FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
September 19 & 20, 2018
Bellevue, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

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 were two pieces of advice adopted during the September Hanford Advisory Board meeting.

Hanford Advisory Board Business

The Board will hold one committee call, one combined committee meeting in October and one combined committee meeting in November. The Board discussed the following:

- Draft Advice: Double-Shell Tank Failures
- Draft Advice: Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for the Closure of Waste Management Area C
- Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Recommendation thumbs up/thumbs down vote
- Scheduling for upcoming committee meetings and phone calls
- Approval of the FY2019 HAB Work Plan and Calendar
- Potential products for the December Hanford Advisory Board meeting

Presentations & Updates

The Hanford Advisory Board received the following presentations and updates:

- Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates
- "John Price Challenge" Response and Sounding Board
- Announcement of approved HAB Leadership
- Draft Advice: Double-Shell Tank Failures
- Draft Advice: Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for the Closure of Waste Management Area C
- HAB Committee Reports

Public Comment

There were no public comments received at the September meeting.

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters and Hanford Advisory Board (Board, HAB) Chair called the meeting into 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

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

Susan Leckband welcomed members to the HAB's out of town meeting in Bellevue, Washington. Susan provided members with an overview of the meeting agenda and objectives. She confirmed the adoption of the June Hanford Advisory Board meeting summary.

On day two of the Hanford Advisory Board Meeting, James Lynch, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for the Board provided members an overview of the EM SSAB Member Code of Conduct. Jim communicated that this document was developed after Dave Borak's visit to the June Hanford Advisory Board meeting. The EM SSAB Member Code of Conduct was based heavily on the Hanford Advisory Board's operating ground rules.

Lindsay Strasser, HAB Facilitator, provided members with informational announcements.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office

Doug Shoop, RL Manager, provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent Hanford Site activities. Doug noted the following key points in his presentation[1]:

324 Building Video

- Doug provided a video presentation on the 324 Building Project. This video can be found on the Hanford Site YouTube channel.
- The contaminated soil beneath B Cell (Hot Cell) is 20,000 rad per hour, which can be immediately harmful to human health. Doug expressed his gratitude to the workers on this project, as well as Brian Vance, ORP Manager who led the project before taking on his role at ORP.

Plutonium Uranium Extraction Plant (PUREX) Tunnel 2 Video

[1] Agency Presentation (RL Update)

- It has been over a year since the collapse of PUREX Tunnel 1, which was successfully stabilized with grout. Doug thanked the Emergency Response Team and workers for the great job they did to ensure there was no contamination release.

- An engineering evaluation was conducted on PUREX Tunnel 2 to determine the condition of the structure. The Engineering Team was not physically able to enter Tunnel 2 and determined that there was a need to stabilization. Video surveillance was conducted which determined there was significant corrosion inside the tunnel.

- Doug provided a video presentation on PUREX Tunnel Two Stabilization Project Animation. This video can be found on the Hanford Site YouTube channel.

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)

- During the week of September 10, 2018, DOE authorized the contractor to resume demolition for the lower risk activities, such as the debris on the ground.

- Doug noted that a video has been released which describes in detail of the work activities that will resume at PFP. This video can be found on the Hanford Site YouTube channel.

- Doug stated that he provided a presentation on other risks at the Hanford Site to the River & Plateau (RAP) committee on August 7, 2018. He noted that there are other aging structures around the Hanford complex that are at risk for failure. Doug provided members with a copy of the risk evaluation matrix[2].

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

Brian Vance, ORP Manager, provided Board members with a presentation highlighting recent ORP activities. Brian noted the following key points in his presentation[3]:

- Brian stated that he ORP has been focusing on the transition from construction to operations. He stated that the optimism in his team, as well as Bechtel and Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) teams is evident. We believe we will be successful with teamwork, including the stakeholders and tribal nations support. Brian expressed his appreciation for the support received from the Washington State delegation and the key stakeholders.

- Brian stated that the ORP mission is focused on safely managing the waste in Hanford's underground tanks while delivering the waste treatment capability needed for the waste immobilization and final disposition. He noted that this mission reflects the continuous focus on the future and ensuring the success of the tank waste mission.

Direct Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) Execution Overview

[2] Project Evaluation Matrix (Risk Matrix)
[3] Agency Presentation (ORP Update)

- DFLAW is system of facilities that cohesively work together to treat waste. The AP Tank Farm is pivotal to move forward, as it provides the infrastructure and tank volume that will be used to prepare and store the waste that will feed to the Waste Treatment Plant. Adjacent to the AP Tank Farm is the Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) System, which is a revised approach in replace of the Low-Activity Waste Pretreatment System (LAWPS). The TSCR approach is a smarter approach as it allows for the waste to be treated on a smaller scale.

- Brian noted that the goal is to start treating waste by 2022, which is ahead of the consent decree milestone date of December 2023. Brian stated that the goal in the first 10 years of operation is to remove 70% of cesium from the tanks which equates to 9 million curies, which will create about 12 million gallons of Double-Shell Tank (DST) space.

Conceptual Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) Layout

- Slide four of the presentation shows a conceptual layout of TSCR. TSCR will provide filtration and cesium removal with an ION exchange medium. The progress has moved along aggressively, as the contract was awarded in July and is not 30% complete.

DFLAW Immobilization Facilities

- The construction of the Effluent Management Facility has progressed. The coating inside the facility has been completed. 55% of the facilities for DFLAW have been turned over to start up and commissioning. More than 85% of the Balance of Facilities has transitioned. The focus has been conducting the start-up process and identifying any issues that may arise. The LAW facility document safety analysis was approved in May 2018. This project was completed several months ahead of schedule. The Analytical Lab now has a permit issued by Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology).

- ORP met with RL to discuss the prototype ION transporter device for transporting the glass in the LAW Facility.

Transition to Operations

- ORP is heavily focused to transitioning from construction to operations. This project is a site wide transition, which will challenge the processes and knowledge. This project will be the first project to be truly operational since the 1980s. ORP met with Mission Support Alliance (MSA), Bechtel, and WRPS to discuss the site wide transition and the 13 infrastructure projects that will need to be completed in order to support the transition to operations and ensure the projects are completed at the right time.

- ORP is dedicated to continue the work ORP has done with RL, as DOE Hanford will need to be cohesive to ensure the transition to operations is successful.

