

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**  
**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
**BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE**  
*September 14, 2011*

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome, Introductions, Overview .....	1
Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report .....	2
Cleanup Budget Update .....	6
Review of next steps .....	7
Attendees .....	7

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

**Welcome, Introductions, Overview**

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest and Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and led a round of introductions.

Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, introduced Jessica Ruehrwein, EnviroIssues, who will be facilitating for the BCC while Cathy is away on maternity leave.

Gerry reviewed the meeting agenda and noted the schedule and importance of addressing the Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report now if the committee would like to bring forward advice for the November Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) meeting. He said comments are currently being accepted on the first version of the report until November 10, 2011, while the next version of the report will be issued by January 31, 2012. Comments on the 2012 report will be incorporated in the 2013 report. Gerry noted that the committee needs to consider short term advice for November, while advice on the 2012 report may be more in depth.

Cathy said EnviroIssues received formatting suggestions for the BCC August webinar meeting summary and asked for committee approval to shorten the webinar summary by attaching the presentation and only including the committee’s questions and answers. The committee agreed; EnviroIssues will incorporate the changes and the BCC will finalize the summary at its next meeting. Sharon Braswell, Mission Support Alliance (MSA), noted a name spelling mistake.

## **Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report**

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC and BCC vice-chair, said it was his understanding that the report is the Department of Energy's (DOE) decision planning document for terms of when, how much, and the extent of work, and that while the Board may comment on the report, it is not subject to the approval of the regulating agencies. Gerry said that the report does state DOE's decision but is a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestone and is therefore subject to approval from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He said the report will be used by the TPA agencies for state purposes and will inform if a project can be accelerated, impacts for deceleration, and reporting cleanup costs to Congress.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, noted that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has asked the Board to consider how the report should be used. Gerry noted that the background information for the report includes specific uses for the report as outlined by the TPA milestone, including providing bases for examining if projects can be accelerated and unconstrained budget scenarios. Gerry said the Board has long been interested in items that are not outlined in the TPA and how much the additional projects will cost and how long it will take to get to them.

Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters and HAB chair, clarified that the report is not a decision document, only a compilation of information. She noted that DOE has said any input to the report will be considered for the 2013 report and not any earlier, as the 2012 report is mostly complete. Sharon confirmed the timeline.

### *Issue Manager Framing*

Gerry asked how many BCC members have read the report, and members responded that most had read the report summary. Gerry noted that many people, including reporters and members of Congress, are reviewing the report which provides a figure of \$115 billion for total site cleanup. Gerry said the details of the report provide many scenarios for how that figure may change. Gerry stressed that the \$115 billion is based on capping of the discharge sites, which is something the Board and the public has advised against, and this is one major concern for the Board to comment on.

Gerry electronically reviewed a handout he authored that addresses areas of concern for the report. The handout comprises of comments made during the September Board meeting, and additional thoughts from Gerry's review of the report. Cathy will provide the handout to BCC members via email after the meeting. Gerry emphasized the following points:

- The \$115 billion does not include areas of concern for the Board, including waste retrieval from the burial grounds and contaminated soil sites, and further remediation along the River Corridor. The \$115 billion does not include a range of alternatives for waste sites and only focuses on capping. The report is supposed to include the upper and lower bounds of all reasonable alternatives.

- The report represents the cost of capping as \$800 million, but that cost does not include characterization of the tanks. The report also represents the full cost of waste retrieval for burial grounds as \$16.6 billion; Gerry believes this amount to be exponentially high.
- The report does not include alternatives for acceleration, which was a specific goal outlined in the TPA milestone. Gerry noted that the Board provided advice on this topic specifically stating that the report should accomplish this goal.
- The report does not demonstrate the interconnectivity of delaying projects or goals.
- Gerry observed that the report only compiles information that is already available, and the compiling should have been easier and quicker.
- The report makes assumptions based on DOE's land use plan for future uses, when EPA and the Board have advised that DOE use the full range of scope based on maximum exposure scenarios multiple times. EPA will not base cleanup decisions on DOE's land use plan.
- The report sites institutional controls (ICs) and their use in cleanup efforts. Gerry would recommend that more work than just ICs should be required for cleanup based on maximum exposure scenarios.

