



Meeting Minutes

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)

Full Board Meeting

February 6 and 7, 2024

Hybrid Meeting – In-person (Pasco, WA) and via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates	2
Round Robin Discussions	10
Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2026 Cleanup Priorities	15
Committee Reports	16
Overview of the Tri-Party Agreement, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.....	17
Board Business	22
Public Comment	26
Meeting Recording	26
Attachments	26
Meeting Attendees.....	27
Appendix A: Fiscal Year 2026 Cleanup Priorities Advice, As Approved	30
Appendix B: February 2024 National Liaison Report.....	37

This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Lindsay Somers, US Department of Energy (DOE) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), opened the meeting in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Susan Coleman, Public at Large and HAB chair, welcomed participants and provided opening statements. She congratulated the HAB for reaching its 30-year anniversary, recognizing the efforts of its past and present members in representing the organizations and citizens of Washington, Oregon, and the tribal governments of Yakama, Umatilla, and Nez Perce.

Susan recalled the first meeting of the HAB, held January 24, 1994, when John Wagoner, the DOE Hanford Site manager at the time, charged the HAB to provide “high-quality advice... on major policy and strategic decisions.” Following the direction of then Secretary of Energy O’Leary, Mr. Wagoner committed to: providing the public access to DOE’s decision-making process, seeking informed advice from the tribes and public on cleanup and environmental restoration, and accounting for the way it would deal with advice.

Susan explained that the HAB was the first of the DOE Environmental Management (EM) citizen advisory boards (CAB) to be established under FACA and it was later grandfathered under the EM Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) charter. She reviewed the present responsibilities of the HAB and the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies under those agreements. Adhering to those commitments, the HAB submitted over 300 pieces of advice to those agencies across a broad range of subjects. She encouraged the HAB to continue to question and investigate topics of concern to its stakeholders.

Susan reviewed the topics of the meeting. The Board members would hear updates from the TPA agencies on their ongoing and upcoming work, finalize its cleanup priorities for fiscal year (FY) 2026, and hear an overview of the agreements and regulations that governed Hanford cleanup. She noted that following the conclusion of the first meeting day there would be an informal celebration and invited all current and past HAB members—as well as the public, agency staff, and others—interested in celebrating the HAB’s accomplishments over those 30 years.

Judie Talbot, HAB facilitator, invited the meeting participants to introduce themselves and provided a review of meeting logistics and meeting ground rules.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

US Department of Energy

Brian Vance, DOE, expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to speak to the HAB. He felt that DOE and its contractors were off to a good start for the 2024 calendar year. The safety culture of the site was reinforced as many workers were returning from holidays. Despite delays due to weather impacts, work was progressing safely. Brian noted that, although there was not a formal presentation being shown that day, a package of project photos was available showing the project work underway on the Hanford Site (*Attachment 2*).

In recognition of the HAB’s 30th anniversary, Brian stated that he was going to deviate from his typical progress update to discuss what he considered the important role the HAB can play in supporting DOE’s Hanford cleanup mission. He noted that during the previous HAB meeting (December 5 and 6, 2023), excerpts were read from the 1994 speech by John Wagoner, the site manager when the HAB was originally formed. While he found that interesting from a historical perspective, he recognized that times have changed and that it was important to highlight the very significant differences between the Hanford

Site of that time, and the Hanford Site of today, and more importantly the Hanford site we're working to shape in the future.

Brian stated that in 1994, when those remarks were originally provided, the Hanford Site had just transitioned from a 45-year national security mission conducted in near total secrecy. At that time, public involvement in Hanford Site matters was a new concept relative to the Hanford site. The Hanford Site cleanup effort—such as its size, scope, cost, complexity, technologies, regulatory framework, funding expectations, and a broad range of other challenges that would be faced in the largest environmental cleanup of its kind in the country were not yet understood. Further, the federal budgeting process referenced in those remarks had also undergone fundamental changes in the interim. And, finally, the Tri-Cities region, as well as the nation at large, had undergone countless changes.

Despite those significant changes over the last 30 years, there were a number of elements of that speech that remained true and important today. DOE, as well as its Tri-Party colleagues, continue to look to the HAB to bring forward perspectives and inputs from the diverse community in order to assist in us in making the best possible decisions in the challenging environment in which Hanford operates. Outreach was highlighted as important in 1994 and that remains true today. Public outreach continues to be important to the Hanford mission, demonstrated by DOE's continued support for the HAB, through its funding, administration, and staff support, as well as the broad range of other engagement activities conducted. Those included tribal affairs program activities, routine engagement with the State of Oregon and the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, engagement with local communities, hosting elected officials from local to national government, and other activities.

DOE also continues to materially support the HAB with funding, administration by the DDFO and other members of the Hanford team, and further DOE and the contractor partners consistently provide the HAB with routine updates on a wide range of projects and issues to assist its members in maintaining an appropriate level of situational awareness to allow the HAB to advance its work.