Other Projects

- The retrieval of the 16 tanks at C Farm is a historic and monumental success, as it is the first of 18 tank farms to be completed.

- Slide 7 of the presentation shows a timeline for the Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Evaluation for closure of the Waste Management Area C (WMA-C). There is a public meeting scheduled for October 16, 2018 in Portland, Oregon and planning for another public meeting in Western Washington for later this year.

- John Ecshenberg will be taking over as President of WRPS in replace of Mark Lindholm. Glen Trenchard will be moving from tank farms to the Technical and Regulatory Support (TRS) group. Rob Hastings will be moving from TRS to tanks farms.

- A-AX Farms has received equipment in order to start retrievals of the tanks. This project has progressed significantly. An interim barrier was installed in SX Farm. AY-102 received a final rinse. A pump was removed from AW-103 and packaged for shipment to Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).

- ORP has authorized and moved forward with transition to full face respirators on SY, AP, and AN Farms for low level workers. The testing for the Strobic Air Unit has started, which is used to destroy chemical vapors. The settlement agreement associated with chemical vapors was sign by the Washington Attorney General on September 19, 2018.

- WRPS representatives received the Voluntary Protections Programs (VPP) Innovation Award in August at the national symposium in Nashville, Tennessee.

- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers finalized reports for the Parametric Evaluations of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant for DOE. These reports were shared with Washington State and the delegations.

Washington State Department of Ecology

John Price, Ecology Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Section Manager, provided Board members with an update on recent Ecology activities. John noted the following key points covered in his presentation[4]:

TPA M-92 Milestone Public Comment Period(s)

- There are three separate public comment periods related to the M-92 milestone for the cesium/strontium (Cr/Sr) capsules.

- DOE held a public comment period from November 2017 through January 2018 for the construction and operation of a proposed capsule storage area.

- The TPA Agencies held a public comment period from May 2018 through July 2018 for changes to the TPA M-92 milestone related to changes for all three wastes (Cr/Sr, bulk sodium, and special case waste).

[4] Agency Presentation (Ecology Update)

- Ecology will hold a 60-day public comment period for the proposed capsule storage area in the future.

System Plan Negotiations Update

- Ecology and DOE engaged in milestone negotiations, extending the deadline three times within the May 2018 through the November 2018 timeframe. Additionally, Anne White, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Environmental Management (EM) asked to be personally involved in the negotiations.

- Upon reaching an agreement, a 30 day advance notice of public comment will be submitted, followed by a 60-day public comment period.

Permitting Update

- Ecology held a public meeting associated with the PUREX Tunnel 2 permit on August 27, 2018 in Richland, Washington followed by a regional public meeting in Seattle, Washington on September 5, 2018.

- Ecology issued a temporary authorization, which allows DOE to set up infrastructure needed to grout fill the tunnel.

- Ecology will consider the public comments received and issue a final decision regarding the permit by late-October.

- The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) revision 9 date has been extended to 2022.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

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

- In July, the acting Administrator signed the record of decision (ROD) for 100-D/H, which includes signatures from Doug Shoop and Alex Smith.

- Rod Lobos is leaving EPA for a position at ORP with Brian Vance's organization.

- The Superfund Task Force is progressing with new energy. This new administration came in and is looking at cleanup. They are looking at further optimization.

- PNNL has announced that they are going to need facilities for another 25 years. With this new timeframe, the 300 Area ROD milestone will need to be adjusted.

- Dave reiterated Doug's risk matrix. It is unknown the when or how bad an event would be but the risks are real. As a site and those that care about the area need to deal with those.

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

Q: "Is the LAWPS Facility complete?"

R (ORP): "The LAWPS Facility was originally planned for treating waste, but TSCR is not the approach we will be taking. LAWPS will not go away and we will reassess once we are able to see TSCR up and running. TSCR has a 5-year lifespan, which will form a basis of what the increments might be."

Q: "Can you give an update on the budget congress approved?"

R (RL): "The President's budget for FY2019 was $777 million dollars, but congress was able to increase the budget to $950 million dollars."

R: (ORP): "ORP had some plus ups in the budget for FY2019, which put us in a position to complete projects."

Q: "I attended the EM SSAB meeting in September and the EM-1 Anne White stated that she has requested all field managers to create a 10-year strategic plan. What can you tell us about this request and how is it coming along?"

R (RL): "On Monday we started the 10-year plan which included projects in the river corridor, PFP, the reactors, as well as other projects. One of the projects we will be including is the TRU waste being shipped the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). We will be open and transparent with the Board regarding our 10-year plan."

R (ORP): "This request creates an opportunity for ORP to identify opportunities for making progress more effectively and efficiently across the complex. It's a more holistic approach as the plan evolves over the next few months."

C: "We received a briefing from the procurement team about the Central Plateau. The briefing was alarming, as DOE wants contractors to propose end states in the Central Plateau."

R (RL): "The end states at the Hanford Site are predicated by the RCRA process. That is what determines the end states. I don't believe that RL is interested in the contractors come up with ideal end states separate from the RCRA process."

Q: "How will DOE utilize the risk assessment in requesting and defending the DOE budget that is submitted annually?"

R (RL): "Shortly after the collapse of PUREX Tunnel 1, there were a lot of communications back in Washington D.C. regarding if there are a lot of other structures that are analogous to risk. Many months ago we started the process of preliminarily communicating with the Congressional appropriators that there are other aging facilities on the Hanford site that are not on the books to be dealt with for quite a few years. We do have risk that we need to mitigate. I have started the dialogue with the appropriators and will continue the dialogue with the appropriators."

Q: "Do we have any projection on what the dose rates will be with TSCR or how TSCR will be shielded?

R (ORP): "We have established a very strict exposure requirements for those columns and the equipment itself. We are monitoring that to ensure the design progresses to ensure those requirements are achieved. As you pointed out, there will be exposure. However, the exposure requirements for that, the curie loading will be very low. We will continue to progress down that path and if we find that we are not getting the results we expect, we can always adjust the curie loading to manage the dose that way. I am confident that we have a very clear picture of what the dose rate will be."

Q: "The TWC had an opportunity to hear about the test bed initiative from Duane Schmoker. What are your thoughts on this initiative?"

