



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

April 17 & 18, 2019

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 2

Welcome & Announcements 3

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates..... 3

Public Comment..... 9

Draft White Paper: System Plan Assumptions 9

Member Introductions/Roundtable 10

Draft Advice: FY2021 Budget Priorities 10

HAB Committee Reports 11

New Member Orientation 15

Phoenix Platform Demonstration..... 17

Board Business..... 18

Attachments 18

Attendees 19

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.

Executive Summary

Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) Action

There was one piece of advice adopted during the April Hanford Advisory Board meeting.

There was one white paper adopted during the April Hanford Advisory Board meeting.

Hanford Advisory Board Business

The Board will hold three committee calls in April. The Board discussed the following:

- Draft Advice: FY2021 Budget Priorities
- Draft White Paper: System Plan Assumptions
- Future Committee of the Whole (COTW) topics
- Scheduling for upcoming committee meetings and phone calls
- Potential products for the June Hanford Advisory Board meeting

Presentations & Updates

The Hanford Advisory Board received the following presentations and updates:

- Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates
- New Member Orientation
- Phoenix Platform Demonstration
- Draft Advice: FY2021 Budget Priorities
- HAB Committee Reports

Public Comment

There were no public comments received at the April meeting.

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters and Board Chair called the meeting to order. The meeting was open to members of the public and offered opportunities for public comment.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

Welcome & Announcements

Jim Lynch, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP) and Richland Operations (RL), noted that the meeting was in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Jim reminded members of the HAB's operating ground rules which were posted both in the back of the room as well as at each seat. In addition, Jim announced upcoming calendar changes which would be discussed in further detail on day two of the Board meeting.

Susan Leckband, Board Chair announced the upcoming departure of Kristen Holmes. Susan thanked Kris for all of her hard work with the Board and wished her luck in her future endeavors. Susan introduced JoLynn Garcia, DOE-ORP and new Federal Coordinator for the HAB.

Susan thanked Board members for their continued commitment to the Hanford Advisory Board and to Hanford cleanup.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge announced as she is expecting her second child, she will be transitioning away from Hanford. Liz took time to share her reflections of her time on the HAB.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland announced her office will be moving to the new city hall in two weeks. In preparation for the move, Pam has brought 30-minute videos on Hanford cleanup which are available for those interested.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy introduced new HAB alternate for Oregon, Tom Sicilia. Tom is a hydrogeologist that will be attending RAP meetings moving forward.

Lindsay Strasser, HAB facilitator provided members with informational announcements.

Susan Leckband confirmed the adoption of the [September 2018 Board meeting summary](#).

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Dave Einan, EPA Region 10 Manager, updated HAB members on recent EPA activities. Key points covered in Dave's update include:

- The Regional EPA office has realigned. Dave Einan has a different title but will continue with the same scope of duties.
- Dave introduced Monica McEaddy, EPA Regional Coordinator for Region 10. Monica is a chemical engineer with a master's degree in environmental engineering. Monica has worked for EPA for over 30 years. Monica is in the Tri-Cities for a Federal Facilities Remedial Project

Management manager's training. This training has been offered five times and there are currently 36 individuals enrolled in the training.

- Monica works in the Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse office. The Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse office reports directly to the Administrator of Office of Land Emergency Management (OLEM).
- EPA's role is to provide oversight to the environmental cleanup at federal facility sites. There are 174 federal facility sites that are listed on the national priority list. EPA works with their regions to ensure there is consistency in the implementation of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) law, policy, and guidance.
- There are roughly 100 full-time employees across the country that work on federal facility sites.
- The cleanup of the Hanford Site is a priority for EPA. A briefing is scheduled for May to provide the EPA administrator information on Hanford cleanup and discuss a proposed plan.
- Any decision document that is \$50 million dollars or more requires administrator review.
- A leadership council meeting is scheduled for May. A representative will be speaking to EPA regarding priorities of Department of Energy.
- EPA is working with DOE and Ethos regarding a dialogue discussion. The next dialogue discussion is scheduled for the summer timeframe.

