



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

March 7 & 8, 2018

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 2

Welcome, Introductions, & Announcements 3

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

Draft Advice: Tank Waste System Planning & Milestone Negotiations 11

Public Comment..... 13

Draft Letter: Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement..... 13

Draft Letter: FY2019 Proposed Hanford Budget..... 13

Committee of the Whole 14

HAB Committee Reports 15

Board Business..... 17

Attachments 18

Attendees 18

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 March Hanford Advisory Board meeting.

Hanford Advisory Board Business

The Board will hold four committee calls in March. The Board discussed the following:

- Draft Advice: Tank Waste System Planning & Milestone Negotiations
- Draft Letter: Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement from the PIC
- Draft Letter: FY2019 Proposed Hanford Budget from the BCC
- Scheduling for upcoming committee meetings and phone calls
- Potential topics for a Committee of the Whole meeting
- Potential products for the June Hanford Advisory Board meeting
- Proposed items for Leadership Workshop

Presentations & Updates

The Hanford Advisory Board received the following presentations and updates:

- Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates
- Draft Advice: Tank Waste System Planning & Milestone Negotiations
- Draft Letter: Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement from the PIC
- Draft Letter: FY2019 Proposed Hanford Budget from the BCC
- HAB Committee Reports

Public Comment

There were two public comments received at the March 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, Introductions, & Announcements

Kyle Rankin, Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) and Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer for the Board, noted that the meeting was in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Susan Leckband provided members with an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives.

Susan confirmed the adoption of the November 2017 Board meeting summary.

Lindsay Strasser, Hanford Advisory Board facilitator, provided members with informational announcements.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office

Tom Fletcher, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) Deputy Manager, provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent Hanford Site activities. Tom noted the following key points in his presentation:

324 Building

- The 324 Building project and the remediation of the waste site within the B-Cell has continued to make steady progress. There has been continued progress with the cleanout of C-Cell in the 324 Building. A, C, and D Cells will hold some of the waste that is exhumed from B-Cell, which will then be grouted in place for future removal. The mockup facility is a replica of B-Cell and the airlock, which located near the 324 Building. The purpose of the mockup facility is to ensure that the systems being designed and built for remediation of the 324 Building are able to complete the project. An upper and lower remote excavator arm will be bolted through the outside of the B-Cell wall with the installation currently planned for late Summer 2018.

618-10 Burial Grounds and Associated Waste Sites

- 618-10 Burial Site backfill is complete as of March 6, 2018. The equipment from the 618-10 Burial Site will be moved to the Central Plateau.

K Area Sludge Removal Project

- The K Area Sludge Removal Project is currently in the process of preparing for the sludge to be moved to the T Plant. The project is in the final steps of the Contractor Operational Readiness Review (ORR). The DOE ORR is planned for April 9, 2018 with a late April or early May start of the sludge transfer. This is contingent upon the results of the DOE ORR.

- The T Plant is a major component of the K Area Sludge Removal Project. T Plant will receive the sludge, as well as the canisters the sludge will be stored into until the sludge transfer can begin. In December 2017 an ORR was completed on T Plant.

Soil and Groundwater Remediation

- The Soil and Groundwater project has continued to have positive results. In December 2017 and January 2018 were record breaking months for pump and treat. 100 million gallons were pumped in December 2017 and 102 million gallons were pumped in January 2018. The goal is to pump 2.2 billion with 50 percent of the goal being reached to date. Pump and treat has continued to operate at an amazing rate with contamination being extracted above the rate that was anticipated. The Uranium extraction from the B Area is well above the anticipated rate of kgs removed.

Plutonium Finishing Plant

- The focus has been trying to find the root cause, as well as acquiring and implementing the appropriate corrective actions followed by a thorough review. A map of the [stabilization boundaries](#) can be found on slide 11 of the Agency presentation. The Access Control Boundary requires permission from a shift manager to enter this boundary.

Plutonium Uranium Extraction (PUREX) Tunnels

- Tunnel 1 was completed on November 11, 2017 with 45,000 cubic yards of grout was placed in the tunnel. Once the grouting was completed, the temporary cover was removed from the top of the tunnel.
- An Administrative Order was issued from Ecology with three corrective actions to be completed. DOE has completed all three actions of the Administrative Order. There is a 60-day comment period currently underway as part of the permitting process, which completes on April 12, 2018. As part of the permitting process, there will be a public meeting regarding Tunnel 2 on March 14, 2018 at the Richland Public Library.

