



Hanford Advisory Board

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

(FISCAL YEAR 2017 AND 2018 HANFORD BUDGET PRIORITIES)

March 16, 2016

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	1
Hanford Contracts Changes	2
Hanford Cleanup Budget Priorities Overview	5
Hanford Cleanup Budget Priorities Advice Development.....	10
Committee Business.....	12
Attachments	13
Attendees	14

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

Opening

Steve Hudson, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) chair, welcomed Board members and introductions were made. Steve highlighted that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss topics associated with upcoming U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Hanford Site contract acquisitions and Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 and FY 2018 budget priorities. Steve recognized that the crosscutting nature of the meeting’s topics compelled a Committee of the Whole (COTW) format.

Hanford Contracts Changes

Introduction

Jerry Peltier, Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) chair, thanked HAB members for attending the day's meeting. Jerry highlighted the importance of upcoming changes to several large DOE Hanford Site contracts, and he was hopeful that the briefing would provide Board members with additional information about when and how the HAB could provide useful input on upcoming contract specifications. Jerry noted that this has been a topic that the Board has tracked closely throughout the past 20 years, and he recognized that many Board members expressed interest in learning about the newly formed Office of Hanford Acquisitions (OHA) and the role that the office would play in drafting upcoming Requests for Proposals (RFP) and contracts.

Agency Presentation

Karen Flynn, U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and director of OHA, and Ellen Mattlin, U.S. Department of Energy—Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), provided Board members with an overview of Hanford acquisition planning. Key points from Karen and Ellen's presentation¹ included:

- DOE-RL created the OHA in May 2015 to begin planning for upcoming contract expirations and contractor transitions. OHA is a joint office that covers upcoming DOE-RL and DOE-ORP acquisitions. DOE-RL begin planning for upcoming acquisitions early, since so many of the Hanford Site's largest contracts are set to expire between 2016—2019. Many of the Site's smaller contracts, including services such as laundry, janitorial, and badging support, will expire between 2018-2021.
- Early efforts by OHA included identifying staff from both DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to assist in acquisition planning, locating space to house OHA operations, and conducting reviews of other federal acquisition processes. OHA staff also began defining the work scope for future acquisitions by using tools such as the DOE-RL 2016-2028 Vision.
- OHA plans to create a Master Acquisition Plan that encompasses the needs of both DOE-RL and DOE-ORP in the coming years. This plan will be reviewed by both DOE-Headquarter (HQ) and the U.S. Department of Energy—Office of Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center.
- In 2015, OHA staff met with external parties such as regulators, members of the community, labor groups, and HAB leadership in order to gather input for DOE to consider as acquisition strategies were developed.
- OHA staff is meeting with members of industry and soliciting input on the potential scope and structure of upcoming contracts. Using questionnaires and Industry Exchange Days, OHA plans to research strategies for minimizing barriers to competition, evaluate small business capabilities,

Attachment 1: Hanford Acquisition Planning (OHA presentation)

identify potential risks, identify contract alternatives, and set appropriate contract terms and conditions.

- Following site visits and one-on-one discussions with companies during Industry Exchange Days, each interested company submits an approximately 20-page Capability Statement that provides DOE with information, thoughts on innovation, and concerns.
- DOE-RL held an Industry Exchange Day and industry site visits in October 2015; DOE-ORP plans to hold an Industry Exchange Day and industry site visits in March 2016.
- An Industry Exchange Day for occupational medicine contractors is planned for March 2016 to provide OHA with additional information from interested companies.
- The Board will have opportunities to provide OHA with input at several points in the acquisition planning process. OHA anticipates that the draft Master Acquisition Plan will be released in either May or June 2016. Following the release of the final Master Acquisition Plan, OHA will use feedback gathered from community and industry members to construct a draft RFP in early calendar year 2017.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. What could the timeline for Board input on OHA acquisition planning look like in the coming year?

R. [OHA] The first opportunity is upcoming in approximately May-June 2016 when OHA releases the draft Master Acquisition Plan. This plan will help OHA answer big picture questions as to how contract work can be grouped and managed. DOE-HQ will then review the Master Acquisition Plan; OHA anticipates that this plan will likely be finalized in late fall or early winter 2016. In early calendar year 2017, OHA will likely have a draft RFP prepared that the Board could review.

