MEETING MINUTES

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)
Budgets and Contracts (BCC)
February 10, 2022
Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening....2

Overview of Draft Advice and Issue Manager (IM) Team Work....2

Hanford Lifecycle, Scope and Cost Report....4

HAB Membership Packet for 2022-2023....5

Committee Business....5

Meeting Recording....6

Attachments....6

Attendees....6

Appendix A – Actions for Follow-up From July 12, 2021 BCC Meeting....8

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.

Opening

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, welcomed meeting participants and notified the participants that the meeting was being recorded.

Gary Younger, US Department of Energy (DOE), announced that this meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Tom Galioto, Public at Large and BCC chair, added his welcome to the attendees. Ruth reviewed the agenda.

Approve February 2021 Meeting Summary and August 2021 Meeting Minutes

Ruth noted that the one document was more akin to a summary than minutes, due the standards on the previous facilitation contract versus the present one. The documents were adopted with no comment.

Committee Elections

Ruth stated that presently, there were no nominations for BCC leadership. She explained that each of the committees that met that week have proceeded a bit differently in their election process.

Tom explained that he was in some of the other committee election discussions that week and supported the approach taken in the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) meeting, which was to begin taking nominations that day and to hold elections in the April committee meeting. He noted that Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management and BCC vice chair, was not present for the discussion. Additionally, he would prefer that the BCC membership had time to consider its nominations.

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, voiced his support for the approach and felt it was appropriate considering outstanding questions regarding the HAB membership packet for that year.

Gary reminded the committee that Emmitt's term would end on June 30th of that year and as in a term limited seat, with the note that that term limit was different than new term limits under consideration.

Ruth asked that nominations be received by March 25th in order to get that information out to the committee in time for its next meeting. She would check with any nominees to ensure the individuals were willing to serve. She explained that members could nominate themselves or others. If any member was usure of what the leadership positions consisted of, they were free to ask herself or Gary for help.

Announcements

Tom asked if there was a comment period expected for the *Hanford Lifecycle, Scope and Cost Report.* Gary stated he was usure but would check. He knew that the report was released to the public and expected that there was going to be a public meeting on the cleanup priorities topic in mid-March. Plans for that were being finalized.

Dana Cowley, Hanford Mission Integration Solutions (HMIS), stated that, historically, there were no public meetings held for the report as they were not required. She provided a link to where the report could be found: https://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/HanfordLifecycleReports.

Overview of Draft Advice and Issue Manager (IM) Team Work

Tom Galioto explained that he presented the committee's draft advice on Hanford Site cleanup priorities to the other committees meeting that week, gathering feedback. For BCC members that did not serve on the IM team, he provided a brief review of the advice.

Tom explained that the advice used three primary inputs in its development. Those included the HAB's consensus advice on the topic from the previous year, which DOE expressed its acceptance of, as well as the updated Hanford 5-Year Plan, and comments from the Hanford 5-Year Plan public meeting. The format of the advice was the same as the previous year, with some small changes such as "crosscutting activities" being changed to "indirect/supporting activities."

He noted that the advice was focused specifically on the formulation year, despite considering an alternative proposal from DOE. DOE suggested a change from a single fiscal year focus to encompass the whole 5-Year Plan, however, the Issue Manager (IM) leading the advice elected not to, as it preferred the advice be focused. Tom asked for committee comment on that point.

Esteban Ortiz, Green Latinos, commented that there was a possibility of considerable change over the course of five years, and as a result, preferred that the advice focus on a single fiscal year. Tom noted that, in recognition of that, there was a sentence added to the advice that noted that items anticipated to be completed by that year were not included in the priorities, however, if they were not completed, they would become priorities.

