



MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (COTW)

DATE: *October 17, 2019* | **TIME:** *8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*

Richland, WA

TOPICS IN THIS MEETING SUMMARY

Opening 2
The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan and Work Priorities 2
Feedback and Input on the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan 5
Answering Questions from HAB Members 5
Gathering Priorities and Sharing Perspectives from HAB Members 7
Closing Comments 11
Document Attachments 12
Attendees 12

The following meeting summary represents topics and presentations covered during the Hanford Advisory Board Committee of the Whole (COTW) on October 17, 2019, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in Richland, WA. This event took place at Washington State University. This is only a summary of the issues and actions discussed at this meeting. The following represents a summary of the topics corresponding with the meeting agenda and may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Susan Leckband, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB/Board) Chair, welcomed committee members. Introductions were made by the Board Chair, Board/Committee Members and Alternates, and other participants (including online participants).

Announcements

Susan Leckband made an open call for announcements and updates.

Jim Lynch, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) welcomed attendees and reminded everyone to sign in. Jim informed members the focus of the meeting is on the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan. Jim then reviewed the safety announcements and the agenda.

The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan and Work Priorities

Brian Vance, Site Manager for the Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) and Site Manager for Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) introduced himself to members and reviewed the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan¹. Brian stated there had been really good progress across the site, and everyone is working to be a high-performing team. DOE was particularly happy to have Secretary, Ike White, out for the 100 K celebration and the sludge removal project. DOE shared that safety is the main emphasis across the site. The Hanford Site 5 year plan is to shape a period that is manageable and achievable to help anchor the team while they are trying to accomplish tasks in the near-term. He also noted there are many priorities used to build onto the milestones. DOE has assumed a flat funding profile of \$2.5 billion dollars per year and they believe that is reasonable and achievable. He noted that the delivery of the Direct-Feed Low-Activity (DFLAW) is still the priority. It is a site-wide transition and it requires both of the DOE offices and all the contractors, national laboratories and laborers working together to achieve a common goal. Brian noted they will also continue to work on other projects but the central theme is DFLAW. The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan is a living document and Brian and his team will continue to review this document every year and make sure it's relevant, ensuring to refresh the document as new opportunities and challenges arise.

Ben Harp, Deputy Manager for DOE-ORP, reiterated the highest priority is to start up the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste Project. Moving into 2021, there are many projects in 2020 within tank farms to support the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Project (WTP). In 2022, significant milestones will need to be completed so they can move into operations for 2023. In 2024, they are in operations at WTP itself with the feed from the tank farms. Within the five year period, there are significant activities leading up to DOE's number one priority.

Joe Franco, Deputy Manager for DOE-RL emphasized the mission statement of delivering on environmental remediation and treating tank waste. Joe reviewed how the Hanford Site 5 year plan was constructed and noted there are several critical components of the plan including capsule storage, Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), crib stabilization and canyon cleanout. All of the critical components will lead up to the 2024 DFLAW operations. Joe reviewed the key goals which are the minimum-safe operations, waste treatment, risk reduction, waste disposition and the long-term stewardship which are the key five goals driving to the end state completion. DOE applies these five goals to the three major components which are

¹ [Hanford 5 year Plan](#)

the tank waste cleanup, central plateau and the river corridor cleanup. Using the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan as a guide, Joe walked members through priorities as established for FY19 through FY2024.

Brian Vance closed out with sharing the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan was a collaborative effort and looked at the requirements in a way that is integrated the two offices. Brian shared that the most important feedback from the HAB is related to cleanup priorities and ways in which DOE can engage with stakeholders more effectively. The focus is on the cleanup priorities, constructive cleanup, and the communities. They will continue to have constructive dialogues surrounding this. Brian noted the relationship between ORP and RL is strengthening, and they have produced tremendous progress as a team and will continue to ensure success.

