

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
**Revised Meeting Summary**  
**June 1-2, 2000**  
**La Grande, Oregon**

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>APPROVE APRIL MEETING SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TANK WASTE TREATMENT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>DRAFT ADVICE - THE PATH FORWARD FOR TANK WASTE TREATMENT.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>DRAFT ADVICE - PUBLIC INFORMATION AND THE NEW TANK WASTE TREATMENT CONTRACT.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>PAST WORKER ISSUES – SETTING THE STAGE FOR INTEGRATED SAFETY MANAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT EXPERT PANEL .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>DRAFT ADVICE - DOE-HQ AUTHORITY OVER SITE RODS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>DOE RESPONSE TO HAB BUDGET ADVICE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>BOARD BUSINESS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Committee Updates.....	15
Environmental Management Advisory Board.....	16
Site-Specific Advisory Boards' Statement of Common Interest.....	16
Selection of a New Board Chair and Annual HAB Self-Evaluation for 2000.....	16
Annual HAB Progress Report.....	17
Distribution of Recently Adopted HAB Advice.....	17
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group.....	17
National Academy of Sciences Peer Review Panel.....	18
September HAB Meeting.....	18
<b>ATTENDEES.....</b>	<b>19</b>

**RECEIVED**  
AUG 25 2000

**EDMC**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Tank Waste Treatment**

Kay Fick, U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), updated the HAB on tank waste treatment activities. There are a number of parallel DOE activities now underway to keep tank waste treatment on track: termination of the BNFL contract, implementation of a bridge contract to continue technical design work, and selection of a new design and construction contractor. The failure of the BNFL contract was a great disappointment to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). A major concern is DOE's ability to maintain the tank waste treatment schedule laid out in the Director's Final Determination.

DOE and Ecology have agreed to amend the existing interim stabilization consent decree to add the following dates related to tank waste treatment: issuance of the Request for Proposals for the new contract in August 2000, award of the new vitrification contract by January 15, 2001, and a 15-month negotiation period for DOE and Ecology to develop a new consent decree to cover the entire tank waste treatment program. Ecology wants to begin a public involvement process this summer focused on the development of the second consent decree. Facility licenses and regulatory approval to start construction are contingent upon facility design.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) members discussed the importance of reviewing lessons learned from the BNFL experience so mistakes are not repeated. They felt that the contracting process must be fair, open, and competitive, which will be a challenge considering the timelines and complex technical issues. Issues that remain to be addressed include retaining technical expertise for the project in light of contractor changes, minimizing project delay, the possible need to build new tanks, negotiating the new consent decree, and public confidence and public involvement.

The HAB adopted advice from the Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee concerning the path forward for tank waste treatment that encouraged the program to move forward with minimal delay. This advice will be shared at the June 7 contractor and public meeting on the upcoming Request for Proposals for the new tank waste treatment contract.

The HAB also adopted advice from the Public Involvement Committee concerning the availability of public information about the procurement process for the new tank waste treatment contract. A major concern was that the "business sensitive" designation has been used repeatedly to withhold information from the HAB and the public. This advice will also be shared at the June 7 Request for Proposals meeting.

### **Past Worker Issues - Setting the State for Integrated Safety Management**

The discussions at this HAB meeting focused on worker protection, one of the three components of an Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS): protection of workers,

the environment, and the public. Tim Takaro reviewed data from his former worker exposure studies to provide a local perspective of past worker health issues. Dr. David Michaels, Assistant Secretary of Energy, joined via telephone to discuss ISMS from a national perspective. The September deadline is approaching for all DOE sites across the country to verify their ISMS implementation. Doug Shoop, DOE-Richland also discussed the Hanford Occupational Health Process and the Employee Job Task Analysis program.

The HAB discussed the importance of implementing work and troubleshooting systems that protect workers and balance the ability to shut down work for safety reasons and the pressure to ensure that meaningful work continues. Strong concerns about integrating safety across the site between DOE-Richland, DOE-Office of River Protection and through all contractors and subcontractors were also discussed.

### **Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Expert Panel**

Ralph Patt, member of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Expert Panel, spoke to the HAB about the Panel's January 2000 meeting report and recommendations to the GW/VZ Integration Project. The four main areas of discussion in January were science and technology programs, systems assessment capability, model transport, and subsurface investigations. The Expert Panel concluded that the GW/VZ Integration Project was moving forward, but progress has been impaired by factors beyond the control of the Project. The Panel noted that permanent and effective leadership, oversight, defined end states, and significant funding are necessary for Project success. The Expert Panel recognized the following areas of success: 200 Area remedial action subsurface investigation, River Protection Project subsurface investigation, and slant bore drilling under the SX tank farm.

### **Draft Advice - DOE-Headquarters Authority over Site Records of Decision**

The HAB adopted advice from the Environmental Restoration Committee directed at DOE-Headquarters expressing opposition to the recent DOE-Headquarters decision to rescind full authority from local DOE field offices and to require concurrence by DOE-HQ on all site cleanup Records of Decision. The HAB concluded that because this decision affects all DOE sites, copies of the advice would be sent to all Site-Specific Advisory Boards.

HAB members noted that if decision authority now lies at DOE-Headquarters, DOE-Headquarters staff should attend HAB meetings and participate in local public involvement efforts prior to making decisions. Concerns were also raised about whether adequate technical expertise exists at DOE-Headquarters to support informed decision-making. Fears were expressed that this decision will result in slow-downs in signing decision documents and in implementing cleanup activities.

## **DOE Response to HAB Budget Advice for Fiscal Year 2002**

Wade Ballard, DOE-Richland, gave an overview of the DOE-Richland's response to HAB budget advice for Fiscal Year (FY) 2002; a summary of comments received at the public meetings held in Portland, Richland and Seattle in March 2000; and the DOE-RL budget transmittal sent to DOE-HQ for FY 2002.

### **Board Business**

Each of the HAB committees gave an update on the issues they are working on. These updates were followed by an update on the activities of the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) by Todd Martin who sits on both the HAB and the EMAB.

Merilyn Reeves and Norma Jean Germond gave an update on the developing Site-Specific Advisory Boards' (SSABs) Statement of Common Interest that is expected to be finalized at the SSAB chairs' meeting in August 2000. The SSABs are also sponsoring a second stewardship workshop at Rocky Flats in the fall.

