

**START**

0038098

TPA MEETING - Seattle, Washington

MAY 12, 1994

TAPE 1 - SIDE 1

NV:

Good Evening. My name is Melinda Page and I'm going to be facilitating the meeting tonight. We have a very full agenda. There was a desire on the part of a number of the public interest groups to have a lot of information but perhaps not so many meetings that all the public had to come to. So there's been a combing of the Tri-Party annual meeting with a meeting that will provide you with information on budget, and also a discussion of environmental restoration refocusing. So my job is to try to get us through all those topics and still have us end somewhere near on time, because everyone wants to cover everything and still leave here when we say we're going to. You will note at the bottom of the agenda, that agency representatives will stay here until everyone has had a chance to comment. So, we're going to do our best to get you out of here by 9:30, but if we need to keep going because information is flowing we'll do that. At this point, I hope you all have the handouts and the agenda, don't want to spend a lot of time on that other than to note that there are two ways that we're going to approach information giving and getting feedback back from all of you. In the first case, there'll be some presentations by the agency representatives on the Tri-Party Agreement status and on the budget. And then we'll hear from one of the interest group representatives who's been working with some of the others about the budget and some views of the budget that you might like to know from their point of view. And as soon as that's finished, we'll have an open discussion with questions and comments from all of you in ???

The second way that we're going to work is that on the topic of environmental restoration refocusing, we're going to hear from one of the agency representatives and then break into small group discussions. We've found that this seems to work on a topic that's complicated and technical, to let you talk in smaller groups to each other first. And we're going to attempt to have someone from one of the agencies at each of the tables to be there as a resource person and to keep the discussion moving along. After, at about 8:50, we're going to bring you back together so that you can share what happened in your small groups with the whole sessions so that nothing gets lost in terms of the major points that are made in the small groups. And then we'll open the meeting to public comments for those of you that came here to make presentation and want to wait until the end to do that. With that I'd like to introduce the three people who are at the head table from the various agencies and who are going to make presentations tonight. First, talking about the Tri-Party Agreement status and, in particular, what's been happening during this past year will be Roger Stanley from the Washington State Department of Ecology. Roger's sitting in the middle of these three. Then focusing on current and future years, and also on combining that with a presentation on the budget is Steve Wisnoos, from the U.S. Department of Energy. Sitting right here. And then on the far end is Doug Sherwood who will be presenting some views on environmental restoration refocusing later on in the meeting. So why don't we get started. Roger, do you want to start?

MAY 12, 1994

RS: Thank you Melinda. I'm just going to do a brief intro to our discussions this evening on budget and the environmental restoration program. With your leave I'm going to sit here. My vision is kind of lousy. If it doesn't work for you I'll try the podium. I'm going to go back basically to this last year and hit basically some of the high spots. My own opinion, I think that this last year was probably one of the best that we've had for Hanford clean-up over the last five, since the Tri-Party was originally signed in May of 1989. That doesn't mean that it wasn't painful, and exceptionally painful in some areas, but on a number of issues I think we've started to see some progress after four years of mounting difficulty and trying to get the rubber on the road basically. I'm going to start off with one area of negotiations that I know many of you have heard about in some of our past public meetings. Those negotiations were prompted by tank waste clean-up issues on the Hanford site and ran for a number of months with the final sign-off of the modifications eventually this past January. Those negotiations were prompted this last Spring, end of March. And basically at that point in time the DOE came to EPA and the State after somewhat over two years of readiness reviews. They were right on the verge then of basically moving ahead with some of their major construction projects of disposing of low-level tank waste at Hanford via the so-called Hanford grout process, and starting construction of the Hanford nitrification plant. That scheduled start of construction date was this last April. Basically what DOE did was after a substantial amount of study, came to us and said that they didn't have their act together or they didn't have it

MAY 12, 1994

together as well as they should have. And gave us a very extensive proposal to modify the tank program. Those negotiations were very difficult throughout the summer, but I think we wound up with a set of tank waste work schedules that are far superior to what we had originally. So the State was hesitant at the beginning, but we certainly fully support what we actually wound up with in January. Some of the key elements of those negotiations was that Hanford's grout program was canceled. The emphasis was shifted to the development of glassification, technologies for actually glassifying the low-level fraction of Hanford tank waste and for start of construction of a nitrification plant for the low-level fraction, far and away the largest volume, in the year 1997. So that the emphasis basically shifted from the start of construction of a high-level vit plant, to low-level processing based on a glassification process which allows us to, first of all, move to a much better waste form, and to start to get the waste out of Hanford's leaking ??? tanks at the earliest possible date. Probably one aspect of those negotiations that at least for me was a major benefit, if not the major benefit, was that when we received DOE's proposal and even before we recognized it, it there were going to be any major changes to the tank program or to any other program under the Tri-Party Agreement, we were going to have to approach public involvement in a far different manner than we have in the past. And the way we went about it this last year was to focus on the formation of a group called the tank waste task force and to essentially hold or have an ongoing dialog with the tribes, ??? groups, and the public throughout those negotiations so we could

MAY 12, 1994

try to take their overall concerns and take them to the negotiation table, wherein the past that hasn't happened. Basically the three agencies went into negotiations and had public meetings at the end of those. But we're on a new track now that I think is proving to be far superior, we are actually taking concerns of all the various players straight to the negotiation table. Another turning point this last year was that it's the first time that we have seen the DOE and its contractors, and to a certain extent the EPA and the State, take some real serious efforts to start to squeeze out some of the excesses, some of the things that are bogging us down on moving clean-up forward. We wound up actually negotiating a separate document from the Tri-Party Agreement itself, a document called the Cost and Management Efficiency Initiative that essentially tabulated a number of elements to gain far greater efficiencies. Items such as contract reforms, cost analysis, regulatory reforms, modification of DOE's procurement systems, and with the bottom line of DOE's commitment to reach a savings on the order of a billion dollars over the coming five years, starting this last year I suppose. But starting to see DOE putting a lot more pressure upon itself and its contractors. And I noted that the regulators are part of that. We're also going through portions of our own regulations that are excessive that have too much bureaucracy associated with them and trying to move to ??? some of those out and looking for better ways to do business. We also this last year wound up finally starting to see a number of substantial physical progress on the Hanford reservation. One that I've been glad to see that rarely gets any airplay, is that

941287-056

MAY 12, 1994

we've started to see DOE's overall infrastructure start to move into position to be able to tackle some of the larger jobs. Office buildings, for example, DOE is completing construction of its tank waste remediation system office complex out in the 200 areas. Not a tank waste processing facility but a necessary activity as DOE starts to actually get its systems in place. One of the other areas of this last year is that we've seen some laboratory facilities finally get upgraded. We saw the completion of the construction of the waste ??? and characterization facility, a low-level lab, state-of-the-art lab out in the 200 areas. It is now just going through the start of the phase. We've seen DOE near completion of the expansion of its high-level hot cells for the analysis of the samples out of the tanks. And we've also seen a number of projects well under way in their construction and nearing completion, some of those deal with liquid effluence and liquid effluent treatment on the Hanford site, a facility called C018 that I think is scheduled to start processing next year and is well under way in construction. We've seen construction of the 101SY mixer pump that was in the news, pretty widespread around the Northwest, but was a really important milestone for DOE to meet and to start to get on top of some of their tank safety issues. Another project that we've been waiting for a number of years to get underway was a restart of a facility 242A ??? that just recently restarted. That facility underwent a major upgrade for a number of years and is necessary to keep on top of or to make sure that we have adequate tank space prior to the time that we actually wind up getting the major processing facilities on line. So we're starting to see

MAY 12, 1994

some physical progress and, as far as the tank waste program goes, it is the aspect of the Tri-Party Agreement that this last year underwent the most radical reform. We basically recast it as DOE's readiness reviews resulted in their set of change requested this last Spring, and we're going to hear a lot more this evening on using that same type of approach as far as public involvement and taking concerns to the negotiation table as far as environmental restoration is concerned. So I think Doug's going to be talking about that later on. That's just a real quick overview and, I don't know Melinda if you want to entertain questions now or if, Steve?

SW: Do we have any Sonics fans here tonight? Be interested to hear how they fare tonight. My portion of the agenda tonight is to talk about the budget and expected accomplishments under the TPA next few years. I really struggled to figure out what the essence was that you really wanted to hear about tonight since it is about a \$1.6 billion program at Hanford. So I'll try to summarize as best I can but what's probably more important is that you have time to express your comments and concerns, so we do have time on the agenda to do that. I would also like to propose that at some future date once the '95 budget has settled down that we would come back in a workshop format with our ??? people and spend whatever time is needed--2, 3, 4 hours--and go into much more detail, the scope and the budget, associated with out key programs. So we'll maybe take a poll later on that issue. But what I want to start with tonight is just a brief overview of the total DOE environmental management budget. From



MAY 12, 1994

comparison of the Hanford budget as compared to the overall EM budget by major program. I think the key point here is, our budget is about \$1.6 billion. That is about 25% of the total environmental management budget. Another way of looking at the budgets is by site. You can see here, this is a comparison of the '94 and the '95 budget. This happens to be Washington or Hanford. We do get the lion's share compared to other states, in fact we get about twice as much as our next closest state with is North Carolina and Tennessee and they get about \$.75 billion. This is a further breakout of the Richland budget. This is the '94 congressional appropriation, this is the President's budget request for '95. A point I'd like to make about the '94 budget is that we're set pretty well as far as being able to meet all of our TPA commitments with that funding. The '95 budget, there's a couple of question marks there. The '95 budget that was submitted does not totally reflect the renegotiated TPA which was signed in January of this year. I'll talk a little more about that later and how we're planning to deal with it. Let me go back to '94 and talk about an eminent reprogramming. There is a reprogramming that will be going to Congress very shortly. This reprogramming is basically a shifting of funds from past years uncosted dollars, applying it to '94 waste management and ??? transition activities. It's not going to impact or take away from any TPA activities. What this will do is that it will fund some things like the environmental impact statement for new tanks, the ??? finishing plant EIS documentation, and things like our health fund, the payment in lieu of taxes for the three counties in the tri-cities area. Once that goes to Congress we