Max Woods, Oregon Department of Energy, also agreed with the approach. He asked, however, if the committee or the HAB overall thought there might be a need to take a look at the Hanford 5-Year Plan as a separate piece of advice. Tom explained the situation around the Hanford 5-Year Plan public meeting, noting that a letter submitted by himself and other BCC members was referenced in the cleanup priorities draft advice. It was stated by DOE that those comments would be addressed in the next year's plan update. Tom stated that he would prefer in the future that the Hanford 5-Year Plan be presented to the HAB earlier, such that it could be commented on before it went out the broader public. Gary Younger stated that he could take that request back to see if that would be a possibility in the future. Ruth Nicholson clarified that the HAB can provide advice on either, but it was dependent on process and timelines.

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, stated that as he remembered the comments on the Hanford 5-Year Plan, there was a lot of energy from the public about not having the opportunity to participate in the formulation of the plan or the draft presented.

Tom moved onward with reviewing the advice content. He hoped that each TPA agency would respond regarding their support for the individual priority items. Max asked if a response was received from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) or the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the prior year's advice. It was confirmed that there were not. Gary clarified that DOE does discuss its response with the other TPA agencies, so even when they are not signatory to a response, they do have some input. In other instances, they provide their own individual responses.

Max asked if the BCC was the fourth committee to look at the advice. Tom explained that the IM team had the first pass and developed the advice and took advantage of committee week scheduling to allow three other committees to provide comment. BCC was the fourth committee to review the draft but had longer to discuss it. Ruth provided a review of the process, explaining the sequence where an IM team was created by a committee, followed by IM team work on advice, which was then brought back to committee.

Tom continued through the draft advice content, focusing on the individual cleanup priority items. Comments provided by other committees were reviewed, item-by-item. Committee members asked clarifying questions on a selection of items. Questions that could not be immediately answered were added as notes for IM team review.

The workforce related item was discussed at length. Max noted that to be a particular area of interest for him, alongside worker safety. He wondered if that item could be directed to EPA and Ecology as well. Ginger Wireman, Ecology, felt that Ecology should be looking at that as a salary problem, as there was a considerable imbalance of wages offered by Ecology compared to DOE. As a result, workers may get trained through Ecology in order to seek careers with DOE instead. Esteban agreed, stating that workforce considerations should be a joint effort between the TPA agencies.

Upon completion of the review, Tom asked that, should there be additional comments, members submit those to himself or the facilitation team.

Hanford Lifecycle, Scope and Cost Report

Tom Galioto reintroduced the topic of the *Hanford Lifecycle, Scope and Cost Report*, noting that he hoped for DOE to provide a briefing on the report in BCC's April meeting. For the time being, he hoped to provide a short overview of what the report consisted of, without going into detail.

Tom noted that each time a new version of the report was published, it tended to result in a lot of consternation due to the stated timeframe and total cost of Hanford cleanup. He reviewed the graphics present in the report, which showed a low range estimate from the present point of $300 billion. That figure assumed that all aspects of cleanup moved ahead as expected, with cleanup achieved by 2078, followed by low-level maintenance beyond that to the end of the century. If things did not go as planned, the report showed that the cost could be more than double at $640 billion. He noted that the assumptions made in those figures were detailed within the report.

He explained that, presently, the site was receiving between $2 and $2.5 billion in funding per year, but the report showed that the need for the present year was $3 billion, then rapidly rising each year. The best-case scenario figure did not appear to be realistic against the funding levels Hanford was receiving. He continued to review aspects of the report, including the work scope breakdown and schedules. He noted that the Central Plateau schedule went beyond the rest of the items, but tank waste was the "funding beast" that required the most funding.

Tom stated that he hoped to discuss the report in greater detail in April. Ideally that would include a DOE presentation, but he hoped to at least hold a discussion otherwise. He also noted that the report was put together with two variable factors, schedule and cost, and as one changes, so did the other. As the schedule extended, cost went up, but as the schedule went down, the cost also went up. Conversely, the budget raising would not increase the schedule, but if the budget was lower than needed, the schedule increased dramatically. With adequate budget, there was potential to achieve cleanup faster.

