

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS – JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING
April 11, 2013
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1
Overview of the Budget Process..... 2
Budget Priorities Criteria 5
2014-2015 Budget Priorities/Criteria..... 8
2014 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report Draft Advice 11
Attachments 12
Attendees 13

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

Opening*

Jerry Peltier, Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) chair, welcomed everyone and introductions were made. BCC approved the March meeting summary. No additions or corrections were received on the distributed draft.

Announcements

Shelley Cimon said that many big groups come through Richland in August so hotel reservations should be made early for summer committee meetings. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, offered to send a reminder to the Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB).

Jerry noted that due to the delay in the Presidential Budget roll-out, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) will not be able to share the information that was expected to be available today. DOE must follow

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

the Tri-Party Agency (TPA) process and brief the regulators, tribes and the state of Oregon before sharing budget information with the Board. Jerry said the information delay makes advice development by June challenging, although the Board does understand the situation.

Kim Ballinger, DOE – Richland Operations Office (RL), said DOE is aware of the Board’s concerns and appreciates their understanding in DOE’s need to follow the TPA process. DOE will continue scheduling briefings on the budget as they are able. The public budget workshop is tentatively planned for the first week of May. DOE will provide more information as it becomes available.

Orientation to the 3 potential pieces of advice

Jerry said he calculated the budgets that will be available to DOE – Office of River Protection (ORP) and DOE-RL, although DOE has not yet confirmed these numbers. The two offices will be \$50 million short of the amount required to be in compliance. The question before the Board is how DOE can make the tough decisions on what actions should be funded and given priority with the reduced budget.

Jerry said he began to become frustrated with the entire budget process as the expected budget information in February was continually delayed. He wanted the Board to create a piece of advice based on broad generalizations of the budgeting process. This advice is not time sensitive and could be tabled if there is not time for full discussion. The Board is usually committed to offering some type of budget advice during the June or April Board meeting. The Board is also considering advice on the Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost (LSSC) Report. Both of these potential pieces of advice are on the agenda for discussion today. A potential third piece of advice could involve specific budget numbers for 2014.

The meeting today will focus on setting criteria for priority selection without assigning specific numbers or rankings to projects. The Board would like to recommend a framework and rational thought process that DOE can use to select priority work knowing that some projects will need to be delayed because of reduced funding.

Overview of the Budget Process*

Orientation to the budget process

Liz Mattson provided several handouts to help illustrate the Hanford Budget Process. The first handout is a guide to the Hanford Budget Process for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2013, 2014 and 2015 (Attachment 2). The second handout details the current status of the Hanford Budget Process (Attachment 3). DOE provided an update to the status handout with corrected numbers (Attachment 4) as well as a handout with a summary of the federal budget process and FY 2015 budget timeline (Attachment 5).

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Liz said she created these flowcharts and tables several years ago in order to better understand the budgeting process across the three years that are always under consideration. The President has recently presented the 2014 Federal Budget Proposal to Congress and Congress must now determine their next step. The continuing resolution for FY 2013 is based on FY 2012 spending levels. The resolution expired on March 27 when Congress moved to extend the funding levels through the end of FY 2013.

Liz said the local DOE offices ask for compliant budgets from DOE – Headquarters (HQ) who then requests that amount from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). OMB can reduce the budget request and the President can make further budget reductions.

Liz said the handouts illustrate a perfect scenario without any delays or complications in the budgeting process. Congress has a number of options once they receive the budget proposals and it can be confusing to know what actions Congress is taking. Liz added that the flowcharts present a high-level overview; the Board could look more closely at the budget process to see actions such as the expectation that in April DOE will speak with the Board about proposed budget numbers for the following FY and ask for their input before making the budget request to OMB.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

Q. When will DOE provide information to the Board about the 2014 budget and what work will be delayed because of budget reductions? The Board is expected to provide advice on the proposed 2015 budget but it is very challenging to offer informed advice when not all the necessary information is available.