Safety, Security and Infrastructure

- DOE continues to focus on safeguards and security, as well as the infrastructure. The mission is not a short-term mission, so funding and execution of the work scope is vital to ensure the safety, security, and infrastructure is in place.

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

Brian Vance, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (ORP) Manager, provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent ORP activities. Brian noted the following key points in his presentation:

- Brian stated the ORP's mission statement is focused on transition, whereas in the past the focus was more of a stewardship role. The focus is the delivery of the capability for treating waste and the disposition phase.

- ORP has a strong team comprised of both federal and contractor employees. Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) is the prime contractor responsible for tank farms. Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI) is responsible for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) and Wastren Advantage, Inc. (WAI) is a prime contractor responsible for the 222-S Laboratory.

Direct Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) Overview

- The DFLAW project has a lot of elements to function properly. ORP is focused on the elements working together correctly in a safely and timely manner. DFLAW consists of AP Farm, Low-Activity Waste (LAW) Pretreatment (PT) Facility, Tank-Side Cesium Removal (TSCR), Low-Activity Waste (LAW) Facility, Liquid Effluent Retention (LER) Facility, and the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF).
- In AP Farm, there is a series of tank farm upgrades that will need to put in place to support the movement of the waste between the tanks and to WTP. A proposal was received from WRPS on March 2, 2018, which is being evaluated. There is a fair amount of work in the AP Farm itself to enable the overall process to continue.
- The next phase is the treatment phase, which has two elements to this phase. One element is the TSCR system and equipment request for proposal was issued in January 2018 with the proposal due March 12, 2018. This solicitation is moving forward smartly to ensure the capability is in place to start treating the waste that will be fed through the LAW Facility. TSCR is an important bridge to start the treatment process in the timeframe allotted.
- The LAW Facility is currently under review with the proposal due by WRPS at the end of March 2018. LAWPS is being looked at as a more permanent facility for the mission. The LAW Facility is showing significant progress with construction, startup, and commissioning.
- The 222-S Laboratory is another component that will need to be ready before waste treatment can start. ORP has started discussion with Savannah River Laboratory and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to look at the local capabilities that will need to be in place to ensure ORP can address technical issues promptly and efficiently.
- The WTP electrical distribution system is energized and startup testing have begun. Crews have been touring the WTP and are able to see the progress. In 2017, the LAW Facility and the Effluent Management Facility (EMF) were under construction phase with the Balance of Facilities (BOF) and the Analytical Laboratory (LAB) are under the startup testing phase.
- In 2018, the BOF systems startup testing will be close to completion and commissioning will begin. The LAW systems commence startup testing. The TSCR system design will be in process. In 2019, BOF and LAB will be in the commissioning phase. LAW startup testing in progress. The TSCR system design will be completed. In 2020, EMF system will transition into startup and the WTP systems will be preparing to support LAW cold commissioning. The TSCR fabrication and delivery will be completed. In 2021, The TSCR commissioning and testing will be completed with operations beginning. WTP will be ready to support DFLAW operations.

C-Farm/AY-102 Update

- C-105 retrieval was completed in November 2017. WRPS is conducting a final waste volume calculation before DOE completes a Retrieval Completion Certification. The next phase is to remove the excess equipment from C-Farm. The next step will be to work with Ecology on a closure path forward.
- AY-102 has progressed with retrieval in September 2017. DOE submitted an inspection report documenting the decision to proceed with closure of AY-102 to Ecology. Ecology issued a response stating that DOE and WRPS met all Settlement Agreement requirements. The next step will be to discuss the path to closure.

A-AX Farm Update & SX Farm Interim Barrier

- A-AX Tank Farm has continued to progress with equipment removal and installation of new equipment. A new transformer was installed, as well as preparations for a new exhaustor and retrieval system control rooms.
- Preparations are currently underway for two interim surface barrier installations to cover nine tanks and portions of three more at SX Farm. The Barriers protect the tanks and soil around the tanks from water and snow.

Chemical Vapors Protection

- ORP continues to focus on tank farms worker safety and health. A third-party review of cartridge testing and hazard assessments as agreed to with WRPS and Hanford Atomic Metal Trade Council (HAMTC) before expanding air purifying respirator (APR) use. ORP received an Office of Enterprise Assessment (EA-32) report and out brief on February 28, 2018. ORP will be reviewing the results and will continue to work closely with WRPS to address the recommendations to ensure the improvement of worker safety in the tank farms.

New ORP Designated Deputy Federal Officer (DDFO)

- ORP welcomed Jim Lynch, Tank Farms Program Manager as the new DDFO representing ORP for the HAB.