Q. At what points in the process does OHA plan to solicit input from the workforce about lessons learned from both short-term work and long-term contracts? How often does DOE solicit this feedback?

R. [OHA] DOE collects information from federal workers, and DOE-RL and DOE-ORP also continually listen for concerns that arise from the contractor workforce. As comments come in, OHA staff evaluate the comments and use workforce feedback to determine what is most advantageous to the government, the Hanford Site, and the workforce moving forward.

Q. Is there a potential way that DOE could solicit suggestions from contractor staff on an ongoing basis?

R. [OHA] There are contractual mechanisms in place that DOE must be cognizant of when soliciting feedback from the contractor workforce. Subject matter experts manage DOE

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

contracts, and they are attuned to what strategies are working and what strategies are not. DOE engages these subject matter experts when developing updated contracts. OHA made the decision to not incorporate ongoing contractor workforce feedback into the acquisition strategy for specific reasons identified during the planning process. OHA will look into why this strategy was not used and identify these reasons for Board members.

Q. There are contractor needs that federal contract acquisition processes must incorporate (e.g. hiring a certain number of small businesses and women-owned businesses). Does DOE build these parameters into larger contracts and then parse them into sub-contracts from there?

R. [OHA] Federal contract requirements do stipulate that a certain percentage of contracts be awarded to small businesses and to other types of business enterprises, and OHA is working to meet and exceed these requirements. OHA plans to examine the Capability Statements and questionnaires received from small businesses to assess small business capabilities.

Q. Could early industry input in the acquisition process potentially build bias into RFPs that will unfairly benefit certain companies?

R. [OHA] OHA is working to keep the bidding process fair to all interested companies. Ideas solicited from industry may eventually make their way into contracts; however, all companies bidding on an RFP have the same opportunities.

Q. [Ecology] Contamination below the 324 Building is high-impact and close to the City of Richland. The current plan for remediating this contamination involves transitioning the work from Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) to CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC). How does DOE plan to manage this transition?

R. [OHA] Discussions for how to manage this transition are ongoing. Generally, contractor transitions are assumed to take between 90-120 days.

R. WCH is partially owned by CHPRC, so WCH crews that are familiar with River Corridor cleanup work may move to CHPRC and assist in 324 Building cleanup.

Q. What efficiencies is OHA providing in the acquisition process?

R. [OHA] Contract consistency is one of the primary efficiency measures that the joint OHA provides. Contract oversight staff may move around within DOE offices, and consistent language and clauses within Hanford Site contracts allow for better management.

Q. What options exist for re-bidding or extending existing contracts?

R. [OHA] Current contracts incorporate an initial timeframe along with additional option periods. Once option periods are exhausted, DOE offices have the option of creating a new RFP or proposing a contract extension to DOE-HQ.

Q. What happens when a contract award is protested?

R. [OHA] Awarded contracts may be protested, and this may delay implementation and transition timelines. OHA is looking into the potential for protested contracts and the potential for staggered contracts as staff construct the draft Master Acquisition Plan.

Q. What comments could Board advice on acquisition planning potentially incorporate?

C. Contractor transitions are always difficult to manage, and, functionally, they often take longer than DOE anticipates. The Board could provide input on the acquisition process that focuses on strategies and suggestions for making contractor transitions less costly and more efficient for workers.

C. The Board should consider the potential role that small businesses could play in upcoming Hanford Site work. Often, small businesses are unduly burdened by federal requirements for working on the Hanford Site. There is often a very high level of initial investment required.

C. [OHA] On the Master Acquisition plan, the Board could potentially provide OHA with feedback regarding the number of contracts that the Board would like to see, as well as any contract mechanisms that the Board believes are important.

Board members thanked Karen and Ellen for the briefing on ongoing and planned OHA work.

