearly, as you so well addressed Madam Secretary, we need to make that something much more sensible, both on the federal and the state level.

The work the Vice President is doing on making government work is so important, and is of course, backed up by our great President. We are very committed to that here in the state of Washington. We have a private sector regulatory task force here in the state of Washington to get at exactly those same things. About how to make regulations, that are important for the health and safety and the environment that we all treasure, work right; but how we can make it work also well with the private sector. That panel is very

important. So is the Training and Education panel, which speaks to us here in the Northwest and in the state of Washington and in the entire country. As Secretary Robert Reich just said, "in the nation, the areas that do well are those areas that have the best educated, best trained work force."

That is just a fact that brain power by which to move forward is what is needed today. The communications and the transportation of those technologies and the brain power in the work force are the keys to accomplishing the objective of family waged jobs, and moving forward with the quality of life that we need. And so that is so important. And the most foolish thing a state could ever do would be to cut into the resources that support higher education and K-12 and readiness to learn. Things that support the state General Fund, so that we can have that educated work force, these are key to us and, of course, the public participation panel.

That is, of course, the real key of how we accomplish the objectives. The tremendous resource that we have is all of those things that the public has to bring in and the last thing that anybody, any industry, any government, or any agency should be doing, is viewing the public as the enemy. When the public is the resource by which we move forward, and I really want to compliment the DOE with efforts on the same, let us have public participation at the front end of the process. Bring that along.

And what an exciting and tremendous opportunity we have. In two days, of course, all things are not going to be able to be considered and answered. But I do hope that we will make sure that all points of view are aired or given the opportunity to be heard. And when we complete this conference, we must move forward with from this great start on where we are going to go. That is something, that looking at the quality of people participating in this, we have every opportunity to do.

And what a tremendous thing that will be for our country, and for our area. Tremendous for our economy, tremendous for our environment, tremendous for the future.

And while it is natural that we all think that what we are doing affects us in the near term, that will be surpassed even by the important effect it will have on the long term. And that is going to be a reward for the participants in this conference for many, many, many years. You are going to be able to realize you made a difference.

Aristotle was asked, “What is the difference between a barbaric and a civilized society?” And Aristotle answered, “That a barbaric society thinks only of itself and only of that immediate time they are in. They go out and plunder and consume, and they go out and they plunder and consume, and they go out and plunder more just for the day. But a civilized society makes all of its actions ‘generationally.’ That it makes all of its actions based on how to make things better for its children and its grandchildren and the coming generations.” Well, we will show in the summit conference again, that we are committed to the coming generations, we are committed to the quality of life of all people in this country. This is going to be a very exciting event. Thank you very much for your participation.

Public Involvement Session 1

Public participation, a guiding principle of the theory and practice of democracy, was the first issue discussed at the Hanford Summit. It is almost ironic that public involvement was made an issue in and of itself, considering the Hanford Summit was intended to be an exercise in public involvement.¹ Tom Hunt, the rapporteur for this session, began the Hanford Summit with an overview of what the public involvement panel had discussed. While the panelists disagreed on a number of issues, one belief rose above the rest:

A thoughtfully executed public participation process, involving all stakeholders early on, operating with full information, results in better ideas and better decisions which ultimately have a better chance of sticking once they're made.

This statement was able to cross the boundaries of the representatives from the different interest groups that debated the topic of public involvement. As Hunt said, members of this panel "who generally sharpen their teeth on each other, stacked arms to explore barriers and solutions toward making public participation more meaningful." Yet, no one believed this kind of cooperation could occur overnight between all the stakeholders. The main theme that exited from the panelists' discussion was trust, or lack thereof.

Why the Mistrust?

Why is there mistrust? Most stakeholders believe that the decades of secrecy and classification of materials production has cast a pall over open dealing and fair process at Hanford. Issues arising from that belief are many.

Speaking first on the issue of trust was Darlene Madenwald of the Washington Environmental

Council, who saw the Hanford Summit as an important first step in the process of regaining trust. "Trust," she said, "is the first barrier we have to get over in order for public participation to really have true meaning." This mistrust has been fueled by the continued lack of access to information relating to DOE activities that affect the public.

Reacting to those claims was John Burk of The Westinghouse Hanford Company. Burk acknowledged the instances of secrecy and non-access and pledged that times will change. In clarifying DOE's behavior, he explained that in many cases, national security initiatives prevented full disclosure of information.

Contributing to the lack of access is the fact that most of the issues at defense waste sites are technical in nature. As such, technical experts are brought in to examine the problem and make recommendations for solutions. "This process," Burk admitted, "is the antithesis of public involvement." Gerald Pollett, the regional director for Heart of America agreed. Pollett believes the public has been shut out because DOE believes that public involvement slows down the process.

Mark Drummond, president of Eastern Washington University, sees the vertical management structure of DOE agencies as a contributor to the history of institutionalized secrecy. These agencies have "worked in a zero sum game for years, and many of us in government know, what we lose, another group gets," Drummond said. "Therefore, we guard things and don't share." Regardless of why mistrust exists, it is apparent to all that steps must be taken to redress the antipathy between the government and the public sector.

John Burk is counting on leadership from Secretary O'Leary to help guide the Department from its rather isolationist past towards a future of open involvement with the public. Darlene Madenwald supported this pledge, but remarked that "actions speak louder than words."

¹In the interests of variety, and for the purpose of this report, the phrases "public involvement" and "public participation" will be used interchangeably.

Rebuilding Bridges

Can DOE regain the trust of the public? Can the stakeholders learn to trust each other? There is the perception that the entire culture at Hanford must change; that government officials will not concede that their ideas are not viable; or that they believe they can make better decisions on behalf of the public than the citizens themselves can make. These questions must be addressed and acted on before any meaningful public involvement process can take shape.

This process begins with examining the current provisions for public involvement. John Schlatter of Bechtel, a government contractor, lent his support to the claim that public involvement can actually speed up the clean-up process. Adding to Barry Mitzman's comment that "public involvement is often driven by regulations rather than genuine concern for input," Schlatter suggested re-evaluating the purpose of the current regulations. If we can take an integrated look at the regulations and their intended goals, we might be able to find a better way to achieve those goals "without confusing the public."

Aside from procedural changes, cultural change is necessary as well. Gerald Pollet stated that trust "takes something more than process, it requires substantive change in departmental policy and actions." When DOE starts listening to the public, and acting in its interests, trust will be regained. Greg De Bruler, from Columbia River United, stated that public involvement counteracts the influence usually enjoyed by special interests. For a change, it is the public's values and principles that are leading the charge. This interaction fosters partnerships, thus beginning the path toward trust.

Prescriptions for success

A number of suggestions were offered by panel members on how to change things for the better. Gerald Pollet spoke favorably of the state grants (like Nuclear Waste Advisory Council and Public Participation grants) dispersed by the federal

government. The state of Washington has submitted such a grant request, but it was refused. Mark Drummond pointed to examples of successful public involvement with both the "future site uses group," and the "tank waste task force." More collaboration will only increase everyone's satisfaction with public involvement in the project. Dick Belsey, a member of the Oregon-Hanford Waste Board, thinks DOE should view the public not only as a stakeholder, but also a customer, since the public, in one way or another, is a recipient of Hanford's "products." "Involving customers," said Belsey, "is expeditious and results in an improved product."

Other suggestions included a site-specific advisory board that would serve as an interface between the public, the DOE and contractors. Tim Mealy with The Keystone Center voiced his support of the concept, as well as his hope that one can be created by the end of the year. John Burk indicated his support for public meetings with site managers. Deborah Illman, an associate editor with Chemical Engineering News, believes the press has a role to play. "Building trust and public involvement depends on getting the straight story; nothing undermines trust like putting a PR spin or a rose-colored tinge on information that the public needs access to," said Illman

It is far better, in the long run, to just disclose the straight story. The other side of the coin is that the media must do a better job in reporting about issues that involve science and technology. They must better prepare themselves, acquire the skills and background knowledge needed to analyze technical information that are parts of these issues. Then they will be able to appreciate and understand the technical challenges involved with clean up.