R: (DOE) DOE will provide information on the 2014 President's budget as soon as it becomes available. The hope is that DOE can offer a public budget workshop in May, but this is still tentative.

C. From the discussion during the River and Plateau committee meeting (RAP) on Tuesday, it appears that the agencies would welcome any Board advice on budgeting or priorities.

C. The big issue for consideration today is that the Hanford Site will be \$600-800 million short of the required funding to meet TPA milestones. The actual numbers are less important than knowing the offices are approximately 30% under the needed funding levels. It is time for the Board to be proactive instead of waiting for DOE to announce what projects are going to be delayed.

C. The Board is not being informed about the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) because of re-baselining efforts being negotiated in court. The information will not be available until next year. Priorities identified by the committee should also be able to be applied to the re-baselining.

C. On April 25 at 1:00 p.m. there will be a webinar of the Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) with a key presentation and budget discussion. The Hanford Site receives a lot more funding than other EM sites. DOE will send an announcement to the Board with more information on how to participate in the webinar.

C. There is a backlog of funding that will keep adding to the LSSC Report. The LSSC Report must be adjusted every year to incorporate the work that was not completed previously because of lack of funding.

C. The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit is another driver for funding. The WTP is under RCRA and that is where the funding obligations are determined. The Board should not limit budget discussions to what is included in the TPA agreements.

C. The LSSC Report is adjusted every year and contains a completion date that is agreed to by DOE. The Board should consider the costs required to meet the level of cleanup progress that must be reached every year in order to reach milestones on time. There are numerous milestones DOE will not be able to reach because of the reduced budget.

Q. How much did American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding reset expectations for the Hanford budget? The Hanford Site generally receives \$2 billion annually. ARRA funding essentially doubled that amount.

R. ARRA funding seems to generally be thought of as a bonus. The ARRA funding really helped in reducing hotel and mortgage costs, such as security and maintenance. The expectation was for DOE to expend that money to the best of their ability, completing shovel-ready projects that were not necessarily based on risk or any factors other than what could be completed.

C. One consideration from the budget presentation is that there is a min-safe amount that cannot be reduced since it is required to maintain safety and security at the Hanford Site. That amount of money will not disappear.

C. There are TPA agreements that legally require a certain level of funding. These agreements are a big pull for Congress when determining the Hanford Site budget. DOE-HQ must submit a fully compliant budget request in accordance with the TPA agreement. DOE does not have authority over what Congress approves but DOE must act according to the TPA agreement.

C. The TPA agreement is a federal document with provisions that outline different options if the required funding is not available. If there is no funding or the technology isn't available then the obligations cannot be met.

Q. Does DOE only have an obligation under the TPA agreement to ask for funding required to meet the milestones? When inadequate funding is received every year, delayed projects and funding requirements begin stacking up. When would DOE hold a meeting if becomes apparent milestones cannot be met because of the budget? Are these issues addressed in the LSSC Report?

R. The local field offices submit the compliant budget request to DOE-HQ. Most of the budget reduction begins at OMB and that is what the Board should plan for. It would be helpful to have someone representing the Hanford Site at OMB.

C. When DOE becomes aware they are going to miss a TPA milestone, they are obligated to notify the agencies. It is possible to renegotiate milestones. In the event of a milestone renegotiation, there might be an opportunity for public comment.

The committee completed their high-level overview of the budget process, and moved onto discussion of developing criteria for budget priorities.

2014-2015 Budget Priorities Criteria*

Susan said there were substantive discussions regarding potential criteria for establishing budget priorities during the RAP and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meetings earlier in the week. The recommendation from both committees is for the Board to focus more on criteria in their budget advice rather than naming specific priority items. Susan provided handouts of flipcharts recorded during the budget discussions at the RAP (Attachment 6) and TWC (Attachment 7) meetings. Susan also handed out copies of the HAB Values White Paper (Attachment 8).