R (ORP): "There are a couple of factors here. One is there was some pretty specific congressional language in the conference report that we're really evaluating what that means and how we can go forward with the test bed initiative. With the respect to the initiative itself, I view it as very complimentary of DFLAW. It's a way for us to look on a smaller engineer scale level some of the aspects of the TSCR equipment. We have an obligation to look to the future supplemental waste in an appropriate incremental way. The test bed initiative represents an opportunity for that. Again, I think it is a complimentary effort that I think we should continue to support. There are some challenges we need to work our way through based on the Congressional language. We will be working close with Ecology to ensure that resources are not stretched in ways we cannot deliver the DFLAW mission. I am supportive of it. I think it is a good approach and it gives us information that helps us reduce the risk and deliver DFLAW better."

Q: "You talked about the infrastructure project working with RL to support operating the plant. Several years ago there was discussion regarding the roads that needed upgrading in order to support the trucks that are needed. When you talked about upgrades, I didn't hear anything about road development or reconstruction. Is that part of it?"

R (ORP): "Yes, it absolutely is. We talked about it over the last two days making sure the road requirements were is in the public works plans. I think part of what I took away from that was ORP and RL will have to continue to work together and make sure our needs for the transition to Waste Treatment Plant operations are reflected and supported in the budget request on both sides to make sure we are able to work together to the juncture point where everything is ready."

Q: "In your ongoing dialogue with DOE regarding budget impacts, do you have a sense of how many milestones that will need to be renegotiated or changed in FY19?"

R (Ecology): "I don't have a sense of how many. There was some additional appropriation for PFP in FY18 which helped. I think in FY19, we may still be evaluating the impacts. We are in Tri-Party Agreement dispute on a couple of milestones which the Hanford Advisory Board specifically called out in advice in 2016. One is the start of the fieldwork for the 200-SW2 Burial Grounds. We think there is some public comment needed on this one. We have a couple of disputes going on. We are not sure exactly how many milestones but we think they are of interest to the public and want to get some public comment on them."

R (RL): "I think John did a great job communicating. I think the ones we are really going to need to get some more input on are the Central Plateau waste site cleanups. With the additional funds that we will take for dealing with PFP, PUREX Tunnel 2, as well as risks in the risk evaluation matrix. I think those are going to cause us to really think about what are those priorities in the Central Plateau and how do we address them."

Q: "With the contract changes every couple years, is there a plan to make that a more efficient process?"

R (ORP): "We are driven by the acquisition process as defined by our Headquarters. Those contracts are generally long-term contracts. There is an initial period and then option years that we continue for good behavior and good performance. We are trying to use the longer term vehicle to get the continuity that we need. There is some benefit periodically to go in and re-compete to try to find new opportunities for new contactors, new small businesses and new ideas to come in. We have to manage that to some extent. However, there are economic benefits and benefits to industry to be able to do that. DOE Headquarters are trying to balance those two priorities to get the best outcomes and value for the government long term."

R (RL): "You had said something about changing personnel with the change of new contracts and processes. To the extent we can, we really don't want to change personnel. Key personnel are considered senior level managers within the contractors rank and do change. The workforce stays fairly steady. Becky said she has been there 32 years. I think the workforce stays fairly steady. I think it goes back to what Brian was saying with the demographics. A lot of those workers who have been out there for 25-30 years, are thinking about retiring. We really don't have the next generation or workers prepared to come in and take over for those workers. As far as procedures change, that is just a huge inefficiency if we have a contractor come in and they are going to change all of the procedures. We put contract language in saying you can't do that. You need to what we call "blue sheet" the procedures that we have in place. We as tax payers have spent a lot of money developing these processes and procedure. We don't want to abandon them. If anything, we want to improve upon them. To abandon and start fresh is of little value to us."

Q: "Will PUREX Tunnel 2 work be performed on off-work hours in order to minimize the exposure to the environment and people?"

R (RL): "The answer I believe is no. What we have done this time different than PUREX Tunnel 1 is there is actually a grout plant that has been established at the site. One of the considerations with PUREX Tunnel 1 was putting all of those grout trucks on the road with all of the drivers. We have eliminated that by doing it this way. It is much more efficient this way as well. I believe we will have on shift."

Q: "There was talk of an RL and ORP merger at one point. Is there a timeline for when that will happen?"

R (RL): "When Brian became the ORP manager we had some very good discussions at his tenure that said we need to work together as a cohesive DOE. It is important that we do that whether we are one organization or two organizations. As leaders of our organizations with a single mission to clean up the Hanford site, we need to work closely together. We have done a multitude of things to make that happen. The Richland Operations office moved from the Federal building over to 2420 Stevens so we share an

office complex with Brian. We have joint staff meetings. Brian and I meet on a weekly basis to integrate our teams. Our Deputy Managers meet on a regular basis. That is the way we are managing. From a Congressional standpoint, there was some language that ORP would continue to operate as a stand-alone until DFLAW is up and operating. I believe it said 2024. While that legislation is out there, it does not preclude us from working together."

Q: "Is there any thought to having one long-term contractor? Talent could be able to be moved around and retain the expertise."

R (RL): "As far as long-term contracts, there are federal acquisition laws and regulations that every federal agency must comply with relative to procurements. Those mandate that on some periodicity you re-compete your contracts with the idea that you are looking for best value to the government. I don't envision that we would ever be able to circumvent those requirements. My experience indicates that usually the longest periods of time that the federal agencies have contracts in place is about 10 years. Usually you have a five year contract with options to extend if the contractor is performing well. That hopefully addresses the long term. As far as having one contractor onsite, certainly that is something that we considered. There are certainly benefits to having one contractor. I think the real challenge with that is that the work on the Hanford site is so diverse. It is hard to find a contractor that is excellent at all aspects of that work."

Public Comment

There were no public comments received.

Draft Advice: Double-Shell Tank Failures

Bob Suyama, Benton County and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair introduced the Double-Shell Tank (DST) Failures advice.

Bob noted that the Issue Manager Team worked effortlessly on producing a great piece of advice. Bob quoted Albert Einstein "The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result." He said that the Board has repeatedly advised DOE to initiate actions to acquire additional waste storage tank capacity. Bob stated that revision 8 of the River Protection Project System Plan (System Plan 8) relies on the usability of the DSTs for another 27 to 68 years, which is beyond the design lives of these tanks. Bob noted that AY-102 is a prime example of a DST failure, as recent investigations have determined that three DSTs have held waste with similar chemistry to AY-102.