941229-016

MAY 12, 1994

can share more details on it. Now, the '95 budget was submitted to Congress by the President in February of this year. And as I mentioned, it didn't totally reflect the original negotiated Tri-Party Agreement with the exception of a number of the tank waste milestones. So in March of this year we initiated an activity to integrate, to take an integrated look at that budget with the help of the EPA and the Department of Ecology. That process is wrapping up now and in May of this year we'll be submitting that to headquarters with the expectation that in the future a budget amendment would be going to Congress to make sure that we're able to cover all of our commitments under the TPA. Once that does go to Congress we would be in the position to share the details of that with you. So how do we prioritize our budget when we go through these exercises? Well the first thing we cover is to make sure that we're covering our minimum safe operations such as out in tank 101SY, that would be a number one priority. A second item would be compliance with the Tri-Party Agreement and environmental laws and regulations. Thirdly, there's other safety things that pop up on the screen like making sure that the old facilities on site are safe, the ones that have been unoccupied for some time and electrical system upgrades. Then we move on to other environmental and safety compliance issues such as the integrated risk assessment, systems engineering activities. And then lastly, the conduct of operations and enhanced operations. That would include site infrastructure activities. Some of the key issues that we have currently in '95 is the problem in dealing with the spent nuclear fuel. I'll talk a little bit later about the ??? basins where quite a bit of the fuel at the

MAY 12, 1994

Hanford site is being stored now, and the need to raise up on the priority list and take care of that problem. The waste receiving and processing facility, at least the second phase of that project, we're assuming in the budget that we're going to be able to privatize that activity. That is, go out to the commercial sector for those operations rather than having the DOE spending the capital dollars to construct our own facility. And we think that from a ??? standpoint that will pay off. The defense nuclear facility safety board has a recommendation that would accelerate the characterization of the tank waste contents by two years over and above what's committed to in the TPA. So if we're to do that, that of course raises some funding concerns. And then something that you'll hear about a little bit later from Doug is the environmental restoration program. We added some things to our plate during the negotiations during last summer, and we're awaiting the completion. And we also agreed to renegotiate or to refocus environmental restoration to address some of the key values that we've heard from the tank waste task force and the future site users working group. And once those negotiations are completed, we'll have a much better idea for the budget needs for that program in the next couple of years. Roger mentioned the cost and management efficiency initiative. The goal is to save \$1 billion over five years. And the idea is to apply those savings to actual cleanup. And so far we've been able to identify about \$150 million that's been proposed so far. And not all that's been finalized yet. Now to what we expect to accomplish, just from a milestone accounting standpoint. We've completed, as of April, 310 milestones under the agreement. Our

9413207-0162

MAY 12, 1994

success rate is about 99% on those. The balance of '94, there's 42 with 75 due in '95, and 33 due in '96. Then you can see the breakout by major program. Where the rubber really meets the road is in the actual accomplishments on the site. In dealing with single shell tanks, we'll be, in '94, we'll complete pumping. We're removing the pumpable liquids from four tanks in '94 and we'll be initiating two more tanks in '95. We'll also complete emergency pumping of tank T111. We'll increase our capability to respond to emergency conditions in the tanks. If one should spring a leak, we'll be able to get in there much quicker than before. We've resolved our major unreviewed safety questions, and that should help us get into the tanks and be able to take care of some of the stabilization also. As far as double shell tanks go, we hope to start construction this year on our new double shell tanks. We'll be starting and completing the conceptual design from low-level waste pretreatment and we'll be issuing 50 characterization reports, not only for the double shell tanks but for the single shell tanks. I think Roger mentioned the waste receiving and processing facility. We just broke ground on that facility last month, and that construction will be completed in '96, or '97. Construction will be complete in '96 and operations will begin in '97. What that does is it receives and sorts and examines and certifies and repackages solid radioactive wastes on the site. This is a picture of the waste sampling in the characterization facility that Roger mentioned. That will be operational in November of this year. That supports our key liquid effluent projects on the site. And we'll be completing the construction of three major liquid

MAY 12, 1994

effluent treatment facilities in the 200 and 300 area with the ultimate goal of ceasing discharges of untreated streams or phase one high priority streams to the soil column in June of 1995. This happens to be the facility in the 200 area. Here is a picture of the K reactor area. We have the K East basin and the K West basin there. We have some milestones in the agreement to deal with the fuel that's in those basins. And the objective would be to encapsulate the fuel and the sludges to get it out of there and get it in a more environmentally safe configuration while it awaits disposition. There was an issue that has recently come up and that we've got a new, much more sophisticated seismic analysis of those basins. And what that analysis shows is that under a ??? earthquake, you could end up with a crack or an expansion of the joints which would cause much more leakage of the water from those basins which is something that we're going to have to deal with and is going to slow down the activities while we deal with that. We've got some technical folks here who can discuss that in more detail if you'd like a little bit later on. But the target milestone agreement was to start encapsulation this year, and that could be delayed beyond this year. I don't think we've got the exact date yet, because this issue is fairly new. It just came up I think this week so it's something to be following. This is just to show you the condition of the fuel in the basins and see the reasons why with the corrosion and so on we need to get it out of there and get it in a much more stable form. Facilities transition, as I mentioned, is the process of taking our old production facilities like ??? petroleum finishing plant, from a shutdown condition to a surveillance and



MAY 12, 1994

environmental restoration from the national budget perspective and Hanford's budget perspective. Let me just start again by going back over a key figure too that Steve gave you. The Hanford cleanup budget is about, for 1995, supposed to be \$1.6 billion. Out of that so called cleanup budget only about \$229 million has proposed to be environmental restoration. Environmental restoration is as you've heard, the investigation and the actual remediation of the contaminated soil, ground water, the final decommissioning of contaminated buildings, but not just keeping them standing there. That's a different aspect, a different category. So it's what the public last year urged the agencies to start prioritizing as getting on with cleanup. However, it is just 14% of the proposed Hanford cleanup budget. Overall, from a national perspective, environmental restoration is 27% of the Department of Energy's so called cleanup budget. From a national perspective, the public interest community has been saying for years, this program, the program that is critical for showing the public in Congress that we are going to make progress protecting the ground water and surface waters near the contaminated weapons complex sites, protecting the air, protecting the drinking water, this critical program is underfunded. At Hanford, it gets about half the priority in terms of funding than it gets for the entire national program. On top of this, the Department of Energy has said, our costs are way out of line, and we all know this I think. When we're spending \$1.6 billion here on cleanup and we haven't cleaned up four atoms of radioactive waste we know that there's waste out there that's not getting cleaned up, and that is the waste in the budget. We know that we can save money. The

9413287.0166

MAY 12, 1994

assistant secretary, Tom Grumbley, has said, we will produce productivity savings. And he took the budget submitted, basically, what was need to get the work done in 1995 and for environmental restoration applied a 10% cut in the budget. For waste management, the really big ticket item in the Department of Energy's so called clean up budget, but the ticket item that deals with ongoing management of ongoing production wastes, etc. that program, which is 53% of the Department of Energy's so called cleanup budget, that program only took a 6% cut for 1995. And the category called the facilities transition, by which the Department of Energy's dumped into the cleanup budget, all its shut down defense weapons production facilities without any transition and now calls them clean up costs. Those items had to only save 6/10 of 1%, and you have to start asking what kind of priorities do we have here. The only good cost studies that the Department of Energy's done for where it wastes money versus what the private sector does is environmental restoration. The real savings are going to be in waste management and facility transition. But they're not taking the cuts. Environmental restoration is. We're very concerned that at Hanford, under current budget targets going out 1996-2000, that the Department of Energy is basically saying we're going to hold flat in environmental restoration. Well if you hold flat, the Department of Energy's own documents show, you cannot increase the priority of remediation for contaminated ground water, protection of the Columbia River, making sure that the public by say the year 2000 is not exposed to any excess risk from radiation or hazardous wastes in the Columbia River corridor. These things can't be

MAY 12, 1994

done on a hold even budget. What are we talking about in terms of priorities. Some of you probably saw this map in the Seattle Times recently. I think they did a very good job of presenting many of the key issues that we're confronted with today. You've got the Columbia River flowing through here. You've got significant levels of contamination entering the river as these ??? maps show. The ??? coming through here. You've got a Uranium ??? down here. You've got a proposed where it says end spring slurry, we'll that's where the old end reactor is. You've got a proposed expedited response action to try to intercept ??? 90 entering the Columbia River 1,300 times the safe drinking water act standard. That standard is not set at "a safe level" set at an acceptable risk level of so many deaths per 10,000 or 100,000 people exposed to it. Now, we're talking about real environmental restoration values being jeopardized. These Uranium concentrations, the highest peak here is about 16,000 ??? per liter. That's a measurement. The relevant standard is 30. You can see, we have to make some judgment calls about do we act here in the 200 west area near the Uranium ??? plant where, last year, we discharged large quantities of liquid waste. Do we act to protect the Columbia River here where we've got large quantities of Uranium entering the river. Do we act to protect the Columbia River here in the 300 area where we have large quantities of Uranium entering the river. Unfortunately the budget documents give us some indication that Department of Energy knows that it lack sufficient priority for environmental restoration to act on the 300 area, for instance, or the end springs area. Again, here's another map. Remember the Columbia

MAY 12, 1994

9413287.0169

River's last free flowing stretch, I mean the Hanford reach to the Columbia River's last free flowing river in the United States. It is an important salmon spawning grounds. So we're not just talking about human health impacts, but we're talking about very real environmental impacts. Quickly, here's a picture that ran in the Oregonian of some, they are sipping from the shoreline. There might of also been a picture taken of people fishing for salmon standing on the shoreline. Which is significant and I'll come to it in a minute is to what kind of radiation exposure they might be getting. The three agencies did agree during the renegotiations to begin an expedited response action near the H reactor where Chromium is flowing into the river 25 times the level that EPA acknowledges causes acute impacts on juvenile salmon. Remember we're talking about declaring many species of native salmon endangered. This is the last natural spawning area basically that's unimpacted by any dams in the entire Columbia River within the borders of the United States. The good news is that is funded. Here's the 300 area Uranium ??? Again, this year, we are still discharging, mostly from facilities that have nothing to do with cleanup, we're discharging well in excess of 100 million gallons of liquid waste into this trench here which drives Uranium into the ground water. The good news is, there will be, we hope, on deadline, although the deadline has changed several times in the past, there will be a liquid effluent treatment plant at the end of the year and this discharge will cease. One of the key values that has been recommended by other groups in the past has been stop all unnecessary discharges immediately. If you do not need a

MAY 12, 1994

941287-020

discharge for cleanup then it's unnecessary. Just because its, one of the excuses has been, well we need it, it's necessary, because it cools the plant. What does the plant do? Well, it's a defense engineering plant. Well I'm sorry, let them pay for liquid effluent treatment facility or a new cooling system until they can operate again. They ought not to be pouring their liquid waste into the soils spreading contamination at Hanford. Here's relative Iodine concentrations upstream and downstream. Upstream, downstream at the Richland water drink ???, drinking water pump house. Here's ??? 99. Again, we're going to have to make some judgments based on values as to whether we start cleaning up ??? here or intercepting ground water here. We do have to set priorities. Here is an aerial survey of gamma radiation along the Columbia River. As I said, if you are standing here fishing, in the course of a year, you'd get 300 some odd milliram of radiation. The EPA annual standard based on one additional fatal cancer per 10,000 people exposed is 25 milliram. You stand there a year and you get 300 some odd milliram. Do we have the funding and the priority, and do have a value that you want to suggest about this river corridor being accessible to the public for unrestricted use. That was the term of a report called the Hanford Future Site Uses working group, which said the river corridor should be available for unrestricted public access in the near term. But I would suggest that unrestricted public access means without any additional risk beyond background radiation. And we need a deadline for that value. Here is just a chart showing the comparison of radiation levels. 100 ??? area shoreline, maximum 356 milliram per year.