Charting a new course

What steps can DOE take to correct some of the aforementioned problems? For starters, it can listen and look. This report's earlier discussion

of public involvement omitted, albeit purposely, two important “publics” -- Indian nations and employees. It also restricted discussion of the general public in terms of stakeholders. A different identity will be discussed in this section.

DOE must listen to all the voices around them, especially those closest to Hanford. Who is closer to Hanford than the employees? Employees have been kept in the dark, according to Shelly Cimone, a member of the Oregon-Hanford Waste Board. The employee group is as close to the work being done as anyone, and their input should be solicited and acted upon where appropriate. Additionally, said Gil Omenn, dean of the

School of Public Health and Community Medicine at the University of Washington, workers and retired workers know a lot about where things were placed, how procedures were carried out, and can contribute on an ongoing

basis as new technical information is accumulated from site assessments.” They can provide answers to important questions and provide important guidance about how to proceed. DOE must listen to the voices.

Even closer are those who live on the land that Hanford occupies -- Indian nations. Bill Burke, a member of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation spoke of his tribe’s treatment by the U.S. government. The Treaty of 1855 established the Umatilla as a sovereign nation, guaranteeing them involvement with the decision making process regarding the Hanford site. To date, little more than “consultation” has occurred, and the Umatilla had no say in the

development of the U.S. government’s Indian policy. Burke wants to become a “partner” with the state of Washington, and participate in the regulatory process. Burke provided as a method of operation for clean up at Hanford the acronym “H.O.W.”, which stands for “Honesty, Open-mindedness, Willingness.” DOE must listen to the voices.

DOE must listen, but also look. DOE must look beyond the present and the past, and towards the future. Gil Omenn suggests that we look beyond the technical implications of processes and activities, and look at real world realities, such as “what is the land going to be used for?” Omenn

firmly believes that any discussion of future land use must involve people like Bill Burke, who “understands the cultural meaning of certain properties and the way they should be treated.” Donna Powaukee of the Nez Perce



Tribe also believes in long-range planning: “A saying has come from the tribes, I believe in the plains area, that planning should take place so that the needs of the seventh generation from us are taken into consideration.” She added that if that advice had been taken in 1943, we might not be in our current situation. Hanford needs long-range vision, and DOE must keep asking questions as it charts the course.

Conclusions:

The group drew a number of conclusions, some of which should and will turn into recommended courses of action. First, and unsurprisingly: it is important to involve the public in meaningful ways.

Second, trust is the most important vehicle to turning things around. Trust must be regained through consistent openness and communication. Third, Native Americans have been kept outside the decision-making process; this must be changed.

Fourth, it is important for public interest groups to acknowledge the successes, as well as criticize the failures. As part of the trust-building, informal relationships must be cultivated between interest groups. Fifth, perhaps there can be some funding for public interest groups to have their voices heard, outside of the courtroom. And finally, we must try to reach the entire public - all segments of society.

Regulatory Session 2

Maura O' Neill began the second session with an overview of what the Regulatory group discussed the day before. Since her opening remarks provided a summation of the ensuing discussion, they are reprinted here. "We have regulations because we want good decisions made and because we want implementation to proceed swiftly and safely. If I was to leave one message that this group has to tell you all today, it is that the system is broken, the decision process is broken. I hope in the next ninety minutes, that this panel will be able to tell you in what ways [the system is broken] and more particularly to give you some proposed solutions to think about. We've chosen four issues to bring forward as part of this summit.

The first one is the simple belief that DOE should fully comply with all federal and state laws and regulations. But, more importantly, it should be held to the same standards as private industry. Just because the U.S. Department of Justice is not necessarily likely to file a suit against DOE as it is against a Weyerhaeuser or Boeing, doesn't mean that DOE can finesse the regulations. The second issue is that there's a great deal of overlap between the laws and regulations.

The group will talk to you today about taking all of the internal DOE orders and just having a big bonfire. They believe that those DOE orders, with the exception of OSHA-type of workplace safety requirements actually hinder the ability of everyone involved in Hanford to have a speedy clean-up. They will challenge the Department to be the leader in the reinventing government revolution.

The third one is about the management structure, and this isn't just "the top dogs are no good," this is in fact where we talk about the whole system being broken. The management structure is counterproductive in the regulatory arena.

Some participants believe individual initiatives are discouraged, they say it's the "cover your assets" problem among everybody, not just in the government, but with contractors and others as well. The decision process is largely ineffective and actually gets in the way of a lot of good people that are trying to get on with this clean-up. Lastly, which is probably the biggest zinger of all, and that is: Should the Department of Energy actually be the lead agency in running the clean-up?"

No sacred cows

DOE should be held to the same federal, state and regional standards and laws to which other agencies and companies adhere. Mike Grainey, assistant to the director of the Oregon Department of Energy opened the discussion by stating that the "lesson of the past 45 years has been that self-regulation simply doesn't work."

The regulations, such as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA), the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), amongst others, are the best way of assuring the Hanford site is an asset for future economic development.

But how did DOE get the exemption? Grainey explained that it might be a carry-over from the weapons production days; a time when self-regulation was inherently necessary for national security. But times have changed, and Grainey believes that DOE must change with the times. This kind of change will have to begin at the federal level.

And who better to speak to that proposal than Janet Gilpatrick, a staff member of Washington's own Tom Foley, the House Majority Leader? Gilpatrick agreed with the need to help with the transition from defense-based ideology to a clean-up response. There is no doubt that changes are coming, she said, but the swiftness of their arrival is still in question.

For Tom Carpenter, a representative from the Government Accountability Project which represents workers at Hanford and other DOE sites, the changes can't come quick enough. He argued for external control, citing self-regulation



abuses within DOE. He explained that since DOE opted to create its own occupational safety regulations (as part of the original OSHA package) "health and safety were in fact put on the books, but not enforced. As a result, DOE workers have less protection than private sector workers." Carpenter believes closer scrutiny will benefit the workers.

Tom Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Energy and Waste Management spoke on behalf of Secretary O'Leary for this session. Speaking to the history of exemption from external regulation, he stated that "that clearly is an era that we emphatically reject and that Congress has emphatically rejected." He is not opposed to scrutiny and regulation, as long as the regulators truly understand the problems they will be dealing with. As he said, "we're not looking to get out of being overseen."

By the same token, DOE can not allow the overseeing to become site management. DOE and regulators must establish a balance between external regulation and site management.

Grumbly maintained that DOE is looking forward to working with Congress, the states, regulating agencies, and the public to establish this balance.

Lynda Brothers, a partner with Davis, Wright, Tremaine suggested that perhaps DOE is held to even higher standards than private companies. She pointed to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, in which there are requirements for independent reviews that aren't required of private industries. As taxpayers, Brothers wonders if we really want DOE held to higher standards than private industry. "It's an important issue to keep on the table," she said.

Clearing "regulatory gridlock"

No matter whose rules DOE must play by to effect the clean up, there was unanimous agreement that the current "Pandora's box" of regulations has rendered the transition process stagnant. Hank McGuire, vice president of Restoration Remediation for Westinghouse Hanford proclaimed the combination of RCRA, CERCLA, NEPA, state regulations, and a wide variety of DOE orders to be a "witches brew." Overlapping requirements, differing measurement standards and methods, and duplicative regulations all conspire to delay progress.

McGuire thinks the question before the group boils down to "can we streamline or eliminate unnecessary DOE orders to accelerate clean-up and reduce costs, as well as reduce the redundancies between the CERCLA and RCRA on sites where both apply (such as the Hanford site)?"

Or can DOE be guided by one set of rules, specifically OSHA regulation? Tom Grumbly affirmed that indeed, DOE will be governed by OSHA in "three to four years." Right now, OSHA doesn't have the resources to manage the project.

With regard to streamlining DOE orders, Grumbly referred to the recent push for “reinventing government,” and said that DOE will execute its own course of evaluation. During this process, Grumbly intends to involve the people who must eventually implement the DOE orders. One reason the current system is in arrears is because there was no ownership or “buy-in” from these people. Grumbly also encouraged other regulatory colleagues to evaluate their procedures and regulations.