Agency Perspective

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Laura Buelow, EPA stated it was nice to have a plan for two offices. However, the plan was not done in coordination with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies, though they do agree with a lot of the work being done. The pump and treat have always been a priority for EPA, and EPA would like more work to be done in the central plateau. Their concerns are the soil issues at the environmental restoration disposal facility (ERDF) and the K Basin and would like to see that in the plan for the next five years.

Ecology

Dan McDonald, Ecology stated that Ecology needs to make sure things are being done differently and come together as a community to make sure things are getting done. What is not on the plan is the subordinate initiatives that are ongoing and are required for the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan to be successful. There needs to be a balance between cost, scope, and timing since they are all high priorities. As perspectives change, the transition will require different perspectives in all of us requiring us to understand what we can do now and later on to treat, dispose and close down the sites.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “Thanks for the presentations and for DOE and the agencies taking the time to be here. It is personal for me to volunteer because the cleanup matters to me and the people in the community matter. Some EM sites have local authority for local decisions and it is not surprising to me things don’t happen as quickly as they should because it wasn’t local. Is there a suggestion to work with headquarters moving forward?”

R: “We are capable of doing our own job, and we need to do a better job at managing headquarters. Our team has to do a better job of managing up, and headquarters needs to be more direct and vocal on a daily basis. We have weekly calls every Monday morning to review priorities and will continue to do that. We will make a priority to manage headquarters to be more effective.”

C: “I saw more activity on site than I have in a long time. Every project has a critical path that plans out what every project needs in order to be completed and not just on a high level. I would like to see an integrated schedule.”

R: “We do have an integrated schedule but the flyer is just an overview. We will look fully at the integrated schedule and keep the team focused on the key and critical information.”

Q: “I would like to hear what end state is being imagined on site as you are doing the cleanup plans?”

R: “End State was coined to other sites like Rocky Flats that were smaller and more manageable to clean up. When I think about end states, we have a longer-term mission. It means to create a definitive scope with contractors within a reasonable amount of time and can provide the resources to develop closure plan packages to get the work done. If they see opportunities that we may not have seen then we will propose scope.”

Q: “I’m concerned this doesn’t translate to the public well. How could we communicate this to the public?”

R: “We have comprehensive plans that review that. Because it is so far in the future it’s hard to imagine what Hanford might look like. Maybe this could be brought up at the next PIC meeting to determine how to best share this information with the public.”

Q: “No matter how good the plan is, things happen that we didn’t anticipate. Have you built into the plan lessons learned and things that can go wrong?”

R: “We do have a process that is ongoing which is looking at risk across the Hanford Site. We looked at ones that are the most likely to creep up. As far as pre-planning, we are going through the critical needs and annually they come to report to us where we stand on those risks of which we then will give to our management team.”

Q: “It is admirable to see the work that has been completed. As the tank waste mission ramps up, what non-tank items are on the radar?”

R: “It always ties back to the long-term plan. While DOE doesn’t lobby, we will continue to update the progress so they can understand how much progress we have made to continue to support these projects.”

Q: “I want a deeper dive and road maps to understand where we don’t have things filled in. How will the culture change at Hanford going from building and construction to operations?”

R: “The DOE building has a countdown clock to DFLAW. We are starting to make sure that all efforts are value-added and there are not time fillers.”

Q: “Is the 5 year plan consistent with the budgets?”

R: “Yes.”

Q: “Your comments on the budget are interesting. Would you support establishing some ground rules on what information exchange should be?”

R: “We naturally do that through the work plan process.”

C: “EPA doesn’t think if the budget stays at \$2.5 billion that the milestones in TPA on the RL side will be met.”

C: “I hope we can provide some common ground that already exists, and I am hopeful for some information for making well-informed decisions.”

Q: “I’m concerned looking at the graphic and top messaging of the 5 year plan. There is an increase of \$30-60 million in funding. We are going to need to be honest and say that it will remain contaminated for

hundreds of years. Are you open to saying upfront under our plan we will be leaving waste long term and acknowledging we have a funding problem?”