#### *Committee Discussion*

- Maynard Plahuta, Benton County, spoke to the use of Full Time Employee (FTE) statistics and their usefulness for local governments in out-year planning for roads, housing, schools, etc. Maynard said the report should include these statistics. Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, noted that currently, an FTE is determined as \$190,000 for all support and benefits for a fully-burdened employee. Gerry said the amount of FTEs needed for the K area is shown in the report. Maynard suggested that the report demonstrate how many FTEs are needed per year, as the data could imply a large number rather than the cost for each employee. Gerry would like to see FTEs represented by project.
- Harold noted some of the assumptions made in the report, including waste being shipped offsite with no reference to how much it will cost to actually ship the waste.
- Susan asked for clarification of the handout item that notes some national environmental impact statements (EISs) are missing from the report. Cathy said this topic was broached by Board member Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy, who said some of the national EISs may impact the findings of the report but that the report does not acknowledge them.

- Liz noted her concern about the report being used to influence decision making, even if it has been made clear that the report is not a decision document. Gerry agreed and said the report could lead to an inherent bias in decision making. He noted that if the dollar amounts provided in the report for burial grounds are represented in actual decision documents, Congress will choose to fund capping as it is a much lower number than the retrieval option, which is misrepresented as \$16.6 billion. Maynard said the report should include logical alternatives between the low and the high costs to provide a basis for how to use the report properly.
- Harold said he would like to see the report outline priorities for DOE and that the priorities should demonstrate what can be expected with current funding projections.
- Gerry stressed that the cost projections do not include \$200 million for legally required remediation work along the River Corridor past the end of cleanup in 2015. He said that as presented, it appears that DOE does not believe they will be doing further remediation, but it is legally required work that has been stressed by the regulating agencies and the Board.
- Maynard said that as the report will be updated every year, the Board will need to see how the alternatives change year by year. As such, it will be important for the first report to lay a basis for good reporting in terms of various alternatives and the costs associated with them. Susan suggested that the range of alternatives be provided via a link in the report rather than adding to the length of the report with alternatives for every action. Gerry agreed and said the report can show a low and a high alternative with links to the mid-range alternatives. Gerry noted that the low cost alternatives should note all required action and referenced the burial ground capping alternative that did not include costs for characterization.
- Gerry said the report is written for someone with a higher-level understanding of Hanford, like Board members, and he hopes the report summary will be more useful in terms of not representing biases, like making it appear that waste retrieval is unaffordable. He said it will be a problem for DOE if they represent total cleanup as \$115 but then exceed it because of something that could have been foreseen in 2011.
- Gerry noted that information about supplemental treatment is in the report, but that he did not examine the assumptions, such as early startup of low activity waste (LAW). Cathy said DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) will provide more information in the 2012 report.
- The committee discussed the use of ICs for cleanup, and Susan noted that some substances on site have a short half-life and that in some cases, ICs can be useful depending on how they are applied.
- Gerry spoke more in depth about the cost figure for waste retrieval in the burial grounds. He said that most other figures in the report contain a standard amount for costs of

overhead and contingency, but that in the retrieval amount, contingency is accounted for twice. Using the same methodology as used for other figures, the cost for retrieval is closer to \$11.1 billion. Gerry also said that the figures are out of line with actual experience from cleanup of burial grounds along the River Corridor. He said that cost comparisons completed by economic students interning for Heart of America Northwest do not match the comparisons received from EPA in regards to burial ground retrieval in the River Corridor versus retrieval in the 100 Area. Gerry noted that the only cost itemized for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is for transportation, which is already included in the full WIPP cost.