Dag Syrrist, manager of environmental operations at Technology Funding, proposed we re-evaluate how we decide to solve problems. By moving to a performance-based standard, outside technology vendors will know what the needs are and can provide, or develop, solutions that work, without going through a “regulatory maze.”

Grumbly agreed that consistent outcome goals are crucial, but often the right “mark” for a clean-up is unknown; or the solution is “politically troublesome”; or there haven’t been good enough assessments of risk; or because DOE hasn’t spent the resources to do them. These are issues that must be considered if DOE is to break free of the regulatory gridlock in which it is currently mired.

Playing by the rules

The current management structure was almost unilaterally blamed for the DOE’s ills. That is not to say that individuals are at fault, but that the regulatory environment has created a management system that is ineffective. For too long the system has rewarded stagnation while not incentivizing or rewarding attempts at change.

Rewarding stagnation? Chris Renda, owner of Environmental Services Network, believes there is a culture of risk aversion on the part of regulatory agency personnel, DOE personnel, M&O contractors, site managers, and remediation contractors: “People are unwilling to take risks, put themselves on the line because there are severe consequences they feel they may incur,” she said.

This culture of risk aversion is deeply imbedded in DOE dictum. The “cover your assets” mentality has fueled the adherence to regulations, no matter how duplicative or unnecessary. State Senator Jim Jesernig agreed, saying that if someone does try something a little “innovative” which has a bad result, “the public interest groups, the regulators, the press, anybody and their dog comes after them like raw meat.” Thus, people have been trained to follow, not lead. Hanford, and other sites like it, are trapped in this “Catch-22.”

Before condemning the “culture of risk aversion,” Hank McGuire offered a practical look at the situation: “We generate large quantities of mixed waste here. There are laws that say various types of waste must be disposed of in a certain period of time. There are no places in this nation where you can treat and dispose of this waste. So to say that compliance should be automatic, the fact of the matter is, until we go through an orderly transition, compliance cannot be automatic. Now there is something about rewarding action, but when you go and do real action, you have got to remember you make mistakes.”

Westinghouse is in a situation where “zero defect” is the expected result. McGuire continued to say that even if 6,000 barrels of waste are safe, and as few as 30 have “problems,” the whole project is tainted, because of this unrealistically high standard. “As long as we treat people who work on site this way, you will find they are a little concerned about taking chances.”

In much the same way that regulations inhibit risk taking, they also slow the development of new technology. New technology products and procedures must undergo tremendous scrutiny to receive approval. In many cases, this duration renders the technology outdated or useless. This troubles Senator Jesernig. He sees no reason why if a technology is approved in one regulatory district, or region, or even one state, it must undergo more scrutiny at another site.

He argues for “reciprocity in accepting technologies” as an important step in achieving clean-up.

Is there a solution? Chris Renda believes the solution begins with small steps, one of which is restructuring the contracts at DOE facilities. We should “incentivise” our contractors toward action. Regulatory compliance should be a prerequisite, not an end in itself. “What should be rewarded are actual steps to affect clean-up,” she said.

Fran DeLozier, from Martin Marietta -- the contractor at the DOE’s Oak Ridge, Tennessee facility, spoke to this idea. Her facility is already complying with OSHA, and has made some adjustments to the management structure to help affect change. She referred to the culture of regulatory compliance that has paralyzed Hanford, saying that Oak Ridge has experienced similar paralysis. She noted that the employees are good people, and understand their jobs well; the problem is, their job is to assure the programs and projects comply with a particular law. There are very few people whose job it is to “get the remediation done.” DeLozier noted that “something is out of kilter” with this situation; contractors need more “champions” and less regulators to get the job done.

Additionally, if we can establish a common vision and educate the stakeholders, we will see results. Jerry Smedes, an environmental consultant, opined that “we have people talking seven different languages here.” Conflict exists because we have not developed a realistic understanding of technology, a realistic acceptance of its limitations and uncertainties. Understanding will move us a long way toward consensus and common vision. Steve Weil of Bechtel agreed, noting we need to find answers to some basic questions, like “how clean is clean,” and “what is considered final waste form, and where will we put that waste?”

The work at Hanford can help in answering different questions. While the “reinventing

operations” is going on, why not use Hanford as a litmus test for the compatibility of some of these regulations (CERCLA and RCRA, e.g.) that interfere with progress? Mary Riveland of the Washington State Department of Ecology suggested that we “look beyond Hanford as a model for technology transfer, and as a model for how these regulations work, and whether or not they were really intended for sites like this, and what we can learn from them.”

Though the challenge is great, Jim Thomas of the Hanford Environmental Action League, (a “watchdog” group based in Spokane), decried we must “create a system through which there is room for individual initiative to take risks and make an attempt to clean up Hanford and address the unprecedented challenges that represents.”

Who should lead?

With all the discussion, a defining question arose: should DOE be the lead agency heading the clean-up?

Senator Jesernig believes that DOE should not have the lead. He would rather see a regulator, most logically the Environmental Protection Agency, carry the load. First, this would eliminate the “two-masters” dichotomy he mentioned earlier; workers would be responsible to one entity. Gone would be the filter of internal orders and external regulations.

Second, the regulator would have to work within budget constraints and under a deadline; this would force them to look at the time- and cost-effectiveness of certain procedures. This would lead to prioritization and realistic approaches to getting the job done. In short, regulator control would increase efficiency and productivity of clean-up efforts.

Lance Stokes, of Environmental Compliance, Inc., in Michigan, agreed in principle but offered a different solution; create a new regulatory entity.

This new entity, funded but not controlled by DOE, would utilize the expertise of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the EPA, DOE, and the states.

It would combine the regulatory sources to eliminate overlap, protect the workers, and move the project forward. Stokes proposed that perhaps public interest groups could act in an advisory capacity to this “entrepreneurial entity.” A creation of such an entity should be easy, given the specter of reinventing government. “Simply put,” Stokes said, “if you are reinventing government, then do it.”

Joe Franco, with EBASCO Services, a hazardous material and environmental consulting company, wasn’t ready to jump on the third party idea, nor was he sure that a regulatory agency is the solution either. Franco believes that what Hanford needs more than anything is a “promoter,” someone (or thing) to promote the clean-up and the future of the site.

He fears that transferring ownership of the clean-up to another regulator “leads us back to the question of self-regulation that opened the discussion.” Additionally, he wonders what kind of ability to promote action a regulation agency can contribute, when its main focus has traditionally been monitoring and auditing.

As to a third party entity, such as the one Lance Stokes proposed, Franco stated: “I think we would all like to believe that could happen, but I am too much of a pragmatist to believe that in any reasonable time frame that it is going to take shape. Time is the enemy of Hanford right now.”

That leaves DOE as the other option. Franco pointed to the Secretary’s comments that there are many competitors for shrinking federal funds; if people in Virginia or South Carolina can get their act together, they will end up with a larger share of the funding.

We must improve the situation at Hanford, and Franco believes that the DOE is the best bet to provide a little “enlightened ownership, stewardship, and leadership.” All other options will take too much time, and may not actually be the answer.

Tom Grumbly made it clear his intention was to keep DOE in the driver’s seat, saying that “the power to manage this institution must fundamentally lie here [Hanford]. The job of Washington is not to have 55 tiger teams coming out here and climbing all over everybody’s backs all the time.” Grumbly foresees a new era, one in which Westinghouse understands beyond doubt, that it is responsible for the clean-up, and proceeds with its set of contractors clearly aligned.

Westinghouse will be held to strict performance standards. Decisions will not be made alone, however. Grumbly described a “collaborative set of decision making processes in which the state of Washington, the EPA, and frankly whoever else wants to participate with us, gets a chance to understand what were doing, and why we are doing it.”