R: “This has been well communicated. We will continue to do remediation as needed and continue working with EPA for record of decision.”

Feedback and Input on the Hanford Site 5 Year Plan

Jim Lynch invited members to use their sticky notes to create questions. Members had the opportunity to create as many questions as they would like and post on the appropriate boards.

Answering Questions from HAB Members

Ruth Nicholson, Facilitator, welcomed members back to find their seats. Agencies answered members' questions from the sticky notes placed on the various poster boards. Brian Vance allocated the questions to the appropriate assistant managers that were familiar with the topic areas for a response.

Q: “Do you have a critical path schedule?”

R: “We have a level one critical path for DFLAW, and we can get that out to the team.”

Q: “Can you provide more details of the WTP technical issues and are you removing WTP from black cells?”

R: “We resolved technical issues in the July time frame for WTP. The definition for resolve is as far enough to be removed into engineering design.”

Q: “What about the AOA (alternative analysis) timeline, completion process, and the technical issues solved?”

R: “We have been in there since late April of this year, and the treatment cost has gone up about 25%. We are going back to evaluate the alternate method selected with is PT analysis. We are also looking at eight or nine other options at this time. We expect to get the results late spring or early summer of 2020. We will continue through the 413 processes with the consent decree process, and we don't have a good answer as to when that will be completed because the consent decree process takes some time. Verification of the technical issues was solved, and all the issues the HAB has addressed as issues have been responded to. We started into the high-level waste redesign last year. Right now, we are at a reduced level and not at full compacity.”

Q: “You have been in design for a year now, do you have specifics on that?”

R: “When we say re-design there are 58 major systems with various phases in life. The technical issues specific to high-level waste were solved in the 2014-time frame so we are well down the path to that.”

Q: “What are the plans for the testbed initiative? The plans may provide a very valuable path for early alternative low-level waste treatment and removal.”

R: “The plans for Test Bed Initiative (TBI) are the TBI equipment has been fabricated, and it was completed in the last couple of weeks. It was tested and it all works. It will be delivered out to the site this week or next. The plans are to put that in warehouses on site and store the equipment for future use. We withdrew

our permit application and that is still something we want to do and at some point, we can re-initiate the permit application and move on with TBI.”

Q: “Can you please provide more detail on the 2024 item to initiate alternate treatment and what is the process prior to initiation?”

R: “The longer-term plan for 2024 is that we do see the need for going beyond DFLAW. DFLAW is the top priority, and we will proceed with that being the top priority, but we need to establish a process for high-level waste mission and stand up a low activity waste capability to support the continuation of DFLAW and the vitrification facility. There are a lot of hoops to jump through in between now and then in terms of doing a more thorough analysis of the alternatives to make sure we are making the right decisions in treating tank waste.”

Q: “Is capsule dry storage the number one priority?”

R: “Yes the capsule dry storage is our number one priority, and you can see that from the flyer.”

Q: “What will happen to the PRF floor plan and when?”

R: “The PRF floor plan will get drilled through and sampled in the 2020 time period. There will be an evaluation of the slab as part of the characterization of the entire PRF site.”

Q: “When will SW1 and SW2 characterization be initiated?”

R: “THE SW1 and SW2 fell below the funding line so it won’t be started in 2020, but we are taking a look into when we will start to do that.”

Q: “Can you please explain the philosophy behind prioritizing building D and D on plateau vs soil cleanup at ERDF or characterizations for future cleanups? Can you explain how these plans were formed?”

R: “When you start the D and D, you’re looking at a couple of things. A workforce that is trained so there is continuity and how to execute work in chunks that won’t be stopped and started which is why the work plans are important. The plans were formed based on the composite analysis which is a tool we use to look at radionuclides and how they would impact the public and that weighs into the plans in terms of what we end up taking for actions.”

C: “Ecology’s perspective is we understand having a continuous workforce. We have an imbalance of having the right kind of waste going to ERDF because ERDF is using clean soil and instead, we should use contaminated soil for remediation. We would like a balance of D and D and soil remediation.”

R: “We understand your concern.”

Q: “Could the system plan could be modified to describe and model how the pieces fit together?”

R: “The system plan does have the work scopes in it. It evaluates many options for doing the tank waste mission, and there’s always one baseline option that ties to the schedules going forward in the near term. As it is put together, we will need to go back and validate that these work plans are consistent with the scope of work.”

C: “The frustration with the system plan is the document is hard to read.”

C: “We have heard that is not easy to read. The system plan will take on a different form wherein much of the information will be appropriate for an informed audience like the HAB. The technical information will be put more into the background with references on how to get there.”

Q: “I don’t see the need to identify a large characterization and effort. It is imperative for understanding conditions and building scope for future remediations efforts. Since long-term stewardship has little money, they are not prepared to remediate sites at Hanford that was not completely cleaned up. It was created for sites with extremely low residual low activity. Convince me that DOE-RL in 2019 will not pass on a hot site to long term stewardships.”

R: “We agree with that, and there are some details you don’t see in our normal processes where we do characterization work. The long-term stewardships we have on-site, that is something RL manages and will continue to manage within the RL system. This is still in the DOE-RL scope of work. Part of the process is the long-term stewardship doesn’t receive waste sites until all of the cleanups have been completed in accordance with records of decision. Then the package is transferred over to the long-term stewardship. As far as radioactivity on sites, it is in accordance with the record of decision which is captured in the documentation for the long-term stewardship.”

Q: “Based on the Analytical Building Blocks provided by DOE and advice on 300 response, the min safe FY 2021 account for approximately \$1 Billion which is nearly 50% of the budget requested for Hanford. Does DOE have any plans to reduce funding levels for these activities so more can be spent on actual cleanup activities?”

R: “The \$1 billion you see in there is tied into \$5-6 million for each office which is tied into min safe. As we complete some sites like K Basin, the min safe cost will be reduced once it is in the interim safe storage mode. We also challenge contractors to come up with innovate ways to reduce the costs.”

Q: “Will you be using the 5 year plan template to move forward?”

R: “I think it would be useful to use the template moving forward.”

Q: “What is the regulator's involvement in the 5 year plan? Can you explain how you are building public acceptance and trust in the 5 year plan?”

R: “We have spent an extensive amount of time with Ecology and brought in EPA in the process. We talk to agencies every week and want to maintain that dialogue so the TPA can maintain the priority list. As far as building trust with the public, I look at it as continuing to engage with the public and to clarify why and what we are doing.”

Q: “Can you explain the ability to have shovel-ready projects and the \$2.5billion budget?”

R: “For the shovel-ready projects, there is a line based on projects that we are drawing our funds from. Some projects may be below that line and are available to work on if we have the funds available. There is more work than funding is available to do. We will continue the process and work with Ecology and EPA on making those decisions moving forward. Every year we submit a compliant request and get those allocations out of Congress. It goes into the process, and then we get the funds out. We provide what we are authorized to provide.”

Gathering Priorities and Sharing Perspectives from HAB Members

Jim Lynch U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) reminded members this is an opportunity to have a dialogue. He welcomed members to participate in the round robin so members have the opportunity to make comments and ask questions.

Each Stakeholder seat was provided up to two minutes each to respond to the framing question round-robin style.

- *What is missing from the Hanford Site 5 year plan?*

The following paragraphs are transcribed member responses that do not represent consensus views of the Board.

Bob Suyama, Benton County

“The one thing I see missing and I’m not sure how you show it, maybe it goes in the line above the 24/7 operations but it’s missing staffing and everyone in the facilities is going to require a lot of staff and I know you’re slowly wrapping up and there’s a point where everyone’s going to be saying we need to hire ‘this operator’. Even yesterday while on the tour, the IDF [Integrated Disposal Facility] when they start running they will have to go into a longer campaign run so somehow you need to come up with a way to go out and look for the right people and put them in the right positions because there’s going to be operations, engineering and maintenance. These will all need the right people and places to maintain operations and once we start the LAW we cannot shut it down.”