Susan proposed an approach to criteria development for the committee to consider (Attachment 9). She noted that the committee is working to develop criteria that will indicate the relative priority of cleanup actions when choices are driven by budget constraints. Criteria should be measurable and consistently applied, understandable, practice, and be either filter or discriminating criteria.

Summary of outcomes from RAP and TWC discussion on criteria

Jean Vanni summarized the criteria developed during the RAP meeting. She said RAP did not want to be site-specific but provided examples of sites for clarity. The criteria are meant for DOE to identify areas that RAP believe are important using high level criteria.

Becky Holland summarized the discussion during the TWC meeting. She said that conversation centered mainly on the tank farms and the committee agreed it is more important to perform work than continually conduct studies. TWC also talked about risks to workers and the importance of characterizing double-shell tank (DST) waste.

Committee discussion

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

C. DOE could be given a giant matrix of all these priorities and rate each one in comparison to the others. The alternatives would end up with a final score so that the project with the highest score would be the highest priority, even if that project does not receive the highest score in all categories. Projects will need to be ranked across a whole set of questions so weighting will become important.

C. There is a concern about what is not being captured. DOE is currently considering the option of sending some tanks to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). This waste has undergone a regulatory process to determine contents of the waste. Are funds being spent on finding a pathway to WIPP and what does this effort mean in terms of continuing tank retrieval? The tanks are not being dealt with.

C. Another consideration should be long-term risk reduction in comparison to potential short-term increased risk in operations. The risk profile could be examined to determine if some action creates a near-term risk that benefits in creating long-term results. The Board should consider how to express these types of trade-offs under discriminating criteria.

C. The number one priority for the Board has always been the removal of tank waste. The Board should continue to prioritize tank waste because that is still the biggest threat at the Hanford Site. Tanks will fail sometime before their expected remediation date. The Board should continue pressuring DOE to stay on schedule for tank waste.

R. The committee is generally in agreement on this point, although some committee members felt that while tank waste is a high priority, it may not be the highest priority at the Hanford Site. Cleanup of the Columbia River is also important as well as protecting worker safety. Criteria should be focused more broadly than only on tank waste.

R. Tank waste is the reasoning behind all the work at the Hanford Site; it is the reason for wanting to keep workers safe and for cleaning up the groundwater.

C. Board advice should use words like “defer” rather than simply saying the work won’t get done. The Board should focus on encouraging DOE to consider the Board’s criteria when making decisions on cleanup work since there are budget constraints that will limit the work that can be completed at this time without seeming to give permission for other work to be delayed indefinitely or stopped.

C. The Board should also remember that it is acting in the interest of the public, not necessarily in the individual interest of any Board member. Personal opinions should not be carried forward if they do not reflect public interest.

C. The advice can first include the global statement about remediating risk in the long term followed by some discussion of values and that those are of equal importance. Board values could provide the basis of

advice background and some could also form the basis of criteria. The values have also already gone through the consensus process so would be useful in advice.

The committee discussed their definition of the word “risk” (see attached flipchart notes). The committee thinks of risk in terms of harm to human health and the environment over the short and long term. Risk can also include the potential to harm. Risk to workers would be included under the “human health” consideration. The Board is referring more to this type of risk than program risk. Program risk includes threats to program completion and the actual ability to carry out a project. The committee discussed adding a footnote to the advice stating the Board is not considering programmatic risk.

The committee then discussed their definition of the term “cleanup” (see attached flipchart notes). Cleanup means regulatory compliance. “Clean” is well defined in the laws and regulations so the Board does not need to create further definitions. Cleanup also includes risk reduction, which is given as part of meeting cleanup standards and is implied without needing further explanation. The basic premise of cleanup is to remove contamination from the environment and to mitigate hazards. A cleanup effort can meet regulatory compliance, but not necessarily remove all the contaminants from the environment. Regulatory compliance represents the minimum risk reduction and minimum contaminant removal. Regulations can also change. The committee’s working definition of cleanup is regulatory compliance, reduction of risk, and removal of contaminants that mitigate hazards.