Grumbly agreed with many of the suggestions made by the panel: getting out to the field quicker; breaking free from old intellectual frameworks; building flexibility into state and regulatory agency agreements; making strides toward quality management, decentralization, and performance standards. “The issue is one of establishing quality organizations and everybody in this room has a responsibility, working collaboratively, to get clean-up done. It’s the only way this country is going to be successful in the long run.” And if it doesn’t succeed? Grumbly pledged we can always return, with much better evidence about what worked, what didn’t, and why. Armed with that information, we can proceed with alternative plans.

Conclusions:

The group made some suggestions and drew some conclusions from their discussions. First, DOE should be required to fully comply with all laws and regulations with which private industry must comply. We must look critically at regulations such as CERCLA/RCRA/NEPA to determine where there is overlap; and also see if these regulations make sense for sites like Hanford. Likewise, we must thoroughly examine DOE orders and remove those that impede cleanup, while at the same time, not compromising safety. This should be done by both the Secretary and an outside agency.

Likewise, the state should have internal regulators review processes. DOE should review their decision-making process and risk aversion tendencies to see if it is possible to reward good decisions and not punish bad ones so severely. It should encourage people to take action and question processes that are ineffective.

If technology is to be used at another site should it still go through regulatory process? According to the panel, no. It is inefficient and time consuming. We must restructure management, perhaps decentralize decision making. Finally, we must restructure our contracts; provide incentives for contractors to finish tasks. We must clearly define where we want to go to, and reward those who contribute to getting there.

Training and Education Session 3

As the session name indicates, training and education are two different entities. Session three focused on training today's workers, educating tomorrow's workers, and integrating technical training with the more traditional curricula. Deborah Illman synopsisized the situation: "I am hearing two kinds of needs here; short-term (or near-term) and long-term needs. In the near term we need to focus on worker's safety training and workforce training. And then, because this conference is focusing on the future and life after clean-up, we have to look at the long-term needs as we anchor new business here, and what the needs will be in terms of educational infrastructure to support that long term economic development."

"Beating swords into plowshares"

Session three demonstrated the far-reaching effects of the transition from the cold war to a "peacetime" economy. With this shift in political ideology comes the necessary re-tooling of many industries; Hanford is a prime example. The most immediate effects fall on the workers; as budgets shrink and priorities change, workers must be trained to support the new direction of the DOE.

Don Carson, of the International Union of Operating Engineers, claims that we're not doing enough worker education. His union is deeply involved with training and apprenticeship programs, some of which take four to five years to complete. Carson feels that the labor movement simply has not done a good enough job of marketing these apprenticeship programs. What makes these programs so vital is they build on what skills workers possess now, and what skills they will need in the future. Carson doesn't want anyone to sell the workers short: "we were good enough to build this place, we are good enough to maintain and operate it, and we will be good enough to clean it up," he said.

Additionally, there must be some kind of consistency in across-the-board training, Carson said. Those workers who are displaced or transferred to another DOE site should not have to undergo a different set of training programs; it is inefficient and inhibitive.

Worker safety was discussed by Mark Brown, director of the state Department of Labor and Industries, who stated that Washington has the highest reportable accident rate in the country. In the zeal to educate and train workers, he voiced his hope that prevention, safety strategy, and risk management loss control initiatives, do not become lost in the parade. We already feel the effects of poor training and lack of workplace safety, according to Ray Robinson, a consultant. Lack of training and education costs dollars in lost productivity, immediate health effects, contamination which leads to shut down, and long-term health effects, some of which we don't even know about. The costs for a well-trained workforce greatly outweigh the costs of one which is poorly trained.

One program that is effective in this regard is the Washington State Fire Service Training Program (WSFTP), according to Les Murphy, of the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF). In order to best protect the site and its surroundings, fire fighters must be adequately prepared with both equipment and training. Murphy pointed to the WSFTP fire training and EMS training programs as models for the nation: "the EMS program has become a national standard. It has never been surpassed," said Murphy. Murphy urged DOE to look closely at the programs offered by the WSFTP and the IAFF.

Mike Fitzgerald, director of the Washington State Department of Trade and Economic Development agreed, stating that ongoing training is the only way to ensure our workers are the best in the world. Realizing that predicting the future is nearly impossible, we should be building skills that will allow us to keep pace with that uncertain future; critical thinking skills that will allow us to

be flexible and adaptable. These skills, supplemented with ongoing technical training is the best preparation for the future.

From a management perspective, a skill that is vitally important especially in the near-term, is understanding risk. Jan Temple was a proponent of this concept. Risk has become an issue, she said, because we have dealt with it improperly so far. Much of the process of educating people on risk management will rely on improved communications, and national collaboration to set standards. "We have issues with regulators who don't understand risk. We don't have baseline thresholds for a lot of issues of risk," Temple said. We need to come to some kind of agreement on what exactly is a risk, a decision that must involve regulators, DOE, the public, and other stakeholders.

When we do, we need increased communication between those who understand the issues, and those who must decide on the course of action. "We have extremely confident scientists, engineers, and managers on our sites," she said, "risk managers need to be able to understand and listen to the talent that is at hand."

The two previous sessions both noted frustrations with regulatory gridlock and the resulting inefficiency. Dag Syrrist proposed that immediate education of the regulators might help reduce some of this gridlock. Specifically, the approval process of new technology can be improved if the regulators have a greater technical knowledge. Currently, Syrrist explained "there doesn't exist a technical capacity within those regulatory committees whose permission we need in order to solve those technologies to meet compliance needs."

He related a "worst case" scenario in Massachusetts, where a five-year project went through 12 site managers before it received regulatory approval to use the "innovative" technology which was by then obsolete.

A related problem is that if a regulatory agency doesn't have the technical capability, they often will farm the technology off to an industry who has the technical know-how to evaluate it.

Syrrist believes this compromises the proprietary nature of innovative technology. He said he is to the point where he is "afraid to deal with the regulatory community for fear of losing what is proprietary technology and intelligence of our capabilities."

Education unification

While near-term training programs are crucial, they are only piecemeal. In order to have any kind of prosperous future, long-term educational efforts are mandatory. To achieve this, partnerships must be formed between K-12 schools and colleges/universities; between colleges/universities and the site; and between the community and the site. Developing these links will not be easy, but the panelists agreed that some solutions exist.

In approaching the education question, we must look at two levels; secondary and post-secondary.

Jim Cochran, of WSU at Tri-Cities, said K-12 schools can begin to generate excitement for the sciences, especially among women and minorities, through programs like MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement). In 1992, this program resulted in 89 percent of its students going on to higher education; of that number, more than 50 percent are now engaged in majors. Programs like these help link the schools with the sites. K-12 schools can also "help set the record straight," and help link the communities and the site.

Russell Jim of the Yakima Indian Nation said: "The education system has failed us in providing enlightenment in this matter; text book after text book deals with manifest destiny, the Oregon Trail, the settling of the West, and the subjugation of the savage natives."

Nowhere does it promote the status of Indian governments as sovereign nations. This has contributed to unfair treatment of the Indians. As DOE begins to involve the Yakima Nation and other Indian nations in clean-up decisions (it is mandated to do so), and moves toward more government to government interaction, knowledge of the status of Indian governments will be mandatory.

Partnering

Colleges and universities can link with DOE sites by involving advanced students, graduate students, master's and Ph.D. students in work where they are part of the investigation; where they are imbedded in the research and development process. Gil Omenn is a strong proponent of this kind of partnership which "captures the strengths of our existing institutions and ties us very well to the economic development of this and other parts of the state."

In fact, a partnership such as this already exists. Trent Montgomery of Southern University in Baton Rouge

Louisiana discussed a project his university is currently working on with the Hanford Environmental Science and Engineering Consortium. The purpose of this project is to channel pre-college students into environmental issues. In

addition, they are bringing students from Heritage College and five other institutions in the southeastern U.S. into the Tri-Cities and to the Hanford site. The majority of these students are from minority communities, but that is because a

number of environmental problems are found very close to minority communities.

This cooperation is helping to "develop and solidify the curriculum as we work together to find solutions to the problems that are currently facing us," according to Montgomery.