Fred Brink, City of West Richland

“Richard Bloom has been my mentor; I’m going to deviate on the 5 year plan because I want to comment on what individuals have said so far. I had a conversation with Carrie Meyer on the break and I think one of the things you can do better is advertising. Funding is dependent on congressional buoyant which is dependent on public opinion. There should be a focus on the community outreach rather than calling meetings and there should be a focus on marketing to the community and to their goals. Yes, it’s time out of the office but delivering the message to the community will get the communities buoyant. I would suggest letters to the editors and getting the community buoyant. We represent the community on the HAB but sometimes it’s difficult to deliver the message you want to deliver.”

Vince Panesko, City of Richland

“I represent the city of Richland and the people who drink out of the Columbia River so we’re interested in the long-term effects. Back in the 60’s when I first started here there was a lot on dose to the public and keeping track of that. One thing missing from this plan you might consider later; it has 5 years and a lot of these things will reduce long term dose to the public and you’re not taking credit to that. You use the composite analysis to make these determinations, like moving capsules out of liquid storage to dry storage certain reduces risk to the public. Every action has an effect, like ERDF, we do a PA and it has an effect on the long term. There are other sites that are going to have an effect. There’s a couple of PA’s that have been done where radiation levels will be above standards for the drinking level, and then it has shown some inconsistencies. Having that mentioning the 5 year plan, the prediction of radiation for 1000 years or something like that will satisfy people like that. The last thing, the cesium in the filters in V plant should be added to that.”

Tony Umek, Tri-City Development Council

“Good job, I want to pick up on Bob’s thought and it would be interesting to see being in design construction and then to operations - you have an aging workforce and I would like to see a graphical representation that shows where we are today and where we need to be in 10 years and here’s the transitions from those here today that are going away. How many engineers and people do we have to achieve that? I’d like to see a plan for the aging workforce and filling those needs and what we need in the buckets and how we can achieve that ramp up.”

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy

“On the 5 year placemat, it would be helpful to know which ones have public involvement opportunities, maybe with an asterisk next to it and also what milestones are due that year? As far as the 5 year plan it would be good to know the interdependencies on the inner tasks and what is going on behind the scenes, but it does not show what is on the top line that is setting up the next 5 years. That’s where I think the HAB has an opportunity to have a dialogue.”

David Bolingbroke, Public at Large

“I would like to echo what Fred said and I would like to see a way that you’re planning to incorporate the public involvement in the 5 year plan so that 2-3 years down the road the public is aware of what the 5 year plan is. I’d also like to see how the outside factors affect the 5 year plan like the alternative analysis and research behind what the definition of high-level waste is as a way to show how those factors might change the scope of the cleanup in the future.”

Rob Davis, City of Pasco

“My biggest comment is later this month, we will have the NAS to talk about grout and alternative treatments and on the 2024 calendar it shows to initiate alternative treatment, but that is not very descriptive. Do you actually mean treating waste or do you mean initiating the construction of a 10 year program to get a facility to handle the supplemental waste?”

Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper

“One of the concerns I have is if we don’t look, we don’t know and there is a potential seriousness for waste sites in terms of stability. I want to see a really well-funded effort to do more characterization. We have 42 miles of unlined trenches, with sections that contain elements of concern to me and we need to be paying attention. There were also past practices that happened under the trenches, such as ponding that are of an issue of concern. One of the things we can do to build contingency and a better understanding to ward off potential unexpected events is to build characterization.”

Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management Employee

“My background is staffing people all over so one of my questions is: how does DOE’s 5 year vision and priorities consider work staffing and institutional knowledge? This warms my heart because I don’t think we understand what it will take to get people to get here and to keep them here. The demographics are changing and what are we doing to bring them up to speed to keep them here?”

