



Summary of Comments Received in Meetings with States

Tennessee: August 4, 1993

DOE management and contractor reform:

- State willing to participate in site-wide review of EM activities, but DOE must first demonstrate better management practices and implement cost-control measures before State would be willing to review legally-required activities and enforceable agreements
- State willing to develop specific recommendations on contractor reforms, and would be interested in participating in DOE's contractor reform initiative
- DOE should allow access to Progress Tracking System (PTS)
- DOE should improve financial-tracking capability, and allow access to such a system
- DOE should develop inventory of all program activities -- including planned activities -- that will influence cost
- Funding allocations in event of funding shortfalls should be made on pro-rata basis, with consideration of risk only where well defined

Waste management:

- DOE will be required to address "risk-sharing" and equity in any effort to consolidate waste treatment under the Federal Facilities Compliance Act
- DOE should accelerate efforts to develop waste "release standards," and ship low-level waste off-site for disposal

Site cleanup:

- Potential need to expand scope of enforceable milestones in cleanup agreements beyond a one-year timeframe; setting milestones to cover a three-year period appears more practical
- Land-use planning should be more-fully addressed in assessments of risk, cleanup, and cost

Public participation and release of information:

- Public participation in site-wide review of EM activities will be necessary, although Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) may not be the best or only forum for such involvement
- DOE should declassify as much information as possible, and release information on health risks -- DOE's Oak Ridge Reservation could be used as pilot

33255



- DOE should establish "ombudsman" to handle routine requests for information

South Carolina: August 5, 1993**DOE management and prioritization:**

- State expressed concern with perception that environmental priorities could suffer in efforts to trim Federal budget
- DOE must ensure adequate resources to cover existing enforceable agreements, although State willing to participate in review of activities to determine options for more efficient management and technical programs
- Any discussion of national prioritization and allocation of limited resources will require clear definition of health risks and criteria to be used for decision-making
- State willing to participate with DOE in supporting budget requests before Congress, although DOE's assistance needed to define effective process for State to present its views (e.g., participation in hearings)

Waste management:

- State expressed concern with concept of regional waste treatment under the Federal Facilities Compliance Act; DOE will be required to address equity in any effort to consolidate waste treatment

Public participation:

- State prefers to expand scope of existing Citizens' Advisory Board rather than create a new SSAB

Colorado: August 18, 1993**DOE management and contractor reform:**

- Until State is confident that DOE has corrected management deficiencies, cut discretionary activities in all DOE programs, including Defense Programs, and has sound cost estimates, State will not be willing to modify milestones in enforceable agreements
- Any effort on part of DOE to define budget within Administration targets is unacceptable; budget must reflect what is reasonably needed to meet compliance obligations
- State willing to engage in site-wide review of EM program, with particular emphasis on:
 - improvements in DOE and contractor management
 - improvements in accurate cost estimating
 - accurately defining scope of necessary technical work

- Access to PTS requested
- Detailed information of technical cost estimates should be provided on routine basis to State
- State recommends more Federal FTE's at site
- Need to address funding to support active State involvement in site-wide review of EM planning; use of funding currently provided under Agreement-in-Principle (AIP) is one option for satisfying such a need

Waste management:

- State requests input into definition of WIPP waste acceptance criteria; such criteria needed to support identification of treatment options and requirements

Public participation and local initiatives:

- State supports concept of SSAB as umbrella group that could consolidate input from a number of existing local and public-interest groups
- Local initiatives, such as water diversion project, need to be considered in comprehensive site-wide planning
- Need for storage capacity at the site using existing buildings must be evaluated before DOE and State consider use of buildings under local economic-development initiatives

New Mexico: August 19, 1993

General DOE management reforms:

- DOE needs to clearly define site-specific and national priorities to support any discussion of modifications of technical activities and enforceable agreements
- Communications with regulators is weak and needs to be improved
- DOE needs to increase involvement in EM management; perception that work of contractors is not adequately supervised by DOE
- Technology-transfer initiatives and opportunities need to be better communicated to public
- DOE needs to release environmental data on more timely basis (i.e., after initial QA/QC review and before data trends are analyzed in DOE reports)

- Scope of AIP could be broadened to allow State funding for participation in EM site-wide reviews

Public participation:

- SSAB provides reasonable vehicle for providing information to public, allowing public participation in EM planning and review of alternatives
- Involvement of Tribes must be addressed; DOE should consider providing funding to regional councils of Pueblos to promote broad-based participation

Ohio: September 2, 1993

General DOE management reform:

- State willing to participate in site-wide review of EM activities, and recognizes need to balance regulatory programs with economic development
- DOE needs to focus program on producing tangible results and State willing to work with DOE to identify these results, which are crucial to Congressional support of EM program
- DOE should allow access to PTS
- DOE should improve financial-tracking capability, allow access to such a system, and share budget-planning information
- State funding to support site-wide reviews of EM programs could be provided through AIP

DOE organization:

- DOE staff levels in the field need to be reviewed; perceived imbalance of FTE's at DOE Headquarters and field offices
- Document turn-around times need to be improved; Headquarters's role in review can cause delays and should be reviewed
- DOE should consider creating an Ohio Operations Office to integrate activities conducted in the State

Technology development:

- DOE needs to improve integration of technology-development program with site activities conducted in Ohio

Public participation:

- SSABs formed at sites will include State regulatory offices and U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) -- although EPA's willingness to consider economic development with regulatory requirements is not clear

Tentative dates for future meetings:

Texas: September 17, 1993

California: September 22, 1993

New York: September 27, 1993

Washington: TBD

Idaho: TBD