Take Aways

- ORP is committed to the successful execution of the DFLAW plan and program. Significant progress has been made over the last year. The ORP team is very talented and focused on maintaining progress. The leadership team is focused on effective change in management and increasing stakeholder engagement.

U.S. Department of Ecology

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

Upcoming TPA Changes

- Ecology is looking to change a provision in the TPA Action Plan Section 5.5. This provision will assist Ecology and DOE on how to handle a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) dangerous waste management unit (DWMU) that is within a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Operable Unit (OU). Changing Section 5.5 of the TPA will ensure the work meets both RCRA and CERCLA requirements without having to double the work.
- The M-91 milestone is the management of transuranic (TRU) waste. Ecology is looking to extend the milestone date for M-91-53 which is initially set for September 30, 2018. Milestone M-91-53 is a DOE requirement for identifying disposition for all TRU waste on site.
- The M-92 milestones are three separate actions, which are the disposal of cesium and strontium capsule, bulk sodium, and the 300 Area Special Case Waste. Ecology is looking to extend the initial date of September 30, 2018 for milestone M-92-09. M-92-09 is a requirement for DOE to propose specific dates for completing the three actions.
- Milestone M-62-45 is the System Plan negotiations, which are currently underway. The System Plan negotiations are to set new milestones for optimizing tank waste treatment mission.
- Discussions have start for TPA Appendix H & I, which is the Single-Shell Tank System Waste Retrieval and Closure Process. Appendix H & I were originally drafted before retrievals actually occurred, so the changes being proposed are to updated based on actual experience of the retrievals.
- Agencies are considering reprinting the TPA document. The online version is the most recent version. A TPA Five-Year review was completed in 2017 with some minor changes made. Agencies will reconsider a TPA reprint after the System Plan negotiations are completed.

Permitting Update

- In 2017, 62 permit modifications were completed with some still in process. The RCRA Site Wide Permit is currently in Revision 8c, which covers all 586 square miles of Hanford. In 2018, there are 34 permit modifications that are either completed or in process to date. A majority of the permit modification issued to date are in conjunction with the work ORP is doing.
- The permit modification schedule looking ahead forecasts 12 potential Class 3 permit modifications and three Class 2 permit modifications for 2018.
- Ecology is working on the RCRA Site Wide Permit Revision 9.

New Faces at Ecology

- Nick Whitaker works on the Natural Resources Team as a Technical Expert.
- Theresa Howell is working on the U.S. Ecology cleanup on site.

- Jay Decker is an Engineer on the Waste Treatment Project section.
- Andy Wargo is a Permit Writer in the Tank Waste Treatment Section at WTP.
- Morgan Johnson is a Permit Writer in the Waste Management Section.

Environmental Protection Agency

David Einan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10 Manager, updated HAB members on recent EPA Activities. Key points covered in David's update:

- David Einan took on the role of Region 10 Manager for EPA in January 2018. David is very familiar with Hanford, as he has been working as an engineer at PFP since 1988. His education background is Chemical Engineer from Washington State University.
- David expressed his appreciation for the HAB and the work being done with advice, community involvement, and open discussions. He also thanked the HAB for the letter written in support of a local EPA Manager.
- One of the big challenges for EPA is the decision regarding the Administrator being the only authority to sign cleanup decisions over 50 million dollars. This is almost every CERCLA decision at Hanford. One example is the Record of Decision (ROD) for 100 D & H which went out for public comment over a year ago. Another challenge is the budget of working under a continual resolution.

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

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

C: "Congratulations David Einan. The Board welcomes you and looks forward to working with you."

Q: "It was mentioned earlier that a public meeting associated with PUREX Tunnels will be held on March 14, 2018 in Richland. Will there be a webinar along with the public meeting?"

R: "Yes, that is correct."

Q: "Congratulations on the work done with 618-10! I understand there were some airborne contamination issues during the process of remediation of 618-10. Will there be any or will there be a need to do continual air monitoring?"

R: "During the initial contamination, there were surveys conducted at that time with the appropriate actions taken to ensure no spread of contamination occurred. Now that the backfill is completed, there will be post-closure monitoring, as well as the routine monitoring process. There will be revegetation next year."

Q: "I would like to hear your comment on the implication of the short-term actions for grouting the PUREX Tunnels in terms of the long-term consequences for eliminating the option for the final end state closure? For example, there is transuranic waste and grouting it would not be the most cost-effective way to meet the end state criteria. Have the near-term actions made the final decision for end state closure?"