- Gerry said that the high cost for waste retrieval of the burial grounds is because even though the tanks do not contain much transuranic (TRU) waste, they do contain 290,000 cubic meters of high-dose rate wastes, which have yet to be characterized and identified. He said the high cost for retrieval is based on the wastes being a high-risk category, yet DOE does not include characterization in their cost for capping. He said DOE should include the cost of characterization with capping, which they currently have represented as zero dollars.
- Gerry said that the report does feature good graphics for breakout cost elements in the appendixes. Melinda Brown, Ecology, agreed with Gerry and noted that the funds needed for maintenance and overhead is an important context to set because it is a large part of the budget.
- The committee discussed DOE's representation of who pays for site wide services. Melinda said the report shows more of a summary concerning what work is done by whom, but does not address what is included in site services. She said they show some project baseline summaries (PBS) where they are doing all of the work, and some where everyone has a share in the work and cost. Gerry said he would like to see breakouts of service costs for the future.
- Maynard said he believes the BCC needs explanations for why DOE did what they did in the report. He said the BCC should ask questions and receive answers in order to provide more informed advice. Gerry agreed and recommended that conversation should take place in October. He said the committee can provide the agencies with a list of key questions, and he hopes EPA and Ecology will take part in the conversation in order to address the use of land use scenarios; key items include burial ground retrieval, the River Corridor, and reasoning for assumptions made.
- Harold suggested that the committee members review the sections of the report that interest them and provide additional feedback to be considered during the October committee meeting. He said anyone wishing to make comment on the report would be welcome, and that each committee should ask a representative member to provide feedback and participate in the discussion. Gerry noted that it would be extremely beneficial for the TWC to review the report and provide feedback and comments on tank

waste issues. The committee agreed to consider advice for larger policy items to bring before the Board in November, and to develop more in depth advice after the new year. Sharon noted that the committee will have two and a half months to review the 2012 report, and that comments and advice will be due mid-April.

- Gerry suggested that the November Board meeting feature a more in depth presentation on the report before leading into the advice. He said it could be as simple as using ten of the charts from the report in order to demonstrate the big picture of the \$115 billion figure for total cleanup. Harold suggested holding a committee of the whole (COTW) to review the report, focus on the issues identified, and hold a dialogue to develop advice. Gerry noted that the Board will need to host a COTW for the Hanford Site-Wide Permit, and that funding is limited. Cathy said the idea can be brought before the Executive Issues Committee. Maynard suggested a two-successive day session for a COTW on the permit and the report.
- Maynard asked how the report was reviewed internally, and by what level of management. Sharon said that Matt McCormick, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), reviewed the report, and it was sent to DOE-Headquarters. Ron Skinnarland, Ecology, said that the deputy assistant manager and project directors from Ecology had a chance to review the report before it was published.
- Harold asked that the regulators speak to what they like and do not like about the report. Melinda Brown said Ecology is pleased with the report in terms of depth, but they still want to know more. She said they will provide comment, but like the Board are concerned that comments for the 2011 and 2012 reports will not appear until the 2013 report.

## **Cleanup Budget Update**

### *Issue Manager Framing*

Gerry reviewed the handout he developed on the Senate Energy and Water Appropriation FY 2012 with Comparisons to House and FY 2011 and noted that the handout is important to understanding the big cleanup picture. He said the House Appropriations Committee is being extremely generous with funding for Hanford, especially DOE-RL. Gerry said the Senate figure would give an increase of \$20 million on top of the budget request to remediation for the Central Plateau, including retrieval and treatment. He said it is ironic to see cutbacks in retrieval and treatment even though both the House and the Senate have directed to exceed the Senate dollar amount.

Gerry referenced the his second handout on the Defense Environmental Cleanup and said it is important to note that the House and Senate are likely to give DOE-RL full authority to move money between any PBS on the Hanford Site. Melinda emphasized that the control points have been changed to the project office level.

Gerry reviewed the dollar figures provided for DOE-ORP, noting that tank retrieval does not do very well funding wise, but that it does better in the Senate.

*Committee Discussion*

- Laura Hanses, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees, asked why there are so many layoffs on site when the appropriations seem to be adequate. Gerry said it is hard to understand why 1,200 people are being laid off, as even with the appropriations from the House, the layoffs should not be so high. He said the committee needs to be asking those questions of DOE.

**Review of next steps**

Cathy said an issue manager call will be scheduled with the agencies in order for them to prepare for the October committee meeting to address questions from the report. She will compile the comments on the Lifecycle Report and provide them to the committee.

*Handouts*

Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report Issues for HAB Consideration  
 Defense Environmental Cleanup  
 Senate Energy and Water Appropriation FY2012 with Comparisons to House and FY2011

**Attendees**

Board Members and Alternates

Earl Fordham	Liz Mattson	Keith Smith
Harold Heacock	Maynard Plahuta	Laura Hanses
Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollet	

Others

Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Michele Gerber, URS	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Jessica Ruehrwein, EnviroIssues
Melinda Brown, Ecology	Shannon Crum, public	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues