DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Full Board
February 5 & 6, 2020
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 2

Welcome & Announcements 3

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates 3

Public Comment 7

The Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials 8

Draft Advice: Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priorities 10

Draft Advice: Workforce Collaboration 12

Committee of the Whole (COTW) 12

HAB Committee Reports 13

Board Business 16

Attachments 16

Attendees 17

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.

DRAFT

Executive Summary

Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) Action

There were two pieces of advice adopted at the February Board meeting.

- FY2022 Cleanup Priorities
- Workforce Collaboration

Presentations & Updates

The Hanford Advisory Board received the following presentations and updates:

- Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates
- The Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials

Public Comment

There were no public comments received at the February meeting.

DRAFT

Welcome & Announcements

James Lynch, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for the Board, noted that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Susan Leckband welcomed members to the HAB meeting. Susan provided members with an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives. She also announced that there were copies of the current Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) public involvement calendar at the back table.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

Joe Franco, DOE, opened the TPA updates[1] with a description of the One Hanford Initiative designed to engage every person to be invested in the success of the mission at Hanford. DOE focuses on One Hanford because it combines efforts at the Richland Operations Office (RL) and the Office of River Protection (ORP) further progressing the cleanup mission and improving organizational habits for cleanup on the Hanford Site. DOE received over 5,000 responses to the proposed logo designs. As part of the Hanford initiative, DOE placed a new site governance model in place. The Site Governance Model provides a structured framework for integrated decision-making to address crosscutting management, technical, and business risks, issues and opportunities at the Hanford Site. The Governance Model is designed as a sustainable and structured process that supports efficient and effective decisions at the increased pace of operations and the flow of information to move quickly and seamlessly from strategic-level committees through operational-level committees to contractor operations. DOE will work to stay focused and integrated between its offices to ensure that there are efficiencies on site to support productive work.

He then provided an overview and update on Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW). He noted that this project illustrated how contractors work together on a highly integrated, site-wide program. DFLAW is the Department's path forward to begin treating tank waste. The DFLAW program projects are forecasted to meet or achieve early critical decision or Consent Decree dates of December 2023. The integrated DFLAW schedule and the critical path continue to be driven by the WTP, Water Treatment Facility and ETF. DOE will work to ensure incoming new contractors recognize their roles in supporting DFLAW, and understand what DFLAW represents overall to the Site and ongoing Hanford progress.

Joe provided Board members with an update at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP). The contractor has completed turnover of 180/257 DFLAW systems from construction to startup and handover of 120 systems from startup to plant management. All three boilers are operating and are in process of being tuned at the steam plant. All major low-activity waste procurements are completed. Finally, the last change to the WTP skyline will be with the placement of the Effluent Management Facility (EMF) stack.

[1] Hanford Advisory Board Agency Update

There have been several upgrades at the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF). Upgrades include the following:

- Completed 60% design review for LERF Basin 41 project
- Completed ETF Air Compressor upgrade project
- Completed ETF Evaporator drain valve replacement
- Completed ETF Rough Filter & Hoist refurbishment
- Initiated ETF uninterrupted power supply upgrade project
- Initiated ETF Reverse Osmosis upgrade project
- Initiated ETF Cooling Tower upgrade project
- Initiated ETF Chiller upgrade project
- Initiated ETF Dilute Caustic Tank upgrade project
- Initiated ETF Verification Tank C repair project

Joe shared with members an update on tank retrievals. AX-102 retrieval has been conducted to the extent of two technologies. AX-104 is the next tank slated for retrieval after AX-104, and workers are installing equipment in preparation for that retrieval. After installation of the first Extended Reach Sluicer System (ERSS) with the modified hose-in-hose transfer line (HIHTL) connector in Tank AX-104, the crew installed an in-pit deck (below left) and connected the HIHLT to the Chem Joint (below right). Extensive operability testing is planned to verify sluicer movement and HIHTL flexibility.