R: “Yes, we have given a lot of thought with that. One of the challenges with the PUREX Tunnels is the radioactive contamination within the Tunnels. The Tunnels have to be stabilized regardless of the end state goal. This was one of the discussions the expert panel had when looking at how to stabilize the Tunnels, which was how to exhume what’s in the Tunnels while minimizing the hazard to the workforce and the public. The amount of transuranic waste in the Tunnels is very small. No decision has been made regarding the ultimate disposition.”

C: “I would like to say Welcome Brian Vance! I’ve always felt that the site needed a manager with military background as we enter the operations phase. I really appreciate what I have heard today.”

Q: “I am concerned with the PFP perimeter that is much larger in footprint and how it impacts the project that need to continue. What are we seeing in terms of schedule slippage and cost slippage, as well as the potential milestone risks?”

R (Tom Teynor, DOE-RL): “As the Federal Project Director for PFP Demolition Project, yes we have been tracking it. The work authorization boundary is not a radiological boundary. There are still surveillances being conducted but not active work being done. The one project the boundary is stalling is groundwater monitoring wells around U Plant.”

Q: “Regarding PFP, I heard that there is some consideration of a tent like structure being placed over the Plutonium Reclamation Facility (PRF)? Where are you at in that thinking process and when will that be in place?”

R: “PRF is the facility that was being demolished when the December 2017 incident happened. Yes, it is being considered, but right now the root cause analysis is currently in draft form. It will be given to the DOE expert panel in the near future, to ensure the root cause analysis is thorough. There are proposed corrective actions that were being worked on now.”

Q: “Regarding ORP, I am concerned about the short fall in funding and some of the immediate consequences with that? What happened in the 1980s with cesium and strontium was removed from tanks?”

R: “From a funding perspective, as you know there is a continuing commitment from the administration to continue the effort here at Hanford. As you know we are focused on DFLAW, but we are looking at High-Level Waste (HLW). HLW has been in a preservation mode for some time, but we are looking at options for the future ensure the progress of the milestone in the future. We will be having a workshop with our team to look at the progress with HLW from a design and procurement perspective. We initiated an army core of engineer study to ensure we are receiving an honest assessment from an external look at HLW and Pretreatment. In regards to TSCR, Savannah River Site has a tank closure cesium removal (TCCR) program so we will be able to see what the operations will look like before the TSCR design progresses.”

Q: “How much kilowatt energy will it take to run the vit plant when all the melters are up and running?”

R: “DOE will need to get back to you on this answer.”

Q: "With PUREX Tunnel #2, there is several hundred feet of empty tunnel between the water-filled door and the last rail car. Is the expectation that this area will be filled with grout, or will it be possible to limit the grouting to the area with the railcars?"

R: "We have been able to get into two risers in Tunnel 2 for observation. It appears there a 120-foot gap between three last cars were placed in the tunnel and the rest of the string. A final decision has not been made but if we grout the Tunnel, we will grout the entirety of the Tunnel due to the complications of expanding the gap."

Q: "What is the status of Administrator Pruitt having to review every cleanup decision over 50 million dollars? How is this affecting the timeline on river corridor decisions? What is the next step after 100 D & H?"

R (DOE-RL): "Having cleanup decisions over 50 million dollars signed by any administrator is going to impact timelines. The impact on 100 D & H does affect the timeline somewhat but we are looking at how to make it efficient."

R (Ecology): "From an Ecology perspective, the goal with this process is to only add a few months to the process."

R (EPA): "There have been a lot of discussion within EPA about how exactly the process of having the administrator review remedies that are over 50 million dollars. There should be a memo issued soon that will give direction to EPA and other federal agencies to better understand the process better. The goal is not to add more time to the process but to work within the established timeframe that exists."

Q: "The TPA changes for the cesium and strontium capsule removal to 2026. Is that still the date you are looking at?"

R (Ecology): "We are still in negotiations on that. We received a letter for Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) that we will consider as we move forward with negotiations."

C: "I have some concerns with the safety equipment being used in the tank farms, mainly the Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) Units. As you are aware, we have to wear an SCBA before we enter any tank farm. Employees have been experiencing numerous issues with rashes on there faces, finding chewing gum in the SCBA, and regulators and pressure release valves not working. The equipment was not made to be worn every day, as they are for emergency issues. The respirators are cleaned offsite and the concern is that they are not actually being cleaned properly."

R: "We are certainly committed to ensure that the workforce is issued the proper equipment they need to do their work."