Other topics of discussion included the upcoming transition of the HAB chair, the annual HAB self-evaluation, the annual HAB Progress Report, distribution of adopted HAB advice, HAB representation on the Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group, the National Academy of Sciences Peer Review Panel, and topics for the September HAB meeting.

## **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

**June 1-2, 2000**

**La Grande, Oregon**

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

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting was called to order by Merilyn Reeves, Chair, Public-at-Large. This meeting was open to the public and offered four public comment periods on Thursday, June 1 at 11:45 am and 4:45 pm and on Friday, June 2 at 11:45 am and 3:45 pm.

Board members in attendance are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public. Board seats not represented were: James Cochran, Washington State University (University); Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen); Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen); Russell Jim, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government); Gary Miller, City of Kennewick (Local Government); Jack Yorgesen, Benton County (Local Government); Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force); and Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force). This was the second consecutive meeting the following seats were not represented: Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper; and Richard Berglund, Central Washington Building Trades.

### **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Merilyn Reeves, Public-at-Large, opened the meeting. Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), welcomed all HAB members and alternates to La Grande, Oregon. New Board alternates were introduced:

- Dr. Larry D. Jecha, alternate, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health)
- John Stanfill, alternate, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government)
- Cindy Myer, alternate, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization).

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Merilyn Reeves announced that the public informational session held Wednesday evening May 31 was successful. She thanked Shelley Cimon for her work to publicize the event. Shelley thanked Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon); Todd Martin, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health); Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon) for their presentations that evening.
- Shelley Cimon announced an evening social at her house at 7:00 pm, Thursday, June 1, 2000. She invited all to attend.

- Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), staffed a Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) booth at the Earth Day celebrations in Richland. She reported turnout was good, and she thanked Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, for assisting her.
- Marilyn Reeves encouraged HAB members to use and distribute the Oregon Office of Energy educational video on Hanford that was shown at the April HAB meeting.
- Gail McClure, U.S. Department of Energy–Richland (DOE-RL), announced a celebration at the Waste Receiving and Processing (WRAP) facility on June 19, 2000 in recognition of the beginning of Hanford shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Any HAB members or alternates interested in attending should contact Gail by June 9.
- Marilyn Reeves announced that Madeleine Brown, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), is stepping down after serving the HAB since its formation. Her contributions will be missed. Marilyn also announced that Ben Floyd, Benton County (Local Government), is stepping down because he has left his position with Benton County. Ben also participated on the HAB since its beginning, and his contributions will be missed.
- Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), announced that her environmental civics students at Open Meadow High School in Portland, Oregon, have produced a 20-minute documentary on air and water quality issues in the Portland area. She invited HAB members to view their documentary at its first showing in Portland later in June.
- Joe Richards, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Tribal Government), introduced Michael Farrow, new Director for Natural Resources for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR).
- Marilyn Reeves announced a June 14, 2000 public meeting in Hood River, Oregon on the 100 Area and 300 Area Records of Decision (ROD).

## **APPROVE APRIL MEETING SUMMARY**

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, announced that Ken Niles submitted editorial changes for the April meeting summary. No other clarifications or corrections were made.

## **TANK WASTE TREATMENT**

Kay Fick, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), gave an overview of DOE-ORP activities related to the April 24, 2000 cost proposal submitted by BNFL. On May 8, 2000 the Energy Secretary Bill Richardson announced that the BNFL contract would be terminated due to high costs and other unresolved issues. The three major problem areas in the BNFL proposal were business management, cost, and schedule. However, DOE had confidence in BNFL's technical approach. DOE sees the dramatic cost escalation as an unacceptable shift of risk from BNFL to the government. BNFL submittals over time had generally been within an acceptable range of anticipated costs until February 2000. In the two instances where costs were somewhat high, BNFL was able to make corrections. The jump in BNFL costs identified in February 2000 was a surprise to DOE-ORP.

DOE-ORP is developing a bridge contract with Bechtel to continue design work until a new contractor is put in place. Secretary Richardson has met with Governor Locke and has reaffirmed DOE's commitment to vitrification at Hanford. DOE is also fully committed to implementing a fair and competitive process for selecting a new contractor. There are a number of parallel DOE activities now underway to keep tank waste treatment on track: termination of the BNFL contract, implementation of a bridge contract to continue technical design work, and selection of a new design and construction contractor. DOE also must decide this summer whether to extend or re-bid the CH2M Hill Hanford Group (CHG) contract. A pre-solicitation meeting for the new design and construction contract has been scheduled for June 7, 2000 in Richland. This meeting will allow an opportunity for DOE to get feedback from contractors and the public on issues and how to make the process competitive and fair. The following week, DOE will hold one-on-one meetings with potential contractors in Washington DC. The new contract will replace the BNFL privatization contract.

The new contractor will have the option to take over the BNFL design. Ken Niles asked about the likelihood that a new contractor would be comfortable taking over the BNFL design. Kay Fick, referencing her past experience with the Air Force, noted that it is possible for a new contractor to take on a previous contractors work. DOE intends for this to be an option in the upcoming Request for Proposal (RFP). Ken also asked if a contractor intending to use the BNFL design would be given preference over a contractor that did not. Kay explained that the criteria that will govern the selection of the new contractor cannot be discussed publicly, but that such a preference would be contrary to procurement federal rules.

Alan Dobson, BNFL, spoke on behalf of BNFL regarding the current path forward for the tank waste treatment program. BNFL is very disappointed with the response to the April 24, 2000 submittal and is cooperating with DOE on the transition. BNFL is committed to the tank waste treatment project and would like to be included in the path forward, if possible. Risk was a key factor in raising costs. BNFL would like to remain involved if a new contractor uses the BNFL design.

Mike Wilson, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology was not vocal in opposing privatization as the contract vehicle because getting the vitrification plant up and running at Hanford was and is Ecology's priority. The failure of the BNFL contract was a great disappointment to Ecology. A major concern is DOE's ability to maintain the tank waste treatment schedule laid out in the Director's Final Determination issued as a result of one and a half years of failed Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) negotiations between DOE and Ecology.