U.S. Department of Energy

Brian Vance, Site Manager for DOE-ORP and Acting Site Manager for DOE-RL provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent Hanford Site activities. Brian noted the following key points in his presentation:

- Brian communicated that this is his first HAB meeting representing both DOE-ORP and DOE-RL. This is not an office combination and is not intended to be. Budget lines will remain separate for both offices. This is an opportunity for the offices to work together more effectively to create a culture that supports the progress being made across the Site.
- There are a number of changes at the Site Brian shared with Board members. Changes include:
 - The TPA Lifecycle report outlined a change in the estimate in cost for the Site overtime. This report creates an opportunity for change and challenge to the Hanford Site.
 - Contract transition has begun.
 - All of the proposals for the mission support contract have been received and the source selection process has begun. Brian expects award in the August timeframe.

- All the proposals have been received for the Tank Farms contract. Expected award is in late July or the early August timeframe.
 - All of the Central Plateau proposals have been received.
 - DOE is in the source selection process for all of the major contracts on the Hanford Site.
- Projects on the Site have all been going very well. The second phase of low-risk demolition has begun at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). Sludge is moving off the river. Stabilization is in progress at the 324 Building.
- Progress is continued to be seen with Direct-Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW).
- Brian continues to focus on the following four themes:
 - Transition to operations
 - Being a demanding and fair customer
 - Constructive stakeholder relationships and engagement
 - Making progress toward a major milestone
- An ethical-compliant culture is being implemented at DOE and with its contractors. DOE is working to ensure an ethical-compliant culture is being brought out into the open and is being reinforced in a very visible way.
- There are a lot of reasons to be optimistic about cleanup of the Hanford Site. All projects are making progress both safely and effectively. Relationships with contractors, regulators and laborers are strengthening across the Site.

U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection

Tom Fletcher, Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) Federal Project Director and DFLAW Program Manager for DOE-ORP, provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent ORP activities. Tom noted the following key points in his presentation:

- DFLAW can be seen as a holistic Site project. DFLAW includes all four contractors and all four contract Assistant Managers (AM) to be able to treat Low-Activity Waste (LAW).
- The Tank-Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) System will be located just outside of the Tank Farms. There will be three Conex boxes full of infrastructure. The main component of TSCR is the three ion-exchange columns.
- The TSCR System is 90% design complete.
- DOE-ORP is using information received from the Tank Closure Cesium Removal (TCCR) System used at the Savannah River Site to aid TSCR startup.

- A significant amount of work is going on at WTP. The Effluent Management Facility (EMF) is almost completely closed. In addition, DOE-ORP has completed about half of the system turnovers.
- At the end of March, DOE made declaration of all the major known technical issues associated with DFLAW on the quality assurance side of the house. Those technical issues have been resolved.
- The SX Farm barriers are put in place to mitigate water infiltration. In most cases it's to stop any migration that water infiltration may cause due to historical fills over over-flow events.
- Double-Shell Tank (DST) integrity technology has advanced tremendously. The ability to understand the integrity of the tank bottom has been a major advancement for the DST Integrity program.
- The Test Bed Initiative is in Phase II. The current objective is to have 2,000 gallons treated and solidified and disposed of in FY2020.
- There is a public meeting scheduled between DOE and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in May to discuss Waste Management Area C.

U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office

Joe Franco, Deputy Manager for DOE-RL provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent DOE-RL activities. Joe noted the following key points in his presentation:

- DOE-RL continues to update and upgrade infrastructure on the Hanford Site. There are hundreds of miles of water lines, sewer lines, roads, electrical lines, and transmission lines. DOE has made a valid effort to understand the state of the infrastructure. DOE will need to apply resources to get the infrastructure up to speed to support upcoming projects on the Hanford Site.
- Grouting of the Plutonium Uranium Extraction Plant (PUREX) Tunnel 2 is 99% complete. Weekly updates can be found on www.hanford.gov. DOE-RL utilized lessons learned from PUREX Tunnel 1 for the grouting of PUREX Tunnel 2. There have been 38,000 cubic yards or 4,000 truckloads of grout used to fill PUREX Tunnel 2.
- The K Basin Sludge Removal Project has been a success. The system in place has been working very efficiently and work is roughly half done. Eleven containers have been transported to T Plant from the K West Reactor Basin. This project is predicted to be complete in September 2019.
- The Plutonium Finishing Plant project has started back up with debris removal and demolition has resumed. DOE-RL is monitoring the contractor's operation making sure all of the controls put in place and the expanded area of operation is workable while maintaining the safety of the workforce.
- Low-risk rubble cleanup is complete at PFP. Low-risk demolition has begun. During the time of low-risk demolition, DOE-RL will be preparing for the high-risk work.