Agency and Regulator Responses

John Price, Ecology provided Board members additional perspective. He stated that the advice was well written and Ecology definitely agrees with the advice. There are no conceptual problems and no wordsmithing problems. Additional perspective offered included the following thoughts:

DST space is analogous to the collapse of PUREX Tunnel 1. The issues were known as far back to 1980. It was a difficult and relatively expensive decision to make so it wasn't done and ran to failure. The DST space issue has been known since the late 1990s. It is a difficult decision to make from a policy and other perspective to build new DSTs.

To build DST space in the next 10 years may run around plus or minus $1.2 billion dollars. There are a few problems with that number. One is it exceeds the Office of Management and Budget guidelines to DOE and other Federal agencies on how much they can increase their budget over time. The second issue with that is the demand for money to build DSTs would come in a timeframe over the next 10 years when ORP's budget is already extremely challenged. There is no way around it, it is a very difficult decision.

Susan opened the discussion for members to provide suggested revisions, comments, and/or questions.

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

C: "On the second page, to strengthen the advice, we had other advice related in the form of budget priority advice. It also mentioned that we have to have additional tank capacity and we suggest that this is a budget priority issue. If you want to strengthen that argument, you can include advice 288, 294 and 297."

Q: "I am having a hard time understanding that large number for tank replacement. It says the number of one tank is the same for the same size as the old tanks. Is it necessary to build them that big?"

R (Ecology): "That number is not for one tank. I have heard various numbers. You hear numbers like $100 million dollars per tank, I am not sure how many tanks that would be or at what capacity. It is certainly several tanks."

Q: "I don't think the actual number is the real number if you take a close look and phase it in a way that makes sense. If you lost a tank, you would have to pump that tank and completely empty that out. How fast could you pump it? How fast do you need to build another tank capacity?"

R (Ecology): "I was just talking about the cost of building new tanks. When you start talking about transferring waste between tanks, you are generating more costs. You are talking about a significant budget impact."

C: "This isn't additional capacity, this is replacement capacity. I think it is important to flavor this into the whole discussion. We aren't looking for additional capacity, we have already lost one tank capacity. Factor in the aspect of replacement capacity plus alternate approaches to replacement capacity. I don't think everyone is envisioning a new tank farm."

C: "I don't know what they do at Savannah River, but I cannot ever imagine repairing a tank in the tank farms. Being a worker out there, standing on top of the tanks with them under ground. I cannot fathom going anywhere near where there is a hole to repair it. For worker health and safety, and the environment I would say no. There is no way you could ever repair a tank with a human being. If they had a remote technology than maybe."

Q: "I think it is remotely done. Brian or Jim, do you know anything on how that is done?"

R (ORP): "I think there are technologies involved to be able to work in that situation. To be honest, I haven't spent the time looking at those. I can't imagine that there would be too much of a stretch to have a capability to apply. I just don't know."

C: "Do we want to ask DOE to specifically look at what ifs of repairable leaks? Is that what we are looking for them to project into the future for planning purposes? I would argue that we are more interested in those bigger problems. Those leaks that really cause us to lose capacity. That is our primary interest and concern in this advice. Are those leaks you cannot repair? While repair may be something that comes out in the future, I don't know that is what we are most interested in evaluating as part of this advice."

Q: "I heard the state was not interested in repairing tanks. So what is their position on repairing tanks? I am not aware of it."

R (Ecology): "The regulations certainly allow it. I think Richard hit on the key issue. Can you find an independent, qualified professional registered engineer that is going to sign off on the repairs as adequate? I just don't know that you can find that. It's a difficult hill to climb. We would certainly entertain it. However, I think it's going to come back to if there is someone who is going to certify the repairs as adequate."

C: "I can't imagine how they would do it. I do think it's fair to be looked at. We are close to losing more tanks and I think it would be worthwhile to look at those tanks nearing failure that haven't failed yet. Take a look at them and see if there is any way you could repair them. Not that you are demanding they be repaired."

Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions and minor wording changes, the Board approved the advice. Members agreed to send the final advice to Brian Vance, ORP and Alex Smith, Ecology.

"John Price" Challenge Response

Jeff Burright, Oregon Department of Energy and Tank Waste Committee member introduced the topic of the "John Price Challenge." Jeff noted that the John Price, Ecology challenged the Board at the March Board meeting to determined and provide a response on what the Board's "favorite" System Plan 8 scenario would be. He provided Board Members and Agency personnel with a brief informational presentation prior to the sounding board.

Lindsay Strasser introduced the sounding board process. Each Stakeholder seat was provided up to two minutes each to respond to the framing question round-robin style.

- *What criteria or assumptions would you like to see considered in the next System Plan?*

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

Earl Fordham, Washington State Department of Health

"No Comment"

Pam Larsen, City of Richland

"In listening to the National Academy of Sciences meetings discussing the system plan, they presume it is a real system plan which it is not. I think it is really important to change the title of the document. It should be called alternative analysis of the system to retrieve tank waste. I agree with everything on the "what do you think page."

Angela Day, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington

"I am looking at the column that says assumptions to consider. The very first one says that the assumption is that the DFLAW will proceed on schedule. I was wondering if we wouldn't want to consider adding an assumption about what happens if that doesn't proceed on schedule."

Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper

"I guess for me I think about chaos theory. The idea that we got a system and things are happening and we end up with something completely different. That really speaks to the idea and the acceptance that we are going to have more failures in these tanks. We have got to understand. I know that we called it an inflection point here. When DSTs fail. When that failure starts to impact mission delays. I think there has to be some very serious consideration of when is that going to be. Do we not need to address the fact that it is going to happen and address it now? That means building more tanks as preparation to anticipate that it is going to happen. For me, that has always been one of the biggest concerns."

Steve Wiegman, Public At Large

"I agree with Pam's comment that this is no longer what the system plan was originally prepared to do. It was designed to connect tanks, delivery, treatment, disposal in a flow of logic so you could see how all the parts interconnected. It no longer does that. Not even close to that. It's no longer a system plan and shouldn't be called that. It is a good thought provoking set of analysis to show what kind of trouble we are really in. The 14 points that Jeff developed in the pink sheets, I agree with all but one of those. I do not think we should defer physical closure of SSTs to take that money to take that money and spend it on other stuff. Other than that, I think those assumptions are spot on."