C (Tom Teynor): "The Hanford.gov website list the latest PFP updates. You can find daily and weekly updates, as well as the letters issued from Ecology and Washington State Department of Health. We will continue to educate the workforce. We have given employees a fact sheet of Ambient Air Monitoring and Information of Radioactive Material Intake. The can be found the Hanford website."

Draft Advice: Tank Waste System Planning & Milestone Negotiations

Bob Suyama, Benton County and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair introduced draft advice on the Tank Waste System Planning & Milestone Negotiations, which was brought forward by the TWC. Bob gave a brief synopsis of how the Issue Manager Team and Committee reach consensus to bring forward the advice to the Board.

Bob introduced Jeff Burrigh, ODOE and TWC member as one of the main contributors to the advice. Jeff gave a detailed briefing on the advice process and the recommendations made in the advice.

Susan thanked Bob and Jeff for their explanations of the advice and how the committee reach consensus. Susan asked the Agency Regulators for their perspectives.

Agency and Regulator Responses

Jon Peschong, ORP, stated the advice the TWC committee is proposing is very clear and well written. Jon highlighted that System Plan 8 indicates the mission will extend longer and will cost more. As far as cost and duration of the mission will be worked out during the negotiations that are ongoing, as well as a baseline revision. ORP is focused on DFLAW and it will not be put off. ORP has an obligation and will continue to look for new technologies and processes over the next 60 years.

John Price, Ecology, agrees with the statements from Bob Suyama and Jeff Burrigh. John stated M-62-45 milestone requires the negotiations to happen. The milestone states that the scenarios need to be consistent in the System Plan. It would be useful for Ecology if the Board brought advice stating which is the preferred scenario. The June Board meeting would be the appropriate time to issue advice on the Board's preferred scenario. Negotiations are scheduled to be completed by April 30, 2018. DOE produces a lifecycle report, but over the last few years Ecology granted a pause. The lifecycle report is the combined cost of RL and ORP work throughout the year. The next lifecycle report will come out in January 2019, which will look worse based on System Plan 8. Advice point number three is being considered in the negotiations. Regarding to advice point number four which addresses risks and tanks, Alex Smith stated that Appendix I, which talks about risks is being considered for revisions. There will be a public participation opportunity for revising Appendix I. Ecology agrees with advice point 5, which is currently being considered in the negotiations and will be looked at further for the next lifecycle report.

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

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

C: "The BCC submitted budget advice last year requesting a 4-billion-dollar annual budget, but the response DOE was not in favor of it. As I was not aware of the System Plan 8, it would've been nice to see what the projected budget would have been prior to issuing the advice."

Q: "Can you explain you reasoning for asking the Board to pick a favorite or preferred scenario in the System Plan 8, as these scenarios are hypothetical?"

R (Ecology): "There are differences between the scenarios and it will help us as an Agency during negotiations to take the Board's input on a preferred scenario. There are a few scenarios that are feasible with enough money."

C: "I think this plays into the advice of us asking for a pause in the negotiations and consulting with the Board about our values."

R (ORP): "There is value in providing the Agencies information of which scenarios are preferential. There are big decisions in the System Plan 8 that drive billions of dollars."

C: "Is the intent of advice point number two to focus on the design of the scenarios rather than general planning? If so, is the Board requesting a fluent design? I think when we go through the wording, that we clarify that."

Q: "Do you know for sure if the public will get the information ahead of time regarding the negotiations?"

R: "We will do our very best."

C: "If the Board had been involved in the System Plan 8 in the manner that was expected, we would not be having the conversation of choosing a favorite scenario."

C: "The Board would like to be involved in the conversation for the next System Plan."

Q: "It was mentioned that June would be a good timeframe to bring forward Ecology's advice request, which was one of the TWC urgency to bring forward this advice, as the negotiations were to be finished by April 30, 2018. Can you explain your reason for why June is an appropriate time?"

R (Ecology): "When we go through negotiations and an agreement is made, we sign a tentative agreement in which we give 30-day advance notice for public comment followed by a 45-day public comment period. There is quite a bit of time after April 30, 2018, if an agreement is made to consider input from the Board."

Q: "Are you looking at a combination of scenarios during negotiations?"

R (Ecology): "We cannot talk about details while negotiations are going on, but Ecology has stated that we like a specific scenario best, as well as other parts of other scenarios."

C: "I would like to see the advice clarify that when saying Health and Safety, it should also include the public as well."

Q: "How are you going to be effective on getting attention of the funding requirements to accomplish what was set out to do in the past?"