Following discussion, Board members identified that they were interested in providing comments on the OHA Master Acquisition Plan soon, with the goal of adopting advice at the June 2016 Board meeting that would provide comments to inform the creation of the plan. Members identified that they could potentially submit additional advice following the release of the draft Master Acquisition Plan, potentially in late 2016. In addition, Board members indicated interest in providing a third piece of advice on acquisition planning in anticipation of the release of a draft RFP.

Hanford Cleanup Budget Priorities Overview

DOE-ORP Budget Presentation

Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP, provided Board members with an update on DOE-ORP appropriations included in the FY 2017 President's Budget, as well as DOE-ORP's FY 2018 budget priorities. Delmar noted the following ideas in his presentation ³⁴:

- The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), signed by DOE, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), and the Consent Decree, signed by DOE and Ecology, are the primary regulatory cleanup drivers that inform DOE-ORP budget requests.
- High-level priorities for DOE-ORP in FY 2017 include:

Attachment 3: Office of River Protection FY 2017 President's Budget FY 2018 Estimated Requirements (DOE-ORP presentation)

Attachment 4: Office of River Protection FY 2017 Analytical Building Blocks

- Safe nuclear and base operations
- Construction of the Low-Activity Waste (LAW) Facility, the Balance of Facilities, and the Analytical Laboratory
- Continued development of Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW)
- Retrieval of tank wastes
- Resolution of technical issues at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) High-Level Waste (HLW) Facility and the Pretreatment Facility
- In the FY 2017 President’s Budget, the total amount appropriated to DOE-ORP is approximately \$1.5 billion. The increase of approximately \$85 billion from the FY 2016 appropriation will support the Low-Activity Waste Pretreatment Facility (LAWPS) and early WTP commissioning activities (*a detailed breakdown of appropriations for FY 2017 by Project Baseline Summary [PBS], including planned activities in FY 2017, is included in DOE-ORP’s presentation on slides seven through 12*).
- For FY 2018, DOE-ORP highlighted planned activities (*a detailed breakdown of these planned activities for FY 2018 by PBS is included in DOE-ORP’s presentation on slides 13 through 18*).

Delmar closed by noting that it was not yet clear as to how the recently issued amendment to the Consent Decree would influence upcoming DOE-ORP Budget priorities. Delmar stated that DOE-ORP and Ecology would likely examine the ruling independently in the coming months to determine next steps in the process.

DOE-RL Budget Presentation

Jon Peschong, DOE-RL, provided Board members with an updated breakdown of appropriations provided to DOE-RL in the FY 2017 President’s Budget, as well as DOE-RL’s FY 2018 budget priorities. Jon highlighted the following ideas in his briefing ⁵⁶:

- DOE-RL has many cleanup priorities, and many of them are interrelated. These include:
 - Maintaining safe, secure, and compliant operations
 - Demolishing the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) to slab-on-grade
 - Treating groundwater through pump-and-treat operations in the River Corridor and the Central Plateau
 - Moving sludge from K Basin to interim storage at T Plant

Attachment 5: Richland Operations Office FY 2017 President’s Budget FY 2018 Estimated Requirements (DOE-RL presentation)

Attachment 6: Richland Operations Office FY 2018 Analytical Building Blocks (Draft Pre-decisional)

- Preparing cesium and strontium stored in the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) for dry-cask storage
- Supporting the repackaging of transuranic waste containers for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
- Maintaining over 800 surplus nuclear facilities and Hanford Site infrastructure
- Several large contractor transitions are potentially happening in the coming years, the first being the transition of (WCH) to (CHPRC). DOE-RL is working with the OHA to plan for an efficient transition of work.
- Beginning in FY 2017, DOE-RL will collect funding for site-wide services into a single PBS (RL-0201) for purposes of clarity. Previously, funding for site-wide services was distributed amongst many PBS's. There is no change in the overall amount of funding requested for site-wide services. Site-wide services support day-to-day operations on site, and they include utilities, roads, information technology, security, and emergency services.
- In the FY 2017 President's Budget, DOE-RL appropriations total approximately \$800 million (*a detailed breakdown of planned accomplishments and allocated funds may be found within DOE-RL's presentation, slides nine through 26*).
- In FY 2018, DOE-RL anticipates that it will need approximately \$1.15 billion to accomplish all planned work (*a detailed breakdown of proposed work descriptions may be found within DOE-RL's presentation, slides nine through 26*).