Mr. Wagoner recognized in his remarks that the HAB should not attempt to become a technical advisor to the Hanford Site, which Brian stated that perspective remained true today, and also extending to other roles that are already formed or performed by trained and qualified professionals, such as regulatory oversight, operational oversight, or inherently governmental activities such as contracting, commercial, and budget activities. While DOE remained committed to seeking the HAB's advice, Mr. Wagoner recognized that DOE may not be able to implement some of that advice for a wide variety of reasons and at this point in the cleanup are much better understood than in 1994. When he made his original remarks.

Brian referenced another quote, "The HAB should not expect, nor could I—Wagoner—allow the Board to make decisions for me." DOE has the responsibility and authority to make decisions and are uniquely accountable for the decisions that are made, the work done at Hanford, and the risk consequence of those choices to the workforce and community. Finally, Mr. Wagoner originally stated that those were "new times; and new times call for new approaches" and Brian stated that he couldn't agree more,

Brian stated that the HAB's focus today should really be on the future, not looking backwards to 1994.

Brian said that as the HAB recognizes the first 30 years as a theme, HAB membership should embrace the unique and important opportunities to work together toward shaping the HAB of the next 30 years.

He stated that the FACA, under which the Board operates, provides valuable insights and expectations. The role of the HAB or federal advisory boards in general is summarized as follows, through the ability to leverage the perspectives of advisory committee members, federal officials and the nation have access to information and advice on a broad range of issues affecting federal policies and programs. The public, in

return, is afforded an opportunity to provide input into a process that may form the basis for government decisions.

Further, the operating framework states that advice should be relevant, objective, and open to the public. The Board should act properly to complete their work and comply with reasonable cost controls and record keeping.

He stated that the mission of the HAB is to deliver consensus-based, policy-level advice as a means to assist DOE in shaping positive outcomes for the complex Hanford mission. Brian stated that he personally found the annual cleanup priorities advice to be the most valuable of the HAB input. That input is vital as DOE strives to apply limited funding in the most effective way to optimize reduction of risk, risk reduction per dollar, in the fiscally constrained environment, and strive to create the safest achievable workplace for the workforce and protect the community as the mission is executed to clean up the environment. There is very real value in priority inputs, including when the inputs do not match DOE's own, by stimulating an important dialogue as DOE seeks to understand the differences and strive to achieve as much alignment as possible across a very broad range of diverse perspectives and interests.

The DOE objective is to gain broad alignment in support of its work is critical because when the majority of those interests in the work see the progress and express support, even if not perfectly aligned with their individual perspectives, that support translates into congressional funding which makes continued progress possible.

Brian acknowledged and appreciated the challenges the HAB over the last several years. The pandemic made engagements and communications very difficult. He stated that while we can be proud of the fact that the HAB continued to operate when many Boards across the country did not, there were impacts to the HAB that we all experienced during that challenging time. He stated that the implementation of term limits was the right thing to do to ensure the HAB was representative of the Hanford community, introduced new people and perspectives that impacted the manner in which the Board had functioned for over a decade. The leadership changes on the HAB, not only the HAB itself but also the DDFO, introduced changes to Board dynamics and culture.

He further recognized that there are a few cultural or a few structural issues unique to the HAB among the FACA boards that contribute to the complexity and challenges the HAB faces. As an example, he noted that at more than 30 primary members the size of the HAB can represent a challenge to efficiently and effectively arrive at consensus advice. Further, he stated that alternate members being treated as primary members added additional and often independent perspectives adding further complexity in the efficiently reaching consensus. Finally, not all positions have alternates, creating a potential imbalance in representation that can impact the free exchange of equally valid perspectives which is a foundational element of the value proposition that CABs represent.

Brian stated that the resulting inefficiencies and challenges can, and he said he thinks have, led to frustration and a Board dynamic that impedes the value that CABs are capable of delivering to the federal activities and constituents that they serve.

He reiterated the quote from Mr. Wagoner that resonated with him and he considers very relevant to the HAB of the next 30 years: "These are new times and new times call for new approaches." With those words in mind, he shared his aspirations for the HAB going forward:

- To work together to establish a positive and constructive working environment by striving to respect each other and the valid but often diverse perspectives each seat bring to the table, being especially open to those perspectives that may not be your own.

- Commit to maintaining a respectful environment for those presenting material and information to the HAB, so the discussions can focus in an environment of civility and that support open and frank discussions on the challenging issues that are faced during the work at Hanford.
- Spend more time with the constituents you each represents and work to expand an enhanced interest in and awareness of Hanford work.
- Strive beyond individual interests that you each may represent to see the site as we have to, a single very complex undertaking in a resource constrained environment to help successfully navigate the inherent challenges of the cleanup mission.
- Renew your commitment to partnership, not only internal to the HAB but also with the agencies you serve as members of the HAB and the constituents you represent.