MAY 12, 1994

I'm going to skip over... Here is, one of our major concerns is the end springs area and the area around the end reactor. We decided to focus on this area as an example because the agencies have chosen it as an example for environmental restoration. As you can see, this ??? 90, the drinking water standard is 8

TAPE 2 -SIDE B

and we need a deadline for that value. Here is the chart showing the comparison of radiation levels. One hundred an area shoreline, maximum 356 milligram per year. Skip over, here is one of our major concerns is the N springs area and the area around the N reactor. We decided to focus on this as an example because the agencies have chosen it as an example for environmental restoration. As you can see, it is ??? and ninety. The drinking water standard is 8 pica curies per liter. It is a log rhythm basically. What you have got is seepage entering the Columbia River here at about 13,000 pica curies per liter. OK. Heck of a difference from 8. The agencies are negotiating currently over an expedited response action for the N springs. The Department of Energy proposed 3 years of additional study. The agencies, the EPA and Ecology are suggesting that there be significant expedited response action next year. What about funding for this as a priority? We went and we finally after much ado obtained what are called the activity data sheets. These are supposed to be available to the public when the president submits his budget request. They were only given to us two weeks ago by the Department of Energy headquarters after repeated requests to the Richland office. These show for the 100 N area and I will just whip this up so you can see the activity data sheet number for people who are interested is 3300 that in

MAY 12, 1994

essence the Department of Energy looking ahead at what it can do in the 100 N area, the area around the N reactor is basically saying I have a blow up of key impacts. Basically saying, by gosh we do not have sufficient funding in environmental restoration to complete assessment activities pursuant to milestone 15 of the Tri-Party Agreement. That milestone says we will complete all investigations by the year 2005. That's pretty damn important because you can't complete all remedial actions, cleanups, unless you first do the investigations. TPA gives the Department of Energy till the year 2005 to complete the investigations. The current budget levels for ER are basically such that they expect to off by 5 years and that's after they have applied productivity savings and new approaches to aggregate management etc. The target case, that's the target budget for 96 through 2000 does not provide for mediation after they issue a record of decision on what to do. Furthermore, there is no funding for new expedited response actions to protect the river. The real question we have to ask in closing here is this. What is the right priority being given to environmental restoration? You heard about office space being built. The Department of Energy's so-called Hanford Clean-up budget will spend about \$50 million dollars, a quarter of the ER budget on offices, new highways, roads, lighting, security improvements, mostly serving facilities that do not serve clean up in terms of 1995 budget. Who is setting those priorities? The new environmental restoration contractor Bechtel was required to come in and promise to build its' own office building with private capital in Richland, but you saw that basically, Roger referred to an office space being built for Westinghouse in the 200 area with your tax dollars out of clean-up funds total estimated cost \$15 million dollars. Why aren't we saying:

1. That will not be used for 50 years in that area anyway so it ought to be built in Richland because we don't have clean up workers to fill it after 15 years from now.
2. Why not use private capital and build in Richland where it will assist in economic diversification.
3. Why is that a priority over cleaning up the N springs. Why

MAY 12, 1994

is parking lots serving defense engineering labs in the 300 area priority over environmental restoration.

There are alot of other questions we need to ask about why ER gets 14% and it's being held even. Thank you.

NV: I will take a few questions now. We are about 5 minutes away from the time we had scheduled to make the ER presentation so I am not going to take a whole lot of questions at this point. I want to get Mr. Sidney Stock to come first because he has another thing he has to do and he requested that. Go ahead.

MS: Thank you. Hard not to be furious and feel helpless, hopeless. I have great cynicism about our government. Not government in general, but our government. Any government that could have contributed to what I consider crimes against humanity that are greater than the holocaust and any others in the past and I am a student of the holocaust because it's going to effect us for so long and so profoundly. So I want to talk the people who work for the Department of Energy and Westinghouse. I don't think things are ever going to be dealt with well. I think it is an impossibility. I think that there is too much money and too much power involved in it and I don't things have fundamentally changed. It is still the same situation that things are happening only when pushing happens. Public interest groups make things happen and otherwise minimal or no changes happen and still we are deceived and so I would request that people who work for Westinghouse and people who work for DOA and EPA and these other organizations and if these things don't pertain to you please forgive me, but that in the most oppressive of organizations it's possible to oppose these things to some degree. You know we saw Schindler's List. He was involved in the most oppressive situation and it's been said we breathe the same air and we drink the same water. It is possible to, while maintaining one's income and I don't denigrate the need for maintaining an income. I know we all have to do it, or most of us have to do it. That you who are in these organizations that I consider so destructive become activists in the best ways that

MAY 12, 1994

you can to oppose these awful, awful things.

NV: Is there another person who would like to comment? Betty, do you have a comment? Would you go to the mike please? And if there are a couple of others of you who would like to comment, it would save time if you would save time if you would stand by one of the mikes and then I'll call on you in turn so we don't have to wait in between. Go ahead.

NV: Do you want us to identify ourselves?

NV: Sure.

ET: My name is Elizabeth Tabbett and I am with Washington Environmental Council, but I simply had a question and that is, did I understand that the funds to the Benton County in lieu of past taxes, does that come out of the clean-up budget?

NV: Uh, Yes it does.

NV: The answer is a portion.

ET: A portion? Any figures?

NV: We, I don't know what the total number is going to be. Tony, do you have anymore you want to add on this or the funding source? Tony Lorenz from our Budget Division.

TL: The negotiations are still ??? (cannot hear)

ET: I'm sorry I missed that very last thing you said. It goes back to 88 and then what?

TL: 1984. Where negotiations are now, from then on, on a yearly basis ??? (cannot hear)

ET: Is it customary, for example, does Pierce County get comparable

9413297-079

MAY 12, 1994

sort of funds because they have military reservation within their county? Is this a customary kind of payment?

NV: I don't really know the answer to that. I do know that ???  
(cannot hear)

ET: Thank you.

9413287.0175

NV: I have a couple of questions. First, I haven't heard anything regarding declassification of documents. I haven't at this meeting I still see that there is a tremendous problem with openness with a willingness on the part of the Department of Energy to tell people what is going on. You have the Secretary of Energy taking extraordinary measures to release information, but Hanford is still hiding documents that obviously have very little, if any, to do with national security documents regarding how much was released from the site and blew down wind. That's not on to enemy territory, at least it shouldn't be what you consider enemy territory. It's the American public. I have heard interviews with various Hanford and DOE officials on the radio and on the TV and they are always patting themselves on the back. Well with this new project we have greatly increased public participation. I don't think you've increased public participation. You've just become more obviously wasteful and more and more people are getting upset and hollering at you. When you really increase public participation is when you take major steps, difficult steps, to get material out to the people to let people really come in and inspect your new budget not handing it out a few minutes before you expect them to make comments. The evidence that you are really concerned about public involvement is still lacking. Then, there was a statement on I think from Mr. Wissness, that you have now started to get on top of safety problems at tanks. I remember Mary Poppins said, "Well begun is half done." Maybe you're telling yourself that you're now half done with the safety problem with the tanks. Started to get on top of doesn't count in my book. Having a

MAY 12, 1994

940287.076  
NV:

wonderful new office tower that looks like something from Epcot Center doesn't count. I remember reading about Hanford in 1943 and 1944. They were not building office towers. They were not paving parking lots. People were living in tents and eating dust and they had a sense of desperate urgency. Hanford bureaucrats will not have a sense of desperate urgency until the Department of Energy stops funding plush office space, stops funding extravagances and puts its' funding where its' mouth is. Gets out there and starts cleaning up meeting and exceeding real clean-up schedules and not concentrating its' efforts on non-problems, like clean-up areas that really don't need to be cleaned up so let's rush them through and declare a victory. Thank you.

NV: I have some questions in the way of clarification. I thought I understood the Department to say that out of a budget of \$6.3 billion, 27 1/2 percent of that amount was being dedicated to environmental restoration. I then thought I heard Linda say that out of that 27 1/2 percent, 37 percent would be dedicated to clean up. Now, Jerry got up and he mentioned a figure that said that 14 percent is the true figure. If I understood it correctly, if I didn't please let me know. Do you agree with this assessment and if not why? Also, that's the first question. The second question is that you stated you have, I believe, a \$1 billion target for savings and you realized \$150 million. Jerry alluded to a number of discharges which he characterized as being unnecessary. Do you concede that any of these discharges from any of these ancillary facilities are unnecessary. Ancillary in the sense of being non-clean up related and if the answer to that question is yes, how much in the way of savings do you think would be realized from getting rid of those unnecessary discharges and presumably expenditures dedicated towards clean up please.

NV: I think on the figures of percentages of environmental restoration of the total budget at a national scale I think it is bigger than it maybe at Hanford and maybe a function of how far

MAY 12, 1994

along various sites maybe in the actual clean-up process where Hanford maybe behind some facilities like Oakridge, so I think there is a difference there. I think there is an issue though of getting into full scale clean up as soon as we can. We want to do that. The \$150 million of savings towards the billion dollars, those are proposed savings we haven't realized all that yet but we would hope to validate those and apply to those savings in the near future, but the final number has not been totally resolved. Savings from unnecessary discharges, I don't know that you'll have a monetary savings from that but you will certainly have an environmental savings and that is what we are counting on.

NV: Do you agree that there are unnecessary discharges. I am sure you probably have a divergence of opinion even if the answer is yes as to how many there are and where and what for and so forth. Do you think it is a significant factor in your position?

NV: I think the discharges if they were unnecessary would have ceased them by now. That's way we are going through the process of preparing or constructing the treatment facilities.

NV: Thank you.

NV: Let's pause for a minute and invite anyone who would like a chair to walk across the ??? Would you raise your hand if there is an empty seat near you? There are a bunch of empty seats in the back. No need to stand through this whole meeting. Okay.

NV: Last year you actually listened to us a little bit and you dropped the plans for grout proposals and you also are now not planning on running the plutonium finishing plant. I would like to know how that is reflected in this year's budget. In other words, what is the cost savings from dropping this to proposals and where is that money going to?

MAY 12, 1994

NV: I don't know what the numbers are grout is significantly reduced and that is wrapping down. There is a certain amount of work there that is ongoing but it is very minimal because I think that was a continuously planned within the negotiations if say the low level vitrification wouldn't work out, is that right Roger?

NV: No, I wouldn't expect to see much in the way of savings from the wrapping down of grout just because the tank program at Hanford, and I don't know the dollar amount that was actually attached this year to those grout falls, but the tank program and the new schedules are voracious enough on the budget. I would imagine they probably absorb it pretty rapidly. I don't know if Tony has any figures on grout or any background information on it. They have basically shifted their emphasis away from the grout program to the other newer elements the ??? mediation system. What was the second item?

NV: The PFP plant, since you are running it, I assume there some cost savings, what is that and where are you using that money instead?

NV: It hasn't run for quite some time. It's just kind of been maintained in a standby condition if you will and what we would like to do is get that facility into a surveillance and maintenance mode. It isn't there yet, but when you do get it to that point, there would be significant savings but not now.

NV: So just to follow up. That means you are still planning to do some grout because you are going forward with construction?

NV: No.

NV: So what's the money being spent on? You indicated that there was some money being spent on the grout program still. I don't understand.

9413287-0178

NV: No. If you look at the overall tank ways mediation system and the grout program was an element of it that has died. It got cancelled and Hanford's not moving ahead with their grout program but there are a number of other elements to the tank ways program that are new on the map. For example, glassification of those low level waste in lieu of grout so naturally they have developmental activities that are starting to cost money for that aspect of the tank program. Tank ways pre-treatment programs are starting to be invested in more and more also so it's other aspects of the tank program rather than grout.

NV: Don, would you care to comment on grout ramp now?

Don: Well it's obviously taken out of the budget for 94 and 95 ??? (could not understand)

NV: What's still in there?

NV: We need to get some of these questions on the mike so that they'll be on the record. What was the question?

NV: The question is how much is still in the grout program?

NV: I would have to look but I think it's \$3-4 million in that order.

NV: It's that close.

NV: \$3-4 million something in that order.

NV: I think last year was 36 actually.

NV: So, he's saying last year it was 36. This year it's 3-4. Jerry.

NV: In terms of the priorities when I think you phrased a good question and I think it is important. We are spending Don says

MAY 12, 1994

\$3-4 million, the budget request was higher in the reprograming I think knocked it down to that and you are spending money on something we all say is abandoned and one of the things we are spending about \$1 million on, believe it or not, is people sitting around pushing paper to cure notice of deficiency from the state department of ecology for regulatory violations for a program that will never be restarted. I mean it is one of those things you ought to write down and tell your bosses that it out. You know.

NV: You're talking about the permitting activities on grout?  
Jerry.

NV: Jerry, the question is -- two people talking at once.

NV: We are proposing that we stop activity in that area. I agree.

NV: Let's go here, here and then here. Go ahead.

NV: Hi. Mine's real short question. My name is Cynthia Sorto. I am staff attorney for Heart of America and Mr. Wissness and I have sort of had this discussion at other meeting before. I feel it is slightly an embellishment on the truth when you state that 315 milestones have been successfully completed or that 99.9% of 315 milestones have been successfully completed. It is not true that the majority of those milestones have been delayed. Isn't successful completion in your mind partially, I think we've had this discussion before, a delayed milestone is in your mind to successfully completed.

NV: Okay. I guess the accounting would be that if a milestone had some significant justification to be changed and we completed on the change date then yeah it would be included in that figure.

CS: How many were not delayed?

NV: Okay. I don't have that number.

MAY 12, 1994

CS: So this would include all the milestones that were changed under the new negotiations.

NV: Yes.

CS: Which was a significant number of milestones. As was the negotiations in 1990.

NV: Right. I would also like to say that the number of milestones in the agreement has quadrupled since the original agreement.

CS: Well that may be true but you and I both work on that side enough to know that you have not successfully completed any where close to 99.9% of the milestones that were to be completed by this date. If you were the vitrification plant would be under construction.

NV: Okay. We won't account for it that way but maybe we need to go back and look at it like that.

NV: My name is Bob Robertson. My comment follows up with hers. Your draft to the EAS you just released and backed up by the National Academy Science document, Management and Disposition of Excess Weapons claims that statements by the public that Dick said they don't think the Department of Energy ought to be managing the waste as long as they are going to also manufacturing of the material. That was pretty nominal. I am wondering what you thought of those comments and if you have looked into that at all as to what you probably ought to do with that or is that again the DOE chosen to ignore that? Comments by the public.

MAY 12, 1994

NV: I am not familiar with the comments on the EAS.

NV: Go ahead.

NV: My name is Tom Lasheen. I wanted to comment on the budget and alot of statements have been made here and I guess the grout program in particular because I feel like there is a real micro-managing of the DOE budget from the floor going on here. It really surprises me, you may not know, the National Academy of Sciences wrote a letter report on Hanford a couple of months ago to the Secretary Grumbly and one of the things that they urged in the possible strongest language was keeping the grout program alive, not as an option to be used, but as a backstop technology to alot of very serious concerns members of the panel had about whether the low level vitrification plant and process can really work the way DOE thinks it will work and the report that we wrote was about systems engineering and this just makes good sense from a systems engineering point of view you do not throw away all your options and just assume you can go full speed ahead with the technology that has never been applied before. It's not the same problem as high level waste vitrification, it's low level waste nevertheless there are grounds for concern. Whether it can really be done. I was thinking furthermore this business about what money gets spent on environmental remediation versus waste management and what I personally feel safe about and I am sure alot of things that make me feel relatively safe as opposed to relatively in a situation of peril as to what is going on at Hanford are money that is spent on the waste management component of the program. I don't know what the budget breakdown really is but that the tank that was burping is not burping anymore, got a stirring rod in it, I assume that is a waste management activity and that was fairly substantial. I know there are radioactive wastes stored in pools out there that you can't walk away from. If you walk away from those pools, they dry out and then really bad things happen. So I don't begrudge the Department of Energy spending money on waste management. I don't think the ability of some fisherman to go strolling the bank with a pole in hand

94227 002  
280 22416

MAY 12, 1994

catching salmon is very important from my standpoint of public safety. There are certainly a lot of other things that are quite critical and if you want to look at how DOE is wasting money I wouldn't pick on office buildings I would look at contracting procedures and that is where the money is getting wasted. The office buildings are a convenient target but that's not the real problem. DOE is wasting money.

NV: Kip Wilson. I have concerns about what he just commented on. I believe we have been paying Westinghouse, Rockwell International, all the other corporations and the Department of Energy in taxes and so forth to maintain those facilities for the last 40-50 years. They have not done their job and the result is fuel rods sitting in basins like that can not within an earthquake and so forth. Grout versus low level vitrification. You're saying that low level vitrification can't work even though it's been proved that high level vitrification can work. That doesn't make any sense at all. There is a company out there consortium that says we will vitrify all the waste and you don't pay for it until we actually produce glass logs. Why can't some type of technology like that be applied instead of using a stupid method such as grout to do this and to say it is an unproven technology is insane. The French have been vitrifying waste for 20 years now and they are caught up with both their defense waste and their civilian high level waste. That doesn't make any sense. To also say that we're suddenly going to have a problem with high level nuclear waste tanks. You've got to be kidding. We have 68 tanks that are leaking and have been leaking and probably by the turn of the century all the old tanks are going to be leaking so what kind of extra crisis are we going to come into. A tank blowing up. Well that's a possibility and so far nothing Westinghouse has done till recently has proved to be effective and hopefully nothing will happen over the next few years but to say we cannot use the vitrification does not make any sense to me.

NV: I said might.

MAY 12, 1994

KW: Might.

NV: Big difference in that.

NV: I am going to make this the last comment on the budget and then we will go into the environmental restoration refocussing presentation.

NV: I'm Chris Jordan from Seattle and I would like to say first of all that when the public asks questions about how our money is being spent that is not called micro-management that's called civic responsibility. So it's okay for me to ask how my money is being spent. I had a couple of questions. How many gallons of industrial sewage are you going to be dumping into the ground at Hanford this year?

I guess Department of Ecology, Mr. Stanley.

NV: I never heard that figure. I think I could give it but I've never heard that.

CJ: Could you give a guess. I am talking about all the liquid discharges. All the liquid discharges, do you know about how many gallons will be dumped out there this year?

S: Sewage, you said sewage didn't you?

CJ: Right, the liquid discharges. You call them liquid discharges.

S: Any kind of a liquid discharge?

CJ: Sure, that's going into the ground.

S: Do you know any ??? Not for the entire year.

CJ: So we're talking 10 million gallons, 100 million gallons, a billion gallons? I know last year it was about a billion.

- S: I'm not going to hazard a guess.
- NV: It will be less than a billion, but it will be close to that.
- CJ: Okay so somewhere less.
- NV: The major large volume discharges come from the steam plants that provide steam heat to most of the facilities at Hanford. They were built in the 1940's and 50's. Most of them have steam heat. Those have large volume discharges that come from them. As long as those facilities are still maintained in their current condition, there will be some heating of those facilities required and there will continue to be steam discharges. Most of it is not contaminated water but it is a very large volume.
- CJ: Okay. So we're talking about something less than a billion but something close to a billion gallons of water going into the ground and I know Joe Paulette has told us a many times that has the effect of driving the plumes, the ground water plumes, farther into the river. I understand that as part of environmental restoration you are going to be intercepting ground water plumes and especially places like N springs are going to try and intercept ground water plumes. Is that right?
- No answer.
- CJ: So as I understand it then we are going to be spending money to dump water into the ground and then spend more money to suck the water back up. Aren't we sort of at cross purposes with ourselves if we do that?
- NV: Yes, we agree with you. For most of the areas near the Columbia River, all of the discharges have been ceased. The N springs area, the discharges were ceased in 1992 or 1991. All other discharges in the 100 areas have ceased. There is one discharge in the 300 area which both Jerry and Steve mentioned.

