

## WELCOMING REMARKS AND CHARGE TO THE BOARD

John Wagoner  
Manager  
Richland Operations Office  
U.S. Department of Energy

-----  
Prepared for the occasion  
of the first meeting of the  
Hanford Advisory Board  
January 24-26, 1994  
Richland, Washington  
-----

Assistant Secretary Tom Grumbly...Mary Riveland...Gerald Emison...  
members of and alternates to the Hanford Advisory Board...distinguished  
guests...ladies and gentlemen:

I'm very pleased to welcome you here this morning. Convening the Hanford  
Advisory Board as my new and informal "Board of Directors" is an occasion to  
which I've looked forward with both enthusiasm and confidence.

I use the term "Board of Directors" advisedly. But it's an appropriate  
term because I need and expect high-quality advice from you on the major  
policy and strategic decisions I face.

My enthusiasm stems from knowledge that we all share -- knowledge that  
the advent of citizen advisory boards at Department of Energy sites is the  
hallmark of a remarkable evolution.

It's evolution marked by sustained and sophisticated public interest in  
the way the Department of Energy conducts its affairs. Today, citizens and  
organizations with legitimate stakes in Hanford cleanup insist on  
opportunities to influence our decisions with their informed advice.

That's as it should be.

It's evolution marked by a new Energy Secretary's candor and sensitivity  
for meaningful public involvement -- and her refreshing view that a  
centralized, overlord bureaucracy is not an acceptable way of doing the  
nation's energy business.

In Hazel O'Leary's curriculum, participatory democracy is not an  
elective course. It's required.

And that too is as it should be.

At the recent Hanford Summit, none of us mistook Mrs. O'Leary's meaning  
when she said:

- ◆ The public will have new access to the Energy Department's decision-making processes.
- ◆ The Department will seek informed advice from Tribes and the public on cleanup and environmental restoration, and
- ◆ The Department will publicly account for that way it deals with that advice.

To me, that has the ring of a new beginning.

I have great confidence in this Board's prospects for two reasons: One, many of you were involved in two landmark advisory efforts here at Hanford: the Future Site Uses Working Group and the more recent Tank Waste Task Force.

Those of you involved in one or both of those efforts helped each other and the rest of us overcome old stereotypes and presumptions. You demonstrated how diverse interests can come together by finding common values.

We still will not always agree. But by working together, we come to understand and be more tolerant of each other's values and points of view. As a result, the products and recommendations the Working Group and Task Force delivered will serve as models for effective public involvement in the future.

The second reason for my confidence in the stature and quality of all Board members and the breadth and diversity of the constituencies they represent.

I'm pleased to report to you that we have a short list of prospective Board chairpersons. Mary Riveland, Gerald Emison and I believe the position is extremely important to this Board's organizational phase and its formal entry into Hanford decision-making. I believe we also agree that we would be comfortable with any of the outstanding persons who comprise the short list. We hope to have an announcement soon on the Board Chair.

The Hanford Advisory Board is one means by which DOE intends to implement the Secretary's bold new public involvement initiative. The Board is designed to bring major interests and perspectives to the table.

DOE, along with our Tri-Party colleagues, the Washington Department of Ecology and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, will look to the Board to bring unique perspectives and values to deliberations and decisions on major Hanford cleanup issues.

My commitments to the Board are clear and straightforward. On funding: the Board will have sufficient funding to achieve its mission.

My expectation is that the Board will prepare a budget and a work plan for the balance of Fiscal 1994. The Board will have independent authority to spend its money as it sees fit -- with but one exception: the Board may not hire its own permanent technical staff. To do so would result in costly duplications of effort.

DOE simply cannot justify that. However, the Board is free to use its discretionary funds to bring in independent technical experts on ad hoc bases.

On staffing: I have committed Energy Department and contractor staff to support the Board's work -- and those costs will not be borne by the Board's budget. These are skilled professionals, experienced in working with you and with other similarly-charged advisory boards.

You have my word that my Acting Deputy Manager, Jack Keating or I will be present when the Board conveys its policy advice to DOE-RL. You have my assurance of your access to the Department's and our contractors' technical experts who will be here to interact with you during your deliberations.