Jan Catrell, Public-At-Large

“I’m happy to report that we got a facility tour that was so well crafted that it brought us sequentially through the DFLAW. In the end, you can really see the through-line from the beginning to the end and a humble water treatment plan that needs to be replaced so the capabilities they can provide will be met in time to make glass. What I saw when we moved through all the different facilities was a workforce that has a ‘Can-do’ spirit, and I believe they felt that way because of the mission. I didn’t know what I didn’t know, now I have a visual anchor for that and I thank you for that.”

Mohamed Osman, Washington State University

“This is my first time attending a HAB meeting. The Interim Director of School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, and I share her comments because I took part in the tour yesterday. One thing that is interesting for me, an electrical engineer, so was the comments when we went to the development of the power facilities. I think MSA taking the lead in that one. And I can see from looking here, we are going from 130 megawatts to 360 megawatts, and so my question here is how can we as an institute take part in training the needed manpower and if you have something like that running 24 hours a day, then we need people to make it reliable because I think they said there was 95% or more than 95% availability but the reliability was still down to 65% and in case of failure there was only a diesel generator which would only support essential things. And so I guess that is my comment.”

Marissa Marker, Nez Perce Tribe

“No Comment.”

Steve Wiegman, Public-At-Large

“First of all, I want to endorse what Jan Catrell said about the tour, all the people in the field were absolutely convincing to me that this system can, in fact, be started and operated and I have to admit I was really skeptical. What you really want is an endorsement of the plan, so instead of us sitting around and guessing what you didn’t include, I would suggest adding an appendix that describes the things that either extend beyond or that are not in the main body of the budget block that you’re going to be spending because we all know the whole system is going to cost quite a bit. My personal goal is you’re going to be able to achieve endorsement from us and we need a little more information in order to accomplish that.”

Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters

“Thank you all again for coming here. In the almost 25 years I have worked for Hanford we ran through about 12 managers and 3 major contract transitions. Every time one of these things happened, delays happened. My concern is much more with the transitions with contractors, and I do not see anything identifying this on the FY2020 and that can be a huge factor and I love this, I can share this with people and this is something I can explain and am really happy I can now see a path from startup but I also suggest some serious contemplation when contractors come on board and that you look really hard at some of the work they do that’s duplicative in order to put their name on a piece of paper when the piece of paper is just fine. I’m hoping when you have that transition you look at that as a way to not necessarily have that as a brand as part of the procedure or whatever that is but that is money that is wasted.”

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board

“Thank you for the DFLAW tour. There were a lot of young faces there so I would like to see pictures of people in the workforce so you can see who is behind the scenes like supervisors and officers. Then you can get a sense of what that workforce looked like, that many are aging. And then I would also like to know what milestones are left behind in the 5 year plan?”

Gene Van Liew, Richland Rod and Gun Club

“I would like to thank the tour yesterday and the 5 year plan that has taken a lot of effort and time. As the cleanup starts, the department has gone in and made sure that the revegetation has taken occurrence right away and are making efforts to stay ahead of the tumbleweeds. It’s an expensive procedure to have the nursery raise the native plants that have helped take care of the environmental issues of the other plants. They are also not planting in elevation; it is in a straight-flat and that is a costly event. The Columbia river water protects fish, wildlife, birds and helps people downstream so it is greatness to say we are getting safer water.”

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge

“I really like some of the thoughts that were articulated so far. Having seeing this for the first time, I feel like there could be improvements or iterations that can be used in different ways but it feels like some things are missing. The enabling assumptions can be expanded and it doesn’t show where there is a case if there’s a ramp up for something. There’s an over articulation of what’s realistic rather than what is ambitious. It would be good to think about what new categories can be added for each fiscal year such as things that set up the context for cleanup and also that shows the risk if the cleanup is not met. This might be good to get on the agenda for the PIC meeting in December.”