Regulator Perspective

John Price, Ecology, noted that the State of Washington requires DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to request all needed funds to meet cleanup requirements stipulated within the TPA and the Consent Decree. John noted that Ecology cannot force DOE to spend more money than they are allocated by the U.S. Congress; therefore, Ecology focuses on ensuring the local DOE offices are requesting enough money to cover all required cleanup costs when their budget requests for out-years are sent to DOE-HQ.

John recognized that there may need to be budget changes made for both DOE-RL and DOE-ORP in FY 2017 and FY 2018 as planned work is adjusted due to TPA milestone updates (for DOE-RL) and Consent Decree amendments (for DOE-ORP).

John highlighted that Ecology is concerned about the remediation of the 324 Building, citing its proximity to the City of Richland and the magnitude of contamination in the soils beneath it. He stated that Ecology would like to see this cleaned up as soon as possible, and he noted that DOE-RL budgets appear to push commencement of remediation activities into FY 2017. John noted that Ecology is very interested in elevating the priority of this project.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. Transition from one contractor to another generally takes approximately one year at the Hanford Site, and there are many costs that are associated with the change. These costs should be factored into projected financial needs.

Q. What is the acquisition strategy for the contractor that will operate the WTP when it comes online? Is it safe to presume that the operator of the WTP will be the new tank farm contractor?

R. [DOE-ORP] Operations beyond Critical Decision Four of the LAW Facility will be made in the acquisition strategy that OHA is currently working to create. There should be no presumptions as to which contractor will operate WTP, as that decision is yet to be made.

Q. For many years, DOE-ORP told the Board that the tank farm contractor would also operate the WTP. Does DOE-ORP plan to wait until the HLW Facility is completed before identifying an operator?

R. [DOE-ORP] At this moment, the assumption that the tank farm contractor will also operate the WTP is not accurate. DOE-ORP will not necessarily wait for the HLW facility to be completed before identifying an operator for the entire WTP complex. Some of the WTP complex operations (e.g. DFLAW and potentially Direct-Feed High-Level Waste) may be incorporated into upcoming acquisition planning. However, during conversations with OHA staff, DOE-ORP identified that an operator for the overall WTP complex is not needed at this time. DOE-ORP will not require a separate operational entity until after the WTP Critical Decision Four. DOE-ORP would like to be assured that the WTP is appropriately functioning before turning the facility over to an operator.

C. Board members have been concerned about WTP operations for many years. The company operating the facility should have working knowledge of the WTP during acceptance test procedures and operational test procedures.

C. The recent ruling on the Consent Decree amended the agreement and updated several timelines.

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP needs to examine the recently released Consent Decree amendment and better understand what effects the changes have on the Office's funding profile. If Board members have perspectives on the ruling as it relates to FY 2018 budget requests, those ideas should be submitted to DOE-ORP as part of the HAB's upcoming budget advice.

R. [Ecology] Board comments may be attached to the FY 2018 budget requests that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP send to DOE-HQ.

Q. How does this update relate to funding in coming FYs and how does it relate to the System Plan?

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. [DOE-ORP] The System Plan is a technical document that covers the technical baseline for tank waste retrieval and treatment. The System Plan covers systems, components, and models for how fast the WTP can treat tank waste; it does not inform funding needs.

Q. The Hanford Site is not receiving adequate funding to complete needed cleanup projects such as the 324 Building, the 618-10 Burial Ground, the 618-11 Burial Ground and the removal of cesium and strontium capsules from WESF to dry-cask storage. DOE has not involved the Board in several recent decisions, such as the vertical expansion of the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF) by an additional 20-feet, the treatment of ERDF leachate at the 200 West Pump-and-Treat Facility, and the change in remediation strategy for 618-10 Vertical Pipe Units (VPU). The Board needs to be more apprised of cleanup decisions as they are made so that members can issue effective, appropriate budget advice.

Q. The DOE-RL presentation did not identify funding for the vertical expansion of ERDF. When is this expansion anticipated to occur?