Extensive meetings were held between DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ), local DOE staff, Attorney General Gregoire, and Governor Locke immediately following Secretary Richardson's decision to terminate the BNFL contract. As a result, DOE and Ecology agreed to amend the existing interim stabilization consent decree. DOE has agreed to add the following dates related to tank waste treatment to the current consent decree:

issuance of the RFP for the new contract in August 2000 containing the current 2007 start of operations date; award of the new vitrification contract by January 15, 2001, and a 15-month negotiation period for DOE and Ecology to develop a new consent decree to cover the entire tank waste treatment program. Ecology wants to begin a public involvement process this summer focused on the development of the second consent decree. There have been no direct talks between Ecology and DOE on the new consent decree yet, but these discussions must begin soon.

Al Conklin, Washington State Department of Health (WDOH), noted that facility licenses and approval to start construction are contingent upon facility design. WDOH has worked extensively with BNFL through the design process to ensure that WDOH approval does not hinder getting vitrification started. Design work to meet air emission standards is key to approving start of construction. If DOE chooses a contractor using a new design, all the BNFL design work approved to date will be moot, and the WDOH approval process will face significant delay.

Doug Huston gave an overview of the May 18 Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee meeting discussions on contracting, cost, schedule, and public involvement issues. Committee members concluded that lessons learned from the BNFL experience should be examined to assure that mistakes are not repeated. The role of DOE-HQ in selecting the new contractor was a concern because DOE-ORP will have to live with the decision. The contracting process must be fair, open, and competitive, which will be a challenge considering the timelines and complex technical issues. Identification of reasonable facility costs should be made by comparing the government fair cost estimate and the BNFL cost estimate. Issues that remain to be addressed include the possible need to build new tanks, incentives for processing more than 10% of tank waste by 2018, negotiating the new consent decree, and public confidence and public involvement.

Paige Knight asked why Dick French, DOE-ORP, or Leif Erickson, DOE-ORP, were not in attendance to represent DOE-ORP. Kay Fick explained that Dick French was currently meeting with contractors. Leif Erickson is drafting the RFP to begin the process of selecting a new contractor. Most acquisitions take a full year and this process will be condensed into six months, so senior DOE-ORP staff are very busy. While DOE had expected BNFL to submit a 30% design, BNFL actually submitted a 13% design. However, DOE and the Expert Independent Review team reviewed the BNFL submittal and concluded the design is technically robust. The Review team's report is expected at the end of June.

Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), asked how DOE planned to retain the technical expertise on the project with the termination of the BNFL contract. Kay Fick responded that the purpose of the bridge contract is to retain Bechtel and BNFL design expertise. Ken also asked if the specifics of the RFP would be discussed at the June 7 meeting. Kay clarified that the specifics of the RFP would not be shared at the meeting because the RFP will not have been issued yet. Peter Bengtson, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), further explained that the June 7 meeting is not a true pre-

bid meeting. Kay added that the source selection official, the individual who will ultimately decide to whom to award the contract, will be from DOE-HQ.

Leon Swenson asked about the likelihood that the RFP would be issued later than August 2000. Kay Fick responded that Dick French is well aware of the time constraints faced by contractors in submitting proposals for this work. The RFP may be available before August. Peter Bengtson noted that the process will be open to all bidders, including BNFL.

Ken Bracken inquired why talks between DOE and Ecology on the second consent decree have not yet begun. Mike Wilson explained that since a consent decree is a legal document, the Washington State Attorney General's office has been working with the U.S. Department of Justice on behalf of Ecology and DOE. Roger Stanley, Ecology, added that Ecology hopes to see a draft consent decree in four to six weeks.

Jim Trombold, Physicians For Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), asked if privatization was no longer going to be considered as the future contracting strategy. Kay Fick responded that privatization is still a consideration. Jim also asked if there had been any response from Congress to the termination of BNFL. Kay said that Congress has maintained the set-aside as a placeholder to keep things moving forward. Termination of BNFL will take some of the money out of this fund, but the remainder will go toward the activities of a future contractor.

Bob Larson, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government), asked if there is a conflict of interest in Bechtel holding both the current contract and the bridge contract while possibly competing for the new contract. Kay Fick said the Selection Evaluation Board must address this issue to ensure that the re-bid competition is fair. Dick French has said the bridge contract to be negotiated with Bechtel is for design only, while the new contract will be for design and construction. Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), echoed Bob's concern doubting that a fair competition of the contract could occur given the great advantage Bechtel has over potential competitors. Jerry said the public must be persistent in voicing these concerns to DOE.

Madeleine Brown observed that the hasty schedule for awarding the new contract should take the presidential election into consideration. Marilyn Reeves noted that the TPA was signed into law under similar circumstances (a change in administration). Madeleine also said the tight time frame may lead to a decision that is not based entirely on technical merit. Many BNFL employees are local residents who have worked at Hanford for years, and their employment status is a concern.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), asked for an update from Ecology regarding negotiations on making shipment of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from off-site contingent upon secured funding for the vitrification program. Mike Wilson noted that a discussion had taken place between Secretary Richardson and Governor Locke with the intent of making this concept enforceable under a consent decree. DOE opposed anything that would impose court enforcement on cleanup, so the

concept went by the wayside. However, the Secretary agreed to bring no waste from new sources to Hanford prior to awarding a new tank waste treatment contract in January 2001.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), urged DOE-ORP to recognize the implications for schedule delay if a new contractor pursues a new design, especially in light of WDOH and Ecology permitting requirements. Currently, there is no responsible party to sign these permits, and there is potential for the current design to be thrown out. If Bechtel was awarded the new contract, there would be less delay. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), asked if WDOH and Ecology planned to put permitting processes on hold until DOE has awarded the new contract. Mike Wilson responded that this is an Ecology concern and that Ecology will not make any decisions that preclude design changes. Al Conklin explained that the signature of a responsible manager and approval of sufficient design are requirements for WDOH to authorize the start of construction. Kay Fick reiterated that DOE-ORP is committed to a fair procurement process and will not make any design decisions at this time.

Gerry Pollet shared recent recommendations made by his organization, Heart of America Northwest. The path forward is proceeding without reflecting on lessons to be learned from the events of recent months as well as other mistakes from Hanford's history. Information has not been made public on the BNFL proposal or the government fair cost estimate. Kay Fick explained that DOE-ORP plans to use the government fair cost estimate in the re-bid process, so the estimate will not be shared with the public.