R (ORP): "I understand your frustration as we have been on this waste treatment plan since 1989. We are where we are today. We have priorities and we are working them. It will be a landmark when we get the Vitrification up and running."

C: "The cross-site transfer line isn't operational right now is it? Its not a single point failure, as its something that needs to be fixed before we can use it. That's something should be noted in the advice."

Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions and minor wording changes, the Board approved the advice. Members agreed to send the final advice to the TPA Agency Managers.

Public Comment

There were two public comments.

Draft Letter: Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge and Public Involvement & Communications Committee (PIC) Chair introduced the draft letter on “Reinvesting in Hanford Public Engagement.” Liz stated that with the recent changes in management within the TPA Agencies a letter was appropriate to express the importance of public engagement and involvement. Liz stated that the PIC committee will form an Issue Manager team to take on the task of writing advice on public engagement.

Liz introduced Tom Galioto, Public At Large and PIC member who took on the task of reviewing past HAB advice and documents related to public involvement.

Susan Leckband thanked Tom for the extensive work put into this letter. Susan stated the reason for issuing letters opposed to advice is to ensure the HAB can voice their concerns sooner rather than later, as advice has a process that can take time.

Agency and Regulator Responses

Jim Lynch, ORP thanked Tom and Liz for the work they did with letter especially the long list of references to past advice. Hyperlinking the references in the letter would be very helpful.

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

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

C: “The PIC had a lengthy discussion with the Agencies about State of the Site meetings at the PIC meeting yesterday, March 6, 2018. We have been asking for the Agencies to bring back the State of the Site meetings, but there has been a lot of reluctance to have one. We issued advice asking for a State of the Site meeting in 2016 and DOE responded with the Hanford Live webinar, which is not what we wanted. The Agencies stated that management would be more amenable to having one if we redesign and change the name of the meeting.”

R (ORP): “The discussion at the PIC meeting was talking about the possibility of renaming the meeting, but there was not agreement of what to call it yet. It was agreed that it will not be called State of the Site anymore.”

Following the incorporation of suggested edits and minor wording changes, the letter was finalized for distribution.

Draft Letter: FY2019 Proposed Hanford Budget

Gary Karnofski, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC) and Budget & Contracts Committee (BCC) Chair introduced a draft letter on “FY2019 Proposed Hanford Budget.” Gary gave a brief synopsis of the draft letter and his perspective on the FY2019 Proposed Hanford Budget. Gary noted that the HAB issued budget advice at the last Board meeting in November 2017.

Gary stated that with time constraints, sending a letter is faster than the advice process. Gary stated that BCC will be having a meeting in April 2018.

Susan Leckband thanked Gary for all his efforts with the letter. Susan informed the Board members that letters do not need consensus from the Board. Susan opened the discussion for members to provide input.

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

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

C: “Thank you for writing this letter. It’s important that we don’t stay silent, as the budget affects everyone.”

Q: “Is there a budget that DOE brings forward separate from the President’s budget?”

R: “No. DOE submits their budget in the fall to the Office of Management and Budget, DOE receives a pass back at the end of November, which they have a few weeks to negotiate it. This is not public at all.”

Q: “Who will this letter be sent too?”

R: “The Secretary of Energy and Acting Assistant EM 1.”

Following the incorporation of suggested edits and clarification for the addressees, the letter was finalized for distribution.

Committee of the Whole

Susan Leckband, Board Chair introduced the topic of Committee of the Whole (COTW), which is a meeting is opened to all committees and the public. Susan stated that the COTW is a great opportunity for the Agencies and public see how the Board works on a focused single subject discussion. The COTW will be heavily focused on the DFLAW process.

The COTW is scheduled for Tuesday, April 10, 2018 in the Consolidated Information Center (CIC) at WSU.

Susan introduced Bob Suyama, TWC Chair as the lead Issue Manager for the COTW. Bob stated that with the help of Echo Dahl and Dieter Bohrmann, ORP a draft agenda was created. Bob reviewed the agenda items for the COTW meeting.

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

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

C: “It was mentioned at the PIC meeting that ORP is looking to host an Open House the day before COTW, which will also be focused on DFLAW. This is still tentative.”

R (ORP): “Correct. Once we have approval, communications will go out to the Board.”

C: “I was hoping to hear from ORP of what information will be available at the COTW.”

R (ORP): “We are still finalizing the planning portion, but basically it will be a road map of what the DFLAW process will look like through 2022.”

HAB Committee Reports

Board and Committee Leadership provided reports on ongoing efforts and anticipated work and products.

Tank Waste

Bob Suyama, TWC Chair gave an update regarding the Tank Waste Committee. Bob stated that the TWC have had three committee meetings since the last HAB meeting in November 2017. TWC received a briefing on the System Plan 8 and all of the scenarios in December 2017. On January 10, 2018 the TWC received a presentation on Glass Science by Albert Kruger. On February 7, 2018 the TWC received a presentation update on WTP Technical Issues Resolution, a Q&A Session with Brian Vance and a System Plan 8 advice discussion.

Bob noted that the Committee of the Whole (COTW) is schedule for Tuesday, April 10, 2018 in the Consolidated Information Center (CIC) at WSU with the focus on DFLAW.

River & Plateau

Jan Catrell, Public At Large and River & Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair provided an update regarding the RAP committee. Jan stated that the RAP held the annual committee leadership selection on February 6, 2018 at the RAP meeting. Jan was selected at Chair of the RAP and Dale Engstrom was selected as the Vice Chair of the RAP. Jan stated that the RAP received presentations on the 324 Building, 100-BC Proposed Plan, the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility Cesium and Strontium Capsules, and PFP updates. RAP committee discussed budget priorities and advice for the 100-BC Proposed Plan for June HAB meeting.

Health, Safety & Environmental Protection

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland and Health, Safety & Environmental Protection (HSEP) Vice Chair provided an update regarding the HSEP committee. Rich stated that HSEP has been involved with TWC and RAP committee meeting for cross-cutting issues. Rich mentioned the possibility of an HSEP meeting in April for an update on Airborne Rad Primer issues, vapor issues, committee business, and SCBA issues with potential for advice. Rich recommended HSEP tour the HAMMER facility for a briefing on the equipment program.

The HSEP committee will have a phone call on Tuesday, March 13, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

Public Involvement & Communications

Liz Mattson, PIC Chair reminded members that each member and alternate formally gets to pick two committees to join. PIC is a freebie that everyone can take part in.

Liz stated the PIC met on Tuesday, March 6, 2018 for a discussion on Reinvesting Public Involvement and how to get the public more involved with Hanford. The Issue Manager team drafted a letter to be sent out to the TPA Agency Managers with the potential of advice in June 2018. The PIC has a discussion on revamping State of the Site meetings.

The PIC committee will have a phone call on Wednesday, March 14, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

Budget and Contracts

Gary Karnofski, BCC Chair gave an update regarding the BCC Committee. Gary stated the BCC had several committee calls over the last few months and are planning a meeting for April 11, 2018. BCC is looking to be briefed on historical catch up on contracting. Gary toured Hanford site as part of Industry Day for the Hanford Mission Essential Services Contract and Occupational Medicine Contract solicitations.

The BCC committee will have a phone call on Tuesday, March 13, 2018 at 10:30 a.m. to finalize April meeting agenda.

Executive Issues

Susan Leckband, Board Chair gave an overview of the Executive Issues Committee (EIC). Susan stated the EIC has been working on the May Leadership Workshop, which is for committee leadership to plan the FY2019 workplan and calendar. Susan asked each committee to submit topics for the FY2019 workplan. The May Leadership Workshop is scheduled for May 15 & 16, 2018 at the Benton Franklin Transit Center.

The EIC committee will have a phone call on Wednesday, March 14, 2018 at 1:00 p.m.

National Liaison

Pam Larsen, National Liaison provided Board members an update to include the following:

Environmental Management (EM) Program - Headquarters

On December 15, 2017 DOE announced a department-wide reorganization that reassigns offices under 2 new undersecretary positions. The EM Program which previously was under the MA Undersecretary, will now report to the Undersecretary for Science, Paul Dabbar. His focus will be on supporting innovation, basic scientific research, and environmental cleanup. Mr. Dabbar was previously a member of the EMAB – advisory board and is very familiar with it.

The administrations nominee for EM-1 is Anne White. She is the founder of Bastet Technical Services and has worked for more than 25 years within the nuclear sector with a focus on project and program management. She has extensive experience at many of the EM sites. She has a master's in nuclear engineering from the University of Missouri and a bachelor's degree in mathematics from the University of Kansas. She has been a consultant to LANL in New Mexico.

Wyoming Senator Brasso has placed a hold on White's Senate confirmation due to concerns about uranium barter. Her nomination was approved by a voice vote by the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee on January 30th.