Underscoring the aspiration, he explained that a key element of the cultural transformation DOE was leading at Hanford was its focus on partnership. Moving into the next phase of the cleanup mission, DOE was committed to strengthening its partnerships with and between its contractor partners, regulators, community leaders and businesses, state and regional representatives, Tribal Nations, Congressional staff, and other groups and organizations that have a connection to the important work at Hanford. Similarly, is also DOE committed to its partnership with the HAB, a citizens board made up of members who understand their important duties, who are committed to partner and work collectively with the DOE and the regulatory agencies to achieve positive outcomes in the complex effort in a resource constrained environment. This can deliver tremendous value and serve a vital role on behalf of the citizens and communities of the region of the Pacific Northwest. He finished with his statement that he looks forward to working with each member of the HAB in partnership to make the Hanford Site and the community safer as the important cleanup mission is continued for decades to come.

Washington State Department of Ecology

David Bowen, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), announced that he had accepted a new position as Ecology's central office Regional Director. He noted that the office oversaw matters in Benton County, and as a result, he would continue to support the work being done at Hanford.

He felt honored to support a project as complex as the Hanford mission and to have worked with so many passionate people. He appreciated the relationships developed with those at DOE, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington State Department of Health (DOH), and on the HAB. He felt lucky to be speaking about his time with Ecology during the meeting marking the HAB's 30th year.

Over those 30 years, he recalled, the HAB provided 314 pieces of advice and he expected there would be more to come. He noted the first piece of advice submitted by the HAB in December of 1994, that focused on values for site cleanup, and Ecology's first response in January 1995, responding to HAB Advice #8 jointly with EPA, which related to Hanford funding. He thanked the HAB for the advice provided and encouraged members to review the advice submitted over those 30 years.

Ecology valued the HAB's advice and feedback as it informed the decisions it made as a regulator. David recognized the amount of work and dedication necessary to develop that advice. He noted HAB Advice 262, submitted as Hanford Sitewide Permit Revision 9 (Rev.9) public feedback, and stated that a response to that advice would be forthcoming in relation to the public release of Revision 9A (Rev.9A).

Additionally, he found the informal feedback, such as conversations within the HAB's committees, to be valuable. As the Hanford cleanup continued, he expected such conversations would continue to be an important component of a better cleanup. He thanked the members of the HAB for their continued dedication.

As an update to Ecology's ongoing efforts and regulatory activities, he provided a review of his presentation slides (*Attachment 3*).

Ecology's recruitment efforts were advancing, having reduced its vacancies from a high of 31 down to 14 positions, with several of those vacancies in various stages of hiring or recruitment.

Over the course of 2023, Ecology conducted 33 outreach and education events, reaching over 1,700 people. Among those activities were several *Let's Talk About Hanford* virtual events, visits to regional schools, and more. He encouraged HAB members to reach out to Ecology if their organizations were interested in hearing a presentation.

In regard to funding, he explained that the Hanford Site continued to work under a continuing resolution with a proposed budget of nearly \$3 billion. While he hoped for budget approval as proposed, he expected that the site could adapt as needed. He appreciated the congressional and community support that contributed to that proposed funding level. Ecology was already advocating for FY25's budget and working with Van Ness Feldman Solutions in Washington D.C. to support its federal advocacy work.

A conceptual agreement was reached in holistic negotiations in May of 2023 and written agreements were in progress. He appreciated the continued patience of the public and stated there would be a robust public comment period associated with that process.

David provided a brief overview of compliance activities performed in the October 2023 to January 2024 timeframe. He invited the HAB to follow the links in his presentation to find additional details on those.

A TPA Public Involvement Survey was presently being conducted. HAB members and public were invited to participate. Otherwise, the expectations for upcoming public events remained the same as reported in December 2023.

The Hanford Sitewide Permit renewal efforts were still underway, owing to its "overwhelming" size. The permit document would cover 49 unit groups and two Corrective Action unit groups, which were comparable to chapters within a document, as well as supporting documentation. Combined, the document was approximately 20,000 pages. Everyone involved was working hard and making great progress and reaching the final few months of the process.

US Environmental Protection Agency

Dave Einan, EPA, remarked that he was involved in Hanford cleanup long enough to remember the formation of the HAB and to have seen its many accomplishments. He recalled that the HAB and the agencies worked together, argued together, and sometimes cried together. He emphasized that was all done together and that being together in the room had a big impact. It was his recollection that the first piece of advice EPA responded to was in relation to the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).

Dave agreed with David in that the conversations held were important, even if not reflected in or submitted as HAB advice. He committed to EPA being present in those conversations, to the extent possible. He thanked the HAB members for their commitment to the Board and the contributions they would continue to bring.

As an update on EPA's activities, he stated that EPA would be entering into negotiations on some short-term milestones and similar items that were put on hold in recent years. Also, EPA had a new employee that would be starting in the coming weeks. He echoed a comment David made: when the Hanford Site

got its final budget, there could be a need to “pivot,” but the TPA agencies would hold the necessary discussions and determine how to best spend those funds together.

Dave added to an announcement from the previous HAB meeting. Emerald Laija, who previously worked in EPA’s Hanford field office and often supported the HAB, had been promoted to the federal facilities office in Washington DC as the deputy director. In addition, she was expecting a baby in the coming April.

He thanked the HAB again for their presence and participation. He looked forward to another 30 years.