Bob Suyama, Benton County

"I wanted to thank Jeff for an excellent job. When he sent me those graphs I said that is going to be two hours but he got through it. What I would like to see in System Plan 9 is at least the two

scenarios that I thought were the most useful. The first was the baseline. I thought having the unconstrained baseline and what it is going to take to get there was very valuable. Having flat funding; I really don't think we are going to have $3 billion dollars per year come to this site. It is kind of like what we have been getting for the last 10 years. We really need to really look at what we are going to be able to accomplish with that flat funding. Just like we talked about before, we have to factor in DST failures for every five years to see how that is going to affect it. We are going to have DST failures. The other issue I would like to see is innovative approaches like the test bed initiative. It is going to allow us to move low-level waste offsite to Texas and it is going to help us empty some of those tanks in the near term. How is that going to affect the process? Maybe it is not a test bed initiative, but something like that. The commercial process if we turn it over to them, we pay them and the waste is offsite."

David Bolingbroke, Public At Large

"I would like to also thank Jeff for the presentation. I would like to second Bob's comments on the importance of being able to measure what we will be able to do in the future based off more of a flat funding schedule. If has been relatively flat in the past and it looks like it is going to be relatively flat going forward. I think we need to prioritize realistically on the amount of funding we are going to have. My other comment would be that I really like the different scenarios. For me it comes down to balancing different priorities. What is most important? Is it about finishing the job the most quickly? Is it about dealing with high-level or low-level waste first? Is it about efficiency? It is trying to find a balance between those priorities that I am still trying to figure out. I think it's about deciding what the most important thing is and then doing the most important thing as quickly as we can."

Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest

"I echo the previous the previous comments except for assumption number four which of course I would argue that it is important to include physical closure of SSTs. I wanted to thank Jeff for these graphs and especially for the one that jumps out at me. I know it would jump out at people I would talk to in the general public. In particular, SST retrieval rates. It is really striking to look at and look at the year 2045 and it really shoots it up. To think about how old those SSTs are. When we talk about assuming that there will be a DST failure every five years, I think it's also important to consider the possibility of more a catastrophic failure all at once. I don't know how you would factor that in. It just doesn't seem likely that those failures are going to be gradual and predictable. On a graph line, it is more likely that it is going to be catastrophic, all at once and probably fairly early in this 100 year picture we are looking at. That would be my concern. Is there some way we can add that thought?"

Jeff Burright, Oregon Department of Energy

"So John, I don't know if you are hearing this but there aren't a whole lot of preferred scenarios coming out. I think the reason why is because there is not an answer in here. There is not a silver bullet. If there is not a clear way to make this mission better, I think it switches to a paradigm of how we manage failure better. How do we be ready for failures in a longer road ahead? We had talked as a committee. Scenario 7, things take longer than you thought. Scenario 8 and 9 are some little ways to gain efficiency. Scenario 10 which envisions some additional storage. I would challenge you to be creative when you think about storage. It's not just DSTs. I think about this TWX facility that is not yet designed. It is something we know we need already. It is something that if we switch to a direct-feed high-level waste paradigm, it's suddenly the long pole in the tent overnight. Is there a way to negotiate the design of that to kill two birds with one stone? I also think about the waste-receiving facilities that are planned to be built around the site. I think about things like above ground tanks after waste has gone through the TSCR. Maybe it doesn't have a dose restriction that makes it have to go underground. Maybe there is some cost savings there. You will be able to see those as potential alternatives to the pink paper. Of the assumptions that we included in here, the only one that Oregon really cannot stand behind is #16 which envisions not even trying to retrieve waste from the tanks. We think you have to try. If high-level waste is going to drive the mission then don't stop building the high-level waste facility. My last point would be that technetium and iodine are really bad actors. If we can find ways to manage that, your options improve."

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trade Council

"I agree with what Pam said. Assuming that this is a real plan and it's not. It's not a real plan. I love it when a plan comes together. I think assumption #4, deferring closure of SSTs after retrieval I can totally stand behind that. I think retrieving the tanks is most important. I think as we have seen over the years, new technology comes around. Eventually, I think there will be some new technology that will help to physically close these tanks. In the meantime, I think we should continue to retrieve waste out of those tanks. Get those tanks to a place where they can be closed."

Tom Galioto, Public At Large

"I am still wrestling with this concept but I will give you my thoughts. I think it would take a lot more thought, rationale and understanding to go through these 16 or 17 items to pick and choose which one I thought was best. I like what Bob has just addressed. That is to include flat funding impact and also separately include a baseline of the current planning. Based on the way that this is structured, I would think you would want to discuss those two items in the text as opposed to putting those in the table. That is where we are currently. These alternatives that we are presenting here are things to consider to improve that. In addition to those 17 items, I think we should have an additional item in the table is what we as a Board heard and discussed back in March and June. We were looking at a DOE sponsored report on the same subject. We said we don't like the assumptions that were chosen. We liked pieces of number 2 and 3. We discussed

this in a previous meeting this year at the HAB. To that would be more of what John is asking for. It would go more towards what you would recommend. That was the recommendation that was written up for our Board to consider."

Melanie Myers-Magnuson, "Non-Union, Non-Management"

"I believe that the decision should be made off the risk. I believe there are a lot of SSTs that are of a higher risk to harm the environment or have the potential to leak. I don't like dropping those off of the list. I am sure there are some that can be held back for a while. I do not believe that they all can be. The only scenario that I really like as it is written is the U farm retrievals because it seemed realistic. The scenario #9 I have a problem with. It is the offsite effluent treatment. The effluents are a secondary waste which means it is a low-level waste which does not require a WIR. We already have capabilities onsite to treat effluents. The cost of offsite treatment includes road closures, expensive transportation, and proper containers. The actual cost of treatment is enormous. When it's treated, you have a form of waste that is no longer a hazard to the environment or people. In this scenario, it is suggesting treating the condensates offsite. To me that doesn't make sense because we have the capability onsite to manage that. Those costs could be placed somewhere else. We could invest that money in other technologies or disposal. I also think that as a whole it would be nice to have a system plan to have a hard look at cost savings associated with waste disposal. There are a lot of nuisances in the regulations that require additional treatment. There are other nuisances where you don't have to treat. I don't think we do a good job at trying to save money. Because it is such a significant cost, millions of dollars can be saved in just a few days."

Dana Miller, Yakama Nation

"Thank you for the presentation. At this time, I will have to pass. This has to go through the proper process within my Government Agency. I will be sending comments at a later time."

Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Nez Perce Tribe

"I am also in the same position for the Nez Perce Tribe."

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board

"There are lots of choices here. The situation here is dire. We are operating on a failure mode. We have to make the best of what we can get from the government to mitigate or reduce the amount of damage we do to human health, environment, and the safety of the workers. I think the thing we need to do is to go after even the most threatening waste first. Assume a flat funding and try to least harmful failure that we can manage based on the technical ability we have now. I guess we

go after the most liquid portions of the waste and get that. Then we go after the next most harmful portion of the waste. If we have a catastrophe, we can get more funding. We should assumed flat funding."

Emmett Moore, Washington State University

"I am here to inform myself more than anything else. I do have a question I would like to ask. The discussion today is based on the near-term tank problem. What is the final date for ending treatment and how many new melters is it going to take to reach that?"

Emmitt Jackson, "Non-Union, Non-Management"

"No Comment"

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge

"I have a few thoughts. I agree with changing the title to make it more clear about how it is used. I do have an idea about potentially restructuring or making it more clear about dealing with some of the worst case scenarios. Having them be ad- ons. You would have some improvement scenarios, some setback scenarios and some funding scenarios. They all kind of do different things to what happens. As we move forward, restructure the document so you could put things together. If we have this improvement, this setback and this funding, see what happens. You could move them around more like building block versus thinking about one of the other. That might help with how the title is changed. In the negotiations, I hear talks about let's be realistic about funding. I also know that if you don't push for what you want, you don't get it. Not accepting budgetary defeat and balancing realistic ideas of milestones that are achievable with pushing more than you think you are going to get. If you are not asking for it, you are not going to get it. I think it is helpful to include some kind of scenario that shows flat funding and accelerated funding in different ways. You could really use this as a tool for congress to potentially relate to the life-cycle scope cost report to show what happens when we actually fund things."

Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters

"We all know how important infrastructure is. I don't see anywhere in here and I assume that the evaporator component of some of these actions. I don't see the assumption that the evaporator could fail. We all know that has happened and it is a single point of failure. It doesn't have a backup. I would suspect that in some of these that the assumption should consider the fact that the evaporator, as a critical part of achieving whatever scenario you would pick could fail."

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland

"I have been listening to all the gloom and doom and am trying to figure out how you insert the gloom and doom into the title of the system plan. I kept thinking in terms of a risk mitigation

plan. After my experience with AY-102, we can look at that but we don't seem to be learning any lessons from moving C-106 to AY-102. Every time we move more waste, we make more waste and it gets bigger. A lot of these items are focused around the aspect of DST failures in the future. As we retrieve these other tanks, we are just making our DST problem worse. Yes, SSTs are leaking. The liquid factor is gone. I would like to see a scenario where we delay the SST retrieval against migration to the environment. When we put it in a DST with a million gallons of liquid on top of it, now we have made it a lot more mobile. Also we are putting greater stress on these DSTs. The scenarios where we are looking at additional capacity and possibly not adding to the problem is what I would like to see."

Draft Advice: Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C

Bob Suyama provided an introduction for the draft WIR advice. Bob stated that DOE is proposing to reclassify high-level waste remaining in the C Farm single-shell tanks as low-level waste. Bob noted that the application of the WIR process sets a precedent setting for Hanford, as it has the potential to establish the criteria for the future closure of all Hanford tank farms. Bob expressed his gratitude to the Issue Manager Team for the countless hours spent on this technical piece of advice, not only through email but through numerous hours of conference calls.

Agency and Regulator Responses

John Price, Ecology provided Board members with two specific comments about wording. John noted that the WIR process is specifically a DOE process and provided only wording comments that would relate to Ecology's role. The first comment suggested to reword the policy basis to better state Washington State Department of Ecology's role. John recommended to reverse the wording to emphasize Ecology's regulatory role. Ecology approves permit modification requests, and closure plans. There will be a permit modification to adopt closure plan for Waste Management Area C in to the hazardous waste permit. In order for Washington to do that, the waste in the tank and the soil cannot be high-level waste. There is a requirement that high-level waste be treated by vitrification to meet land disposal restrictions. The purpose of the recommendation to reword is to carry that sense. On page two, John informed the members that Ecology did not use the referenced record of decision. The ROD is a DOE record of decision under the National Environmental Policy Act. Ecology has not yet adopted the parts that tank closure waste management EIS that deal with tank closure. Ecology will do that through a State Environmental Policy Act determination at the time the WMA-C closure plan is issued for public comment.

Jim Lynch, ORP did not have specific technical suggestions for changes of the document. He thanked the Board for their time and effort on putting the advice together. Jim noted that this is a complex topic with several public meetings. There will be additional meetings in the future. Jim reminded members that Brian provided a timeline on slide 7 of the morning's presentation. He encouraged members to think about future opportunities for public comment not only as the HAB but as individual stakeholder groups. The Department's intent is to consider the advice as whole and values the advice on this topic.

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

Q: "Is the Department of Energy willing to move the public comment period closure to after the December Board meeting?"

R (ORP): "No, not at this time. There is no plan to move or extend the closure date. We will continue to consider comments as they continue to come in."

Q: "I have a question regarding characterization of the last 4-5% of what is in the tanks. Can you really determine what is in there? Or is this just reclassifying it based on a volume determination?

R (ORP): "I don't have the answer to that off the top of my head. One thing that I did want to mention regarding some of the more technical questions is that on October 3 there was a request to do more of a process integrative approach to answer some of those questions on more details as well as look at soils and other kind of things. That is something that Chris Kemp is going to be talking to the TWC. I am sorry I don't have a direct answer to that question. However, I think it was captured to provide to our technical team and has been provided for clarification."

Q: "John talked a while ago about 99%. My question to DOE was what did you mean by 99%? My recollection was that 99% was a goal and that you would apply the best technology and then submit a request to Ecology for whatever the residual turned out to be. I need a little clarity about what DOE thought it meant in the ROD when they adopted the 99% alternative. If we can't get that clarity, I will just be quiet."

R (ORP): "I cannot provide the technical answer to that today. I know that I have sent that on to the technical team for their consideration. I don't know if there is any room in here to phrase it as a question in your advice."

C: "There really needs to be some specific information about Appendix I which is the process of closing tanks in the TPA. It is an interim process DOE and Ecology as I recall. We need to lay that out for people to understand."