C. Since regulations can change, the compliance amounts for cleanup are not fixed numbers. A site that was determined to be clean may no longer meet that definition if regulations change.

R. The Five-Year Review process should identify sites that are no longer in compliance and would require further cleanup in the event of changes in regulations.

C. The tribes would also likely want additional cleanup beyond the regulatory compliance level. The tribes believe any cleanup should be to background levels of pre-Hanford Site operations, although the tribes realize that is not realistic. The Board has stated in the past that they are in support of tribal treaty rights. There would be more agreement among the Board to say that the Board supports “consideration of tribal treaty rights.” The Board will give more thought to the conversation about treaty rights as part of the cleanup definition during advice development.

R. [DOE] DOE works with the tribes at a government-to-government level. The Board may want to avoid speaking for the tribes because they have a separate relationship with DOE and are acknowledged differently.

Susan noted that criteria should not be too obscure and could be built into a matrix that would allow each criterion to be given a different weight. Final scores could then be determined for each project under consideration. Committee members divided into two groups to further refine the criteria developed during the TWC and RAP meetings. The groups were given 30 minutes. They then provided their points to Susan who compiled the criteria for the entire group to discuss.

2014-2015 Budget Priorities/Criteria (continued)*

Regulator perspective

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided his perspective on prioritization and the budget. Dennis said there are no hard budget numbers available yet. EPA's top priority is protecting the Columbia River by removing sources of contamination and establishing a robust groundwater treatment system. He said DOE has not completed work that was begun in many areas, such as in the 100-N Area where 170 wells were built but chemicals were not actually injected because funding ceased. New wells are not going to be installed in 200-UP until 2016 so the complete protection system is not in place. If wells are not installed until 2016, it will be 2018 or 2019 until treatment capacity is available. EPA would like wells to be drilled in 2014 to start putting protection in the 200 East Area. Groundwater is still a high priority. Dennis said he is concerned that the actions today seem to be a repeat of what was occurring in the early 1990's when a lot of money was invested in the groundwater systems and those efforts were then forgotten about for almost 15 years. Groundwater was put back on track because of efforts from the public and an act of Congress.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

C. Many of the overall budget priorities have been established for some time but the current budget outlook has led the Board to attempt to quantify the risks.

R. [EPA] EPA has established four major risk categories. The top risk for everyone working on DOE-RL is to complete the work on the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). The groundwater protection system is a top priority for EPA and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), although that work is not being funded. There is a lot of money being spent on K Basin. Work on the annex has stopped because it is not currently funded. DOE is working on the final remnants of soil cleanup, although this might not be a big priority item in terms of risk reduction. There is also cleanup along the Columbia River near the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds as well as the 324 Building. DOE is required to fund certain increments because of contract requirements. Additionally, Congress has established control points for funding. A DOE budget person would be better able to answer questions about funding in respect to the different control points.

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Q. Do the DOE offices have any authority to move funding? At one point, DOE-RL had the authority to shift \$5 million between control points. That amount of money could really make a difference for some projects.

C. The Board could write an advice point that DOE should be given greater authority over how funding is spread between control points.

R. There is a real hesitancy from DOE to ask Congress for that. DOE-HQ also has some flexibility on how money is distributed.

Q. Can EPA elaborate more on what is entailed with the 200 East Area groundwater study?

R. [EPA] The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) needs to be completed and then that information will be included in the Proposed Plan (PP). The characterization has been completed and the next step is to evaluate the technology and make a selection. The reports are scheduled to be complete by the end of 2015. It is important to decide on these critical groundwater decisions because there is at least a three year window to get into the budget cycle.

Q. Given the significant reduction in budget, are EPA and Ecology speaking with DOE about what work is going to be funded and prioritized?