Board Questions

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, asked about status of the second Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) melter. Brian clarified that the “real path to Melter 2 was through Melter 1.” The team was working to address some issues that were not anticipated from a design perspective in Melter 1, such as in-leakage. As the tolerances for Melter 2 were tighter, it was not expected that would still be an issue, however, the same modifications would be made as an assurance. Modification of Melter 1 was complete and testing was underway. He expected that the heat up of Melter 2 was on track for late February.

Chris commented that he started his career working for a prime contractor at another DOE site over 30 years prior. In 1991, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) was still evolving and there was still a lot to be decided on cleanup policy. As a result, there was a lot of opportunity for policy-level advice. Presently, however, there were fewer opportunities to offer such advice. Additionally, the site was moving toward operations and would be engaging in the same activities, day-in and day-out, through completion. That would represent a further challenge for the HAB to offer advice.

Dave stated that he had been pondering that challenge as well and believed that may be a contributing factor to less frequent advice offered by the HAB. However, the HAB could continue its role of communicating the information received back to its constituencies. He stated that, though there may be less advice offered, the importance of the HAB was not reduced.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy, commented that it was good news that major decisions had a path forward, which was not the case when the HAB started. With those decisions being made, the HAB would need to determine what was left to discuss and advise upon.

Tom noted that, the last time the Hanford Sitewide Permit was presented to the public, as Revision 9, the HAB formed a workgroup. He suggested initiating a workgroup for Revision 9A, anticipating the volume of work involved in developing a response. Ryan Miller, Ecology, believed that the HAB had two workgroups support its Revision 9 response, with one reviewing the permit content and the other developing advice. He suggested reaching out to Liz Mattson, a previous HAB member who supported those groups.

Pam Larsen, Benton County, commended David on his accomplishments and leadership during his time with Ecology, both within his department and within the Tri-Parties. She recalled the early days of the HAB where members did not know each other or trust each other yet. By working together and connecting outside of meetings, relationships among the HAB’s membership were developed. She missed those interactions and felt that there were fewer opportunities to develop such relationships presently.

Additionally, she recalled that there were many challenges posed by cleanup in the HAB’s early years, making it difficult to find areas of focus. She appreciated Dave’s mention of the ERDF advice, recalling how threatening of an addition it seemed to be when proposed and the level of opposition it inspired.

However, she felt it became invaluable for advancing cleanup. She appreciated the investment of the HAB members throughout the years and hoped for the past level of collaboration to continue. Further, Pam thanked Brian for his enthusiasm and willingness to work with the HAB.

Susan Coleman asked what decisions may be upcoming in calendar year 2024 that the HAB should look into or advise upon. Brian expected that path for 2024 was already established and the HAB should instead look toward the future. He stated that the congressional budget process made near term advice less practical. Looking toward the future would give the TPA agencies more time to react to the advice provided.

David stated that the high-level waste (HLW) facility design seemed to be ramping up, so there was a possible opportunity there. Revision 9A would be important input for the HAB to provide. He clarified that public comment could be provided from individual members if advice from the full Board was not formed.

Dave stated that the 100-K and 100-N proposed plans were anticipated in the coming year and EPA would be inviting public comment or advice. He suggested that the HAB continue to look forward to decisions related to the 324 Building. The HAB's annual cleanup priorities advice remained important to each of the TPA agencies. Finally, he invited suggestions on getting the agencies' messages out to the broader public to celebrate the site's successes.

Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge, asked if there was an anticipated timeframe for updates on the 324 Building cleanup to the public. Dave expected that there could be a status update in March but clarified that it would not include details on items that were not yet finalized such as schedules or technical details. Ideally, he stated, a proposed plan would be available in the fall, though it could take longer.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest, supported Tom's idea on forming a Revision 9A workgroup to figure out how to efficiently provide feedback on that permit. She also agreed with points made about how advice and opportunities to provide advice had changed over the years and expected that the HAB would need to consider how to continue to advise on ongoing projects. She thanked David for his service in the Nuclear Waste Program and asked who would be covering the position.

David stated that his official last day was February 15 and Stephanie Schleif would be serving as the point of contact until a new program manager was recruited. He noted that he was given permission to continue assisting the program until the new program manager was in place. Related to the Revision 9A workgroup, he noted that Ecology was developing fact sheets that highlighted changes made to the permit, which could serve as a good starting point.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, recalled the mission progress he had seen from over 20 years on the HAB, during which time the HAB made significant efforts to impart its values through its advice. The HAB did not intend to provide technical advice, but it sought to support the agencies in their decisions and ensure that its values were heard. However, he cited "low hanging fruit" that the HAB could apply its values to. As an example, a Hanford report released by a Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) invited input from the public and regulators on the proposals it put forth.

He appreciated the scope and complexity of the mission, reflected by the number and scale of the projects represented in the HAB's draft FY26 priorities. He asked that serious consideration be given to those priorities, as the HAB applied its values to each of those choices. He was proud of the Board for the effort it put forth and the accomplishments it made. He appreciated Brian's efforts in managing the cleanup and being forthcoming with the Board when challenges are encountered.

Rob Parmelee, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, asked for clarification on who was the “decision maker” in regard to the 324 Building project. Dave explained that DOE was the responsible party for the building itself and related decisions were made solely at the discretion of DOE and its contractors. Decisions related to the soils underneath were joint decisions between DOE and EPA. The two were presently working together to determine a path forward. He expected a conceptual agreement on that regulatory path forward by the end of the year, though it might not be officially documented by then.

Brian contributed, explaining that the technical path forward would likely be similar to what the agencies had agreed to by the end of 2023, though they still needed to ensure that the regulatory elements were in alignment. He stated that budget would play a big part in the path forward, both in relation to that project and the broader Hanford Site.

Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, explained that there were many potential impacts to local communities that were completely separate from technical aspects of cleanup. As an example, there were potential impacts to the local economy as cleanup progressed and investments shifted. She felt that the communities needed to be prepared for those impacts and suggested that the HAB should be on the “front line” for that. She asked that the agencies be specific and direct with the HAB on the areas where it could be helpful or a partner.

Jeff Wyatt, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, commented on the uncertainty around and the need for additional funding to advance the cleanup mission. He felt that the public was often given the impression that there were no issues and Hanford matters were well under control. He wondered if it would be helpful for the public and congressional representatives to understand the many risks present, beyond those that made front page news. Without knowing those risks, there was little motivation to invest further into the project. David agreed and explained that Ecology tried to convey that message through its public engagement. While it celebrated what had been accomplished it also discussed what was left to do, emphasizing that spending in the present made it less expensive over the long-term.

Tom noted that there were several comments related to the volume of advice submitted. He reminded HAB members that conversations were still important when the TPA agency representatives were in the room, as they could take those messages back to the project. Further, he reminded members that their points of view were valid, even without fully understanding all technical aspects of the project.

Miya asked how Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) system issues, such as additional leaks reported by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), were being addressed. Brian stated those were being addressed well and explained that while TSCR was a demonstration project, the issues seen in operations were relatively minor. He clarified that the leaks identified was dry residue found around fittings. All lessons learned from the TSCR demonstration were being documented, resolved, and applied to its successor, the Advanced Modular Pretreatment System (AMPS). TSRC was very effective, from DOE’s perspective.

Miya asked for an update on a plan to send previously pretreated waste from tank AP-106 back to AP-107 for additional treatment. Brian confirmed that waste would be treated starting in the March to April timeframe and it was anticipated to be compliant with the waste acceptance criteria. Based on DOE’s analysis, every gallon treated from that point would also be compliant.

Chris noted that news distribution changed significantly since the Hanford cleanup started, owing largely to the rise of social media, and much of the public would now go to sources other than traditional media for their news. He recalled a *Tri-City Herald* article that was reposted elsewhere, garnering hundreds of comments that suggested a lack of understanding and contributing to the spread of misinformation. He

asked how such comments could be dealt with, stating that it would become increasingly important going forward.

Brian stated that the goal was to get information out as quickly and accurately as possible to reputable sources so it would be available for those willing to put in the time to understand it. Trust in the local community was a focus so that when those community members saw news elsewhere, they would know where to go for accurate information. He stated that DOE could never be as fast as someone putting a perspective or perception out to the world through social media.

At the topic's conclusion, Susan presented David with a [letter of appreciation for his service](#). She expressed her appreciation for each of the presenters for taking time to hold a discussion with the Board.

Round Robin Discussions

Susan Coleman introduced the round robin question for HAB members: *What was an experience or insight that shapes your values and how you lead?*

Susan explained that the topic served as an opportunity to get to know one another better, stemming from a discussion at the prior HAB meeting. Judie Talbot contributed, stating that it was an opportunity for members to share their motivations for serving on the HAB.

Rob Parmelee explained that, when asked to join the HAB as a member, he was unsure of what the HAB did or how to best represent his constituency. After gaining experience as a Board member, he tried to consider impacts on employment and worker safety, as well as public safety. He felt that an individual needed to work hard toward balancing membership and work priorities, which could be difficult. He believed that the HAB's role was to provide advice that informed policy, considering the many types of risk factored into decisions made by the TPA agencies.

Chris Sutton described an experience with his first job out of graduate school. The company was one of the largest in the United States at the time and was working to rebuild its research lab. To support that effort, it hired a star researcher from Exxon, a company that, at the time, had a reputation for maintaining a world-class research lab. That researcher, however, suffered from alcohol addiction. The manager of the company's geological research went through considerable effort to help the researcher through the issue and supported his recovery, though ultimately unsuccessful.

The company's efforts to support that researcher left an impression upon Chris. A lesson he learned about leadership was that it focused on people, with decisions related to people being more impactful than financial or technical decisions. Ultimately, all problems were people problems, and all those problems could be solved by people. He explained that the idea could be applied to the HAB's work, particularly in leadership of the HAB's committees or Issue Manager (IM) teams, as the individuals participating on the Board may bring unique perspectives and contributions.

Tom Sicilia shared an event that influenced the way he listened. In middle school, a document draft he wrote was returned covered in red ink. Though initially distressing, his father told him that the level of feedback showed that the reviewer cared enough to take the time to provide that feedback. He stated that everyone on the HAB was there because they cared enough to be part of the discussion, to improve cleanup, and make the Hanford Site better. All feedback was provided because they cared enough to do that.

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland, described his time working for various DOE sites across contractors of varied sizes. When he started with Westinghouse at Hanford, he noted, the company had about 3,200 employees. Over the next six years he saw that number shrink to about 1,600 employees.

During layoffs, management had an important role in making choices. Richard observed that, as the company got smaller, it got more effective and efficient. However, eventually Rockwell took over and started dictating work.

Richard explained that, on the Hanford site, there was a work control program. He stated that it was not a means of getting work done, but rather a means of controlling the work that is done. He expected that limited the work people were able to do, resulting in workers getting used to not doing work altogether much of the time and getting frustrated. In his service on the HAB, he worked to “do no harm” and not further impact work being done, recalling past instances where HAB advice impacted the work he was doing on the Hanford Site. As a HAB member, he strived to make the HAB’s advice clearer and more direct to the objectives, rather than trying to put in a “kitchen sink” of suggestions. As a representative of West Richland, he was motivated to understand and communicate the actual risks of the Hanford Site and the consequences of actions taken.

Jeff Wyatt acknowledged he would be diverging from the topic at hand with his comments as he was still considering Brian Vance’s statements. He thought Brian’s statements were well thought out, however, he was confused by the HAB’s mission based on those comments. He heard a number of topics where DOE did not wish for input on, such as technical, regulatory, or budget matters. While those aspects were clear, he was not clear on what the HAB should be doing or what areas there were to provide input on.

Steve Anderson, Grant and Franklin Counties, also had similar questions as Jeff. He noted that he found the HAB’s purpose to be largely around communication, serving as sort of a liaison from the TPA agencies to the public and the members’ constituencies. He was glad to see new members added to the Board as it had the potential to make more people aware of what was being done at Hanford. He recalled Chris’s earlier question related to social media, stressing the importance of having information conveyed through trustworthy sources.

Amber Waldref recalled a piece of advice she received during her time as a city council person from the city council president, which shaped how she led and how she interacted with others in a group setting: “perfection is the enemy of the good.” She strived to adhere to that advice in both her professional and personal life. For the HAB, she felt that was something to consider. As a group, the HAB worked together to create values-based and priorities-based advice that reflects everyone in the room, even if it was not perfect from an individual’s perspective. She was proud of how the HAB was able to work through that, understanding that sometimes a minor detail or specific words could be meaningful to an individual, where it may not be to others.

Rob Davis agreed with Amber, stating there was often a certain point where something was “good enough” to move along and make progress. He discussed his professional background, having served in the nuclear industry across multiple sites and companies. At a certain point, he decided to go back to graduate school where he met Doug Riggs, a legislative director for Representative Doc Hastings. Together, the two formed the Hanford Information Network, where they used a grant from the State of Washington to visit public schools around Washington to support Hanford education. He felt teaching students about Hanford, many of whom had never heard of it, was an enlightening experience that led to his interest in supporting cleanup as a member of the HAB.

Rob Davis explained that his values were shaped as far back as his time in Boy Scouts, which were effectively “do good and try to contribute,” working toward the betterment of everyone. In response to previous comments, Rob explained that it was difficult not consider technical advice because many of the questions that the members and public had were technical. He suggested that quality assurance should be reviewed by the HAB in order to appreciate that the work was being done in accordance with established

codes, standards, and regulations. While the HAB could not advise on technical matters he felt that it was appropriate to bring up technical concerns and have those concerns addressed.

Michelle Holt explained that her motivation for engaging with the HAB was influenced by her upbringing in Arco, Idaho. The area was the first to be lit by atomic power. Located near the Idaho National Laboratory, she grew up seeing the economic and employment impacts of related environmental remediation. She cared about how nuclear facilities impacted their communities. Thinking about what shaped her values or how she led, she thought about a consistent mindset she brought to each of her positions as an executive director over 25 years across multiple industries. In each instance, she tried to bring curiosity and a desire to learn, rather than trying to come in as a subject matter expert. Wherever there was an instance where she heard “because this is how we have always done it,” her first instinct was to ask why. She believed, in listening to others, she had the opportunity to learn. She felt that was the most important thing that HAB members could do as well, be it listening to presentations or their fellow Board members, and to believe that personal connection could drive opportunity.

Brisa Guajardo, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, stated that she did not have a technical background or previous experience with Hanford. However, she was drawn toward the HAB with the interest of learning about Hanford to find what the general public needed to know about the Hanford cleanup with the intent of determining how to take that information back in a simplified form. Being a leader taught her that listening was valuable, but also to stand up and speak at times when she did not agree with something. That was not to create an argument, but to make an alternate perspective known and considered in the eventual decision. To her, listening, guiding, and understanding were the end goals.

Tim Kovis, Public at Large, explained that he worked in the tree fruit industry. His motivation to join the HAB stemmed from an event about a decade prior where Governor Inslee discussed a Hanford tank leak with the press, which negatively impacted the perception of Washington’s agricultural exports. In joining the HAB, he hoped to support the communications aspect of Hanford and help to provide a more accurate perspective to those not involved in the Hanford cleanup mission.