Q: "John do you have something to add? Was 99% the goal and not the requirement?"

R (Ecology): "The 99% is really a goal and Pam referenced Appendix I. Appendix I is what I would call a get along agreement. The TPA is really a get along agreement. Ecology, DOE and EPA have both overlapping and conflicting responsibilities and authority. At one point in Appendix I it talks about Ecology and DOE approving the performance assessment under their respective authority. We really are making two decisions. DOE has to make a disposal decision for leaving radionuclides in the tank and in the soil. Although I really think they are more focused on the tank at this point. Ecology has to make a permit decision to close those tanks. The norm is to close those tanks by clean closure. This means to remove all of the waste from the tanks and the contamination from the soils. That is the default. If that can't be done our regulations state that we need to make a determination. In this case DOE has removed the waste from the tank and the contamination from the soil to the maximum extent practical. We will use

the environmental impact statement and other information to make that determination. We have not made that determination yet. We are not bound to the 99%. It could be more. It could be less. It is a goal."

C: "I think the question really is because the TPA has Appendix H which allows for a process to where if you can't get 99% because is technically impractical, there is a process to allow for less than 99%."

C: "I thought Steve's question what do they mean by 99%? What they mean is the TPA definition."

Q: "What does that mean in the terms of the advice?"

R (HAB): "Did DOE commit in a record of decision to achieve 99%? Or did they commit to achieve 99% or the best we can do because the TPA says it is ok."

C: "I think they are committed to the process."

Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions and minor wording changes, the Board approved the advice. Members agreed to send the final advice to Brian Vance, ORP; Doug Shoop, RL; and Alex Smith, Ecology.

C: "I have one comment on the very last page. I strongly recommend that we delete the phrase that reads that meet NEPA and SEPA requirements. That we also delete the second paragraph in the policy background that references NEPA. The reason is if we invoke NEPA we are approving the preparation of an environmental impact statement. If we are approving the preparation of an environmental impact statement, we are approving up to a two-year delay in the project. The regulations prevent you to committing resources while the EIS is being carried out. We are essentially agreeing to a two-year delay in the project if we keep this statement in. With respect to SEPA, it does not apply to DOE. It does apply to Ecology. As John indicated a few minutes ago, SEPA can be used to delay a RCRA permit which could also delay the project. I don't think that the HAB needs to be in the position of suggesting or being in the favor of delaying these projects when it is not necessary we do that. By removing that one phrase, it does not affect the advice in any way, shape or form. It takes away the possibility that someone thinks we are approving a delay in the project."

HAB Committee Reports

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

Tank Waste

Bob Suyama, Benton County and TWC Chair provided an update regarding the TWC committee. Bob stated that the TWC had two committee meetings since the Board meeting in June. The TWC received an Agency presentation on the draft WIR Evaluation for closure of WMA-C and debrief of the June 18, 2018 public meeting associated with the WIR. The TWC discussed the "John Price Challenge" path forward and the DST Tank Failures draft advice following the Agency update on Tank Integrity. Bob noted that the TWC worked on two pieces of draft advice at the August 8, 2018 TWC meeting in preparation for the September Board meeting. Bob also noted that a combined TWC and HSEP meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 3, 2018 at the Richland Public Library.

The TWC committee will not have a committee call in October.

River & Plateau

Jan Catrell, Public At Large and River & Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair provided an update regarding the RAP committee. Jan stated that RAP committee met on August 7, 2018, where Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest was elected as Vice Chair of the RAP committee. Jan noted that the RAP received an update of PFP, Milestone M-91, and PUREX at the August RAP meeting. Jan also noted that Doug Shoop provided an Agency presentation on the Risks at Hanford (Risk Matrix). Jan expressed her thanks to Doug for his openness at the August meeting.

The RAP committee will not have a committee call in October.

Health, Safety & Environmental Protection

Rebecca Holland, HAMTEC and Health, Safety & Environmental Protection (HSEP) Chair provided an update regarding the HSEP committee. Rebecca stated that the HSEP committee has not met since April 2018. Rebecca noted that the HSEP committee will receive an update on the Beryllium Program and Worker Safety at the October 3, 2018 combined HSEP and TWC committee meeting. Rebecca also noted that she is transitioned from her work at Tank Farms to the 324 Building Project. Rebecca also noted that a combined HSEP and TWC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 3, 2018 at the Richland Public Library.

The HSEP committee will not have a committee call in October.

Public Involvement & Communications

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge and Public Involvement & Communications Chair provided an update regarding the PIC committee. Liz stated that members can join up to two committees, as well as the PIC as a freebie. She noted that members interested in joining the PIC will need send a request to the HAB Facilitation Team. Liz also mentioned there will be a WIR public workshop held by DOE on October 16, 2018 in Portland, Oregon followed by and evening session hosting by Oregon Department of Energy. Liz noted that TPA Agencies will be hosting a Hanford Regional Dialogue meeting on November 1, 2018 in Hood River, Oregon. The PIC formed an issue manager team for new HAB member orientations.

The PIC committee will not have a committee call for October.

Budget and Contracts

Tom Galioto, Public At Large and BCC Vice-Chair provided an update regarding the BCC Committee. Tom noted that the BCC added two new members. He communicated that the BCC had five committee calls this year and one webinar presentation. Tom is working with the facilitation team on creating an electronic folder on the HAB website for BCC products members can easily access. Tom noted that the BCC will be having a combined meeting with TWC on November 7, 2018. Tom also mentioned that there is a potential for a half day Committee of the Whole (COTW) in January 2019 for FY2021 Budget Priorities, with a potential separate topic the last half of that day.

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

EM SSAB

Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper and Board Vice-Chair provided an update regarding the recent EM SSAB activities. Shelley stated the bi-annual chairs meeting was held on May 3 & 4, 2018 in Roswell, New Mexico. She stated that Ann White, EM-1 was visiting Hanford during the EM SSAB meeting in Roswell. She noted that Ms. White expressed the need for technology and innovations in the EM cleanup. Shelley also noted that Ms. White mentioned pensions and debt that could impact the EM complex. Shelley mentioned the possible collaboration between the Idaho National Laboratory Citizen's Advisory Board and the Hanford Advisory Board to discuss the future disposition of transuranic waste.