Robin Klein, Hanford Action of Oregon (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), asked if the BNFL design is retained, does that obligate DOE-ORP in any way to BNFL after the contract is terminated. Kay responded that DOE-ORP will address future obligations, such as this, in the legal contract termination process.

#### **DRAFT ADVICE - THE PATH FORWARD FOR TANK WASTE TREATMENT**

Leon Swenson presented the HAB with draft advice from the Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee regarding the DOE-ORP path forward for the tank waste treatment program. The Committee would like to see the program continue to move forward with minimal delay. Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government), observed that it is important for new HAB advice to reference past advice because current DOE staff were not at Hanford site when the prior advice was issued.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, pointed out that Ecology's Directors Determination is the only document that contains an enforceable schedule for tank waste vitrification. TPA milestones have not yet been negotiated, and the consent decree does not include the vitrification program at this time.

Merilyn Reeves suggested that the HAB present this advice at the June 7 meeting. The HAB agreed to send the advice to the TPA agencies and Secretary of Energy Richardson,

in addition to submitting it at the June 7 public meeting. Peter Bengtson assured the HAB that comments submitted by both contractors and the public will be considered as DOE-ORP and the Source Evaluation Board write the RFP for the new contract.

Todd Martin was not optimistic about DOE-ORP keeping the procurement process fair and open given that Bechtel has been working on the project for the last two years, DOE-ORP is currently negotiating a bridge contract with Bechtel, and Bechtel may be competing for the vitrification contract. These reasons could deter potential competitors from bidding. Due to the BNFL contract termination, there will be inevitable delays in meeting the July 2001 start of construction TPA milestone. Any delay to start of construction could impact the hot start of operations TPA milestone in 2007. However, the 15-month consent decree negotiations period could be an opportunity for meaningful public involvement. The HAB should participate in this public involvement process recognizing that there has not been public involvement in tank waste treatment project decisions since 1995.

Gerry Pollet expressed concern about the pressure to meet the July 2001 start of construction date due to the only 13% design that is now completed. He suggested that the 2007 hot start of operations date be the advice focus. Leon Swenson agreed. Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) (Local Business), and Ken Bracken emphasized that the HAB's ultimate goal is to see start of operations in 2007 and the 2001 start of construction date should not be delayed. Roger Stanley said the schedule in the Director's Determination has some flexibility around the 2001 start of construction date. Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Workforce), supported meeting the hot start up date, but was concerned that this proceed without compromising worker safety.

Dave Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organization), expressed concern about how DOE-ORP planned to address current and future leaking tanks, especially when faced with the potential of further delay in tank waste treatment.

The Board reached consensus on Advice #109 on the path forward for tank waste treatment with no objections or abstentions.

### **DRAFT ADVICE - PUBLIC INFORMATION AND THE NEW TANK WASTE TREATMENT CONTRACT**

Ken Niles introduced draft advice from the Public Involvement Committee concerning public involvement and the procurement process for the new tank waste treatment contract. The draft advice stated that the public should have access to information pertaining to the contract decision once the contract has been awarded.

Gerry Pollet said the "business sensitive" designation has been used repeatedly to withhold information from the HAB and the public. He asked if the bid proposal will be incorporated into the awarded contract, and if all information will be made public. Wade

Ballard, DOE-RL, said at most DOE sites, the winning proposal becomes public information once the contract is signed. Harold Heacock and Bob Larson suggested that the advice be sent to the Source Evaluation Board and the Source Selection Official at DOE-HQ who will make the final contract award decision.

The Board reached consensus on Advice #108 regarding public information and the new tank waste treatment contract with no objections or abstentions.

The following HAB members expressed interest in attending the June 7 meeting to represent their respective constituencies and the Hanford Advisory Board, including the two pieces of advice adopted at this meeting.

- Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy,
- Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council,
- Susan Leckband, Hanford Work Force,
- Ken Bracken, Benton County, and
- Harold Heacock, TRIDEC.

#### **PAST WORKER ISSUES – SETTING THE STAGE FOR INTEGRATED SAFETY MANAGEMENT**

Ruth Siguenza explained that the Health, Safety, and Waste Management (HSWM) Committee has done extensive work on Environment, Health and Safety issues and the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS). The discussions outlined for this HAB meeting were focused on worker protection, one of the three components of ISMS: protection of workers, the environment, and the public. In November, the HSWM Committee will bring the full range of ISMS issues to the HAB illustrate how each of the three aspects are intertwined and work as an integrated system.

Tim Takaro reviewed data from his former worker exposure studies to provide a local perspective of past worker health issues. Former worker exposure is relevant to the bigger ISMS picture because cleanup work exposes workers to contaminated legacy waste. Hazards will exist on site until all decontamination and decommissioning work is completed. DOE is now taking responsibility for exposures to current and past workers.

There are two separate worker-monitoring programs at Hanford put in place as a result of the 1993 Defense Authorization Act. The first program monitors building and construction workers and is administered by the Center to Protect Worker's Rights. About 30,000 workers could be at risk, and about 18,000 of these are currently participating. The second program is administered by through the University of Washington and monitors production and non-construction workers. There are an estimated 35,000 workers who could be at risk, and about 13,000 workers participating in the program.

Tim Takaro summarized the results from the University of Washington program. Hazards identified include noise, gamma radiation, solvents, asbestos, uranium, plutonium, gases, and beryllium. Of the workers participating, 85% suffer from hearing

loss, and over a third of the workers have been affected by beryllium exposure. There are 50 known buildings that have significant beryllium contamination. Information from former workers will assist in the building assessment process that will benefit current workers. The results show a pronounced increase in cancer rates from cumulative exposures after the age of 45.

Dr. David Michaels, Assistant Secretary of Energy, joined via telephone to discuss ISMS from a national perspective. DOE-HQ has made a significant commitment to protect workers now and in the future through ISMS implementation. Dr. Neal Goldenberg, DOE-HQ, and Dr. David Statler, DOE-HQ, joined Dr. Michaels in discussing ISMS with the HAB.