He asked that the committee review the report and provide feedback in April.

Chris Sutton asked if it was known who prepared the report for DOE, noting that in the past, other federal agencies such as the US Army Corps of Engineers were commissioned to oversee the report. Gary Younger was unsure and stated that he would ask about that.

Esteban Ortiz felt that it was important to ensure the public was aware of the conditions presented in the report, as that was essential for the TPA agencies and the public to agree on what needed to be done and work toward a common goal. Otherwise, there was greater potential for the work to be delayed. He likened it to his experience in the US Navy: if there were not enough people to do the work, they did not have the means to propel a ship. Tom and Gary agreed, with Gary noting that it was ideal for DOE to be able to show the work that it had done, as by showing the value the funding provided, DOE was able to get more funds in turn.

HAB Membership Packet for 2022-2023

Gary Younger hosted a question-and-answer session, as many of the committee members were present for his presentation on the same topic the previous two days. He noted that he was working to get answers to the questions posed on paper and that members of the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) may see those results.

Tom Galioto stated, for members of the BCC not yet introduced to the subject, that DOE Headquarters had presented a case for membership packet changes that involved new criteria for potential HAB members, presented changes to how diversity issues might be handled and improved upon, and posed potential changes to how term limits were handled. He noted that there was "movement" within the HAB to discuss the option of submitting and advice item on the topic at an EIC meeting, as the changes could have a critical impact to the functionality of the HAB.

Susan Coleman, Public at Large, suggested that, for university-specific seats, that Columbia Basin College (CBC) should be included, as it represented an incredibly diverse population. Gary stated he appreciated the comment and stated it was an option for consideration being considered. That was considered not only for diversity, but many Hanford-related pipelines and programs were at CBC. As an example, many of Hanford's laboratory technicians trained there before the analytical laboratory was available.

Ginger Wireman stated that Eastern Washington University and Heritage College should be considered as well, with Heritage College at the top of that list, as it served a large Latino and Native American population. Gary agreed.

Committee Business

Tom Galioto reviewed a committee business action items list (*Appendix A*). He noted that the time for several items had passed or were no longer relevant. He closed or updated items as applicable. Two items were added: a question to the EIC of the best means to submit comments on the *Hanford Lifecycle, Scope and Cost Report* and Chris Sutton's question of who developed the report, which Gary Younger agreed to ask about.

Tom informed the committee about a EIC discussion on potential committee restructuring, as some of the BCC members had not has exposure to the discussion. He explained that a question was raised on the topic to determine if the current five HAB committees would adequately address the needs of the Hanford Site as it moved into operations. He offered to answer any questions the committee might have on the topic and to bring member concerns back to the EIC.

Chris Sutton stated that it was the first he heard of topic and asked if the discussion originated with the HAB or DOE. Tom was not sure but stated that the initial idea appeared to come from discussions between DOE and HAB leadership. He noted that the idea had not yet been discussed in depth. Gary clarified that the idea was to make an examination, but not necessarily a decision. It may be decided that the HAB committee structure was fine as-is.

Tom requested a BCC meeting during committee week in April. For topics, he asked that a briefing and discussion on the *Hanford Lifecycle, Scope and Cost Report* be held. Additionally, he hoped to review the BCC work plan for the coming year. He explained that the initial draft of the work plan would typically be created at a Leadership Workshop, which was planned for May of that year. He hoped for committee input prior to that. Tom also noted that there were topics that were not available for the day's meeting that he hoped would be a possibility in April, including a presentation on the end state contracting model. He

asked that it cover the item in greater depth than a 101 briefing, such that the committee could better understand the budget breakdown and work packages that influenced the control of funds. Gary agreed to look into the requests.

In closing, Tom expressed his appreciation for the participants' time. He stated that the committee's comments on the cleanup priorities draft advice would be reviewed by the IM team, which was planned to be presented in the March Board meeting. He hoped the committee members would attend and be satisfied with the final product.