Joe provided members with an overview of the Hanford Site Tank Integrity Program. The Tank Integrity Program is an industry-leading program to maximize the useful life of Hanford's Double Shell Tanks (DST). Recent and planned activities include:

- Updated DST chemistry control limits provide additional conservatism
- Enhanced Inspections
    - First DST primary tank bottom volumetric inspection planned FY2020
    - New technologies for routine under-tank visual inspections
    - Ultrasonic inspections of wall/floor for thinning, pitting or cracking
- Corrosion monitoring probes – 2 additional probes planned to be installed in FY2020
- Tank repair technologies – feasibility study
- Cold Spray repair evaluation

Joe Franco shared a time-lapse video of the demolition of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) which was well-received by the Board. Workers recently completed demolition of PFP's main facility (234-5Z). The removal of the main processing facility marks a dramatic change in the Hanford Site landscape and highlights a historic accomplishment in the overall cleanup mission. Final activities at PFP include packaging and safe disposal of the rubble from the Plutonium Reclamation Facility, core sampling soil beneath the building pads and stabilization of the site with soil cover. This work is underway now with completion expected in the spring timeframe.

Work on the 324 Building Disposition Project continues outside radiological areas. In December, workers finished installing micropiles outside of the building, in preparation to excavate and add support to the building's foundation. At the mock-up, workers continue training. Most recently, workers are training on radiological assay equipment that will be used to measure the radiological content of soil beneath B Cell. In November 2019, project management issued a stop work on radiological activities inside the building due to a trend of minor radiological contamination incidents on workers' skin and clothing. It is important

to note, there have been more than 12,000 radiological entries since remediation preparations began. 99.9% of those occurred without incident. CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) has assembled a highly experienced 12-person team to assess various aspects of the 324 Building project. That team is wrapping up its report, with finalization expected in the next couple of weeks. It will also incorporate feedback from a Jacobs corporate review and a CHPRC radiological control review. Implementation of corrective actions will likely include additional training. .. DOE anticipates work will resume in the late February/March timeframe. DOE concurrence before work can begin.

As the Hanford Site transitions to 24/7 operations, the Hanford Fire Department recently debuted a new ladder truck that will play a crucial role in emergency responses. The truck, which replaces a 25-year-old unit, was put into service on January 23, 2020, with a traditional "Push-In" ceremony. This ceremony plays homage to firefighters in the 1800s who used horse-drawn equipment and would have to push the fire engines into the garage after returning from a fire. The new truck is part of an overall site infrastructure upgrade plan to prepare Hanford for 24/7 operations.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Alex Smith, Ecology, explained that Ecology[2] proposed holistic TPA negotiations with DOE after being informed that there is serious risk for missing Consent Decree milestones. This was considered a better alternative than returning to court. The agencies have been negotiating the scope and have selected a mediator from the Federal Mediation Service to help. They anticipate starting negotiations in late February or early March.

She also reviewed key inspections, permit modifications that are in progress, and public involvement opportunities in her presentation. All permit activities involve some sort of public involvement. She also introduced the photos of new Ecology employees, including:

- Laura Watson, Director
- Heather Bartlett, Deputy Director
- Tyson Oreiro, Tribal and Environmental Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Laura Buelow, EPA, introduced Lynne Hood, a new employee in the local EPA office in Richland. EPA hopes to hire another recent graduate soon for the local office.

She congratulated DOE on the completion of PFP cleanup.

Project and cleanup updates included:

[2] Department of Ecology Agency Update

- The public comment period on the 100 BC Proposed Plan closed in December, and the agency is working through the comments now. The Record of Decision (ROD) will go to EPA Headquarters for review and approval.
- There are upcoming interim cleanup decisions on the BP5/PO-1 Groundwater Proposed Plan. It is another project that requires EPA Headquarters review.
- There is an upcoming removal action in the PW-1 OU that may include interim stabilization with grout for 3 waste sites. EPA's position is that there is a ROD in place that requires removal, treatment, and disposal (RTD).