Dr. Goldenberg said the commitment to implement ISMS is to ensure that past worker exposures are not repeated. The central question ISMS asks is "Are we protecting workers, the public, and the environment?" An example of how ISMS addresses worker exposure is through examining how the management structure controls hazards in the workplace. Recently at Hanford, ISMS verification activities examined "near misses" at Hanford and their root causes, which were found to be management issues. Near misses have increased in recent years. DOE-HQ is also working closely with professionals in the occupational health and epidemiology fields. For example, past standards for beryllium exposure were thought to be protective of workers, but turned out to be inadequate. DOE-HQ recognizes that chemical safety as an issue that needs to be addressed. The cause of a tank explosion at Hanford a couple years ago was due to lack of knowledge about what chemicals were present in the tank. This emphasized the need for completing a chemical inventory. The September deadline is approaching for all DOE sites across the country to verify their ISMS implementation. A major concern is that implementation is not consistent in the field.

On April 12, 2000, Secretary Richardson announced that workers exposed to beryllium and radiation will be compensated. Currently, Congress is considering different bills to develop these worker compensation programs.

As a former worker, Leon Swenson asked how the complicated network of work systems can be simplified to protect workers. The ability to shut down work for safety reasons must be addressed in light of the pressure to ensure that meaningful work can continue. Dr. Michaels noted that troubleshooting often involves bypassing existing safety controls in order to meet schedules, which causes accidents.

Jim Trombold acknowledged Dr. Michaels participation in the worker compensation public meeting held in Richland. Jim asked if medical input is used to calculate the funds requested from Congress to compensate workers and if compensation for exposed workers will affect Congressional decisions to fund cleanup work. Dr. Michaels said appropriated funds are based on estimated radiation and beryllium exposures among former workers. Exposures beyond those have not yet been addressed, and Dr. Michaels said this will be a complicated process.

Keith Smith asked why it has taken so long for DOE to assess the effects of beryllium because the adverse effects have been known for a long time. Dr. Michaels explained that the toxicity standard for beryllium was set in the 1940s, based on the observation that workers did not immediately get sick from beryllium exposure. Therefore, it was assumed that adverse effects would not appear in the future. Keith also asked about the discrepancy between senior management buy-in to ISMS and actual implementation at the worker level. Keith indicated that workers are sent the message that safety is costly and if workers insist on too much safety, DOE will contract work out to a cheaper contractor (with less concern about safety). Dr. Michaels said that he believes increased safety leads actually leads to increased efficiency.

Pam Brown said HSWM has been concerned about the transparency of ISMS across the Hanford site, including reporting systems between DOE, contractors, and sub-contractors. Currently there are no requirements and no budget for monitoring ISMS down to the sub-contractor level. Dr. Goldenberg noted that some contractors are doing a better job than others

Doug Shoop, DOE-RL, outlined the Hanford Occupational Health Process (HOHP) that is a part of ISMS. Past processes intended to detect hazards were not effective because the focus was on getting the job done. Today, safety is integral to getting the job done. In the past, long-term health effects were not understood and hazards were underestimated. In 1996, 142-worker compensation claims were made at Hanford at a cost of over \$3 million. Currently, there are a number of site initiatives to address worker safety down to the sub-contractor level, including HOHP, Enhanced Work Planning, the Environmental Management System, and the Voluntary Protection Plan. HOHP was developed cooperatively by DOE-RL, Hanford contractors, stakeholders and members of academia to focus on risk, hazards, and work activities in completing medical evaluations of workers.

The Employee Job Task Analysis (EJTA) has been completed as part of the HOHP for the majority of employees on site and has been evaluated by the University of Washington. To ensure that all hazards are identified and controlled, workers are brought in to the process, although each contractor has its own system. All contractors on site are required to complete the EJTA for each employee. However, transient workers do not always get monitored in this system and should be included. This is a management responsibility. Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) clauses in contracts indicate that fee is conditional upon compliance with all contract requirements, including ISMS.

Doug Shoop clarified that the system he described was for DOE-RL, not DOE-ORP. No one from DOE-ORP was present to speak on how ISMS is implemented at DOE-ORP.

Keith Smith asked about the cost efficiency of EJTA. Doug Shoop explained that the focus is to ensure that EJTA is monitoring its target population, so money is not wasted.

Pam Brown asked about eliminating the counting of lost workdays incentive so there is less pressure to compromise worker safety. Doug Shoop responded that the contractors are setting these goals themselves. Pam indicated that HSWM will be discussing ISMS metrics and invited other HAB committees to provide their input on how ISMS effectiveness can be measured.

Joe Richards reported that an ISMS verification assessment of CH2M Hill was just completed, and the company has implemented measures that go beyond worker protection. He stressed that ISMS includes environmental protection, public protection, emergency preparedness, and emergency response.

Merilyn Reeves asked if there have been any problems with ISMS being implemented separately by DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. Joe Richards observed that there is no centralized, site-wide organization to oversee ISMS and one problem is that ISMS is implemented individually by contractors and sub-contractors. Doug Shoop responded that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP work as a team, holding regular meetings, to implement site-wide. Keith Smith said that one goal of the Hanford Atomic Metals Trades Council (HAMTC) is to have one organization to address ISMS across the site. Wade Ballard said the reality is that each contract is different and covers different work, which explains the variations in implementing ISMS.

## **GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT EXPERT PANEL**

Shelley Cimon introduced Ralph Patt, member of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Expert Panel, who spoke to the HAB about the Panels January 2000 meeting report and recommendations to the GW/VZ Integration Project. The Panel met for the sixth time last January. The four main areas of discussion in January were science and technology programs, systems assessment capability, model transport, and subsurface investigations. Fifteen recommendations were made in the January report of the Expert Panel.

The Expert Panel concluded that the GW/VZ Integration Project was moving forward, but progress has been impaired by factors beyond the control of the Project. The Panel noted that permanent and effective leadership, oversight, defined end states, and significant funding are necessary for Project success. There is not confidence that these barriers can be overcome. The GW/VZ Integration Project faces a number of problems, including slow progress toward developing the systems assessment capability model, lack of rigor in project planning, lack of existing peer review systems, and funding reductions for source-term characterization. The Groundwater Modeling Expert Panel and reported the following concerns to the GW/VZ Expert Panel: lack of attention to chemical requirements for the groundwater model, lack of monitoring in the vadose zone, and the need for further model testing.