National Liaison

Pam Larsen, City of Richland and National Liaison provided Board members an update to include the following:

EM Program Leadership

Ann Marie White is EM-1.0 She comes from the private sector and comes with a lot of energy. She is very focused on getting things done.

They are accepting applications for EM-2. The rumor is that Mark Frei will fill the position. Many individuals know Mark, he has been working for Bechtel on the Waste Treatment Plant most recently.

EM-3 is the position that Stacy Charboneau held. EM-3 is considered site services. Ken Picha is currently acting in this role. Ken is known to many onsite as he has held headquarters responsibilities that included tank waste. The site manager reports to EM-3.

Erik Olds is in acting capacity as Chief of Staff. This role is detailed for 120 days.

The EM Office of Special Projects is being led by Mr. Hutton. The EM Office of Special Projects oversees WTP.

Dae Chung has taken on Mr. Hutton's previous role in Safety, Security and Quality.

Mr. Owendoff has a new opportunity within EM to be a special advisor at the Savannah River Site.

DOE Headquarters

There is frustration with the function of the Defense Nuclear Safety Board. The Board is downsizing by 20%. Congress does not like the downsizing. This Board is appointed by the President and provides advice on nuclear safety facilities. Over the years, DOE has followed their advice many times. It is very expensive for DOE to follow the advice.

DOE has refused to respond to the most recent letter from the DNFSB. DOE has said that the Board can only make recommendations regarding protecting the public. The Board will not be allowed to provide advice on WIPP which is alarming to many.

Paul Dabbar, who has responsibility for the Office of Science and Environmental Management programs communicated "this administration is focusing on innovation through smart investments, streamlined regulations and collaborative approaches to problem solving". In order to get to completion and closure, they would like to shorten schedules bring in costs.

Ann White directed site managers to develop 10 year strategic plans. She is very interested in regulatory reform with an emphasis on "end states". She would like to see a completion mindset. It was noted that the EM cleanup mission is the third highest federal liability after federal debt and entitlement programs.

PFP was identified as a near-term win for the EM program. Ms. White noted that there were more than 100 cleanup sites EM was responsible for. This number has been reduced to 16.

EM will focus on risk reduction, safe, and cost-effective cleanup. Ann White encouraged the EM SSAB to have a completion mindset.

Pam expressed concern that companies bidding on the next Central Plateau contract have been directed to propose "end states." There is only one Record of Decision for the Central Plateau and that is for U Canyon. Final cleanup for the rest of the area have not been met.

FY2019 HAB Proposed Work Plan and Calendar

Susan Leckband, Board Chair provided an overview of the proposed FY2019 HAB work plan and calendar.

Members took the time to review the proposed work plan and calendar.

The proposed FY2019 HAB calendar was approved by consensus with no changes made.

The proposed FY2019 HAB work plan was approved by consensus following the addition of the following changes:

"Composite analysis" in the topic of "Tank Waste Retrieval & Closure."

"Evaluate & provide recommendations for Hanford Regional Dialogue meetings"

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

Q: "Has the out of town meeting location been decided for FY2019?"

R (Facilitator): "The facilitation team has not received notification of an approved FY2019 out of town HAB meeting."

Board Business

Announcement of HAB Leadership
Lindsay Strasser, Facilitator announced the approved HAB Leadership for Board Chair, Vice Chair, and National Liaison. Lindsay noted that the HAB Leadership terms are two years.

The approved HAB Leadership are as follows:

- Board Chair – Susan Leckband
- Board Vice Chair – Shelley Cimon
- Board National Liaison – Pam Larson

EM SSAB Recommendation Thumbs Up/Thumbs Down
Susan Leckband, Board Chair introduced the EM SSAB recommendation regarding SSAB involvement in enhancing stakeholder and public engagement. Susan noted that EM-1 asked for the EM SSAB Board to list potential stakeholder and public engagement activities as a way for site managers to be more engaged with the Advisory Boards across the EM complex. Susan asked members to review the recommendation and vote a thumbs up or thumbs down.

Members gave a thumbs up to move the recommendation forward.

Scheduling of Upcoming Committee Meetings/Phone Calls
Committee members provided input on committee phone calls and meetings for October and November. The RAP committee requested a committee planning phone call in October for a tentative November 6, 2018 committee meeting. A combined committee meeting is scheduled for TWC & HSEP on October 3, 2018. A combined committee meeting is scheduled for TWC & BCC on November 7, 2018.

Potential Products for September Meeting
The following preliminary topics were discussed:
- System Plan Assumptions white paper

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)

Attachment 4: Draft Double-Shell Tank Failures

Attachment 5: System Planning Assumptions "John Price Challenge"

Attachment 6: Draft Advice Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C

Attachment 7: Fiscal Year 2019 Hanford Advisory Board Calendar

Attachment 8: Fiscal Year 2019 Hanford Advisory Board Work Plan

Attachment 9: EM SSAB Member Code of Conduct

Attachment 10: Project Evaluation Matrix (Risk Matrix)

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Pam Larsen, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Phil Lemley, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Liz Mattson, Member	Melanie Myers-Magnuson, Member
Emmitt Jackson, Member	Shelley Cimon, Member	Dan Serres, Alternate
Gerry Pollet, Member	Helen Wheatley, Alternate	Susan Leckband, Member
Todd Martin, Member	Angela Day, Alternate	Dan Solitz, Alternate
Jeff Burright, Alternate	Steve Wiegman, Member	David Bolingbroke, Member
Tom Galioto, Member	Kristie Baptiste, Member	Rich Bloom, Alternate (Phone)
Rudy Mendoza, Alternate (Phone)	Emmett Moore, Member (Phone)	Jan Catrell, Member
Dana Miller, Member		

Agency, Contractor & Support Staff:

Earl Fordham, WA DOH	Kristin Holmes, DOE-RL	James Lynch, DOE-ORP
Paula Call, DOE-ORP	Echo Dahl, DOE-ORP	Dave Einan, EPA
John Price, Ecology	Randy Bradbury, Ecology	Dana Cowley, MSA
Jennifer Colborn, MSA	Ginger Wireman, Ecology (Phone)	Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)

Members of the Public:

David Swale	Carmen Vidal	Amanda Pardo
Norm Cimon	Bert Reynolds	Annette Cary (Phone)
Kelsey Shank (Phone)	Dee Gray (Phone)	Adrian Woolcock, ProSidian
Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Melissa Amaro, ProSidian	