Peter Wright, EPA Assistant Administrator, and his deputy will be visiting Hanford in March. Agendas and itineraries for tours and other meetings are being developed. EPA will let the HAB know of public engagements scheduled for that week.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):
Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: "Respect to Hanford and making decision for Records of Decision, it's more strategic and lets you look at end state contracts. How do you estimate Hanford cleanup cost if you don't know the end state? Second, just realized when cleaning up tanks, what is the radioactivity so we can find the risk and future options? Is it still highly radioactive?"

R: "Work with Ecology and part of that process is taking samples and analyzing what's there and go in and do very detailed mapping to have a very accurate number of waste there and a path forward. I will take months to go through this process."

Q: "For Emy, if she could talk more about PW-1 and understand the need for stabilizing and samples. How you eventually are able to remediate that at later time?"

R: "Z crib and Z-9 trench all located in PW-1. This is a removal action done under DOE's removal authority. EPA wants to make sure the remedy identified in the ROD [Record of Decision] can be implemented because in the ROD, we were going to dig out those waste sites. The Z-361 tank would be removed completely under the design for the remedy. By putting grout in, we shared those concerns of being able to dig out the waste sites in the future. There will be public comment for this removal action that is required under the regulations. EPA is waiting to see those assurances from DOE can be made without extending cleanup or making changes to the cleanup remedy."

Q: "PW-1, I'm remembering years ago a hope for remediation and kind of turned down. Very excited about work at PFP and am wondering where the workforce is going that accomplished what we did?"

R: "As we start to complete, there is plenty of other work in place. Looking at K area, it is the same contractor in the K Basin, the crib, and Z-9."

C: "The Energy Communities Alliance met with [Congressional] delegation staff and the committee staff. We were told the [HAB] committee leaders do not support DOE leadership. We let everyone know Brian

is doing a great job. Heard from number of people very familiar with funding in 2020, there are things on the horizon that put us in jeopardy [budget]."

Q: "Future land use dependent on a number of things. Integrated risk information and integrated risk assessment on site that addresses intersections and activates could be overshadowed. Is it going to be focused specifically or in a broader sense?"

R: "This risk assessment requirement is out of the waste regulations for any facility in the treatment unit and how it's affecting both biology and humans in that area. To my knowledge, it is integrated with all the waste streams in thermal treatment, but not in other areas."

C: "It's important however we get there, an integrated approach is something that can be very beneficial."

Q: "Will contaminated soil be buried in ERDF [Environmental Remediation Disposal Facility]? What is the timetable? Is DOE planning to conduct a WIR [Waste Incidental to Reprocessing] on the contaminated soil, since the source of B cell waste was Hanford tanks?"

R: "Soil is just like all of our other remediation as we remove contaminated debris. We'll have a non-destructive analysis and see what the acceptance criteria is. Low-level is ERDF. For the timetable looking at the setting up and preparing B Cell getting ready for cutting floor, starting remediation, and see how that progresses. Not given a definite date."

Q: "The AX-102 completion - when you do the sampling, will you be sampling side walls or just the floor?"

R: "Sampling on the floor, but pictures from the tank show a really good job removing materials off the wall."

Q: "PFP [Plutonium Finishing Plant] completion closure process, understanding the increased buffer area. [What is the] process of then shrinking that buffer back down and then eliminating that?"

R: "This will be a controlled process right now, so there are no intentions on reducing the boundaries. Looking at the source of contamination, one thing I'd like to follow up with, once there is a protective cap on PFP, it does not stop there. Still will be a heavy DOE presence in there. There is a significant characterization we will have to do."

Q: "The scope was supposed to bring PFP slab on grade and contract to another entity. Can you tell us what the contaminants are and what the risks?"

R: "I'd like to remind folks of what we've discussed before about the facilities infrastructure. Z-9 crib and some others moved up to the top. Sometime soon, we will be briefing everyone on that list."

<u>Public Comment</u>

There were no public comments made on February 5 or February 6, 2020.

The Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy, gave a presentation[3] on The Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials. He has been working with the state of Oregon for 30 years on transportation issues. States have several regional organizations with which they work together on these issues, including the Western Interstate Energy Board, Southern States Energy Board, Council of State Governments in the Midwest, and Council of State Governments in the Northeast.

Ken introduced some of the aspects of his presentation with a quiz that pointed out the following facts:

- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission rules that required advance notification to states of spent fuel shipments went into effect in 1982.
- The largest number of spent nuclear fuel shipments in the United States was in 1974. There were (at least) 223 truck shipments and one rail shipment.
- Shippers of radioactive materials do not have to pre-notify states prior to each shipment. Pre-notification is only required for certain high-activity shipments, such as spent nuclear fuel.
- DOE first declared the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) site ready to open in October 1991. However, due to litigation, WIPP did not receive its first shipment until 1999.
- Some of the WIPP transportation protocols were tested during shipments of cesium capsule return to Hanford (20 shipments from Colorado in 1994-1995 and two from Virginia in 1996) and radioactive contaminated nitric acid from Hanford to England (50 shipments in 1995).
- Western governors stressed the need for safe and uneventful transportation for WIPP shipments.
- WIPP has received 12,644 transuranic waste shipments.
- Hanford has made 650 shipments of transuranic waste. An additional 6,450 are expected. This number could significantly change as shipments aren't scheduled to begin until about 2028.
- Loaded WIPP shipments have traveled 15.1 million miles.
- Nuclear weapons need periodic maintenance and are transported through the U.S. by the federal government by semi-truck. The weapons are transported in unmarked semi-trucks with numerous unmarked escort vehicles.

[3] The Safe Transportation of Radioactive Materials

- There were three commercial spent fuel reprocessing plants constructed in the United States: West Valley in New York, GE Nuclear Energy in Illinois, and Allied General Nuclear Services in South Carolina. West Valley and GE accepted fuel, but only West Valley operated.

The first big shipping campaign with the opportunity for the states to become involved was for transportation of spent fuel from Three Mile Island to the Idaho National Laboratory in 1986. The initial discussions about transportation began between DOE and 10 states along the route four months before shipments were to begin. DOE was surprised by the extent of state requests to be involved. The entire rail transportation route was inspected, as were all shipments before, during, and after shipment. DOE also provided emergency responder training.

The concept of "safe and uneventful" transportation relies, in part, on confidence in the robustness of shipping casks. Accident prevention is based on common sense measures that work well, including well-trained and experienced drivers, well-maintained trucks, rigorous inspections, bad weather protocols, and identification of safe parking locations. Ken said that even with all of these precautions, some accidents will occur and a robust emergency preparedness program is also needed. That includes emergency preparedness training, shipment tracking, advance notification, and other plans and procedures.

There have been only a handful of minor accidents in the 12,644 shipments over 15.1 million miles to WIPP. As plans progress towards the eventual shipment of commercial and defense-generated spent nuclear fuel, the states have generally promoted the WIPP transportation program as a starting point for developing a transportation program for these shipments. The WIPP program is not easily copied, as all WIPP shipments have been by truck and most of the spent fuel shipments are expected to be by rail.

For the most part, what is being transported in and through Oregon (and similarly through Washington) used to be related to Hanford. For decades, Hanford received low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from national laboratories and DOE facilities around the nation. Some waste has left Hanford over the past 10 years, but there have been no shipments to WIPP since 2011. We expect shipments to resume in the mid- to late-2020s. By 2030, Hanford could be the predominant shipper of waste to WIPP.

Shipments that are now occurring involve commercial facilities in the Richland area, such as Framatome (which makes nuclear fuel) and Perma-Fix NW. A relatively few number of shipments involve commercial low-level waste going to the US Ecology disposal site at Hanford. The US Navy continues to ship de-fueled reactor compartments from Navy warships via the Columbia River for disposal at Hanford. The Navy also occasionally ships spent nuclear fuel by rail from the Puget Sound Shipyard to the Idaho National Laboratory.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Perspectives

Jim Lynch, DOE, highlighted the good collaboration with the states in terms of the Environmental Management program and WIPP shipments.

Randy Bradbury, Ecology, recognized Ken Niles' expertise. He explained that currently, the waste that is really leaving Hanford is from the Perma-Fix facility. In the future, we anticipate Hanford waste will be sent to WIPP.

EPA had no comments on the presentation.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):
Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: "Will there be room in WIPP for our TRU [transuranic] waste?"

R: "My guess is as good as yours. I don't know the answer. DOE would have to answer that."

R: "At every EMSSAB [Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board], I ask that question, and DOE says every time that, yes, Hanford TRU will go to WIPP."

Q: "In your quiz, it said DOE is not obliged to tell us about shipments. I remember planning shipments, and each has a notified person. Has that gone away?"

R: "There are notifications made to the states about certain shipments. For nuclear weapons and weapon's components, there are no notifications made to the states.""

Q: "I also remember if there was an emergency, we learned as soon as it left Hanford was it was under a different jurisdiction, did that get fixed?"

R: "If there is an accident involving a radioactive waste shipments, DOE assets at Hanford would likely be part of any response."

Q: "Is there information in waste on traveling that students can use for class? We're trying to map roads most frequently used and how often?"

R: "A little bit of that is available online. In some cases, it is relatively obvious which routes are used by certain shipments if you know the origin and destination. We do have an Oregon annual report that does list the number of shipments by route."

Q: "I am concerned about security concerns given the domestic and foreign security."

R: "Weapons shipments are heavily protected. Spent fuel shipments also require armed escorts. WIPP shipments do not have security, as the amount of radioactivity within these shipments is generally very small and not easily dispersed. Shipment security if very much a part of the planning for all of these shipments.

<u>Draft Advice: Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priorities</u>

DRAFT

Tom Galioto, Public-at-Large and Budgets & Contracts Committee (BCC) Chair, introduced the draft advice on FY2022 Cleanup Priorities[4]. He reviewed[5] the process of developing the advice, including the resource materials the Issue Manager Team used to guide its work. The approach was different than in past years in that the advice is focusing on cleanup priorities, not budget numbers. While DOE had requested that the HAB prioritize programs and projects, that posed a few difficulties since the HAB has not historically done that.

Jim Lynch expressed DOE's appreciation for the description of the process used to develop the advice.

John Price, Ecology, explained that Ecology is also trying to change how it interacts with the DOE budget process, which has sometimes been frustrating. Ecology wants to look at the budget life cycle. The regulators' job is to keep applying a steady approach to DOE. John had no specific comments on the draft advice.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):
Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: "John, I don't understand the broader contents of what you said. Do you think Hanford can get more than $2.4 billion more a year from Congress?"

R: "I don't know if that's possible or not. We independently baseline discovered if DOE didn't get more money, the process would never finish. It's not in our perspective to judge what can be appropriated or not appropriated. We need to push DOE to get that money, otherwise we will get re-negotiation on milestones. We need to have continuing dialogue with DOE on what's appropriate. We need to push DOE to get full compliance funding."

C: "I can tell you, Congress said it's your choice what you do with the $2.4 billion so you need to understand that reality."

C: "We fully understand, but there is a real cost to the funding going on right now. DOE wants to spend $50 million stabilizing significant risk around PFP [Plutonium Finishing Plant]. In some respects, this is wasted. Spending now because we don't want to spend full cost. Our job as regulators is to remind them, they have to meet schedule. We have to keep pushing on them. That's our job."

Q: "Echo Pam on the budget and on the congressional delegation on the Hanford side. There might be some perception on Congress that dollars, to the extent we can build momentum now. It's not only responsibility but also to secure funding in the future. The questions I had were on page 4 of the tank storage capacity. Is this specific to the scope of design and process but also included in the prioritization of construction?"

R: "Design, because that's an item that has been identified on a number of advices for years. DOE has been reluctant for years. The HAB is concerned that may not be the case, and we would like to get a jump on design and permitting without spending capital money on construction."