R. [EPA] Part of that decision-making is decided under the TPA agreements. Milestones can traditionally be moved if there is a good cause. EPA is willing to push some of the work out but typically does not want to adjust TPA milestones because of funding issues. There will be some very difficult decisions to make in 2014 about what work will get funded. It is not likely the budget will be increased.

The committee reviewed the potential prioritization criteria developed by the small groups. They first reviewed the points that appeared to be duplicates and then further refined those points. There were a number of repetitive points that were deleted. One BCC member also wrote a preamble statement for the committee to consider. Some points were identified to be moved into the background of the advice.

Main points from the discussion include:

- The Board should identify criteria that actually help to make choices and how to differentiate between criteria. Weighting criteria is very helpful when there are a lot of criteria.
- Projects that are not on a critical path should be filtered out right away and not be considered.
- Short term risk should be prioritized when the budget is tight; future risks become less important.
- Some contaminants are more mobile than others. There could be two criteria – one that identifies if there are mobile contaminants and another that looks at which contaminants are more likely to move. The priority would be to address contaminants that are likely to move fast and would be more difficult to address at a later time. Concentration is important to consider as well.

- Geography is also important to consider. Some waste sites are in closer proximity to the Columbia River and pose a more immediate threat. These sites might score lower on other criteria. The 324 Building is an example.
- A number of the points could become overarching criteria that would fit in the background section. For example, projects should not divert resources away from cleanup and any project that does could be filtered out of consideration before going through the weighting criteria.
- Having infrastructure in place is important. TWC talked about this during their meeting using the example of 100 workers at Waste Management Area C with only one change trailer. DOE may think of infrastructure more as roads and water systems. The committee may want to better define this point.
- Risk to workers is different than protecting human health. Some risk to workers is expected as part of working at the Hanford Site but unnecessary risk should be avoided. Workers could also be used as an example when talking about protection of human health.
- All potential cleanup actions should be protective of human health and the environment. That should be basic filtering criteria. Additional criteria could then further determine which actions would be more protective than others.
- Determining which projects to complete is never as simple as drawing a line and cutting everything below that line. There are min-safe operations that must be met. Some projects cannot simply be deferred.
- The Board always needs to focus on policy level issues; not detailed implementation of any priority setting criteria. The Board expresses their values and then the agencies make decisions. Advice should not advocate for one project or another and should not get into a detailed analysis of priorities.
- Weighting the criteria could be an optional part of advice development. The Board could decide they are satisfied listing criteria that are all important for DOE to consider. The advice could lead to relative rankings.
- The first items in the draft criteria list are all general policy considerations with a few exceptions. The last points are more specific, discriminating factors. These first points could be written as a prelude discussing the importance of protecting the Columbia River and human health. The advice could list out these value points with a statement about how DOE should keep these things in mind and then the advice could move into the more specific criteria for further evaluating the potential cleanup options that already meet the filtering value criteria.
- The Board would not list out all the projects at the Hanford Site. The Board would advise DOE to use the evaluation criteria when a project is under consideration. Projects can be scored to help

determine priorities. The Board should consider what the desired results of the advice and the scoring would be. The ultimate goal is to use criteria for prioritizing cleanup work.

- Board input is only one piece of many decision criteria that DOE will use when deciding on cleanup projects. The Board should recognize that they are providing DOE with the Board's values for decision-making and potential ranking system. This advice would not be final decision criteria.
- This prioritization criteria is only the first step of a much more complex process. OMB has their own scoring process that the Board should be aware of and consider as a framework. The Board can discuss whether it agrees with OMB criteria or not. However, the Board should also not let OMB have too great an influence over potential advice. In order for the Board to provide meaningful advice to the agencies, it is important to also think about EPA, Ecology and the OMB scoring process.
- OMB is not aware of the details of where money would be spent at the Hanford Site. OMB would not fully understand the impacts of funding at a level of \$100 million instead of \$121 million. The local offices prioritize where money is spent and have conversations with OMB on funding decisions.
- The criteria should not exceed a half dozen points or perhaps ten points at most. The first points could be collapsed and included in the background.
- Achievability of projects is a major funding consideration. Money should not be expended on projects that people are not convinced can be completed.
- If transuranic (TRU) waste were removed from the Hanford Site, it would save \$20 million a year, but this work does not impact human health and would likely not score very highly on the priority list if DOE were to use the criteria being discussed today. The discriminating criteria should be looked at more carefully to capture some of these situations. Some of those criteria may not be necessary.