While the purpose of this particular program is different from the one discussed by Omenn, the methodology is the same. Montgomery's efforts show that there can be linkage between universities and DOE sites.

In addition to linking the universities with business, Omenn also supports collaboration between "the whole array of institutes of higher education." Community colleges, four-year schools and Washington State University and the University of Washington need to evaluate the special attributes they might bring together.

What's in store

What good is all the collaboration without

knowledge of what the future will hold? But how can we predict the future? We can't, and none of the panelists suggest that we try. They suggest that we educate our young to be able to adapt. Frank Parker of Vanderbilt University



reminded the panel that the clean-up mode won't last forever; just as weapons production did not last forever. Furthermore, "the idea that we can predict what the future is going to be is just crazy," he said.

He supports broadening the education foundation to include training in law, in philosophy, and ethics. “We must learn to deal with uncertainty.” Deborah Illman thinks we can make some kind of prediction of the future. While admitting she was going out on a limb, she sees a number of businesses and industries flourishing at Hanford.

Included in her list are environmental sciences; earth sciences; environmental engineering technologies; chemical engineering and materials science; materials processing; bio-remediation; and bio-applications. If we accept those as possibilities, we can plan for how the state’s educational facilities can meet the needs of these industries.

An important “truth” that emerged from this discussion is the connection between education, the community, and the site. The economic survival of the Hanford community will depend on a solid investment in education, communication between the site and the community, institutional reform, and an ambitious team effort.

Tom Grumbly offered his own “crazy idea” which sparked discussion on this subject. He proposed linking an incentive to “get on with cleaning this place up with an incentive to improve fairly dramatically the state of training and education and maybe the economic development activities.”

How? By setting cost objectives. Estimate how much a certain activity will cost, and carry it out for less. The money saved by working faster and smarter would be split by the contractor and the community. The community’s share of the money could be used for education or training, or even spurring economic growth in the region. Grumbly believes this to be a great way to galvanize public support and give everyone on DOE’s side some real incentive to get the job done. Ray Robinson stated his support for such a program, adding that if there was a tangible financial benefit to it, educators and trainers would have the incentive to produce more qualified workers.

Another option would ask the public to choose a trade-off, for example between a \$100 million clean-up “to the nth degree,” or a \$50 million version of the same clean-up, but with the other \$50 million going back to the community. Grumbly thinks that in a society with limited resources, the public needs to be given incentives to begin making trade-offs.

Conclusions

The group’s recommendations included setting both national and international standards for education in technical issues, as well as encouraging collaboration between K-12 schools and colleges. There needs to be consistency in training standards from site-to-site. They also saw the need for more accredited programs specifically in industries relating to sites like Hanford, such as the Hazardous Material Associate Degree directed by the International Union of Operating Engineers. Training and certification of workers is mandatory, both for their health and safety, as well as preparing them for the evolution of technology.

In training the workers, we must eliminate duplication, so we’re not repeatedly teaching the same things. We must find a way to inculcate technical training amongst the regulating agencies, to speed up the innovative technology approval process. We also must develop health and safety training for uncontrolled areas. Finally, there must be involvement between all interest groups in educating the workers and the young, providing a safe work environment, and developing a real sense of common purpose between the community and the site. For in the end, they are reliant on each other’s success.

Technology Transfer Session 4

A rose by any other name . . .

What is technology transfer? It goes beyond patents, licensing and the mechanics of developing technology. As Don Williams, director of technology transfer at Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories pointed out, technology transfer encompasses all of the communications processes by which technologies and knowledges are disseminated, shared, and applied in practice.

The challenge for technology transfer, restated by the group's rapporteur, Mike DeCesare of The Rockey Company Public Relations is "to move privately funded, publicly funded, or jointly developed intellectual property, technology skills and processes into the marketplace in order to meet profit objectives, economic competitiveness, and timely site remediation and restoration goals." Privately funded interests must be included in this definition because technology transfer is a two-way street. Much of the discussion focused on creating, or stimulating, both "DOE push" and "market pull" for new technologies.

Barriers to dissemination

What currently inhibits the transfer of DOE technology to the private sector? Deborah Illman thinks that the media's track record in promoting new technologies has been a little "hit or miss." Claiming the media to be a catalytic force in technology transfer, she would like to see the media do better at publicizing advances in technology or new products, especially those that emanate from sites like Hanford. In much the same way, Illman suggests that DOE can do a better job of publicizing new technology.

Roger Lewis from the DOE reiterated the same frustrations mentioned in the previous sessions, regarding regulatory framework, and the resulting culture that has inhibited innovation.

Gil Omenn claimed that calling something innovative is "the kiss of death, because the regulators are afraid of anything that hasn't been accepted as proven." Lewis sees a change in that under the new administration. As there becomes more incentive to finish projects, there will be more room for innovation.

Stephen Gomes of American Technology Initiative, Inc., refuted the myth of technology transfer that the technology is ready to come off the shelf from the public sector into the private. What his company has found is that "80 percent of the technology [coming from the public sector] requires substantial additional applied research before it is ready to be introduced into the commercial marketplace." Lee Rivers of the National Technology Transfer Center agreed, saying that there are many technologies currently under production in state sites, that are not quite commercial yet. Rivers holds that investors are not likely to provide funding for technology that requires substantial work to become commercial.

It makes sense, though, that these technologies aren't marketable right away. As Dag Syrrist pointed out, the technology is often developed to solve a particular problem, not to serve as a profit center. For a company to take that technology out and make a product out of it "there are a lot of things missing." Small companies, especially, are shut out of this process, because for them time is money; and bureaucracy does not lend itself to timeliness.

"A bureaucratic gauntlet"

Perhaps the overriding reason there has been little movement from the private sector to the public sector has been the high hurdles impeding access to DOE standards. Cheryl Dobbins, owner of a minority, small business concern spoke to the insanity of this practice. Rather than differentiate between the two, she opted to place minority and small business in the same category with regard to the challenges of breaking into the markets DOE sites have to offer.

These technical companies, she said, “would rather participate in the discovery, refinement, and problem solving process, rather than have administrative and procurement hurdles placed in our way.” Gil Omenn called the maze of permits and approvals needed for new technology implementation a “bureaucratic gauntlet.”

These hurdles often require knowledge, or at least familiarity with a number of disciplines. A small company just can’t afford to hire attorneys, MBA’s, contract offer specialists, and accountants necessary to successfully negotiate this maze. Big companies can, and as a result are more likely to be awarded contracts. While this may appear to be chiefly a small business problem, we may be shutting out ingenuity because of procedure. In either case, whoever considers developing a proposal for a DOE contract must choose between attending to current clients, or devoting tremendous amounts of time and energy to the proposal.

August Kugler with KECI, a small business concern, related that all too often DOE requests for proposals require prior experience on DOE sites. This requirement is quite prohibitive, especially given the fact that most small businesses haven’t held DOE contracts, resulting in a cycle of exclusion for small business. In order to transfer technology into the sites, outside companies must be given access to the site to learn the existing technology and the site’s needs.

Return on investment

Who stands to benefit, or suffer, from the fate of technology transfer? The public. Two-way transfer that can successfully involve local business, or bring business to the community, as well as spur timely and thorough clean-up will produce remarkable results. Why are we falling short now? In addition to the failure to involve both disseminate and inculcate technology, there has been no return on investment. In other words, those companies that have made use of technology transfer have “taken the money and

run.” Arjun Makhijani, from the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, thinks we need to tie the fortunes of DOE contractors more closely to the economic development of the community. We will return to this idea in the next section of this report.

Gil Omenn believes that the educational community must be included more often than it has currently been. In a claim which was later challenged by Don Williams, Omenn stated that “other national laboratories have made a commitment to working with the leading educational institutions in their state and region.” He also voiced concern over university retention of intellectual property rights.

Don Williams agreed with Omenn, but noted Pacific Northwest Laboratories currently has collaborative contracts to support DOE with more than 100 universities, with more being created. In 1992 alone there were more than 800 visiting students, and with the University of Washington PNL had invested more than \$2 million of research. Both would agree, however, that a continued investment with local universities must be made by DOE to help shape a desirable future in communities surrounding the sites.