[4] Draft Advice on FY2022 Cleanup Priorities

[5] FY-2022 Cleanup Priorities Advice

C: “My observation in the world is there are some projects that they would be cheaper in the long run if they started out with the trickle funding rather than a big pile. You can almost always have positive things come out of it.”

C: “If the item is prioritized below it, that’s below the $2.5 million but would like portion of funding to move it up above the line to address it in some fashion.”

C: “I understand it does look like we are wanting more money, but what were really focused on is the adequate funding at public involvement that it’s important to strengthen public involvement process so while it is an expansion, there is a precedent to it, and we think it’s important.”

Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions, the Board approved the draft advice on February 6.

Draft Advice: Workforce Collaboration

Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union/Non-Management and BCC vice chair, described the development of the Workforce Collaboration draft advice[6]. In his research[7], he found that this is not the first advice of this nature that the HAB has issued. There were reports and draft advice in 1994, 1996, and 2004. The Board has been interested in workforce issues for quite a while. Emmitt emphasized the importance and value of maintaining workforce continuity at Hanford.

Jim Lynch thanked the Issue Manager team for its work. He expressed appreciation for the background information, as well as the identification of concerns and provision of suggested solutions.

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, noted that the agencies also have a changing workforce. She said that the draft advice has made Ecology think about workforce transitions, transfer of knowledge, and a diverse workforce.

The Board discussed specific revisions and wording changes on February 5. Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions, the Board approved the draft advice on February 6.

Committee of the Whole (COTW)

Susan Leckband opened this discussion which was focused on the next COTW, including identification of desired topics.[8]

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):
Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: “As I look at this waste, there are so many organics in there. I haven’t heard anyone discuss in detail how we catch them, how we process, and how we keep them from being a hazard. So that’s one area I

[6] Draft Advice on Workforce Collaboration

[7] Workforce Collaboration Advice

[8] Excerpt from draft meeting summary on HAB discussion

think we should look at, and the second area is getting a report from Bruce for the TWC [Tank Waste Committee]."

C: "I think the chemical portion is huge. I think it could be one element of that. What would you think if we look at this list, and what it's going to take to know what the end states are? I'm wondering if that's something we can encompass."

C: "I think that's a great idea - the chemistry aspect - maybe we should invite DOE. You can destroy the organics with temperatures. I think these are worthy for discussions they are pretty technical though."

C: "I endorse Bruce talking about this. This place is clearly not closeable. One of the issues I'm curious about at DOE locally is who can participate in this conversation because everyone is busy doing short term jobs and defining end states as doneness of that particular job but in reality, the end state is the reality of when we are done with it. I don't know how to engage DOE in this discussion."

C: "In March, the plan is to have someone from PNNL [Pacific Northwest National Laboratory] will be coming to talk to us [the Tank Waste Committee]. If we go grout for either on site or off site, what do we do with those organics? I encourage you to come to the TWC meeting. I'm in support to talking to end states and the CLUP [Comprehensive Land Use Plan]. I think it's important to talk about the Inner Area Principles in the discussion. I would like to see that included in the conversation."

C: "There are local folks looking at that now so they can support long term stewardship programs."

C: "If we recommend a Committee of the Whole end state organics, what happens to organics that are left on site? How we got where we are? How does that play into clean up decisions?"

C: "I think you hit it out of the ballpark; that is a good topic. Once you know where you're heading then you can look at all the pieces on fitting where you are and where you want to be. I fully support it."

C: "I agree with what you are saying. One of the things I suggest is we understand the whole context of the site. We ship waste here from a lot of places, so we have a lot of stuff here that still plans on being here. I recall having making a comment we probably have the world's largest quantity of lead. We have stuff from all over the world. I'm not saying let's fix it all, but I would like for us to understand what it is."

Susan Leckband wrapped up the discussion saying she is going to propose that end states be the COTW topic, and that the meeting be held in October or November 2020.