- The 324 Building has several hot cells as well as contamination of Strontium (Sr) and Cesium (Cr) underneath the building. DOE-RL is in the process of removing the highly-contaminated soils underneath the 324 Building.
- The Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) Capsule Project is a high-priority project for DOE-RL. 1936 SR and CR capsules will be moved from wet storage in the Basin to a dry storage pad.
- 216-Z-9 Crib and Tank 241-Z-361 are high-risk aging structures on the Hanford Site. DOE-RL will be reviewing the stabilization process of these structures. The stabilization process will be compliant with the remediation under the Record of Decision (ROD).

Washington State Department of Ecology

Alex Smith, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) Program Manager, provided Board members with an update on recent Ecology activities. Alex noted the following key points in her presentation:

- Ecology is supportive of phase II of the Test Bed Initiative (TBI). Ecology supports the concept of getting waste treated and out of the state for final disposal.
- Ecology is working with DOE-ORP to approve the permit that is needed in Tank Farms to support the Test Bed Initiative. The permit will be a Research and Development (R&D) Permit. Meetings are currently underway to look at what this permit might look like.
- Maia Bellon met with Anne White in late March to discuss a variety of issues. Maia shared with Anne White that Ecology supports the TBI. However, Ecology does not want TBI to impact DFLAW.
- The Tri-Party Agreement turns 30 this year. The Tri-Party Agreement was signed in 1989.
- Ecology is currently evaluating 2019 funding and how it may fall short to meet TPA milestone obligations. Milestones may be moved out to accommodate funding deficits.
- System Plan 8 negotiations are in progress. The deadline for negotiations has been extended to May 17, 2019. Ecology is hopeful no further extensions are needed. There will be public comment period as well as a briefing to the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) when complete.
- In 2019, Ecology has processed 47 permit modifications for the Hanford Site.
- The law requires the renewal of a Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) permit every 10 years. Rev. 8C is the current permit DOE is operating to.
- Rev. 9 will be the renewal of the Hanford Site permit. Ecology is working to a very comprehensive schedule with the final permit expected to be issued in 2022.

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

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

Q: “I know we are very early in the FY2020 budget process. Could you share with us what the compliant budget request for FY2020 that went from Hanford to DOE Headquarters?”

R: “I believe those numbers are publically available. I believe the number for DOE-RL was \$1.4 billion and DOE-ORP was \$1.8 billion for the top line.”

Q: “For DFLAW, the work in AP Farms and the ability to transfer from tank to tank. Does that transferability exist now? Or is that part of the upgrades you need to do to get ready?”

R: “Within AP Farms, it exists today. From AP to TSCR and back will need to be added.”

Q: “Is TBI part of our local budget submittal to DOE-Headquarters or is it coming from a separate funding source?”

R: “This depends on what year we are talking about. In the budget you see a line for 14A; that is a local request.”

Q: “Where does the TBI funding come from for FY2021?”

R: “That will be a local request.”

Q: “Assuming phase II of the TBI is a success, what comes next?”

R: “Once we are successful with TBI phase II that will establish a basis and help us to demonstrate technical capability of pretreating tank waste. It will allow us to do some of the math and be able to move us forward to identify if this is a suitable pretreatment process. It will also potentially allow us to use this process to clear out more space in the 200 West Area in the SY Farms.”

C: “Thank you so much. Your presentations were fascinating and encouraging. Alex, thank you so much for your presentation and giving us a sense where Ecology is at. That was very encouraging as well.”

C: “I just wanted to bring something up that came up at the Public Involvement & Communications (PIC) committee meeting yesterday about storytelling and presentations. Looking ahead and thinking about the Lifecycle report implications and the milestones that will probably be changing in the future, just the fact with Hanford that deadlines keep changing. We were talking about the opportunity with the M-91 milestone coming up, to look at how that story can be told a little differently and workshopping that. In preparation with how we talk about those things with the public, we have two newer people on the PIC with new ideas on how to tell stories. We don’t always do the best at telling a story to engage people. It is more a laundry list of the progress that has been made.”

Q: “When will the System Plan be ready for public comment?”

R: “System Plan 8 is out on the website. System Plan 9 scenarios are due by October 31st for the TPA.”

Public Comment

There were no public comments received at the April Board meeting.

Draft White Paper: System Plan Assumptions

Bob Suyama, Chair of the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) introduced the topic of the Draft White Paper on System Plan Assumptions. Bob communicated that 13 months ago, System Plan 8 was issued and John Price challenged the Board to provide preferred scenarios. Lead by Jeff Burrigh, the TWC took on this challenge reviewing System Plan 8 in detail. The Board responded to John Price's challenge via a round table discussion at the September Board meeting. The transcribed responses of Board members were incorporated in the white paper.

Jeff Burrigh shared that the TWC was not looking for new edits. The process was simply to memorialize the work that has been done. Jeff provided a reminder that the purpose of the System Plan is to take a look at the mission for tank waste retrieval and treatment going out 40-50 years. Then asking what if questions of the current path. Can we shorten the mission or make it any less expensive? System Plan 8 looked at 11 different scenarios. John's challenge to the Board was to try to figure out if the Board had a preferred scenario out of a mix and match combination of what was presented in System Plan 8. After a lot of discussion, the group decided they would be unable to land on a single preferred scenario. What the group could do is develop a list of assumptions they thought were worthy of further consideration.

Agency & Regulator Perspective

Jim Lynch, DOE shared that he has been following the process along with the Board. Jim expressed his appreciation for the effort and the process of memorializing the document. He believes the white paper was a valuable way to capture a variety of opinions. Jim plans to share the white paper with the DOE folks leading the System Plan discussions.

John Price, Ecology expressed his appreciation for the Board's white paper. John does not feel like it was necessary to pick one scenario. From a public involvement standpoint, John hopes to get to some draft milestones in the current System Plan negotiations shortly. With milestone changes, Ecology is trying to explain changes in a legal order. Ecology struggles to explain what the public's choices are and what they should be talking about. The white paper provides a road map to discuss the choices and issues they should be talking about.

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

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

Q: "How will Ecology or others at DOE use the white paper for development of System Plan 9?"

R: "We are working on System Plan 9 scenarios with DOE. When this is approved, we will probably take this back to our team. We will ask them to give us a rundown of how many of these things are in the scenarios and how many are not. Certainly if we are not putting some of these things in the scenarios, we

should be able to explain why we didn't. I think as Jeff explained, we are due a briefing back to the Board on the scenarios. I think Ecology and DOE should explain why we didn't include certain things if we do not include them. It really is a roadmap for us."

R: "I am not directly involved by that is exactly what I would do. I would share with the team and have them take a look at the table. I do appreciate you including the rationale and the purpose of each of the scenarios. I don't know if that mirrors exactly how the System Plan gets published, but I think that is an important thing for the team to discuss."

C: "It would be awesome if the people working on the scenarios were asked to read the white paper. I know it is long but it would be great. I would be curious if it influences any of their thoughts and ideas."

By consensus, the System Plan Assumptions white paper was approved. Members agreed to send the white paper to Ecology and DOE-ORP.

Member Introductions/Roundtable

Susan Leckband, Board Chair introduced the topic of Member Introductions/Roundtable. She shared that this topic on the agenda is to introduce everyone to each other with an emphasis on the new members. This time is an opportunity for those who have been on the Board to share their passion for Hanford cleanup.

Using the framing information provided on the agenda, members went around the table providing formal introductions and sharing what it was that got him or her involved with Hanford cleanup.

Draft Advice: FY2021 Budget Priorities

Tom Galioto, Public at Large and Budgets & Contracts Committee (BCC) Chair introduced the FY2021 Budget Priorities draft advice. Tom provided members with an overview of the development process of the FY2021 Budget Priorities draft advice. Tom shared that to be most effective, budget advice should be submitted in the April/May timeframe.

Agency Perspective

Jim Lynch, DOE shared that the process to include all committees that the Issue Manager team went through to generate this advice was great. The layout of the advice highlighting the priorities with descriptions is helpful for the Agencies.

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

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

C: "I want to congratulate the team on a really outstanding piece of advice. I am really impressed with the writing of this document."

Q: "Do you think we should or shouldn't clarify the statement?"

R: "I was really struck by Brian Vance's presentation this morning. In particular, I am fairly concerned cleanup is being rebranded to risk reduction. There was a quote that read "we continue to reduce the risk at the Site." He went on to say we continue to go on to shape the trajectory of the Site. I am pretty

concerned that risk reduction is going to be the new cleanup and I don't like that at all. It was from the language, it wasn't what was on the slides. I would be delighted to be proven wrong."

C: "If we are not concerned about risk, then why are we doing cleanup? How clean is clean enough? If you get it down to the point where there is no risk associated with it, then it's clean enough. We are not going to get it all off the Site. There is sometime where we have to say this is clean enough. It is clean enough when it is down to an acceptable level. If you don't put risk in there, I don't see how you are going to answer the question."

C: "The cleanup levels are based on risk. The RCRA values are all based on risk. It's the same when you talk about radiation dose. There is a dose associated with certain levels of radiation exposure. You start with that and you go down through the calculations and come up with an acceptable level. Risk is being used all the time. Now we are just adding cleanup levels."

C: "I think the conversation of risk needs to happen in another place and not be associated with this advice. The terminology used in cleanup is a risk-based understanding. I like the thought. The thought is we are defining cleanup as a fuller body than simply risk reduction. Maybe it's a different place. Maybe it's a different advice. We have to go with the terminology already being used otherwise we may lose our message."

C: "I think we are running into something I struggle with a lot when I do talks with students about Hanford. They think cleanup means that everything gone. Cleanup is based on a risk metric. I often use the risk metric to talk about cleanup. Cleanup doesn't mean no waste, that's not what the regulations are. I also see your point in which there is a way in which risk management can stand in for taking things out of the ground. Because cleanup is already risk management by regulations it's confusing to say that they are separate."

C: "This is clearly a rich vein of discussion that everyone has really well-formed ideas on. I just wanted to point out that tomorrow we are going to be talking about potential committee of the whole topics. One of the suggested topics is a discussion is what we mean by risk that can relate to end-state criteria and how it relates to cleanup. Cleanup itself is an abstract term. How clean is clean? I want to get to a place where we arrive at a place of mutual understanding. I don't know that we will get to that point with one sentence in the budget advice. I just want to point out that we have another opportunity."

Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions and minor wording changes, the Board approved the draft advice. Members agreed to distribute the FY2021 Budget Priorities advice to Department of Energy.

HAB Committee Reports

Board and Committee Leadership provided reports on recent activities, ongoing efforts and anticipated products.

National Liaison

Pam Larsen, City of Richland and National Liaison provided Board members an update on current events. Pam's report included the following:

Anne White – Comments at Waste Management

- The Environmental Management (EM) program is 30 years old. The program was established by President Bush, Admiral Watkins and Leo Duffy.
- In 1990, President Bush declared the end of the cold war and began downsizing the nuclear complex.
- Progress report:
 - 91 sites cleaned up
 - 16 sites remaining
- 16,000 RCRA permits won't work.
- They have a renewed sense of urgency to drive down the liability.
- Use accurate updated information for program management and accountability.
- Prioritization will be based on science and risk.
- They are examining the comments they received on the High-Level Waste definition.
- The Deputy Secretary is looking at options for regulatory reform.
- They are exploring RCRA/CERCLA integration.
- They want to drive down maintenance and operations costs.
- Subcontractor and small business goals will be a priority.
- EM will be restoring their intern program.

Jeff Griffen – EM3 Field Operations

- They want consistency and accountability in interactions with contractors, focusing on project completion.
- They have established a new HQ fee advisory board for consistency. They want to be fair and robust and clearly define corporate expectations.
- They will stress safety, security, QA, and will streamline contracts to expedite closure.
- Each site will do an options analysis to tackle liabilities in 10 years or less. These should be shared with stakeholders in April.

End State Contracting

- The end-state philosophy is being called a key “reform initiative” for contracting in an effort to reduce the EM program’s lifecycle cost estimate. If the work goals can be met, the program can begin to reduce the cost estimates that have increased over the past 8 years to over \$369 billion.
- The principle idea is to pay more fee for early and under cost work. This is an effort to replicate successes made with cost-plus-incentive fee contracts used for closure sites like Rocky Flats in Colorado. The plan is to convert most of EM’s existing cost-plus-award fee contracts at its 16 sites to cost-plus-incentive contracts focused on end states as the contracts are re-competed over the next several years.

Around the Complex

Oak Ridge

- Remediation of the Gaseous Diffusion Plant complex is expected to conclude in July 2020. 1,200 acres and 14 buildings totaling 332,000 square feet have been transferred to private use. 23 companies offering 300 private industry jobs exist on the former site.
- The latest announcement is the construction of a medical isotope production facility. This will employ 200 people in high-paying jobs.
- Currently water from the existing Oak Ridge site landfill, which carries contaminants from solid or hazardous waste is released to drain through an unlined ditch to mix with clean storm water in a sediment basin prior to being assessed.
- As a new landfill is about to be built, EPA Region 4 has expressed concern about water discharge standards. DOE is considering an appeal to the EPA Administrator over the field division.

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB)

- In May, 2018, DOE issued Order 140.1 which limits the access of DNFSB to nuclear weapons facilities and documents. The order also calls on DOE to speak with “one voice” to DNFSB, by requiring Agency contractors to filter questions from board inspectors through DOE and not communicate directly. Congressional committees are raising concerns about the order

Idaho

- The Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant is about to close. It processed most of the 65,000 cubic meters of on-site Transuranic (TRU) waste for shipment to WIPP. They wanted to treat waste from other sites but that did not work out.
- Less than one acre of a Cold War waste burial ground remains to be remediated. Once complete the landfill will be covered by native gravel and soil as part of a 130 acre cap.

Savannah River Site (SRS)

- The cesium is captured in equipment very similar to the TSCR system being developed for pretreatment of Hanford Tank waste. Ultimately, it will be merged into sludge tank waste and vitrified.
- TCCR began operations in January 2019. By the first of April, it had processed more than 150,000 gallons of waste at a rate of 5 gallons per minute. They are very pleased with how initial operations are going.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

- They celebrated 20 years of operations last month. The mine has received 12,390 shipments of TRU waste.
- In order to increase existing capacity, they have applied to their state to implement a new method of recording waste volumes. Presently a 55 gallon drum containing only 5 gallons of waste is counted as 55 gallons. It changes the current volume of the facility from being presently half full to being 1/3 full.
- A contract has been issued to build a new ventilation system that will triple the current airflow. This will allow them to place waste and do mining for new storage space at the same time.

Tank Waste

Bob Suyama, Benton County and TWC Chair provided an update on the efforts of the TWC. Bob stated that both he and Steve Wiegman were re-elected and will serve another term as TWC leadership. The TWC focuses on all things related to DOE-ORP. The committee hosted very robust meetings in November, January and March. The TWC anticipates potential advice on Glass Formulation and TSCR for June.

The TWC will not have a committee call in April.

River & Plateau

Jan Catrell, Public-At-Large and River & Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair provided an update on recent RAP committee activities. Due to inclement weather, the March RAP meeting was canceled. Jan shared the RAP was able to have Doug Shoop attend a RAP meeting prior to his retirement. The RAP is looking forward to tackling third-quarter HAB activities and the upcoming HAB Site tour.

The RAP committee is scheduled for an April 23, 2019 committee call.

Health, Safety & Environmental Protection

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades (HAMTC) and Health, Safety & Environmental Protection (HSEP) Chair provided an update regarding the HSEP committee. Due to inclement weather,

the March HSEP committee meeting was canceled. HSEP looks forward to discussing the Hanford Site traffic safety topic.

The HSEP committee is scheduled for an April 23, 2019 committee call.

Public Involvement & Communications

Jeff Burrigh, Oregon Department of Energy and PIC Chair provided an update on recent PIC activities. Jeff shared PIC leadership changes. Jeff has stepped in to serve as Chair of the PIC. Liz Mattson has transitioned into the Vice-Chair role. The PIC hosted an April meeting. The main focus of the meeting was to debrief on the recent public meetings. The committee discussed the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) public meetings as well as the Hanford Regional Dialogue (HRD). The PIC felt the meeting was a success while they discussed lessons learned. The next HRD is tentatively scheduled for June in the Tri-Cities. Jeff reminded HAB members that the PIC is a “freebie” committee and invited those who may be interested to join.

The PIC committee will not have a committee call in April.

Budget and Contracts

Tom Galioto, BCC Chair provided an update regarding the BCC Committee. The BCC has been extremely active over the last few months. The BCC met in November to discuss DOE’s response to the FY2020 Budget Priorities advice. This discussion assisted with the approach and formulation of the FY2021 Budget Priorities advice. The BCC submitted comments on draft request for proposals as individual input. The occupational medicine contract was awarded to HPM Corporation. The BCC will continue to follow the status of contractor awards. Tom appreciates the support of both the new and existing members of the BCC.

The BCC committee will not have a committee call in April.

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters and Board Chair provided an update on EM SSAB activities. The EM SSAB Chairs meeting will be held in May. The group will be discussing the ten-year plans for each site. The EM SSAB was requested to provide input to the ten-year plan. Shelley Cimon, Board Vice-Chair and Susan Leckband agree that they do not have enough information at this time to provide advice. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) Cleanup report on milestones identifies that there should be better definitions on major and minor milestones. Susan will be drafting a high-level recommendation addressing this topic that will come from the EM SSAB. There is the potential for a demonstration on a system similar to the Phoenix Platform at the May meeting. Finally, there will be a discussion on technologies needed to expedite cleanup.

New Member Orientation

Susan Leckband provided an introduction to the HAB New Member Orientation. HAB members Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, and David Bolingbroke walked members through two presentations addressing

new member orientation. Highlighted information provided to members during the new member orientation include the following:

- DOE Division of Responsibility
- Tri-Party Agreement & The Consent Decree
- History of the Board
- HAB Governance Documents
- HAB Key Products
- HAB Committees
 - River & Plateau
 - Budgets & Contracts
 - Healthy, Safety & Environmental Protection
 - Tank Waste
 - Public Involvement & Communications
- HAB Committee Structure
- HAB Seasons
- Key Contacts
- Board Member Roles & Responsibilities
- Committee Meetings
- Committee Calls
- HAB Resources

Presentations with detailed information provided during new member orientation can be found at:

[New Member Orientation Part I](#)

[New Member Orientation Part II](#)

[HAB Related Acronyms](#)

Phoenix Platform Demonstration

Susan Leckband introduced the topic of the Phoenix Platform Demonstration and Brett Simpson from the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). Brett walked members through the process of navigating the Phoenix Platform. Key points from Brett's demonstration include:

- The Phoenix Platform began in 2010 when DOE-RL wanted an easily accessible portal for soil and groundwater data.
- Phoenix was created as a large, single, and cohesive platform.
- As the Phoenix Platform evolved, tank data has been included.
- The Phoenix wizard reduces applications from nearly 30 to 3.
- The “hamburger” in the upper left corner provides access to user guides and user information.
- The GIS explorer allows you to view the Hanford Site.

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

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

Q: “Does someone have to input the data?”

R: “All data has been qualified and approved prior to entering the Phoenix Platform. Once it has been loaded into Phoenix, synchronization occurs overnight. You can get as near real-time as you can get without working in the laboratory.”

Q: “Are other Sites using the Phoenix Platform?”

R: “Principally local, but there is some traffic from other national labs and international users. We believe researchers and/or students are looking at Phoenix because of the amount of soil and groundwater information. No other sites are using Phoenix for their data yet, but some long-term stewardship sites are less advanced and much more limited.”

Q: “Can we see where chromium has been minimized or things like that?”

R: “Yes you can.”

Q: “Is there a way to tell how deep the wells are?”

R: “Yes, you can examine particulars of any well but is difficult to examine all at once because there are 3,000 – 4,000 different wells.”