R. [DOE-RL] The permit modification was approved by EPA. The expansion will save approximately \$30 million, and the work only entails removing four-feet of soil from above closed cells and refitting the liners.

Q. Does DOE-RL still anticipate that cesium and strontium from WESF will be moved into dry-cask storage by 2018?

R. [DOE-RL] The transition of cesium and strontium from WESF to dry-cask storage is a five-year effort that will cost approximately \$100-125 million. In the coming years, DOE-RL will work to procure casks and cask liners, and then clarify procedures for transferring capsules into the casks. The actual movement of the capsules into the casks would likely occur four to five years in the future.

C. The DOE-RL public budget presentation would be more clear if it also included the anticipated budget needs for FY 2018 on the table incorporated into slide five.

R. [DOE-RL] DOE-RL will examine the slide with our communication team and determine if these numbers could be incorporated into a future version.

Q. According to the DOE-RL budget presentation, the PBS for RL-0100, Richland Community and Regulatory Support, is decreasing by approximately \$5 million. How will this impact the HAB's funding?

R. [DOE-RL] In past years, DOE-RL consistently requested \$20 million for RL-0100, but actual appropriations were consistently \$15 million. Beginning in FY 2017, DOE-RL broke out several costs and incorporated them into other PBS lines. Board funding will remain stable into FY 2017.

C. Many HAB members are regional and they must travel in order to attend Board and committee meetings. This is difficult for the existing HAB budget to absorb, especially since the HAB budget has decreased by over 60% since the Board's inception. Many Board members serve entirely as volunteers, and HAB members have been working to cut costs wherever possible. Increased

funding from DOE would allow the Board to increase its effectiveness by engaging more members of the public and by holding regional Board meetings.

Q. What is the reason for the delay of work at the 324 Building? Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz noted that there was an outstanding need for novel robotic technologies; however, the Board believes that the DOE-RL was ready to begin work as soon as possible. Is there a technical delay?

R. [DOE-RL] Current plans to remediate the 324 Building call for sawing through the floor of the building and exhuming contaminated soils with robotic technology. The robotic technology exists; however, there is a lot of deliberation and preparation that is needed to appropriately specialize the robotics for specific needs of 324 Building remediation. DOE-RL can only manage a set number of highly technical remediation projects at any given time, and DOE-RL is working to decide how to best proceed with cleanup on the most efficient timeframe, taking into account needs throughout the Hanford Site.

Board members thanked the presenters for the depth and quality of information that they provided.

Hanford Cleanup Budget Priorities Advice Development

Introduction

Jerry Peltier provided Board members with a draft background for potential HAB advice on the FY 2017 President's Budget and FY 2018 Budget Priorities. Jerry encouraged Board members to discuss the following questions:

1. What was missing from DOE public budget presentations that your committee thinks should have been included?
2. What are some points that you think should be included in HAB FY 2017 and FY 2018 budget advice?

Through discussion in breakout groups, Board members identified the following ideas² to potentially include within budget advice:

- Fully fund at least six HAB meetings per year, including at least one regional Board meeting, to meet regional representation and HAB diversity requirements
- Provide future budget information to the HAB in a timely manner and in Analytical Building Block format
- Provide the public with a five-year budget projection

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

- Highlight how funding needs will shift due to a higher level of cleanup activity on-site (leading to increased pressure on site infrastructure and worker safety)
- Fund an analysis of climate change impacts on the Hanford Site (e.g. impacts of potentially increased precipitation on-site as it relates to Long-Term Stewardship)
- Fund an analysis of impacts associated with increased public access associated with the Manhattan Project National Historical Park
- Fully fund the movement of WESF cesium and strontium capsules into dry-cask storage by FY 2018 (adequate completion of the process by FY 2019)
- Fully fund the remediation of the 618-10 Burial Grounds, including the efficient movement of workers to the 618-11 Burial Grounds following completion of work
- Fully fund the remediation of contamination under the 324 Building (underscore that the HAB is disappointed in the decreased funding for the project in the FY 2017 President's Budget)
- Soil and groundwater remediation should be fully funded throughout the Hanford Site, but not at the expense of other cleanup projects
- Fully fund sludge removal from K West, and fully fund upgrades to T Plant that will allow the complex to accommodate sludge storage
- Fully fund all River Corridor Record of Decision work
- Request that DOE-RL highlight how shifting scopes of work are funded (e.g. vertical expansion efforts at ERDF) in budget information
- Fund a stability analysis of the Plutonium Uranium Extraction Plant Tunnels
- Fund the characterization of remaining contaminants at the PFP site after the facility is demolished to slab-on-grade
- Fully fund the remediation and characterization of all currently identified deep vadose zone contamination site-wide
- Fund the optimization of pump-and-treat systems to address all perched water and deep vadose zone contamination
- Restore funding for the additional 900 feet of the strontium barrier along the Columbia River
- Adequately fund and highlight upcoming contract transition needs and fund the efficient transfer of trained workers
- Fund the characterization of VPUs, Trenches, and uranium contamination at the SW-2 Burial Grounds