The Expert Panel did recognize the following areas of success: 200 Area remedial action subsurface investigation, River Protection Project subsurface investigation, and slant bore

drilling under the SX tank farm. The machine used for the slant bore drilling is an example of innovative technologies developed at Hanford.

Merilyn Reeves asked about the value of the Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement (Comprehensive Land Use Plan) and the value of HAB in supporting work in the 200 and 300 Areas. Wade Ballard said the systems assessment capability aims to understand the kinds of decisions required to reach an end state. Ralph Patt noted that the Expert Panel is concerned that an end point cannot be determined without knowledge of how long it will take for the carbon tetra-chloride plume to reach the Columbia River.

Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, indicated that the Expert Panel will be submitting products to address end states. Wade Ballard noted that in response to the recent HAB budget advice identifying the need for characterization funding, DOE is working to balance modeling and characterization activities with limited funds. Characterization is very expensive. Mike Graham, Bechtel, said characterization was discussed at the May Expert Panel meeting in an attempt to find a balance between interpreting new data and mining old information. Old data can be use to develop hypotheses, but it cannot provide an accurate picture of what is in the ground today. DOE has worked to coordinate work across projects and contractors to avoid overlap and reduce costs.

Norma Jean Germond asked if funding were not an issue, how many slant drills would be needed to get a good understanding of what is under the SX tank farm. Ralph Patt noted that there are about twelve "big leakers" that could provide the basis for a good picture of what exists. The contaminants that threaten the river are plutonium, and technetium-99. Once the contaminants are clearly identified, end states can be established.

Dib Goswami, Ecology, explained that stakeholders, tribes, and regulators have questioned the effectiveness of the systems assessment capability as a model that could be used to make decisions. The systems assessment capability model must address uncertainty. Characterization is needed to add new information for the model to be effective. Ecology has recommended to DOE that focus be placed on characterization and monitoring activities, that DOE fund monitoring wells, and that DOE show effective integration across vadose zone programs and contractors. Ecology expected the Expert Panel to communicate with the regulators and to continue detailed assessments. Ecology has been please to see that, since January, the GW/VZ Integration Project has addressed characterization, uncertainties, and compilation of known and unknown sources. Currently, DOE has no plans to elaborate on the systems assessment capability until 2004. Two million dollars has been moved to environmental restoration work in fiscal year 2001.

Doug Sherwood noted that in January, EPA and DOE were at odds about the remove, treat, and dispose cleanup alternative for the 100 and 300 Areas. The RODs will issued with remove, treat, and dispose as the preferred alternative. EPA would like to see the issue of determining end states for the 200 Area addressed. Doug invited the HAB to provide policy advice to TPA agencies on this issue. Establishing the point of

compliance for the carbon tetra-chloride plume is another outstanding issue that cannot be answered until adequate characterization is done. The National Academy of Sciences has also convened a panel that is examining technology development for science and technology cleanup programs at the Hanford site. The next meeting of the this panel will be at the end of June.

Tim Takaro asked about technologies the Expert Panel is examining for remote sensing. Ralph Patt said there is not much information available about remote sensing technologies, but that the Expert Panel will be discussing this at its next meeting. Mike Thompson explained that DOE-Science and Technology is not funding remote sensing work, but that the Subsurface Contaminants Focus Area is addressing these technologies.

### **DRAFT ADVICE - DOE-HQ AUTHORITY OVER SITE RODS**

Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, reported that the proposed plan for the 100 Area burial grounds was out for public comment. Remove, treat, and dispose is the preferred alternative. He noted that the Environmental Restoration Committee supports the proposed plan, and suggested that individuals submit their comments by June 22.

The draft advice from the Environmental Restoration Committee is directed toward Carolyn Huntoon, DOE-HQ. It addresses a recent DOE-HQ decision to rescind full authority from local DOE field offices and to require concurrence by DOE-HQ on all site RODs. The Environmental Restoration Committee and the regulators are strongly opposed to this decision. The HAB concluded that because this decision affects all DOE sites, copies of the HAB advice would be sent to all Site-Specific Advisory Boards.

Ken Niles noted that if decision authority now lies at DOE-HQ, staff from DOE-HQ should attend HAB meetings and participate in local public involvement efforts prior to making decisions. Ken Bracken observed that this recent DOE-HQ decision may relate to Hanford planning for the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds and pre-1970 transuranic waste. There are concerns that technical expertise is lacking at the DOE-HQ level. This expertise is necessary for informed decision making. Ken cited a 1994 letter from then Secretary of Energy Thomas Grumbly stating the importance of making decisions locally based on complete information from the site. Wade Ballard said the DOE-RL's perception is that DOE-HQ wants to ensure consistent decision making across the DOE complex.

Doug Sherwood noted that in EPA's experience, rescinding ROD authority from local offices to DOE-HQ results in significant slow-downs in signing RODs. He expressed appreciation for the HAB's attention to this issue. Mike Wilson said Ecology plans to draft a letter to DOE-HQ to address its concerns regarding this issue.

Pam Brown remembered that at one time, DOE-HQ had an official liaison with the HAB. However, when that person left DOE-HQ, a replacement liaison was never named. Wade Ballard agreed to look in to this. Gerry Pollet said the HAB charter requires senior decision makers to work with the HAB. This is an issue for the regulators to take to

Carolyn Huntoon to ensure that this will continue if decision authority remains at DOE-HQ. However, the TPA is based on local signature authority.

The HAB reached consensus on Advice #110 regarding DOE-HQ authority over site RODS with no objections or abstentions. It also agreed on the content of the accompanying cover letter.

## **DOE RESPONSE TO HAB BUDGET ADVICE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002**

Wade Ballard gave an overview of the DOE-RL responses to HAB budget advice for Fiscal Year (FY) 2002; a summary of comments received at the public meetings held in Portland, Richland and Seattle in March 2000; and the DOE-RL budget transmittal sent to DOE-HQ for FY 2002. Wade noted that the comments received concerning accelerated cleanup along the Columbia River were consistent with DOE-RL's 2002 budget goals. Cost estimates for this work were initially high, and DOE-RL made some changes to reflect this. DOE-RL did not address the compliance gap issue because giving priority to cleanup along the river over the Central Plateau affected the compliance gap. He acknowledged criticism on specific non-cleanup activities funded under the Environmental Management budget, such as downwinder litigation, but indicated that DOE-RL does not have the ability to affect these decisions. Wade Ballard also noted that funding for safeguards and securities is an issue that is decided at DOE-HQ.