Q: “Is there any way you could determine when a well gets above a certain limit?”

R: “Yes, the alerts are robust in the kinds of things you can request. You can get new groundwater samples and can get information if the well has changed or groundwater sample result has changed.”

Next Steps

Brett Simpson offered to attend future committee meetings to walk through additional information on the Phoenix Platform.

Board Business

HAB 25th Anniversary Celebration

The HAB will host a 25th anniversary celebration in September. Susan encouraged members to provide any pictures or historical documents they have to the facilitation team.

COTW Topics

Members discussed outlined COTW topics identified on the HAB's FY2019 work plan. Items identified include the following:

- Central Plateau
- Critical Infrastructure
- Budget
- Programmatic Topics
- Risk

Other items identified as topics of interest for COTW include:

- Test Bed Initiative
- Waste Reclassification
- Hanford Cleanup End States

Potential Products for June Meeting

The following preliminary topics were discussed:

- Potential Advice on Traffic Safety from HSEP
- Potential Advice on Glass Formulation and TSCR from TWC

Closing Remarks:

Susan Leckband, Chair thanked Board members for their attendance, thoughts and decisions. The meeting was adjourned.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Agency Update (DOE Presentation)

Attachment 2: Agency Update (Ecology Presentation)

Attachment 3: Draft White Paper: System Plan Assumptions

Attachment 4: FY2021 Budget Priorities Presentation

Attachment 5: Draft Advice: FY2021 Budget Priorities

Attachment 6: New Member Orientation Part I

Attachment 7: New Member Orientation Part II

Attachment 8: HAB Related Acronyms

Attachment 9: Tank Waste Committee Report

Attachment 10: Budgets & Contracts Status Report

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Susan Leckband, Member | Tom Galioto, Member | Bob Suyama, Member |
| Jeff Burrigh, Alternate | Jan Catrell, Member | Rebecca Holland, Member |
| Pam Larsen, Member | Shelley Cimon, Member | Gene Van Liew, Member |
| Helen Wheatley, Alternate | Paige Knight, Member | Antone Brooks, Member |
| Chuck Torelli, Member | Rob Davis, Member | Fred Brink, Member |
| Richard Bloom, Alternate | Gary Garnant, Member | Mike Korenko, Alternate |
| Phil Lemley, Member | Liz Mattson, Member | Emmitt Jackson, Member |
| Kristen McNall, Member | Dan Solitz, Alternate (Phone) | Tony Umek, Member |
| Rudy Mendoza, Alternate | Jeff Burrigh, Alternate | Tom Sicilia, Alternate |
| Kate Griffith, Alternate | David Bolingbroke, Alternate | Tom Galioto, Member |
| Shannon Cram, Member | Ed Pacheco, Alternate | Emmett Moore, Member |
| Richard Jaquish, Alternate | Dana Miller, Member | Margery Swint, Alternate |
| Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Member | Julie Atwood, Alternate | |

Agency, Contractor & Support Staff:

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| JoLynn Garcia, DOE-ORP | Jim Lynch, DOE-ORP | Brian Vance, DOE |
| Joe Franco, DOE-RL | RP Detwiler, DOE-RL | Alex Smith, Ecology |
| John Price, Ecology | Dave Einan, EPA | Kristen Holmes, DOE-RL |
| Dieter Bohrmann, CHPRC | Joe Franco, DOE-RL | Mark Heeter, DOE-RL |
| Jeff Frey, DOE-RL | Carrie Meyer, DOE | Ronnie Dawson, DOE-ORP |
| Rob Hastings, DOE-ORP | Tom Rodgers, DOH | John Price, Ecology |
| Alex Smith, Ecology | Ginger Wireman, Ecology | Brian Stickney, DOE-RL |
| David Einan, EPA | Anne Knaap, Ecology | Jennifer Colborn, MSA |
| Abi Zilar, Northwind | | |

Members of the Public:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian | Sherri Schatz, ProSidian | Anne Wallenhaupt, ProSidian |
| Brett Simpson, PNNL | Kathy Hibbs | Ed Wannemacher |
| Annette Carey, Tri-City Herald | | |