- Fund upgrades to Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Facility to maintain minimum safe operations
- Identify changes in budget needs based on recent outcomes of Consent Decree arbitration, including a potential review of the FY 2017 President's Budget
- Fully fund continued single-shell tank retrieval
- Fully fund the design of new tank storage capacity, incorporating an analysis of regulatory needs for potential new tank storage capacity
- Fully fund an early start to the LAW Facility
- Fully fund ongoing construction at the WTP, including the resolution of all technical issues
- Fully fund preparations associated with WTP startup beginning in FY 2018 for acceptance test procedures and operational test procedures
- Fully fund the study and implementation of tank vapor mitigation technologies that benefit worker safety
- Fully fund an update to the safety basis and the Safety Analysis Report

Board members noted that the advice should open by thanking DOE-RL and DOE-ORP for the detailed budget information that they provided to members of the public with at recent public budget workshops.

Issue managers volunteered to write and review draft HAB advice in preparation for the April 2016 Board meeting based on ideas presented by COTW members.

Cathy McCague, facilitator, noted that the advice would be sent out to Board members who attended the COTW meeting for review prior to the advice moving forward at the April Board meeting. She highlighted that all edits, comments, and changes to the draft advice should be directed through the HAB facilitation team to ensure that document versions were appropriately managed.

Committee Business

BCC Leadership Selection

BCC members reviewed the nominees for 2016-2017 BCC leadership positions and confirmed Jerry Peltier and Don Bouchey for the roles of committee chair and vice chair, respectively.

Changes in committee leadership for BCC would become effective in April 2016.

Closing Remarks

Steve thanked Board members for their attendance, thoughts, and discussion. The meeting was adjourned.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Hanford Acquisition Planning (OHA presentation)

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Attachment 3: Office of River Protection FY 2017 President's Budget FY 2018 Estimated Requirements (DOE-ORP presentation)

Attachment 4: Office of River Protection FY 2017 Analytical Building Blocks

Attachment 5: Richland Operations Office FY 2017 President's Budget FY 2018 Estimated Requirements (DOE-RL presentation)

Attachment 6: Richland Operations Office FY 2018 Analytical Building Blocks (Draft Pre-decisional)

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Don Bouchey	Becky Holland	Emily Peterson (phone)
Jan Catrell	Steve Hudson	Tom Rodgers
Shelley Cimon	Mike Korenko	Ed Revell
Shannon Cram (phone)	Pam Larsen	Bob Suyama
Sam Dechter	Susan Leckband	Gene Van Liew
Dirk Dunning (phone)	Liz Mattson (phone)	Jean Vanni (phone)
Tom Galioto	Kristen McNall (phone)	Helen Wheatley
Gary Garnant	Jerry Peltier	

Others:

Karen Flynn, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Jennifer Colborn MSA
Kris Holmes, DOR-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Jennifer Copeland, MSA
Jon Peschong, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, North Wind/DOE-ORP
Janice Ward, DOE-RL		Kelsey Shank, SN3
Joanne Grindstaff, DOE-ORP		Katherine Bittinger, WSU
Ellen Mattlin, DOE-ORP		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP		Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
		Julie Atwood, Public
		Daniel Leone (phone), Public