Jerry Peltier, Maynard Plahuta, Liz Mattson, Harold Heacock, Dick Smith, and Art Tackett will refine the criteria and develop a weighting process for the next draft of the advice. They requested holding at least two calls before the next committee meeting. The first call will be to further refine the criteria points and reduce those points to six or eight. The second call will focus on weighting the criteria.

2014 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report Draft Advice*

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Issue Manager introduction

Jerry provided a handout of the draft advice on the 2014 LSSC Report (Attachment 11). A handout with comments on the draft advice from Ken Niles was also provided (Attachment 12) as well as the State of Oregon's comments on the LSSC Report (Attachment 13). Jerry reviewed the general structure of the draft advice.

Agency perspective

Sharon Braswell, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), said that overall DOE felt the advice is well-developed. DOE would like to remind the Board that the LSSC Report is a TPA milestone so DOE cannot choose to suspend the 2014 report. The LSSC Report is a snapshot of the budget process with any impacts to scope and schedule changes. Anything that occurs after the end date of the report is not under consideration.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

The committee reviewed the draft advice on-screen and considered the changes suggested by Ken Niles. They agreed with Ken's suggested changes to the first two paragraphs of the draft advice but did not all agree to some of Ken's suggestions on sequestration. The committee worked to soften the wording on some of the advice points and deleted sentences or points that did not add to the advice.

The committee noted that there are many positive aspects of the LSSC Report. It is a useful tool for understanding small or obscure projects with estimated costs. The Report provides an understanding of DOE's current thinking. The Board might not agree with the cost and scope outlined in the Report, but the Board does agree with the schedule.

Jerry noted that there are additional points in Oregon's letter to DOE on the LSSC Report that might be worthwhile for the Board to incorporate or reference in the advice. Jerry will revise the draft advice before Tuesday and then Susan will send the next version of the draft advice prior to the 10:30 BCC call on Tuesday. The BCC/Joint Committee will also need to begin framing the agenda for the joint May meeting during a committee call.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Attachment 2: A Simple Guide to the Hanford Budget Process

Attachment 3: Where are we right now in the Hanford Budget Process?

Attachment 4: Where are we right now in the Hanford Budget Process? (Revised numbers)

Attachment 5: The Federal Budget Process Summary & Timeline
 Attachment 6: Transcribed Flipchart Notes – RAP Budget Discussion
 Attachment 7: Transcribed Flipchart Notes – TWC Budget Discussion
 Attachment 8: Hanford Advisory Board Values
 Attachment 9: Criteria Development
 Attachment 10: Superfund and You – The FS Evaluation Criteria
 Attachment 11: Draft HAB Advice on the 2014 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report
 Attachment 12: Draft HAB Advice on the 2014 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report with Ken Niles edits
 Attachment 13: Oregon Department of Energy 2013 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report
 Comment Letter to DOE

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Allyn Boldt	Steve Hudson	Mark Reavis
Shelley Cimon	Norma Jean Garmond	Becky Rubenstrunk (phone)
Laura Hanses	Mike Korenko	Dick Smith
Barbara Harper	Liz Mattson	Art Tackett
Harold Heacock	Jerry Peltier	Jean Vanni
Rebecca Holland	Maynard Plahuta	

Others

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL		Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
		Sharon Braswell, MSA
		Barb Wise, MSA