Tim described an impactful experience from a previous job where he supported Representative Doc Hastings. During the evening of a birthday fundraiser at a Republican club, Tim was surprised to see Senator Peter Welch join the party. Representative Hastings clarified that Senator Welch was a friend that he invited. That served as a lesson that, regardless of political views, people can get along, work together, and find consensus that supports the greater good.

Kermit Mankiller, Nez Perce Tribe, noted that he was in business and consulting for much of his life where he would make decisions directly. As a result, to him, serving as an “advisor” as part of a larger group on the HAB required a shift in mindset. Regarding leadership and the HAB, he recognized the varied and potentially competing interests and values associated with the varied seats. He suggested following the “80/20 rule” or the “Reagan rule.” If where 80% of things would not be agreed upon, the group should instead focus on that other 20%. He suggested that members represent and remain true to the values of the organizations they represent and respectfully accept that others may have competing priorities.

Pam Larsen described an impactful experience from her time in student leadership during high school. She participated in a leadership training camp during which there was an exercise in which students participated in a mock jury trial. One student was taken aside and instructed to maintain a single position against all opposition. The other students participating in the exercise needed to try and work through that conversation without fully comprehending why that individual could not be made to change the position, which she found interesting. Another thing she learned was that, when working through a problem with a

group, she advised putting oneself forward and getting an idea on paper. That provided a starting point for conversation and compromise.

Pam provided a brief review of her professional background, which eventually resulted in her service as director of the Hanford Communities, where she worked with regional elected officials on what was going on at Hanford and the associated risks. With that information, those representatives were able to communicate that back to their constituents or identify areas of concern for further consideration. She explained that, when she joined the HAB, it was a contentious environment where many of the seats and members did not trust one another. However, as the group developed relationships, they developed trust and were able to work together more effectively. In many cases, lifelong friendships were developed. She appreciated the opportunity to serve in leadership on the HAB, both in committee leadership and as the HAB's national liaison.

Jim Conca, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), stated that, while he did not feel he had a talent for management, he consistently found that decisions based on science were typically better, faster, and cheaper, without the need to rework those decisions. He felt that did not often show up in the decision-making process, with the science being considered after decisions were already made.

Dan Strom, Benton-Franklin Health District, agreed with Jim. Prefacing an experience that shaped his values and leadership, he defined actuaries as mathematicians who evaluated risk to support insurance companies in setting the rates necessary to be profitable businesses. He clarified that there was no emotional content in the decisions those actuaries made.

A notable influence on Dan's values was the evolution of quantified risk over time. In 1977, the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) published radiation protection guidance for the first time that used quantitative and probabilistic risk assessment, which defined a threshold where, for radiation work to be as safe as other "safe" professions, it needed to have a one in 10,000 chance or less of dying on the job across the span of a career. Following the publishing of a catalogue of risks and relative values in 1979, decades of quantitative risk assessment followed. Alongside those were studies of perceived risk, which often focused on the disconnect between actuarial risk and perceived risk, as well as distinctions between risks, such as dreaded versus familiar risks and voluntary versus imposed risks.

Over time, Dan learned to be sensitive to the different valuations of risks to human health and the willingness to pay to avoid or mitigate those risks. He felt that, to have meaningful dialogue about managing human health risk in relation to Hanford, there needed to be an understanding of the stakeholders' valuation of risks. He learned to separate actuarial risks from perceived risks and made his spending decisions based on actuarial risks.

Charles LoPresti, Washington League of Women Voters, stated that while Hanford could be insular and inward looking, it needed to ensure it did not become disconnected from the wider world. He felt that the HAB was in a good position to serve as that conduit. With its diversity of interests, the HAB is able to bring in perspectives from the outside world. Charles also remarked that many good points arose from the day's discussions and wondered if those could be captured and shared through means such as a blog. As a final point, he stated that to advocate for something, such as through HAB advice, clarity was important. He hoped to reach that clarity through discussion.

Jeff recalled an event from his past where he and a team of scientists worked for a startup related to new nonstructured materials. Jeff and that team worked on a project for three years, securing grants, contracts, and patents. However, at a point where the project was gaining momentum, the associated venture capitalists halted the project with the reasoning that the marketability was more than 10 years into the

future. They wanted to see profits sooner. The lesson he learned through that experience was that investment in engineering and technology development on the front end could save a lot of money later. He recalled the previous efforts around construction of Hanford's HLW facility and felt that was an important lesson to apply. He stated that, while the HAB could not provide oversight, it could still provide valuable feedback by listening closely and raising such concerns before multi-billion-dollar mistakes were made.

Miya Burke shared that she worked for ten years as a chef. While working in a kitchen might seem like a different world, she learned a lot that was relevant to working with the HAB. Through that work, she met many different people with differing perspectives and ideas of how to work. It was a job that could not be successfully done alone, so those varied groups needed to find ways to work as a team, form common ground, and get the job done together, much like the work of the HAB. She learned valuable lessons in working with people and bridging such gaps.