MAY 12, 1994

There is a treatment plant for that which is going to be on line at the end of this year. So all of the discharges near the Columbia River will have ceased. The other main purpose of the liquid ??? program is now underway is to get the current discharges away from the contaminated areas. With large volumes of treated and uncontaminated water in an area that does not cause further spread of contamination or minimizes that spread. It's not a total cessation of discharges which is what everybody would desire and would be the best for clean up. It is the start.

ES: I guess my concern is when I see that somewhere upwards to a billion gallons of water will be dumped and that part of the budget for actually cleaning up along the river is only 14% of your budget at Hanford, it tells me that you haven't put river clean up and ground water problems as the top priority as they need to be. I know last year I attended all the TPA meetings and we told you over and over again that we really want clean up along the river to be your top priority and I don't see that in your budget. I heard you say good things last year but I don't actually see this happening in your budget this year and I would like you to go back and look at that 14% number. That's too low and also when you allow a 10% productivity cut out of your environmental restoration budget and that's the largest budget cut compared to other categories. That shows me again you're not putting a high priority on your ground water problem out there.

NV: I would say that is a great lead in for talking about refocussing the environmental restoration program. I think we have heard some of his priorities and if you don't mind I would like to go ahead and start discussing the environmental restoration program if we could.

NV: The mike is over there.

Background noise.

MAY 12, 1994

9413287.0187

DS: Good evening, my name is Doug Sherwood. I would like to give a brief presentation on some background information on the environmental restoration program. So far tonight there has been alot of budget information given out about the entire environmental management budget at Hanford. What I would like to go through first is just a little bit about what is the environmental restoration program so you will get a sense of what the various programs areas are at Hanford and how the environmental restoration program fits in. You'll think back about both of the budget presentations that were just given. They really talked about waste management activities which in this case include solid and liquid waste management and tank waste for mediation system. Those are really waste management activities. Those of you with ongoing waste or generated every day at Hanford whether they be a result of taking paint samples or dirt rising other waste sites or cleaning up these old facilities that are in transition from active operation to D&B. All those generate waste and that waste that is generated today is handled by the solid/liquid waste program. The ??? program is the program which handles the day to day management of tanks, tank safety issues and then disposal. Special initiatives. This is really an emphasis on cost cutting and reducing the cost of doing business at Hanford. Former nuclear facilities. Hanford is moving so that all of the nuclear waste processing facilities that are Hanford basically have said they are no longer needed and those are moving through a state from operation to facility transition which is the activity that gets those facilities down from hopefully a \$30-50 million budget to maintain them to something much lower, keeps them in a stable, safe condition so that they can be decommissioned at a later date. Then the environmental restoration program which is the one I am going to concentrate on in a minute cites poor infrastructure. Well we've heard about new buildings but this is really in addition to the information systems, health monitoring systems and laboratory capacity to support those other initiatives. The final part of the program which we really haven't discussed much tonight is the technology development part of this program. That's the part

MAY 12, 1994

done by principally by Batelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories. They not only service the needs of Hanford in those technology development efforts but they also do technology development for the entire DOE complex. In addition there is some other work that is going on that supports other government agencies. They do research for the Environmental Protection Agency. They do some research for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. They service other government agencies. So that's pretty much the whole picture at Hanford as far as the program breakout and categories. These are some of the projects that fit into those categories. These are kind of the major groupings again. So if you see these you can associate them with individual budget categories. For the environmental restoration program, these are examples of the types of facilities and waste sites that are currently in the program. All of the reactors along the Columbia River have been moved into the environmental restoration program. Other facilities that surround those reactors support buildings, I can see I am a better door than a window. You think I could get Linda to put on the rest of those for me? I can see some people other here going like this. Go ahead we'll get to some of the waste site information in a minute. The overall environmental restoration program is really divided into these five major categories. We have clean-up actions. Those are clean up of waste sites that have been known release points for radio-nucleates as well as hazardous substances, waste characterization activities. Those are activities where you would go out and characterize a group of waste sites. What we call an operable unit which is a group of sites that we can investigate, assess and then remediate as a group. Hazard stabilization and elimination. At Hanford because we have so many of these older facilities that are not in a well kept state and have been inactive for many years. For instance, the reactor facilities. The 8 initial reactors that were developed at Hanford have all been inactive since 1971. That's over 20 years of inactivity. These sites represent a significant hazard to worker health and safety and within the last two years we've had a fatality. That resulted from a worker falling through the roof of one of these

9413207 0100

MAY 12, 1994

9413287.0189

facilities. These are significant hazards. They're on the order of the same type hazards we face in the environment. They are dangerous to site workers. The last two categories technology and infrastructure and program management are really the building blocks which help us start remediation. Those are the activities we need to have to build our program. In terms of the regulations that govern how we clean up Hanford and handle the waste that are currently on the site. We really have two types of categories, retro programs which are the programs that regulate ongoing waste management activities. Those programs are led by the Washington State Department of Ecology under their base resource conservation and recovery act program. Environmental restoration activities are pretty much equally split between the Washington State Department of Ecology and the US Environmental Protection Agency and those are clean up of past practice waste sites at Hanford. Waste sites that have not been used since the institution of ??? in November 1980. As I stated earlier, the waste sites are divided into groups called operable units. Those are groups of waste sites or in some cases, areas of Hanford's ground water that have been identified as single sites for the purpose of remediation and investigation. Within those operable units, there are also ??? sites that are going to require closure. There are 15 of those. The environmental restoration program has initiated work on 27 of the operable units. Some of them are being characterized, some of them there's actually some ongoing removal actions called expedited response actions, or clean up actions underway. We also have one record of decision for an entire NPL area which includes 4 operable units. This is a breakout of all of the operable units and waste sites at Hanford. As you can see most of our waste sites are in the central portion of the site in the 200 areas. Many of the sites though are in the 100 areas and the 300 areas along the Columbia River. These 4 operable units are the site for which we have already made a clean up decision in the 1100 area. Just so you can get an idea of where we started in investigations. This is the list of operable units that are currently under investigation in 1994. The main priority set

MAY 12, 1994

when we signed the original Tri-Party Agreement were to address those operable units and waysides which we felt had the greatest potential the impact the Columbia River in the near term public health and safety. So we started principally with sites along the Columbia River in the 100 areas. Also in the 300 area and the 1100 area which is very near the city of Richland. We started selected sites in the 200 areas based on knowledge that those sites had contaminated the ground water and represented the major sources of ground water contamination within the 200 area. As I stated earlier, we also started several expedited response actions. There were several reasons for starting these. No, I thought someone was waving at me. That's okay. Come on. No. You wouldn't wave at me.

9443287-0190  
TAPE ONE, SIDE 3

NV: ...We also started several expedited response actions. There were several reasons for starting these. No, I thought someone was waving at me.

NV: ??? Can we move up?

NV: I know, you wouldn't wave at me. Several of these actions were started because we felt they could represent final cleanup actions for operable units. In other words, we knew what the answer was for cleanup, we knew what the alternative was that we should select for cleaning up those units, and we felt that cleanup action would result in getting on with it and cleaning up areas where there wasn't very significant contamination. Those would be these last three areas here. Those actions are all completed and the date that we've received as a result, and at least in these two cases the cleanup actions resulted in that cleanup to background.

NV: I know that the sodium dichromate site, your decision was going to be to do nothing?

MAY 12, 1994

- NV: No, there was about 5,000 barrels that contained sodium dichromate that were removed from the site, as well as some sodium dichromate itself and some contaminated soil that was removed.
- NV: So they reversed the decision to leave the site out as it was. Were either of the others, was there a decision to do nothing, to leave it in place?
- NV: Actually there wasn't much contamination found at the White Bluff site, but yes, indeed, these were not major actions. You're right.
- NV: ???
- NV: OK. The carbon tetrachloride action that was taken at the same time this was going on at Hanford, the ??? program nationally, the DPA runs, was getting a lot of pressure to identify what was called presumptive remedies, cases where you knew what the appropriate cleanup alternative was and it didn't take a bunch of rocket scientists to figure it out. For this site, carbon tetrachloride is in the vapor phase, it degasses out of the soil commonly. We had a bunch of wells in the area where we could suck these gases out of the ground effectively, and we just went out and put vacuum pumps on them and captured the carbon tetrachloride. That activity is still going on today, and we've removed about 20,000 pounds of carbon tetrachloride from the soil. Here are the locations for all of the expedited response actions that are currently completed, in the process, or in the planning process.
- NV: Where did that carbon tetrachloride go that you removed?
- NV: Are you going to take questions now or do you have a choice.
- NV: It goes off site to an off-site contractor for destruction. In addition to those programs that are required by the regulations,

MAY 12, 1994

there are other activities in the environmental restoration program. I'm just going to go through these real quickly and let you read them. These are other activities that are not currently covered by the Tri-Party Agreement that are the decontamination and decommissioning of nuclear facilities. And these are the examples of the work that has been completed and the work that is currently underway. There are also other cleanup activities underway at the site that are not specifically required by ??? but may be required by other regulations. DOE's own regulations require them to control the spread of surface contamination in areas near operating facilities or near old waste sites. In addition, we have underground storage tank removal program, that's the common gas station type problem you have essentially throughout the United States. And the last area is to abate possible releases of asbestos. Now I'd like to move on to kind of the next phase of what we've done in the environmental restoration program. Over the past couple of years, we've had a couple e of task forces that were mentioned earlier--the tank waste task force and the future site uses working group. These groups were a group of diverse citizens that represented a lot of regional interests that we have in the Northwest. Those groups identified areas where they thought we should concentrate our environmental restoration efforts. And during last summer's negotiation for the tank waste task force, they made suggestions as to where we should start cleanup actions and where we should accelerate cleanup actions. These are some of those actions. These are essentially the first phase of what we're calling ER refocusing. This is where we did receive values from the public and we did move out and try to change the program. I don't believe we probably want to go into each one of them, but I'd just like to give you, these are our activities that really occur near the Columbia River. These are activities that really are attempting to contain and control the spread of ground water contamination. And we're also trying to develop a common understanding of the Columbia River which has the endorsement of these interest groups and that really makes sense as far as addressing contaminate problems in the Columbia River. This also