<u>HAB Committee Reports</u>

Tank Waste Committee (TWC)

Bob Suyama, Benton County and TWC chair, provided a visual presentation[9] based on the agenda for the last TWC meeting. He reviewed the topics discussed, including the DFLAW critical path, Double-Shell tank inspections, the Lateral Flow white paper, and TSCR. They formed an Issue Manager team to work on the Lateral Flow white paper. One of the major topics on the March TWC meeting agenda is grout.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection (HSEP)

Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, and HSEP chair, gave the committee report. The committee plans to have a call on February 11th. The HAB has received a response to the advice on traffic safety and the HSEP committee would like time to review the response. They also would like to discuss the possibility of developing additional advice on traffic safety issues.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

Jan Catrell, Public-at-Large and RAP chair, described the topics addressed at the last RAP meeting, including discussions on:

- Draft advice on FY2022 cleanup priorities,
- Draft advice on workforce collaboration,
- Cleanup and contamination issues in the 324 Building, and
- Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) permitting.

Looking ahead, RAP would like briefings on the Gable Pond cap, the status of the canyons, Z Crib stabilization, and the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF). The committee will have a call on February 12 to discuss the agenda for the March meeting.

Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC)

Jeff Burright, Oregon Department of Energy and PIC chair, provided an update on PIC activities. He started by explaining that there are several public comment periods that are currently open or will be coming up soon. Many are permit modifications.

As a part of the PIC meeting held the day before the HAB meeting, the committee started discussions on a four-part series on the effectiveness of public involvement. He reminded the Board of advice #239 that included some principles of public involvement. The PIC will use this as information to continue discussions about lessons learned over the years, future challenges, and how to get people to engage.

The committee also talked about the regional HAB meeting, originally scheduled for April in Seattle that will not be in Seattle after all. The meeting will be in Richland. The PIC talked about other options for such a meeting, including the possibility to hold a regional meeting near tribal communities and the importance of meetings in metropolitan areas. Looking forward to its April meeting, one of the topics of interest is Ecology's development of a story map for Hanford.

[9] TWC Report

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Tom Galioto provided members a visual presentation[10] while thanking the facilitation team and the Board for accommodating a difficult schedule in developing the draft advice on FY2022 Cleanup Priorities and on Workforce Collaboration. He did not think BCC needed a committee call in February, but the committee would like presentations on new Hanford contracts as they are put in place. He noted that the advice on FY2022 Cleanup Priorities purposefully did not discuss budget numbers, but the BCC has been asked to consider additional advice on the need for budget process improvement and on the budget itself.

National Liaison

Pam Larsen, City of Richland and Board national liaison, provided the national liaison update[11] which included details of specific cleanup activities in Idaho, the WIPP, Oak Ridge, Savannah River, West Valley New York, Los Alamos, Portsmouth, and the Tonopah Test Range.

DOE Headquarters has put forward a proposal to deal with a small amount of orphan waste at Savannah River, and the first requests for proposal have been issues for end state contracts.one has been awarded. The 20th anniversary of the WIPP was celebrated with 12,500 shipments. Idaho is the primary shipping site. Areas of focus for Headquarters include getting the best value for new procurements, innovation and technology development, building community trust and support, and workforce pipeline.

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB)

Susan Leckband announced that the next EMSSAB meeting will be the last day of March and the first two days of April 2020 in Las Vegas. The HAB is a subcommittee of the EMSSAB. There are eight boards like the HAB that make up the EMSSAB, and their participation is through their chairs and vice chairs. The EMSSAB meets twice a year to talk about issues that connect with at least two sites in the DOE Complex. EMSSAB advice goes directly to DOE Headquarters. The HAB has the most experience of any of the sites because they do not have term limits. The HAB chair and vice chair have drafted many of the pieces of advice that the EMSSAB has adopted. Until people come to see Hanford, they often do not understand why Hanford requires so much money for cleanup.

Executive Issues Committee (EIC)

Susan Leckband informed the HAB that the EIC had met informally on February 5 to discuss several issues, including the concern that Board meetings have many empty chairs. The EIC wants to get back to normal in terms of process and is reviewing the HAB Process Manual for opportunities for improvement. All Board members are welcome to provide comments and suggestions on the process manual.