Gerry Pollet expressed a number of concerns regarding the budget transmittal letter sent by DOE-RL to DOE-HQ. First, DOE-RL indicated that the compliance gap could be addressed by changing the TPA. Second, downwinder litigation is directed toward past contractors working on site, not the site itself. Third, Gerry said the summary of public comments from the public meetings does not include his presentation on alternative reviews.

Dennis Faulk noted that this year's budget process was the first that EPA saw DOE-RL address regulator comments. He suggested the budget submittal include an outline of issues that DOE-RL addressed in response to concerns raised by regulators and the public.

Max Power, Ecology, echoed the concern that the TPA could be changed to address the compliance gap. He encouraged the HAB to continue to raise this concern. Ecology also recognizes the significant changes that have resulted from the separation of budgets for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP.

Ken Niles asked about the costs associated with disposal of off-site waste. Wade Ballard explained that waste shipped to Hanford from off-site should arrive with adequate funds to deal with it through all its life. Ken requested that the Dollars and Sense Committee follow this issue closely.

Keith Smith said from a worker perspective, the reason cleanup costs are so high compared with seemingly little work getting done is due to paper shuffling requirements.

He suggested that money be spent to tear down unused building so that hazards in operating buildings can be addressed to protect workers.

## **BOARD BUSINESS**

### **Committee Updates**

#### Health, Safety, and Waste Management Committee

Pam Brown said topics for the June meeting will include an update on the chemical management system and ISMS, discussion of how ISMS addresses environmental protection, an update on uranium disposition, planning for addressing transuranic waste, discussion of the 200 Area Initiative (including coordination with the Environmental Restoration Committee), tank farm issues relating to the consent decree, and Paths to Closure. Wade Ballard noted that HAB recognition of the significance of this document would be valuable.

Ken Bracken and Merilyn Reeves expressed the belief that the HAB should pay increased attention to Paths to Closure and how closure of other DOE sites could affect Hanford cleanup. DOE-HQ is paying close attention to this document, which is related to the movement of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste in the DOE complex.

#### Environmental Restoration Committee

The committee has discussed the 100 and 300 Areas, both of which will have proposed plans and focused feasibility studies issued for public comment in the month ahead. In the 300 Area, the biggest unknown is removal of extremely hazardous materials from the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds. At its June meeting, the Environmental Restoration Committee will begin to define terms relating to the 200 Area. EPA has asked the committee to begin discussing the 200 Area for the last year, including discussing boundaries for the Central Plateau and where to set points of compliance.

#### Public Involvement Committee

Ken Niles announced that the committee adopted a new work plan at its May 31 meeting. It specifically wants to work on public involvement issues relating to the upcoming negotiations for development of the second consent decree for the tank waste treatment program. The committee is planning to hold a joint meeting with Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee to address this issue. The September committee meeting will last a full day.

#### Tank Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee

Todd Martin said the focus of the committee is on influencing tank waste treatment program decisions. DOE has not listened to the HAB on tank waste treatment issues dating back to HAB advice in 1995. He suggested that the HAB may need to re-evaluate

the need for the ad hoc committee and the time spent on this issue because DOE is still not listening to HAB advice.

### Dollars and Sense Committee

Gerry Pollet said the committee will meet with Bob Rosselli, DOE-RL, to discuss contracting decisions in June, including issues of contract renewal and contract structures.

### **Environmental Management Advisory Board**

Todd Martin reported that the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) had a Paths to Closure Committee. DOE-HQ did not want EMAB to look into Paths to Closure and directed the Committee to change its focus to transportation issues. Todd informed the HAB that EMAB convenes sub-committees that welcome anyone interested party to participate.

### **Site-Specific Advisory Boards' Statement of Common Interest**

Merilyn Reeves explained that a draft of the developing Site-Specific Advisory Boards' (SSABs') Statement of Common Interest was included in the HAB meeting packet for HAB members to review. Secretary Richardson requested that the SSABs develop this statement. Norma Jean Germond said the SSAB chairs are developing this statement to ensure the survival of SSABs through the upcoming change in administration. This statement will be finalized at the next SSAB chairs' meeting in August. Any comments from HAB members should be sent to Merilyn before then. Merilyn reported that the SSAB charter has been renewed for the next two years.

The SSABs are sponsoring a second workshop on stewardship at Rocky Flats in the fall. Up to 10 HAB members can attend, budget withstanding. Interested HAB members or alternates should contact Gail McClure. Those that expressed an immediate interest at the meeting were Norma Jean Germond, Susan Leckband, Pam Brown, and someone to represent CTUIR. Susan Leckband volunteered to become the stewardship issue manger for the HAB.

### **Selection of a New Board Chair and Annual HAB Self-Evaluation for 2000**

Max Power explained that according to the HAB Charter, the TPA agencies have the responsibility to appoint a new HAB Chair. Merilyn Reeves has announced that she will step down by February 2001 having served the maximum six years allowed under the HAB charter. Merilyn said when she steps down as chair, she will also discontinue her participation on the HAB. The TPA agencies are interested in how the HAB will participate in the selection of someone to become the new chair.

Merilyn Reeves also noted that the HAB is required to do an annual self-evaluation. EnviroIssues is responsible for overseeing this under its current facilitation contract.

Merilyn asked for volunteers to work with the facilitation team on this year's evaluation. Ruth Siguenza suggested that the HAB consider asking for ideas about the characteristics and skills desirable for the next HAB chair as part of its self-evaluation process. Todd Martin said this year's self-evaluation must recognize two significant transitions that may coincide: the change in the HAB chair, and the re-bid of the HAB facilitation contract. Norma Jean Germond, Leon Swenson, Dennis Faulk, and Max Power volunteered to review the last annual self-evaluation and provide feedback to Ruth for this year's evaluation.

Merilyn Reeves also announced that she will not attend the November HAB meeting. This could be an opportunity for the HAB to discuss expectations, scope of work, and the selection process for a new chair.