260-22646

MAY 12, 1994

9413287-0193

includes the potential removal of reactor piping that is in the Columbia River. These are also actions that we're currently negotiating, developing specific milestones for the decommissioning activities in hopes that we can coordinate those activities with other waste site cleanups to make a more efficient cleanup program and to cleanup all of the contaminate problems in a given area. The site cannot be used for other uses if you've cleaned up the waste site contamination but there's still old nuclear facilities sitting there. So, to make this program work, we need to be able to clean up all of those problems concurrently. And in order to do that, we need to have a place to put the waste. One of the recommendations from the future site uses working group was to attempt to move all of the waste away from the river to the central part of the site. But to do that we need to construct a large disposal facility to contain that material. We've had one set of public meetings on that facility, and we will be back talking to you again in the next few months. So now we're to the part of what is ER refocusing. Well, simply it's a way to prioritize how we do environmental restoration cleanup and hopefully to the values that we have been provided by the public and these groups in the past, and hopefully to get some more input from you tonight on what your values are and how we should take those into account when we're renegotiating these activities. I think what we're really looking for is your advice on how we can make this program a better cleanup program. It's not simply ore money. It's simply how we can do this job better and more effectively. Some of the potential outcomes of ER refocusing, I'm not enamored by the 500%, please don't ask me about it. We haven't been doing much ground water remediation and so a 500% increase doesn't mean a lot to me. What really means a lot to me is getting a handle on the problems and spending whatever it takes. So please don't get possessed with 500%. But what we do know about is we do need to increase remediation along the Columbia River. We need to have a geographic remediation strategy which cleans up large parcels of the Hanford site. It's a 560 square mile site. We're hoping that current ongoing cleanup action result in the cleanup of about 1/2

MAY 12, 1994

of the site over the next year. These are not the most hazardous sites, but if we can use this land for other uses it is a benefit to the local economy and to the state of Washington. What we're trying to do is to increase activities on actual cleanup, which is remediation of waste sites and decommissioning of nuclear facilities. And to do that, we'll have to construct this waste disposal facility in the 200 area, and we're going to try to do it on a continuing basis which supports ongoing cleanup activities. And I guess, finally of the last two this one is the most important and that's to get those decommission activities in line with operable unit cleanup. I guess I'd like to go ahead and take your questions now. No? I guess I wouldn't. OK.

NV: I've spent a good deal of time talking with some of the public interest groups about how best to handle all the questions that would come up and then hear back from you. And the consensus seemed to be small groups discussion. But I also want to get permission from you to officially extend the meeting by about 30 minutes, and we'll take it longer if it takes longer than that to finish the public comments. I need to know if there's anyone who needs to leave exactly at 9:30 p.m. and wanted to make a public comment on the record before leaving. OK. So what I'm going to do, can I assume then the others of you are willing to stay about an extra 1/2 an hour in order to get through these discussions?

NV: I'd like to make a proposal ??? during the final public comments.

NV: OK, would the rest of you like to spend a shorter period of time in small group discussion like 20 minutes, so that when I try to stop you all, all of you who are nodding yes, will stop talking? OK. So I think, unless I hear somebody else raising their hand and saying no, no, no, we'll do a couple of things here. We'll shorten the time on the schedule for small group discussion to about 20 minutes. That will leave more time for public comment. I'm going to ask that when you go into small groups and select someone to report back from your group, that rather than reporting every single thing that was said out of a sense of duty

MAY 12, 1994

to the members of your group, take the last couple of minutes to figure out the 2-3 most important points you want to make, and then if some other group stands up and makes it, don't make it again. Make a different one so that we get some coverage here. Otherwise the reporting out of 13 small groups is going to take about 20 minutes. So lets take an opportunity, would you like to make a comment now so you're sure to get it done and then...? I'm still assuming that we're going to be extending the meeting after the 9:30 time to 10:00, is that all right with everyone else. Nods of approval or disapproval. OK, so go ahead please. Let's wait one minute. There's a lot of shuffling around. They're bringing us new water too. Thank you very much. OK, go ahead.

IV: My name's Gordon Kinder. I'm here tonight representing the mountaineers. I've been told, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that this is an appropriate time for groups such as mine to tell you what we feel in our opinion some of your priorities ought to be. Is that essentially right? OK. The mountaineers are the oldest and one of the largest conservation organizations in Washington state, with over 15,000 members statewide. Over 75% of our members support the goals of our conservation on whose behalf I am here testifying tonight. As an environmental group we are intensely interested in the welfare of the wildlife resources of this state, and the preservation of the quality of the habitat in which it dwells. This is particularly true in areas of unique and still relatively untouched quality such as that characterizing the Hanford reach. Our goals include the preservation and restoration of natural streams and rivers and the protection of endangered species. The reach already enjoys designations of an environmental research park, areas of critical environmental concern, ??? by recreation areas and a national wildlife refuge, and is a candidate for designation as an expanding national wildlife refuge and for wild and scenic rivers status. I'm here tonight to urge the three parties of the Tri-Party Agreement to make the preservation of the quality of the Hanford reach a top priority. To do this it is absolutely

MAY 12, 1994

essential that the three parties ensure that the vast amounts of toxic ground water and ??? underneath the Hanford site be contained and prevented from reaching into the river, and that the enormous quantities of effluent discharge ??? the site itself and into the Columbia be properly treated prior to discharge. Otherwise the long-term risks posed to this spectacular fish and wildlife resources in this region will be ??? over a long period of time. Of the ??? of quality of these wildlife resources there is little doubt. The Hanford reach is home to 40 plant and animal species that are designated ??? on state and or national endangered lists. 184 species of birds, including 23 species of waterfowl, along with 36 mammal, 9 reptile, and 4 amphibian species. It also is the site for the bald eagle and ??? The only remaining native spawning beds for salmon on the main stem of the Columbia is also in the Hanford reach. The reach is home to Columbia's last great natural salmon run, the ???, which thrives in this critical spawning area whose ??? is important as such that it has been recognized in international treaty. It is also home to fine spawning habitat for steelhead, sturgeon, and ??? salmon, and an important migration corridor for steelhead, coho, sockeye, and spring and summer Chinook. These ??? fish share the Hanford eco system with nearly 40 other native and introduce fish species including mountain white fish. It is possibly the only significant white sturgeon spawning habitat remaining in the entire stem of the Columbia River. It is also home to Washington state's species of special concern, including mountain sucker, ???. The reach has also, as has been mentioned earlier by Gerry, the largest free flowing stretch of the Columbia between the Canadian border and the Bonneville dam. It also has one of the largest remaining areas of intact ??? habitat in the state. The wide range of future missions for the site is possible in the future including expanded energy production, research and development, etc. In light of these possibilities and if these magnificent qualities are to be protected, preserved, and enhanced, it is absolutely critical that all three parties to this agreement give them the highest priority and implement appropriate policy such as the containment and pretreatment of

9600-2825146

MAY 12, 1994

the huge quantities of lethal waste already on or under the site and to be produced in the future. Thank you very much.

9413287.0197

NV: So we're going to go in to small groups. I want to ask first, each small group will have at least one representative of one of the three agencies there to help facilitate and be a resource person. Can those persons who are from the agencies raise their hands so I can see how you are distributed around the tables? OK, so John, would you be willing to come up to. OK, sorry. So we need an agency representative up here. And then would those of you where there's only one or two people at a table, move to another table so there's 10 people or so at a table? Let's join the others so we can get full tables of discussion. And then before you start discussing, I need to tell you a couple of more things. OK, is this a not full table? We have three or four places up here in front. Raise your hand if there is still a place for someone at a table. OK. All right. So now, would each table please begin by having the agency person identify him or herself? And I'd like the agency person to serve as a facilitator. This means that the agency person will make sure that no one person dominates, including the agency person. OK? Introduce yourselves to each other. Pick someone who is willing to take some notes. That person is going to have the responsibility of choosing three things that you want to report back. Not the whole list. Three things. Let's get going and I'll let you know when you have five minutes to go. I hope it's clear to everyone here that the topic here is environmental restoration, not all the other things. The topic of this small group should be environmental restoration reprogramming--the values and principles that should take place in that.

(BREAK)

Get your reporter to report out. What are the most important three things you want your reporter to share with the whole group. Are you all ready to share your three things with the full group? Can I get your attention back to the front please?

MAY 12, 1994

It's time to stop this conversation. And, if the reporters could queue at these three mikes. Each group has something that it's going to report out, right? Hello, it's time for one person to be talking, and that one person is me. Let's get the reporters to queue up. Could we get everyone's attention at the middle mike.

NV: We have 3.5 items. The first one is focusing all along the river meet state EPA standards for exposure risks calculating the risk on a worst case scenario that uses real downwinders, the people who would be impacted. That's one. Two, look at a variety of technology options, even if they're high cost. Three, is be open with us. Don't be afraid to tell us if you have difficult problems and keep making documents available, because we're having trouble getting them. And the half is, you have good values and plans laid out, now follow through and put the dollars behind it.

NV: Could I ask each of the reporters, too, if you could take a minute after and write these up the way you said. We're taking notes as fast as we can, but we don't want to miss it. This is important. It's being recorded but it's been requested that we get a quick report out of these things. It takes longer to transcribe all the meetings. It will be fully transcribed, but after the report. Over here.

NV: Item one is more budget clarification next year, i.e., let's identify the factors for inflation and the increased scope of the programs. Item two, reprogram all savings to environmental restoration. Item three, more carrots than sticks will be forthcoming.

NV: All right. One was already said by somebody. And the second was, more funding going towards research and development for ??? and things like that have not yet been found. And the other one is being responsible upstream neighbors. Everything that Hanford does, they must realize affects all downstream communities.

MAY 12, 1994

6610.282146

NV: Our first one was, I guess, kind of echoing everybody else. Just general fiscal accountability concerns, where is the money going, and what are the prioritization apparatus that are sending the money to those places. Our second one was concern over the technology development fund and the technology development activities. Some folks at our table feel that ??? one of the polluters, has a strangle hold on all of the technology development work. And it doesn't seem that some of the private people out in the commercial arena who could do the work better and a lot cheaper, given much of a chance to move into that procurement process. Our third one was, concerns for the tri-city economy are taking a precedence over real cleanup of the site. Much too much focus is on keeping jobs in the tri-cities rather than fixing the site. And our last little .5 would be that the presentation, Doug you did a great job, but it was a lot of information to absorb really quickly, and it would be great if some kind of abbreviated stuff could go out to the Hanford mailing list prior to these meetings.

NV: We apologize for not having that available. If you will get with one of us before tonight's over with your address, or if it's out there already, go put an asterisk by it and say that you'd like a copy of the view graphs and we will send them to you.

NV: I think the point being made is that we'd like them in advance?

NV: I apologize.

NV: Understanding the difficulties with mailing the schedules.

NV: So brief summaries, maybe not even full presentations to the Hanford mailing lists, in advance. Great.

NV: Sherwood is an honest man. And there's an honest man over here. And the man from Westinghouse, they did answer very well. The bureaucratic clout trap gets in the way sometimes, and that's

MAY 12, 1994

not personal. The group had three major concerns. It really deals with, the Hanford site is the major problem in the United States, let's keep an awareness of that. The protecting the river is the major point of reference, but it does not isolate out ER or the site waste management. Those have to work together, so the suggestion is, the three major parties sit down and say, this is priority one, two, and three, and this is where it has to come in and this is where we work together. There's isolation out with the Health Department does the radioactive. There's the major criticism is the fragmentation at the site of the different groups responsible for different things. And they're not sitting down and saying DOE, get off your duff, you are no longer the major player, you've got to work with everyone's that's involved. And the EPA is willing and Westinghouse ??? problems. The budgeting problem is being represented by this woman. She's much more expert at speaking to it from a ...

NV: The budgeting issue is what Sidney brought up earlier. There, is first of all, if you can't be clear about the dollars it's very hard to trust an agency to be clear about all of the contaminates and the radioactive particles. These contracts have to be arm-length contracts. There should be something like the states of Wisconsin and of Oregon do in their green and blue book that is done annually that clarifies the whole organization, where the money's going, so that all the agencies know, the public knows. There isn't just a bunch of papers that you receive that, one of the problems that we have had, is that the government has been using many many different accounting processes. It isn't clear to me what accounting process we're using for the dollars. That's why I have repeatedly requested the IAEA standards-- International Atomic Energy Agency--which is what Glen Seaborge said should be an oversight agency that is not profiting from contracts. It's an arms-length management and gauge and an oversight that doesn't profit. As long as you write contracts with Westinghouse and General Electric making more money the more they foul up, we are not going to clean up. And that's why we

MAY 12, 1994

have to have clear contracting, arms-length contracts, with an oversight that is not making money on disasters.

NV: Conclusion, then was, the Congressional request for budgets, legitimate as it may be is delaying a very important issue. We've got to clean the place up. So these suggestions are practical and also the ??? you can get together. And the studies are there already.

NV: OK, thank you.

9413287.0281  
NV: Our group was more, we were doing more fact finding and sharing of information. But three things that came up were that clearly there needs to be a better definition of what the priority of the program was and what is the priority of the program in terms of refocusing, bridging what the two differences are. The second item was, how do we go about doing all of our coordination within the ER program with so many groups doing work, with the ground water, how do we coordinate our efforts with waste management and other activities, and how do we get that work done in a unifying fashion. The third item was, it sounds like the priorities of activities from the public is consistent, and that we should continue to do work from the river towards the center of the site.

NV: OK, that's the last one I think. Once again, I ought to say to everyone, there was a question. This entire, all of the presentations that are being made, is being recorded and all the public comments, and they will be transcribed. It takes a while to do that, so we've been asked to turn around a quick summary of each of the meetings. And it would be real helpful to our note taker, which is Vickie, if each of you who reported would write out what your report was so that we're sure we got it right in this summary of the meetings that we send around. OK.

NV: Are full copies of this entire meeting going to be available to us?

MAY 12, 1994

NV: Sure, sure. Did you sign there? They don't usually automatically disseminate because some people say why are you flooding us with paper. So I'd say, if you want a full report, you ought to go to the sign in list and say send me a report, and DOE will get that handled, or EPA, DOE I'm assuming. So let's go to the public comment portion of the meeting. I'm assuming that there are some people who would like to make public comments. I'd like you to queue at the mikes just like you've been doing, and identify yourself if you're speaking officially for an organization, say what that is. And I'm not going to be running a stop watch on everyone because that makes everyone unhappy. But do be mindful of the time and other people's need to talk too.

NV: I'm Page Knight, and I'm the Chairperson of Hanford Watch down in Portland, Vancouver area. I'm also a member of the Hanford Advisory Board. In reference to the question that was raised by ??? tonight on the 315 milestones that were equated at being 99.9% of the milestones being met at Hanford in the last year-- one of the things that I'm noticing across the board wherever I go is that a lot of the problems that we, that the DOE and the public, have with each other is that the semantics, the words, the language that are being used. I would like to say this. And I have said it before, and I'm going to continue to say it until I see some changes really happen, that I would like the tri-parties to be careful of the words they use, like complete, completed milestones when we're only talking about changed milestones. I also would like to request that when somebody who is sent by the agencies cannot answer all of the questions, I think that it puts them in a very difficult position because we get very angry and very irritated and once again become very distrustful. And I would like you real people to come to these meetings, and I know that it will take a lot of time out of important work. But we're not going to get anywhere until that happens. I think that it's a real waste of our time, and it's a real drain on the energy of some of the people who sit up here to take the brunt of our anger. To have it work that way. So I

MAY 12, 1994

want the real people at these meetings. I've said that before, and I'm going to continue to say that. And then I would also like to put out a challenge tonight to the DOE in particular. And that challenge is that the DOE take no legal action, such as resolution processes, or defenses against citizens who sue them because they are not meeting requirements. I would like no more legal actions along these lines to be taken by the DOE in the next year. That's the first challenge. The next challenge will be the next year and the next year. I'm basing this on the fact that in 1993 the DOE Hanford office, Richland office, spent \$47 million of your tax money and my tax money defending themselves against such law suits. Thank you.

9413287.0203  
NY:

Anybody else want to talk? It would be helpful if you use this mike that's OK just jump up. And if you want to use the floor mike queue up there. My name's Todd Martin, and I'm a staff researcher for the Hanford Education Action League. There's been a lot of concern aired tonight about budget, and about fiscal accountability. This is something that ??? been working on for a long time. And, like Gerry probably said, although I missed his presentation because I was late, I've heard it before. And he's right. What DOE needs to do is simply make their budget process more transparent. As taxpayers, we need to know what they plan to do, and how much they think it's going to cost. And once that is done, we need to know how long it took, and how much it actually did cost. Very simple information. The next item, environmental restoration, that we're dealing with tonight, I'd like to oversimplify that one as well if I could. And Doug's last slide shows the outcomes of ER refocusing. And the very first bullet is, you know, a 500% increase in the budget. And I'd like that slide to just show two bullets, essentially the first one shows a fivefold increase in budget, and the second would be a fivefold increase in on-the-ground cleanup, or maybe at least a fivefold increase in on-the-ground cleanup. I think that's not unreasonable to ask for. The last thing I'd like to say is, I mean this has been a really long meeting, and I was really impressed with the turnout here tonight, and I'd like to

MAY 12, 1994

thank everyone who came. And although I'm not entirely happy with everything we saw on the screen tonight, I think all of you should know that all of these guys, particularly Doug, has had a very long day. And they deserve some recognition for that. Because he'd worked really hard today. He's gotten bashed from a lot of angles. And you all need to know that. He's working hard.

NV: Would you do me a favor? Would you invite anyone who wants to continue bashing us tomorrow to the Advisory Board Meeting?

NV: Absolutely. There's a Hanford Advisory Board Meeting which is an Advisory Board made up of ??? interest groups from environmental groups to local economic development people to local government officials that advises these three parties on the various cleanup activities. And they're meeting all day long at the ??? Hilton, and public comment will probably be around noon and around 4:00. It would be great if anybody wanted to stop by and see the proceedings and air their concerns.

NV: Who's next, anybody?

NV: My name's Fred Miller. I didn't mention that last time. I want to start off by taking an opposite stand with what Todd just said. I don't have a whole lot of sympathy who are getting very well paid and who aren't doing their job and who have to sit around and listen to me tell them that they're wasting my money. If you don't want to spend very long hard days getting bashed by the public, start doing a good job, and then you can spend long hard days getting patted on the back by the public. The slides that I saw here tonight, even at the machine gun rate, they were going up and coming down, were the same old DOE stuff. Did anybody notice the picture that Steve Wisnoos called a typical single-shell tank? It looked beautiful. It looked like a centerpiece that you would put on your table. There was no leakage, there was no plume of deadly garbage falling out the bottom of it, it wasn't about to fall in because it's rusting to

MAY 12, 1994

pieces. There was no background of well-paid bureaucrats who'd been sitting on their butts not replacing it for generations. When the DOE starts admitting how bad things are at Hanford, instead of saying, yeah, it's a bad problem but everything's under control, look at this picture of the typical tank. Then Americans will be very very scared. And for a while they'll be bashing you 10 times as hard, and perhaps throwing a few of you in jail and certainly throwing quite a few of you into the unemployment lines, and then we'll see a little bit of cleanup happening. We'll see the attitude at Hanford of--who really cares, I'm going to get paid anyway, they can't fire me--start changing. The K Basin that you mentioned earlier, the phrase I heard was, in the case of an earthquake there could be more leakage of water. What that means is that it's already leaking. And what's in that water is high-level nuclear waste that's been washing out of those fuel rods that are rotting apart. And that basin was built, was it 40 years ago, and was designed to last 20 years? It's more than high time that the DOE got real serious about replacing it, and put into its budget the replacement cost of that, particularly since when you're talking about in another flyer from the DOE about the Purex and UO3 plant deactivation, it says that there's an inventory of spend fuel rods in those plants that's going to be put into this leaking, rotting, worthless shell. The cleanup isn't happening, and yet we keep on hearing people say that it's happening. I want those people to be attacked by the citizens, and I want them to have a much harder time than they do now, and I want to go out and have to find a new job. When the DOE starts really taking this kind of very serious steps in the Hanford cleanup, then we'll see things happen. Last year we had a lot of publicity around some workers who were dropping rocks into high-level nuclear waste tanks. And three people were fired. The three lowest people involved. The Vice-President in charge for Westinghouse Hanford in charge of those tank ??? should have been fired because he publicly said that they were going to spend a whole lot of money, my money, they were going to do a major overhaul of their training program less than a year before that. If bureaucrats make promises that

943287 0205

MAY 12, 1994

they don't keep, then get rid of them. Recently, there was a news report upon the occasion of the exit interview with the DOE historian of George Bush's Assistant Secretary of Energy, he came right out and said, and he deserves a small pat on the back for saying it on the very last day of his employment, that the Department of Energy had signed the cleanup agreements, including the Hanford Tri-Party Agreement, with no intention to comply with them, that their only intention was to basically keep the people happy out in the sticks so that they can go on building more bombs. So far I haven't heard anything from the Department of Energy that lets me know that that attitude has changed. I haven't seen anybody suffer as a consequence of that even though almost the entire of the Hanford/DOE bureaucracy is the same people. You were all ??? in the deception that that Former Assistant Secretary of Energy reported. I haven't heard anyone say that he was inaccurate on that the last day of employment. Why hasn't the Department of Energy started to go after the people who have been creating and promulgating this deception. And on the other hand, that the carrot side of the carrot stick equation, Hanford's heroes are the whistle blowers. They have suffered extraordinary punishment, often illegal, because of what they did. They need very publicly to be rewarded, very significantly. And it needs to be very clear that anybody who's still working out there who blows the whistle will not be persecuted, and will be rewarded, and it will make a big difference in their career. When that happens, then I'll start to feel like I'm getting real information from the Department of Energy and from the contractors. Until then, all the presentations in the world don't mean much to me...