Kristen McNall, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board

“I was really heartened today to hear that the cost of min-safe might go down but one of the things I’ve been thinking about lately was if we have interim problems, this can be a substantial force on our budget. I have also been hearing that our funding will remain flat so my concern is that we have increased emergency projects and min-safe will increase with inflation that we will have less and less funding for cleanup. We need to have a greater focus especially in public information in how those costs are being created.”

Shannon Cram, University of Washington

“I echo everyone’s thanks and am appreciative of having this conversation. I would love to see some language in this document about how essential is public involvement and public conversations essential for the success of the cleanup. I know it was discussed in the presentations and I would love to see some grounded examples used in the next 5 years to acknowledge that the public is essential to make this happen and to make it happen equitably and efficiently.”

Closing Comments

Agencies provided their closing comments.

DOE

Brian Vance, Site Manager for DOE-ORP and Site Manager for DOE-RL provided members with his closing comments. Brian communicated that they will continue to demonstrate their efforts and continue

providing the opportunity for dialogue for the team. This meeting was a great place to discuss the Hanford Site 5 year plan and if there are ways to improve it, they will tailor it to different audiences at different times. Brian echoed the concerns about the workforce and the people in the workforce. They are working on many fronts to get out and reshape the perspectives while presenting opportunities for people to live in the community with a rewarding career. Brian noted they have to work together as Tri-Party agencies to create conditions for a more safe, efficient, and effective process in moving forward.

Ecology

Dan McDonald, Ecology stated there is a complexity involved in the discussion moving forward including manpower, material, maintenance, money, and methods. Dan stated we should continue to be aware as a community moving forward.

Nina Menard, Ecology thanked DOE for the good graphic placemat. Nina stated the biggest concern is with funding and the concern of being able to finish the cleanup at Hanford.

EPA

Laura Buelow, EPA appreciated the work and effort put into the 5 year plan and sees the 5 year plan as a useful communication tool. Laura stated in between the priorities for work and the deadlines, they recognize they won't get the funding they need every year, but appreciated everyone coming out to the meeting.

Susan Leckband adjourned the meeting.

Document Attachments

Document attachments represent presentations, literature, images, and exhibits distributed and covered during the Hanford Advisory Board COTW on October 17, 2019.

Attachment 01: The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternatives:

Susan Leckband, Member	Shelley Cimon, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member
Chuck Torelli, Member	Dan Solitz, Member	Jacob Reynolds, Member
Marissa Merker, Member	Rob Davis, Member	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Fred Brink, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Emmitt Jackson, Member
Tony Umek, Member	Jeff Burright, Alternate	Tom Sicilia, Alternate
Jan Catrell, Member	Steve Wiegman, Member	David Bolingbroke, Member
Tom Galioto, Member	Mohamed Osman, Member	Shannon Cram, Member (Phone)
Kristen McNall, Member (Phone)	Rodolfo Mendoza, Member (Phone)	Liz Mattson, Member (Phone)
Gerry Pollet, Alternate (Phone)	Ken Niles, Member (Phone)	

Others:

James Lynch, DOE-RL	JoLynn Garcia, DOE-RL	Carrie Meyer, DOE-RL
Dan McDonald, Ecology	Tom Rogers, WDOH	Joe Franco, DOE-RL
Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Brian Stickney, DOE-RL	Bill Hamel, DOE-ORP
Rob Hastings, DOE-ORP	Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP	Laura Buelow, EPA
Anne Knaap, Ecology	Nina Menard, Ecology	Jeff Lyon, Ecology
Earl Fordham, WDOH	John Martell, DOH	Mike Priddy, WDOH
Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)	Jen Colborn, MSA (Phone)	Lindsay Strasser, North Wind (Phone)
Yvonne Levardi, DOE (Phone)	Abi Zilar, North Wind (Phone)	Theresa Bergman, CHPRC (Phone)
Linda Maiden (Phone)	Curtis James Black (Phone)	Ruth Nicholson (Facilitator) ProSidian
Ashley Herring, ProSidian Facilitation Team		