Jon Yerxa is my point man for the Hanford Advisory Board -- and your point of contact to reach me.

DOE is committed to seeking your advice. We may not always be able to implement it. But, when we cannot, we will report back to you -- in writing -- the reasons why. And, we will try to help you modify your recommendation toward action that you can support and that we can implement.

Finally, DOE cannot and will not control this Board. You are independent of DOE and its Hanford regulators. That is the only arrangement the people of this region will find credible.

DOE will not presume what you need to know or when you need to know it. We will not limit the scope of your work.

I also have some expectations of you.

One: The Board is not going to be a handy, one-stop shop that simply punches DOE's public involvement tickets. I've made it clear to DOE and contractor managers that the Board will augment, not replace other reliable and effective public involvement programs in place now or planned for the future. There are interests not represented on this Board. We are obligated to solicit their views as well.

Two: From my point of view, creation of this Board has a simple driver: I need your advice. I need you to understand our mission and goals and how we propose to achieve them -- and the limits on our resources. I need your thoughtful judgments about major decisions we must make, and how we should go about making them.

I need you to understand that I do not expect -- nor could I allow you to make decisions for me. The Energy Department has the responsibility and authority to make decisions and we are accountable for them.

I happen to believe that your involvement will help us make better decisions that will stick -- and decisions that will result in a safe, timely and cost-effective Hanford cleanup.

To make our partnership work, I need to understand your perspectives and your values so that I can factor them into the decisions my managers and I will make. I will concede that in the past, our judgments have been influenced more by technical values than other, equally valid values.

These are new times; new times call for new approaches.

I expect the Board to advise DOE on matters that involve major Hanford cleanup issues and decisions. Perhaps foremost among those are important budget issues and decisions -- and how we deal with the gap between the funding we will have and achieving compliance with our commitments in the Tri-Party Agreement.

The federal budget-making process compels us to offer you a narrow and fleeting window of opportunity to inspect the Fiscal 1995 budget -- and to influence the decisions we must make to deal with a shortfall that is a foregone conclusion.

We will give you every opportunity we can and all the assistance you need in understanding both the process, the problems we face, the decisions we must make, and the implications of our choices.

I need your advice not only on how we allocate funds, but also on how we rank substantive components of cleanup and restoration; decisions on how we deal with competing values like worker and public health, environmental protection, costs, using available technology and getting on with the job...decisions on Hanford issues that have national implications, and, if need be, decisions on how we make mid-course corrections in the face of budget cuts or technological breakthroughs.

Tomorrow you will begin to define the manner in which the Board will take up issues. Likewise, my managers are working to design criteria that we believe should qualify issues for the Board's agenda. Forging early general agreement on compatible, if not parallel processes is, I believe, in our collective best interests.

Your meeting packets included a summary of DOE's recent Project Performance Study. It does not paint a flattering picture of what it costs and how long it takes DOE to do cleanup work -- as compared to the private sector and other federal agencies.

Page 5  
Wagoner/HAB

Tomorrow and Thursday, the entire DOE national complex is involved in a "stand-down" to discuss how we will address problems identified in the Performance Study. Ron Izatt, of my staff, will discuss the Study and our response with you tomorrow afternoon.

This is a critical report and our response is equally critical. I cannot overemphasize DOE's need for constructive advice from this Board and other Hanford stakeholders.

A final thought: Over the years, the Site has been advised by more than 200 independent technical experts and groups, including some of the nation's best scientific minds. In the future, we can and we will call on such individuals and organizations for independent technical review and advice.

I think it would be unfortunate and counter-productive if this Board tried to be one of Hanford's 200 technical advisors.

I do want you to be my one counselor on key policy matters that affect many different interests.

The Future Site Use Working Group and the Tank Waste Task Force succeeded because they were able to focus on broad, over-arching issues; they were able to stay above technical detail and deliver valuable counsel on values and principles.

The Hanford cleanup needs more of that.

I'm sure you're all anxious to attack this ambitious agenda. I'm confident that your collective skills, experience and enthusiasm will provide the momentum you need to move quickly into this and future agendas.

I look forward to a productive relationship with the Hanford Advisory Board. You have my word that I will do everything I can to make this effort a success and a value to all of us.

Thank you.

-0-0-0-