Opening the floodgates

The panel presented numerous suggestions for improving the two-way transfer of technology. The DOE must make it easier for private companies to compete for and win government contracts. Failing that, they must be given access to DOE current technology to determine if there exists a need for their technology.

Cheryl Dobbins made it very clear that contracting with small business is a great way for DOE to control costs. Small business is reminded every two weeks how important cost-effectiveness is. She wants “the rightful opportunity as tax-paying Americans to participate in the process that ultimately will result in the development and maturation of a new jobs-producing industry.”

As part of this process, why not have real demonstrations in real field needs, where one technology is stacked up against another technology, and have an independent organization evaluate and validate the results? Gil Omenn proposed this as a way to both involve outside business and speed up the clean-up at Hanford. Both



Dag Syrrist and Lee Rivers advocated federal funding of developing technologies, whether they originate from the public or private sector. The cost, in time and material is simply too much for many small companies to manage. Laura Shikashio supported that theme, and proposed that small business could repay that money once the product has been commercialized and is being sold.

Syrrist's bottom line is "we need a better mechanism for people who have a for-profit motive to talk to people who have a public science motive."

Assuming we can provide a mechanism, the gap between DOE and the private sector is a chasm that must be bridged. One way is through increased information dissemination. Deborah Illman suggested a DOE electronic bulletin board, a "clearing house" at the sites, or technology conferences which would showcase new technologies.

Judy Merchant added that state-level energy offices can be an important vehicle to distributing information to regional businesses. Jack Corey from Westinghouse Savannah described a two-day "vendors forum," sponsored by Westinghouse that brought together outside

companies (regardless if they had worked for DOE before) and site personnel.

Day one was dedicated to explanations of the problems and challenges facing the site. Day two offered the opportunity for the vendors to meet with managers, scientists, or engineers. The vendors were

then given one month to submit a proposal for how they might provide services and solutions.² The DOE will evaluate these proposals and award contracts where appropriate.

Beyond communication, what is needed is an organization that understands the needs, requirements, and processes of both sides. Some on the panel likened this hypothetical organization to a broker.

While not exactly a broker, The National Technology Transfer Center (NTTC) links technology providers with technology users, in both the public and the private sectors. Lee Rivers of NTTC, explained that technology access agents at the Center help bring these two sectors together. Through the use of a 1-800 number, clients can tap into the vast databases of active resources in the federal laboratories. They can find out where opportunities exist.

"To serve the needs of industry, and bring together people from the private and the public sector who have mutual interests from a technological or scientific perspective," Rivers said "the access agent will talk to the laboratories and allocate the work out between both large and small business where relevant work is going on."

² Note: At the time of the conference, this program was underway. The editor of this summary does not have the results of this program.

This is a good example of the kind of communication, collaboration, and centralization that the panel felt is needed.

The toll-free number for the National Technology Transfer Center is 1-800-678-NTTC. The Department of Energy also has a toll-free number for DOE technology development, procurement activities and cooperative research: 1-800-845-2096.

Conclusions:

The recommendations from the group were divided into two divisions. First, there was agreement that there must be increased awareness of technology transfer opportunities. This includes alerting more vendors to DOE problems and needs. To help outside vendors, they must have access to technical resources including facilities, equipment and people. Second, there must be faster collaboration. Steps must be taken to take advantage of the strength of the technical businesses, especially small and minority ones. The system must be improved to promote expediency and involvement; RFPs must no longer be driven by prior and recent DOE experience, but by innovation and ability to get the job done. Other suggestions included:

- Use Hanford as technology test bed -- stack up technologies side-by-side to determine solutions
- Tech support not subject to procurement rules - change threshold for discretionary contracting from \$25,000 to \$500,000
- Let government turn intellectual property over to private business
- Examine all contract and grant mechanisms in the system with an eye toward bringing people in
- Create incentives in public sector to encourage technology transfer
- Understand culture gap between the public sector (non-profit) and the private sector (for profit). Perhaps some kind of broker who can help the two interface
- Create a role for a public advocate, much like an ombudsman

Session 5 Economic Development & Partnerships

The rapporteur for this session, Susan Hutchison, provided a thorough introduction to the fifth session. It serves as the introduction for this session's summary report.

“First, we want to inform you of a set of goals for economic development that may involve two constituencies. One local (city-state-regional), and second, national interest, that is the U.S. tax payers who certainly are footing a tremendous bill. These goals are interactive and interdependent. First the goals for local economic growth are these: to sustain and create local jobs, to transition site-dependent communities, to expand regional economic diversity and to encourage private sector investment.

The goals for the national interests are to get value for the tremendous dollars spent here; to foster technological advances that promote clean-up and transfer-out; to enhance national industrial performance and competitiveness; and to provide a free flow of information to the public on clean-up progress insuring continued funding.

Some of the issues our panel grappled with are positive and some are negative. First, environmental clean-up is a relatively new, growing, and potentially gigantic industry with markets throughout the United States and exportable around the world. Second, collaboration, sharing, and commitment between the public and the private sectors are essential to meeting long term economic growth and clean-up. Third, there is a quagmire of federal and state regulations which impede efficient clean-up and discourage economic growth. Fourth, clean-up and economic growth must occur within a political climate.

This panel consists of representatives from local, regional, and state entities, from regulatory agencies both (state and federal), public interest groups, investors, and contractors. Coalitions,

joint ventures and partnerships, are essential to the achievement of economic goals. In fact, the process has already begun in the past three days, in the bringing together of all these interests to talk and hash out the issues. This panel would go so far as to say if all we do over the next twenty to thirty years, with thirty to sixty billion dollars, is clean up Hanford, then the money is wasted. We are presented with a tremendous opportunity to foster the U.S. environmental technology industry.”

A regional center

As discussed in the fourth session, economic development will result from a successful technology transfer mechanism. Much of what was stated and promoted in that session holds true for this one. Bill Snyder from the Oregon Environmental Technologies Association proposed the immediate development of a “regional enterprise center” to expand the network of private sector businesses who recognize the value of the knowledge, expertise, and technology residing at Hanford.

Like Deborah Illman and others in the technology transfer panel, Snyder advocated this method of increasing access to opportunities and information provided by the clean-up. This center would be comprised of all the region's stakeholders, including: Hanford contractors, the Washington State Department of Trade and Economic Development, Tridec, Washington Environmental Industry Association, Oregon Environmental Technology Association, and others.

Tony Armstrong of GTE applauded this concept, adding that a “broad array of firms bringing their ideas to Hanford is critical to the clean-up.” It is this kind of experimentation and testing of innovative technology that will not only serve Hanford, but the nation as well. With the shrinking sums of congressional appropriations, what is learned at Hanford can have great effects on how subsequent clean-ups proceed.

Jim Souby, of the Western Governors' Association agreed, stating that defense waste is not only a Hanford problem; it is a regional and national problem as well.

Potholes and obstacles

There are, however, a number of factors at work as to why a center such as this has not occurred before. First, clean-up has a number of significant health threats associated with it which require strict and comprehensive environmental regulation. These regulations cause great delay, as the regulatory group aptly demonstrated. Second, many of the sites are located on federal lands, but local public interest groups have asserted that states should have a major say in the proceedings. These two factors make it hard for consensus building.

Souby feels that these hurdles can be overcome with some cooperation and common vision among the stakeholders, especially DOE, EPA, and the Department of Ecology. He spoke of test demonstrations, in which the regulatory directors would participate to develop common standards, that would become nationally-accepted. Therefore, if a technology passed muster in Hanford, it would be accepted in Colorado or New Mexico. Souby said solving this regulatory issue "would add tremendous market potential to smaller firms . . . it's one we can move on very quickly." These demonstrations would not only be for the implementation of technology, but for new administrative procedures as well; it would be part of the reinventing government initiative.

Tom Grumbly voiced his support for the plan to remove barriers to clean-up, but questioned the regional aspect of the proposal. Why should the federal government spend its time, money or efforts on Hanford? What if New Mexico or Colorado comes up with a similar "regional" plan? Souby responded by saying that the group certainly does not want to claim more than its "fair share of resources." The fact is, that Hanford has value as a test site, and its benefits

would be spread out eventually to other states. "With respect to the regional center and the allocation of its resources, I know how that works in Congress, and it gets to be a problem. There are probably winners and losers and I think our organization has to try, as we always do, to maintain equity."

Dag Syrrist added that the group took "great pains to describe [the regional center] as *A center*, not *The center*." But there has to be a beginning, a structure that works somewhere. The regional center would provide an outlet for the critical phase on the road to commercialization -- the testing and demonstration process. A developer needs to show performance somewhere. More importantly, the developer needs an unbiased, credible source to review the product. The regional center provides a "place for investor and developer to determine if they want to go further" on a given technology.

Dennis Cossey of Innotek Corporation advised that we look past the U.S. government as a market; that real opportunity lies in the exporting of environmental services. However, these services must be tested and proven before they can be marketed. Hanford represents an opportunity for that testing.

Grumbly again recognized the merits of the regional center, but returned to the premise that any kind of regional attention must be supplanted by or coordinated with attention to national needs or other regional requests. This kind of manifold movement is tough to accomplish, especially where federal funds are concerned. He foresees a future requiring much cooperation in dealing with equity issues among the states.

As important as equity issue are, Grumbly asserts that outcome and results are equally important. "We're not interested in technology for technology's sake, we're interested in its outcome," he said. And as part of that testing, the regulatory agencies must be brought in at the beginning to set the parameters for success.

Otherwise, the developers and the investors run the risk of massive time and capital investment into a product which may never be approved because it misses the mark. "But," Tom Grumbly asked, "what if you just miss the mark?" Then good technology and time and effort may have gone to waste. Why not have outcome "parameters," without strict compliance or unreasonable outcome standards? This would allow technology to move on.

Mary Riveland of the Department of Ecology rebutted that claim with her statement that the bottom line is public health and environmental safety and "economic development or cost effectiveness concerns" should not override this purpose. Grumbly countered by saying we must "get away from the rhetoric of protection of public health and get real about this clean-up."



Solutions

Sharon Bloome, president of Heart of America Northwest, offered a plan that supports the visions that Secretary O'Leary and Governor Lowry stated at the beginning of the Hanford Summit. Following is a transcript of her description of the plan. "We have three challenges that confront us simultaneously. First, how to get innovative clean up technology demonstrated and used for real pressing problems at Hanford like the plumes heading into the Columbia River.

Second, how to tap regional entrepreneurial and intellectual creativity to produce those new promising technologies or allow them to move

from the research and development state into real demonstration. Third, how can our over \$1.5 billion annual investment in the Hanford cleanup spur regional economic diversification and regional environmental industry, while benefiting our primary environmental and safety goals? The following proposal addresses all three challenges, the elements are as follows. First, set aside a minimum of \$20 million, (1.25% to 3% of the annual Hanford cleanup budget for 10 years) to be used for research, development, and technology demonstration grants to small environmental technology firms in the region.

Second, these grants would be used for research,

development and demonstration of technologies deemed promising, by an advisory panel because they offer solutions to Hanford clean-up problems, to which we currently have no answer, or offer a more cost effective

and rapid methodology. The grant recommendations would come from a "blue-ribbon" Hanford cleanup science and technology advisory panel. The panel would review the proposals from our regional small environmental technology firms. The state of Washington or an independent entity would be the administrator, this would offer a way to show real progress deploying innovative technology rapidly, and because of the pressing nature of some of our problems, like the plumes entering the river this plan needs to be in place by the beginning of the year. This proposal is something that the economic development panel has spent a great deal of time discussing and feels very strongly about as a concrete result for this summit."

In addition to Bloome's proposal, a number of other baseline suggestions came from the group. First, John Griffin from Battelle's Columbus Laboratories suggested putting in place some mechanism to encourage the formation of businesses from the current Hanford staff. These people, "would have the benefit of being local residents, would locate their businesses here, and would help ensure the economic development of the region," Griffin said.

Another idea proposed by Griffin was to provide some type of seed fund, perhaps in connection with a state partnership, for employees who wish to become entrepreneurs. Add to this a "science park" which would impart opportunities for testing and research, and you have the potential for new business growth.

But economic development should not be restricted to local development alone. George Bakevich, president of Interstate Nuclear Services, advocated the state and region to offer additional financial and regulatory incentives to attract the broad business base necessary to ensure future jobs.

John Lindsay of Tridac concurred, saying that long-term concerns are paramount. While he was excited about the test-bed idea, he emphasized that we must not create "something where companies come in, do their work, and leave."

Mike Fitzgerald of the state Department of Trade and Economic Development quoted Einstein to summarize his views on the situation: "a perfection of means and confusion of aims seems to be our problem." In other words, we lack a set of clear goals. "We've invested heavily in education, we're working to streamline the regulatory environment to balance the tax system, to invest in transportation, and to create modern infrastructure," Fitzgerald said, "Our state's biggest environmental challenge is also its biggest opportunity, to do what we have concluded to do around this table today."

Conclusions:

A number of suggestions came from this group: establish a coalition based on a regional enterprise center; fix the regulatory process and the quagmire of regulations and; allow the site to be a test bed for streamlining the procurement process.

They also recommended setting aside funding to provide resources (\$20 million) for research and development grants to smaller firms; improve private access to needs; more clearly define outcome parameters and; create new industries, seed funds and incubator space in the form of a science park.

Closing Remarks
Governor Lowry and Secretary O'Leary

Governor Lowry:

Somebody had an idea for the Summit and I'm going to mention that in a moment. It has more than met each and every one of our expectations. I think that this has been an historic summit that signals very excellent things, for the future of our region, our state, our country, and our world. So, I want to say thank you to all of you who have made such a significant contribution in that happening, and while frankly most people have been acknowledged again, Barry Mitzman - great job; Booth Gardner and Dan Evans - the co-chairs, thank you.

I was happy to see that this morning the Tri-City Herald had a small editorial recognizing Ralph DiSibio as the person who actually first said we ought to have a Summit to look at the tremendous history of the contribution

of national security that the Tri-Cities area, that Hanford had made in the military mission and how important that was to our national security; and how this community has transitioned through from that mission to the new national security mission of clean-up and environmental technology for doing that. He suggested we have a summit here to look at that. And the local community took that idea that Ralph had to their legislators who took it to me. I took it to the Secretary, and it's been just tremendous.



While Neil McReynolds, for instance, mentioned when we look at all who is here working together for exactly the same objective for exactly the same goals it's just tremendous in that we would not have seen this a number of years ago. So, what tremendous future prospects and opportunities do we have?

Probably some would not understand this little half way joking comment that I'm going to make. But, you know we can't see our nameplates from the back, so you never quite know what nameplate you're sitting at when you sit here. Yesterday two of my friends were, I believe, unknowingly sitting in each other's place. Brock Evans, a longtime friend of mine at the Audubon Society was sitting in Jim Watts' chair. But people that know the long committed history of both Brock Evans and James Watts know what a tremendous

assembly that was, at how we have all come together for national security.

In addition to all of those things, what is so abundantly clear is that it is a new day at the U.S. Department of Energy. There is openness and com-

mitment to involving the local people who really know the way to move forward with answers on this. What has been brought forward by the tremendous Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary, and so consistently shown by both Secretary O'Leary and Assistant Secretary, Tom Grumbly, is that it is clear that we do have a new day.

Having seen the opportunity in so many of the proposals that have been brought up, I am confident we're going to see progress made, and real answers come out of this conference.

For instance, there is new collaboration between the DOE and the DOE. Now I know a lot of people here at Hanford think, of course, I mean the federal DOE and here in the region; well that's a welcome new collaboration also. But what I was actually referring to was the state Department of *Ecology* and the U.S. Department of Energy collaborating on the Tri-Party Agreement that will bring us much greater progress in the future, and the creation of a site specific advisory committee, that I say we will have operating in 60 days.

Moving ahead we will bring involvement and greater concentration on higher education right here where it is needed, so that we can be using that education to advance this technology. I see us moving on that soon. We can utilize the entrepreneurial spirit and the ability of our local and small businesses. We have the opportunity to really move forward with ideas that have come from this conference, such as the regional enterprise center and the technology test bed, and others which can help shape our future.

Secretary O'Leary, frankly, over this summit we have asked many things of you. We have it all down on tape. We realize that you must prioritize those, that you must go back and take these wonderful recommendations that have been made by these panels and put those together in the way by which we can prioritize those and move forward.

We recognize that and we are your partners in doing that. We are your partners in that prioritizing, we're your partners in continuing in a new era to again see the tremendous contribution to national security, that the Tri-Cities area will be making. This summit is a wonderful way in which we all move forward. So, thank you all very much for your contribution.

Secretary O'Leary:

Thank you very much. First of all I want to join my colleagues in complimenting this entire panel, its leadership, its rapporteurs, and those who spent the days of preparing ahead of time to make this such a rich and valuable experience for all of us. I want to address my comments, however, to the people sitting in the bleachers who really understood when we first started two short days ago. I recognize that it falls in my lot in some way to focus us on the action beyond commitment. I know that that's my job.

I'm a fledgling student of Stephen Covey and what he has so far taught me is that we must always begin with a purpose in mind. So, I commend all of those who have been a part of, first of all, daring to have the vision, working the plan with a purpose, focusing on a set of principles which are so bound to what I am now learning, and more importantly, articulating the vision.

The work that's been done here by the various panels I like to focus in ways that always involve something symbolic, and so I've been sitting here crafting a straight line with arrows to the right and to the left and I've written environment, technology and the economy. If I have the luxury of the talent and now draw a circle, I would place education and public involvement within that circle, and I think there we would have the dynamic to drive what we all intend to do.

I'm well aware of the fact that I made walking-around commitments all day yesterday and today when I wasn't sitting in this room and I have been well advised by my good friend and colleague Tom Grumbly, and all of you who are anxious to buy copies of those tapes, that he too on our behalf has made commitments. I'm clear to say that not only is he expected to make commitments, but that I honor his commitments and I say so too with regard to my other, very excellent, colleagues who are with me.

I'll use this as an opportunity to tell you that I believe soon we'll have another very excellent colleague, to bring to the continuation of the summit. I'm pleased and proud to report to you that Dr. Tara O'Toole had her confirmation hearings this morning. From everyone who has reported to me while I've been scattering about through Hanford, it was an excellent hearing and we expect a vote out of the committee by next week, this time.

I have to make one other comment to put in context so much of what I'm feeling about this very rich experience. Someone talked about humanizing and refusing any longer to demonize. I think there is so much that has occurred here, as we have worked with each other, and more importantly **I would like to commit I will continue to work.**

The other thing that has struck me most profoundly have been the young people who acted as volunteers. Those who know me well know it's always my occasion (which explains why I'm often late, Governor), to stop and chat with people who don't expect to be chatted with. So, I have interviewed some of these young people.

The one that thrilled me the most was after I stepped out of an elevator just a minute ago, said "Oh my God, that's Hazel." Which made me feel very good to have him understand that I am not so much the Secretary, but a live person who sees hope in that young person, and the others who have told me what they have learned here today, moving among us and understanding now what we intend to do. I would say to those of you who have been involved in education that no more better education could we have started than to have these young people here, volunteering in the days that we have been working.

I want next to cover a series of commitments that I have made personally. But before so doing I want to endorse each and every commitment that Tom has made on behalf of our family -- the Department of Energy.

Here are my walking-around commitments. Next month we'll take some major steps to reduce secrecy across the Department of Energy, and in our facilities. We'll declassify large amounts of important information and rethink our approach to classification, and we'll do it within 30 days.

With respect to our colleagues in the Indian nations we'll re-examine the department's Indian policy in consultation with the affected tribes that we have met here today and those with whom we come in contact and those whose governments we deal with, throughout our many complexes. Here specifically in Hanford we'll endeavor to meet again in the next three

months to work on how we carry that message forward not just in the Department of Energy, but how we inculcate that activity throughout the Clinton Administration. I know my president would want me to commit to do that.

I have indicated that I will visit some of the Indian community and reservation areas, and I think that I have promised that I will go to a sweat lodge. We will definitely explore funding for citizen participation and give an answer to you with respect to the \$20 million lost or misused, and I don't mean that in a bad way, but simply not responded to by the state of Washington, within the next two weeks. We will assist in any way you would like us, Governor, with respect to the formation of the site specific advisory committee but we will not, I repeat, will not seek to control it.



We want advice from it, and we will honor that advice. To labor, we have agreed to a new process to address labor concerns about privatization, and I think this one is being mentioned publicly to engage labor and discussions whenever privatization is proposed. When we do privatize we will protect labor's rights to negotiate with a new employer, and if any work force changes result we will follow the 3161 provisions, i.e.; attrition, retention etc.

Another labor commitment: we will include dollars for construction of HAMMER in the 1995 budget request and do it with a great deal of enthusiasm because that's the right road. With respect to the lands on the

Hanford Site, working with John Wagoner and all of you, we will move ahead aggressively to develop plans for Hanford lands that respect their natural cultural and economic potential.

I would go further and point out to you that my colleague Dan Reicher, who put aside the opportunity to serve with distinction as Tom's deputy, has given me the great honor and privilege of serving as my assistant chief of staff and environmental counsel. He has given me a vision of green lands and insists the Department of Energy as it cleans up, will return lands to natural public use.

I look forward to the day when we can begin to do that, and actually hand over lands back to the public from which we took it 50 years ago. This is my personal commitment.

We will work with local government to provide payments in lieu of property taxes, and I met with some of the hard workers who have been following the department for years to get that commitment. I have committed and we will go forward within the next two to three weeks to live up to commitments that should have been lived up to years ago. With respect to whistle-blowers, I do endorse the recent process agreed to at Hanford for addressing whistle-blower complaints.

There's been some feel or rumble that we have not gone far enough. I will look at that. If we have not gone further, I will take the steps necessary to go even further. I have also agreed to make an address at a major conference in Washington on whistle-blowers sponsored by the Government Accountability Project.

Now let's talk about the rest of those next steps. Someone asked me today in an editorial board meeting, what I thought could possibly happen from the summit. I said anything we want to happen if we just plan and then move out to set a strategy to implement those plans. The products that have been reported out of each of these five working groups, in my mind, provide the basis for those strategic plans.

What I've heard from each one of your eloquent spokespersons is that through desire these groups can continue to work to refine those recommendations for solutions that have been so articulated here today, and they're willing to go forward to work with us in a way that is meaningful to see them come to fruition. I recognize that the buck does stop here.

What I would like to propose is that those commitments that I've made here today, I will deliver on and I will deliver on as soon as possible. Where I have indicated timetables I will deliver within that time frame.

Other proposals that have come out of the task groups easily afford themselves to implementation within a very short period of time, and really require very little further in terms of guidance; we will act on those.

Those very rich proposals, especially those which have to do with that I would call an incubator for testing and economic development, do need additional work. I believe that there are others I heard that require additional work. I would commend these groups to continue working to involve others particularly to think about an opportunity to involve those in the audience who I am sure are here because they have something to offer and something to add.

More importantly what I would like to propose, after having talked to some of my colleagues at lunch, is that those of us who will continue working set for ourselves a schedule that commits us to come back to this town within six months for a progress report on those things that the Department or the state can implement within those six months; and begin to receive progress reports on those commitments that are now ripe to move further, with a further goal of setting priorities. I believe that if we can embrace this process people will not ask what we did here because they will see what we have accomplished.

So, I commend you, and more importantly I thank each of you in the room for giving me this opportunity to share what I believe is a very unique day and will form the foundation for progress that cries to be made. I thank you all.

*Report written and produced by
Columbia Resource Group
Seattle, Washington*