Oak Ridge

DOE has completed the demolition of the contaminated and unneeded buildings at the former uranium enrichment complex. Soil remediation is underway at the area now known as the East Tennessee Technology Park. 2200 acres will be turned over for private development.

Los Alamos

They seem to be recruiting away senior project managers from Bechtel Hanford. Mike Costas as well as Brian Zieroth the HLW Project Manager have recently relocated there.

Idaho

Construction of the final Accelerated Retrieval Project structure built over a TRU waste burial ground was completed last month. This was announced in the February 20th EM Update Newsletter. This temporary structure or something similar may be considered to place over the PRF rubble at Hanford.

Workers recently completed improvements to the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit. It will use a fluidized bed steam-reforming process to treat 900,000 gallons of liquid tank waste. The state of Idaho is fining DOE for the delay in getting the plant up and running.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

They are hoping to seal off the south end of the Plant's underground mine (which includes six filled waste disposal panels and supporting areas) to allay safety concerns and ensure workers have clean air and stable ground in the rest of the facility. With the area closed, workers can continue efforts in a completely clean environment. They are also planning for their first maintenance outage since reopening the facility.

Savannah River Site

On February 1, SRS broke ground on a second 32.8-million-gallon liquid waste disposal unit. SDUs are permanent disposal units for low-activity grouted waste. It is the second of 7 mega units to store grouted tank waste.

Waste removal was completed in Tank 15 one of the sites remaining 43 high-level waste tanks. They also removed Melter 2 in their vitrification plant and replaced with Melter 3. I believe that DWPF has been operating for approximately 20 years. The melters have operated far longer than anticipates.

Board Business

Scheduling of Upcoming Committee Meetings/Phone Calls

Committee members provided input on required committee phone calls for March. COTW and three committee meetings were scheduled for April.

Susan stated the Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board will hold a bi-annual meeting on May 2 & 3, 2018 in Roswell, New Mexico.

Potential Products for June Meeting

The following preliminary topics were discussed:

- Potential advice from TWC on Double Shell Tanks
- Potential advice from BCC on Budget Priorities
- Potential advice from RAP on 100-BC Proposed Plan
- Potential advice from HSEP on Respirator Issues
- David Borak visit
- EMSSAB May meeting recap
- Potential Board Leadership nominations
- Request from John Price, Ecology

Closing Remarks:

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

Attachments

Attachment 1: Agency Update (RL Presentation)

Attachment 2: Agency Update (ORP Presentation)

Attachment 3: Agency Update (Ecology Presentation)

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Stephen Metzger, Alternate	Pam Larsen, Member	Richard Bloom, Alternate
Robert Davis, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate (Phone)
Gary Garnant, Member	Bob Legard, Member	Phil Lemley, Alternate
Liz Mattson, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Shelley Cimon, Member
Susan Leckband, Member	John Martell, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Mike Priddy, Alternate	Emmett Jackson, Member	Dan Serres, Alternate
Margery Swint, Alternate	Paige Knight, Member	Jeff Burright, Alternate

Dan Solitz, Alternate (Phone)	Dale Engstrom, Alternate (Phone)	Jan Catrell, Member
Ed Pacheco, Alternate	Steve Wiegman, Alernate	Rudy Mendoza, Alternate
Sam Dechter, Member	Tom Galioto, Member	Gary Busselman, Alternate
Emmett Moore, Alternate	Rebecca Holland, Member	Woodrow Star, Member
Kristie Baptiste, Member	Earl Fordham, Member	Ken Niles, Member (Phone)
Rebecca Holland, Member	Woodrow Star, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate
Dawn Wellman, Member	Gary Karnofski, Member	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Todd Martin, Member		

Agency, Contractor & Support Staff:

Mark Heeter, RL	Kyle Rankin, RL	Tom Fletcher, RL
Dieter Bohrmann, ORP	Dawn MacDonald, ORP	Jon Peschong, ORP
Echo Dahl, ORP	Alex Smith, Ecology	John Price Ecology
Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Randy Bradbury, Ecology	David Einan, EPA
Jennifer Colborn, MSA	Tom Teynor, RL	Ashley Morris, RL
Dana C. Gribble, MSA	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC	Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)
Jim Lynch, ORP	Carmen Vidal, CHPRC	Kaylin Burnett, ORP

Members of the Public:

David Swale	Terry Walton	Mike Luzzo
Sherri Schatz, ProSidian	Jeff Dennison	Melissa Orona, ProSidian
Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Curtis Black (Phone)	Dee Gray (Phone)
Michael Turner (Phone)	Linda Maiden (Phone)	