---

[10] BCC Status Report

[11] National Liaison Report

Susan also asked that each HAB committee begin to prepare for the annual spring Leadership Workshop at which they will discuss the HAB work plan, what is working, and what needs to be changed or improved.

Board Business

Susan Leckband explained that every year, HAB committees select their chairs and vice chairs in March so that the new chairs and vice chairs can be seated in time for the spring Leadership Workshop. She also noted that every HAB member can be an official member of two committees, which is a function of managing the HAB's travel budget. Members are welcome to self-nominate if they wish to serve as a chair or vice chair of a committee.[12]

Jim Lynch, DOE, noted that the HAB committee week has been moved to the week of March 16th, a week later than was on the original HAB schedule for 2020.

In addition, Susan Leckband announced that in every even-numbered year, the HAB selects the primary leadership of the Board: chair, vice chair, and national liaison. These positions serve a two-year term. Susan would like to put together a nominating committee for this by June.

JoLynn Garcia, DOE, announced that DOE has turned in the membership package to DOE Headquarters. However, the TPA agencies are currently recruiting again for the Board's public-at-large members. She encouraged Board members to assist in getting the word out. JoLynn cautioned that the people who are currently nominated for appointment in 2020 are not a voting HAB member until the package has been approved by DOE Headquarters.

Susan Leckband further explained that the only Board seats with term limits are the public-at-large seats and the non-union/non-management seats.

The Board adopted the meeting summary for the December meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Hanford Advisory Board Agency Update

Attachment 2: Department of Ecology Agency Update

Attachment 3: The Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials

Attachment 4: Draft Advice on FY2022 Cleanup Priorities

Attachment 5: FY-2022 Cleanup Priorities

Attachment 6: Draft Advice on Workforce Collaboration

Attachment 7: Workforce Collaboration Advice

[12] Excerpt from the HAB process manual on selection of committee of chairs

Attachment 8: Excerpt from draft meeting summary on HAB discussion

Attachment 9: TWC Report

Attachment 10: BCC Status Report

Attachment 11: National Liaison Report

Attachment 12: Excerpt from the HAB process manual on selection of committee chairs

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Robert Davis, Member	Pam Larsen, Member	Fred Brink, Member
Bob Suyama, Member	Phil Lemley, Alternate	Rebecca Holland, Member
Jacob Reynolds, Alternate	Emmitt Jackson, Member	Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Member
Marissa Merker, Alternate	Mike Priddy, Alternate	Gene Van Liew, Member
Helen Wheatley, Member	Susan Leckband, Member	Antone Brooks, Member
Dan Solitz, Alternate	Tony Umek, Member	Ken Niles, Member
Steve Wiegman, Member	Tom Galioto, Member	Rudy Mendoza, Alternate
Jeff Burright, Alternate	Jan Catrell, Member	Bob Legard, Member
Earl Fordham, Member		

Agency, Contractor, and Support Staff:

Robin Whitney, DOE-RL	Tom Teynor, DOE-RL	Paul Hirschman, DOE-RL
Greg Jones, DOE-RL	Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Naomi Jaschke, DOE-RL
James Lynch, DOE-ORP	Paul Schroder, DOE-ORP	Brian Harkins, DOE-ORP
Yvonne Levardi, DOE-RL	JoLynn Garcia, DOE-RL	Laura Buelow, EPA
Lynne Hood, EPA	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Alex Smith, Ecology
John Price, Ecology	Scott Davis, MSA	Peter Bengtson, WRPS
Moses Jaraysi, CHPRC	Kelsey Shank, the EDGE	Dieter Bohrmann, CHPRC

DRAFT

Ashley Herring, ProSidian	Jasmine Martinez, ProSidian	Ruth Nicholson, Facilitator
Patrick Pittenger, BFCG	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Ginger Wireman, Ecology
Paula Call, DOE-ORP	Joe Franco, DOE-RL	

DRAFT