END OF TAPE ONE, SIDE 3

SIDE 4 - SIDE B

NV: Until then all the presentations in the world don't mean much to me because I know I can't go and find out if you're facts are really true because you classify them. Because you do everything you can to conceal the source data. Thank you.

NV: Please bear with me. I'm another one of those dragging people here. I'm Cindy DeBruler. I live down the Columbia River with a group called Columbia River United who works on the Hanford advisory board as well as the citizen task forces to make sure that the river is sufficiently represented in interests. I have just a few points. First thing, I missed the very beginning of the meeting and I don't know if there were any problems discussed at that starting point but what I did hear was that again we are reaffirming that progress is continuing and to me I would rather hear about the problems that are going on it just strikes more truthful. I have made this comment time and time again. I know that Triangle Associates who facilitating this meeting has made this comment and yet it still feels that way to me. That we're being assured that it's okay and things are under control at Hanford and maybe if people were saying you should be concerned and we do have some problems and these are our biggest problems. That type of an attitude would ring more true with the public. Secondly, the presentations tonight. I know that everybody was really tired and I really appreciate the hard work and I agree that we do have some honest men here at the table tonight working hard for us. But the information that was presented was not digestible. Sometimes just a little too boring and long and monotonous and just if you could shorten it and make it a little more relevant to the people out there. Again I think it would be more helpful and you would get more feedback. Again I agree with what Todd said the budget process for example could be made more transparent so it's not just a bunch of numbers. They're up and then they are gone. I couldn't take in that information. If you could just express what you plan to do and how much it will cost. The diagrams are very helpful and the pie charts that sort of things. Again look at the way it is presented to the public. The process. Doug's presentation on ER and what's going on. The program is great. I think it would help the public to be involved if we could find out how we got here and this was the question I raised today. It really wasn't answered at the Hanford Advisory Board meeting. Where are the values and the priorities that have determined the program that we have got now? Where did they come from? What are they? We can't put new values on until we have some sense of the process of how we got to where we are and what went wrong along the way so that how can we fix it. Finally, I think it would be helpful if we had a sense of what changes the regulators, the agencies would like to see in the ER program because the whole refocussing idea going on here. We're reaching out. We're

MAY 12, 1994

going to refocus. We're going to change our priorities. I feel like they have more information there on what should be changed and how to go about it but for some reason we are not hearing this yet. Like maybe it's a bomb that is going to hit later and then gee we didn't anticipate it or come up with values to counter it in advance. So oh well we had our chance. I hope I pray that I am wrong. That there is not information here that's already set down about changes that are going to be coming in the priorities and programs that aren't being laid out on the table from the beginning. So thanks. Good night.

NV: My name is Doug Wells. I work for the state Department of Health. I just want to make a small sales pitch. We just released a report on the Columbia River sediments and radio activity in them. Anyone who wants a copy please give me a call. My number is 206-586-3585 and I will send you a copy.

Thanks.

NV: What's your name?

DW: Doug Wells.

NV: I think I am almost too tired to hear the answer but the last meeting I went to like this. Excuse me, I'm Jim Trumbull, the MD with Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility. I was intrigued by contracts with government agencies. I guess we have 3, ecology, environmental protection agency, and DOE. So we have 3 tax peer support agencies who have a contract. In the last meeting I went to there was a lot of concern about the laissez-faire attitude by anyone of them. Let's say DOE on what teeth or in the Tri-Party Agreement. In other words, if they don't comply to a milestone or something else out of bad publicity and maybe a little pressure from Congress or the newspapers, I mean certainly a fine can't scare a tax supported agency. If DOE fouls up and really doesn't comply with a guideline the public expects, are people at the DOE going to lose their jobs? What kind of teeth do we have in the Tri-Party Agreement?

NV: Are you looking for an answer?

JT: I guess I'm not too tired for an answer. I don't expect you to because you didn't answer very well last time.

NV: So what you would like is some teeth in the agreement.

JT: I just want the people here to be concerned with what a contract means when you have tax supported agencies. Are you gonna fine them with our tax money or what? Congress gonna give more money to pay for fines?

NV: No answer needed then.

JT: Well if they have an answer, let us know sometime.

NV: We have the same provisions in the TPA as far as ??? in any way that we have in the private sector as far as capabilities ??? or to issue orders for certain ???

Either orders or penalties both.

JT: Do you pay any money from the state of Washington?

NV: Typically what we've done with the penalties that have been levied thus far, we don't have any interest in lining state coffers, we've taken those monies and turned them around to beneficial activities in the Hanford area that are not. So we're not putting it back into something they should be funding as far as clean up. It's something else.

JT: ???

NV: Go ahead.

JT: I'm glad Roger answered with the state's perspective because the state has a different legal position than the US Dept of Energy. I sure as hell would like to hear for the record if the US Dept of Energy is going to be responding positively to the number one comment from the ??? public hearings which was that the Tri-Party Agreement and ??? other environmental laws should be acknowledged as fully enforceable in court by the state or citizens at Hanford and is the Dept of Energy going to agree to adopt as its' policy or is it going to use Tri-Party Agreement as a shield which is its' current legal position.

9413287.0209

9413287.0209

MAY 12, 1994

NV: I think John Wagoner stated he feels that the Tri-Party Agreement is legal and enforceable. I think it's shown on at least on one occasion where we had missed a milestone and we were fined \$100,000 which we paid to the EPA.

JT: You paid EPA, not the state. The point is you're not answering the question, Steve. Let's start, make it simple. Will the Dept of Energy acknowledge that either the state or citizens can enforce, let's say, the clean water act or ??? for a non-Tri-Party Agreement milestone issue. When you violate it, like when someone decides not to report a leak from a high level nuclear waste tank which is a serious criminal violation are you going to agree that it is enforceable in court?

NV: I think our position was laid out in our response to comments. I think that should be fairly clear. You know our position is still the TPA is enforceable and other environmental laws are enforceable as well.

JT: Is your position that the TPA is only enforceable by citizens suits with no penalties. That is the position you've laid out in federal court so is that what you're saying? Do you not agree that RICRA ??? is enforceable if there is a leak from a high level nuclear waste tank which is not a Tri-Party Agreement milestone?

NV: I'm Jim Bauer with the Dept of Energy and I think the issue that Jerry is raising is an issue broader than Hanford. It is an issue broader than DOE. It's a United States government position and that issue is being litigated right now in court with Jerry and that's right. The comment from the side was with tax dollars for defense and that's true but the position is something that hasn't changed but it is not something that is entirely within the control of DOE or Hanford so it's an issue that keeps coming up and the answer is the same and I guess it will be until the courts rule differently.

JT: Well I would hope that it would be the same until the Dept of Energy decides to change its' policy which is fully within your ??? and for the record again you're not going to get any credibility from the public about your commitments if your rhetoric here is great Steve but when you know damn well that the legal position in black and white is that the RICRA portion of the TPA provisions are not enforceable and that other laws are not enforceable at Hanford. When that is your position you don't have...

NV: We have ??? on the RICRA side also.

JT: You don't have the credibility to say we're gonna comply with the TPA. You don't have the credibility to show that this is going to be a model clean up, if you cannot say we are going to be subject to the same compliance regime as every other super fund site and every other polluter in the United States and that's all.

NV: I just have one request. Back to the beginning and perhaps this could be the end too on page 2 of your site focus for fiscal year 1994. Your Hanford site goals for the fiscal year 1994 which Roger has confirmed are the same as last year's are to eliminate and manage the urgent risks and inherent threats in our system which I don't understand how that can be done when money is slated for all these other things. It might seem like a drop in the bucket to some people but you don't need new highways, you don't need these new office buildings, you don't need parking lots, you don't need new electrical systems, how can ??? manage at all if studies on fish, wildlife and humans are not even done properly. You haven't even done that. Nobody is even addressing that issue. To provide a safe workplace that is free from accidents, injuries and adverse health effects. Well we don't hear much about workers safety and if you can fish on the banks of the Columbia River nearby for two weeks and get a year's worth of gamma radiation how safe can it possibly be to work there. Especially when you're talking about a wide application of herbicides and other chemicals. You couldn't pay me to go to Hanford I don't think and visit the site but I've heard horror stories about workers safety and you admit the workers there have a different viewpoint on that. They're probably not told as much as they could be told and I know there are some workers should be wearing certain kinds of protective gear in certain areas and they're not. It's been seen. It's been witnessed and probably been photographed. The last thing is to establish a system that is in control managerially and financially. Well again, you need enough money, you need more money, that has to be allotted to the actual clean up. Forget parking lots and office buildings and all that stuff. You have to listen to these suggestions and stop widely reassuring us and actually due some refocussing, all this talk about refocussing, refocus the priorities and the budget and do it.

NV: Okay, looks like we are at the end of the meeting. Thank you all very much for coming and for giving the extra time that was needed to finish and if you want to go to Hood River or Portland or Pasco next week then we'll see you there.

NV: I would just like to tell everybody in the room that Cadillac ??? (he did not finish)