Meeting Recording

https://youtu.be/XKPQRs1OPCM

Attachments

Attachment 1: Meeting Agenda

Attachment 2: Deputy Designated Federal Officer Slide

Attachment 3: Draft Meeting Minutes from February 2021 BCC meeting

Attachment 4: Draft Meeting Minutes from August 2021 BCC meeting

Attachment 5: Draft Advice on Hanford Cleanup Priorities

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Dan Solitz, Primary	Estaban Ortiz, Primary	Maxwell Woods, Primary
Robert Waldher, Primary	Steve Anderson, Primary	Susan Coleman, Primary
Tom Galioto, Primary	Chris Sutton, Alternate	

Others:

Gary Younger, DOE	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Abigail Zilar, GSSC for DOE
	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Amber Peters, HMIS
	Spencer Good, Ecology	Cerise Peck, HMIS
	Earl Fordham, Washington State Department of Health	Dana Cowley, HMIS
		Patrick Conrad, HMIS
		Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge
		KB
		Joshua Patnaude, HAB Facilitation Team
		Olivia Wilcox, HAB Facilitation Team
		Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitation Team

Note: Participants for this virtual meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.

Appendix A – Actions for Follow-up From July 12, 2021 BCC Meeting

(Updated at the February 10, 2022 BCC Meeting)

Item #	Action Description	Creation Date:	Assigned To:	Status
1	Does the Idaho EMSSAB have similar concerns as the HAB re: not receiving detailed budget info prior to DOE submittal to HQ	8/12/2021	Jacob Riddle	Cancel this one. 2/22
2	Provide detail of DOE-EM key personnel involved in budget and program reviews.	8/12/2021	Jacob Riddle	DOE-EM personnel. Still of interest. 2/22
3	Identify the proper way to transmit the budget sharing chart to DOE, and send it to DOE	8/12/2021	Tom Galioto	Consider creating formal Advice to transmit. – update 2/22 decided not to do advice. Closed
4	DOE to review/comment/concur with HAB budget sharing chart	8/12/2021	Gary Younger	Closed 2/22. Gary followed up with MGT
5	Provide the most recent (~Feb 2021) DOE-EM budget guidance memorandum sent to DOE sites	8/12/2021	Jacob Riddle	Closed 2/22. Provided
6	Determine how the HAB members can access public budget info; ideally receive presentation on the subject.	8/12/2021	Unassigned	It's not clear where we can find this type of info. Unclear path forward. – 2/22 update – re-assigned to Tom Galioto to research for BCC
7	Upload (to Teams BCC group site) C. Sutton's comparison eval of HAB Advice #309 items with DOE FY2023 Cleanup Priorities from 7/15/2021 public meeting	8/12/2021	Chris Sutton	Posted to Teams – 2/22 update - Completed
8	Investigate TPA Milestone #36 requiring DOE Lifecycle eval every 3 yrs.	8/12/2021	Tom Galioto	2/22 – Being done. Complete
9	Confirm that DOE includes a copy of our Cleanup Priorities advice with its annual budget submittals to DOE-HQ and ultimately to OMB.	8/12/2021	Gary Younger	2/22 – how do we confirm that? Gary sent it to HQ. Closed
10	T.Fletcher previously mentioned SRS received $5M to support culture/ workforce issues. Did Hanford receive similar funds?	8/12/2021	Gary Younger	Emails exchanged. 2/22 update – OPEN. Follow up with Tom Fletcher

Item #	Action Description	Creation Date:	Assigned To:	Status
11	BCC call scheduled for Aug 24. Get agenda items to Ruth.	8/12/2021	Tom Galioto	Call held. Closed.
12	Clarify with EIC the best way to submit comments on Lifecycle SSS Report	2/09/2022	Tom Galioto	Pending
13	Question of what organization developed the 2021 Lifecycle SSS Report (DOE, Contractor, Other?)	2/09/2022	Gary Younger	Pending