Paige Knight said the HAB must recognize that Merilyn Reeves volunteered her time for free for the last six years. Realistically, the new chair will have to be paid. Paige also emphasized that an important characteristic for the chair, as exemplified by Merilyn, is the ability to remain neutral. Norm Dyer suggested that the HAB consider one of the two vice chairs to fill the chair's position.

### **Annual HAB Progress Report**

Merilyn Reeves explained that the annual HAB Progress Report is also put together by EnviroIssues under the facilitation contract. She asked for volunteers to work with EnviroIssues on this year's report.

### **Distribution of Recently Adopted HAB Advice**

Ken Niles asked if HAB advice could be distributed to HAB members prior to the next meeting packet, which will not be mailed until August. Advice adopted at this meeting was made available to all members at the conclusion of the meeting. Furthermore, EnviroIssues agreed to fax copies of the signed advice to the full HAB fax list the week following this HAB meeting.

### **Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group**

Paul Kruger, DOE-RL, joined the HAB meeting via telephone to discuss recent changes to the Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG). DOE-RL recognizes the value of HAB involvement in the STCG because of the different viewpoints offered by HAB members. Recently, Harry Boston, STCG chair, sent a letter to the HAB requesting the names of HAB members who will be participating on the STCG. Pam Brown and Gordon Rogers have filled two of the three HAB seats on the STCG, but one seat is vacant. The five STCG sub-groups are subsurface contaminants, decontamination and decommissioning, nuclear materials, tanks, and mixed waste. The nuclear materials subgroup is new. Currently, the HAB is represented in STCG sub-groups by Dave Watrous, TRIDEC (Local Business) (mixed waste), Gordon Rogers (subsurface

contaminants), and Pam Brown (decontamination and decommissioning). There are no HAB representatives for the tanks and nuclear materials subgroups at this time.

Recent changes in the STCG have shifted management council decision-making to the sub-groups. The management council now meets quarterly, rather than monthly. Pam Brown noted that the STCG provides a mechanism to communicate across site cleanup programs with strong regulator and tribal participation. She was critical of the schedule change in management council meetings because information exchange between sub-groups is less frequent.

Gordon Rogers encouraged interested HAB members and alternates to attend STCG meetings. Travel funds are not provided to HAB members by the STCG, an issue that should be taken up with Harry Boston. Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health), and Tony Brooks, Washington State University (University), expressed interest in attending an STCG meeting. Tim Takaro said his alternates, Joel Massman and Dave Stensel, University of Washington (University), might be able to provide expertise to the STCG, but he could not commit them to regularly participate. Ken Niles indicated that the State of Oregon participates in the STCG separate from the HAB. He echoed concerns about the lack of available travel funds.

Merilyn Reeves asked the STCG to provide brief descriptions of its activities to the HAB. Paul Kruger agreed that this was an excellent idea and agreed to work with Gail McClure to develop material that would be valuable to the HAB.

Pam Brown and Gordon Rogers agreed to draft letter in response to Harry Boston's letter indicating the HAB's desire to continue participation on the STCG through Pam, Gordon, and Tony Brooks.

### **National Academy of Sciences Peer Review Panel**

Mike Thompson explained that DOE-HQ asked the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a peer review of three areas of science and technology work at Hanford: groundwater/vadose zone, decontamination and decommissioning, and high-level waste. The objective of the 18-month review is to assess the timeliness and sufficiency of grants and other funded activities for cleanup decisions. The next meeting will be in June.

Doug Sherwood said that this review adds value to work done throughout the site. Merilyn Reeves suggested that the HAB send past pieces of advice to the review panel. Mike Thompson agreed to pass on relevance pieces of HAB advice to the panel, DOE-RL, and others involved in the peer review process.

### **September HAB Meeting**

The HAB identified potential topics for the next HAB meeting, including tanks, site contracting decisions (Fluor Hanford, Bechtel, tank waste treatment, and HAB

facilitation contract), the annual HAB self-evaluation, DOE-HQ response to Advice #110, upcoming SSAB chair's meeting, SSAB stewardship workshop, Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement, DOE-RL uranium disposition plans, transuranic waste project management plan, K Basins, WIPP shipments, and 300 Area accelerated cleanup.

## ATTENDEES

### HAB Members and Alternates

Mark Beck, member	Norm Dyer, alternate	Allen Conklin, ex-officio
Ken Bracken, member	Norma Jean Germond, alternate	Joseph Richards, ex-officio
Pam Brown, member	Doug Huston, alternate	Michael Farrow, ex-officio
Madeleine Brown, member	David Johnson, alternate	
Shelley Cimon, member	Robin Klein, alternate	
Harold Heacock, member	Jeff Luke, alternate	
Charles Kilbury, member	Todd Martin, alternate	
Paige Knight, member	Cindy Myer, alternate	
Robert Larson, member	Keith Smith, alternate	
Susan Leckband, member	John Stanfill, alternate	
Victor Moore, member	Dave Watrous, alternate	
Ken Niles, member		
Jerry Peltier, member		
Gerald Pollet, member		
Merilyn Reeves, member		
Gordon Rogers, member		
Leon Swenson, member		
Margery Swint, member		
Tim Takaro, member		
Jim Trombold, member		

### Agency Staff and Contractors

Neal Goldenberg, DOE-HQ (phone)	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Michael Graham, BHI
David Michaels, DOE-HQ (phone)	Tim Hill, Ecology	Tom Logan, BHI
David Statler, DOE-HQ (phone)	Max Power, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Kay Fick, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Alan Dobson, BNFL
Wade Ballard, DOE-RL	Roger Stanley, Ecology	Geoff Harvey, BNFL
C.K. Kasch, DOE-RL	Joy Turner, Ecology	Sandy Murdoch, BNFL
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	MaryAnne Wuennecke, Ecology	Louise Dressen, EnviroIssues
Doug Shoop, DOE-RL	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Michael Thompson, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Tara Williams, EnviroIssues

	Doug Sherwood, EPA	Jeff Hertzell, FH
		Barb Wise, FH
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec
		Chris Chamberlain, Nuvotec (phone)
		Donna Sterba, Nuvotec
		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
		Ginger Benecke, TRI
		Ralph Patt, IPEP

**Members of the Public**

Kent Anderson	Ralph Patt, IPEP	John Stang, Tri-Cities Herald
Sarah DeVore	Kelly Skoulin	