Susan invited comment from the presenters' table.

Dave Einan agreed with many of the comments heard throughout the discussion, as many of those values and motivations aligned with his own experiences. His philosophy was "lead, follow, or get out of the way." As a regulator, that often came into play. Sometimes there were opportunities to lead, but he strived to be honest with himself when it was time to get out of the way. He also noted that "leadership" did not always mean "manager." Many organizations stated that all their employees were leaders, whether managers or not, and Dave believed that to be true when the skills were fostered.

Jeff noted that the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board was preparing an annual update to the Oregon State legislature and asked if Dave had any advice on what to include. Dave stated that he would need to think about that response.

Ryan Miller also noted his agreement with many of the comments heard. He stated that, as a value, he tried to "listen to understand rather than listen to respond" to better understand the perspectives of others. By moving into management and observing other managers, he learned that it was important to build working relationships both with co-workers and the communities they served, as well as building trust through communication and transparency. He was continually working to improve those relationships with the HAB, his team, the other TPA agencies, and other stakeholders.

Lindsay Somers, considering the question, thought back to her time in college when she decided to study abroad. In doing so, she was forced to step outside of her comfort zone, as she was experiencing an unfamiliar culture where she knew no one. She worked to understand other people's values, perspectives, and what was important to them. With the HAB, she worked toward the same. She appreciated hearing everyone's perspectives and seeing the process of consensus where all seats' values were put forward. She hoped for that to continue and hoped for the HAB to continue welcoming its new members.

Roberto Armijo, EPA, explained that he had a very similar experience to Lindsay through his time in the Peace Corps service in Paraguay, which influenced his values and leadership efforts. He too needed to engage with an unfamiliar community and lifestyle, learning what was important to those people not just culturally, but also in relation to the project the Peace Corps was undertaking. He felt that experience translated through his time in graduate school as well as his present work with the EPA. He felt that relationship building, community building, and community connections were all important.

Susan shared that she grew up in a military family where she was taught to consistently ask "why," noting that may seem counter to perceptions of the military. In her own time in the military and throughout her career, she continued to ask that question and was encouraged to do so.

She described her work as having been about 50% technical and 50% administrative, with the technical aspects being related to classified material, rather than related to engineering or science. One of her bosses told her that it was her job to “keep him out of jail.” A significant portion of that involved asking “why” and challenging norms to get to the root of why people did things a certain way. In order to protect people, the potential for unintentional human error needed to be considered. To prevent that, systems and processes needed to be in place that could adapt to human beings.

Susan spent her early career learning to ask why and its benefits, which she continued to do transitioning to management. She observed that practice helped employees and organizations to learn, grow, and move forward with a fuller understanding of what they were doing. She felt that with a mindset of asking why, people would be more capable of adapting to new or unfamiliar situations.

Judie shared that an important lesson she learned was the value of giving others the “space to change their minds.” She felt that was something not always fully appreciated.

Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2026 Cleanup Priorities

Jeff Wyatt provided a brief introduction to the HAB’s FY26 cleanup priorities advice (*Attachment 4*). He noted that some items initially considered for inclusion were referred to the HAB’s committees for potential standalone advice at a later date.

Jeff reviewed the high-level advice items and invited Board comment and discussion on each individual item. Comments included:

- Pam Larsen commented on the item beginning with “Evaluate greenhouse gas emissions...” She suggested that the carbon footprint of Hanford operations was outside of the scope of the HAB and asked for further explanation. Chris Sutton stated that energy use reduction was a nationwide concern and policy issue.

Further discussion covered HAB constituency concerns around air pollution and use of diesel generators. Tom Sicilia offered alternate wording that advised evaluation of alternate energy sources, rather than air emissions.

- Pam suggested that the item to “Address the extent of contamination at the 324 Building...” should be shortened such that it did not specify how it would be addressed. Jeff explained that the Issue Manager (IM) team that developed the draft advice consulted EPA on the wording for that item. Tom provided a wording adjustment, asking to address the contamination “under” the building.
- Rob Davis asked for a clarification on the transuranic (TRU) waste item, noting that a recent presentation suggested that shipment would not begin until 2028. Tom clarified that an acceleration was being requested. The group adjusted the wording to reflect that clarification.
- Pam was concerned about the 618-11 burial ground being too close to the Columbia Generating Station (CGS) to be remediated without a facility shutdown. She would object to the item, if so. Chris noted that the priority as worded reflected an established milestone. McClure Tosch, Yakama Nation, was familiar with the project and visited that site recently. He explained that it was located far enough to the west that it could be remediated without impacting CGS operations. He clarified that the concern was that groundwater flowing through the burial ground could carry contamination towards the CGS footprint. There was an agreement among the TPA agencies to increase monitoring in the area through installation of additional wells.

Dave Einan provided further clarification, explaining that the associated milestone was well overdue. There was concern of contamination reaching the river. As negotiated, there were established steps to reaching that milestone that included evaluation of the conditions to determine if acceleration was

necessary. The design would ensure that remediation would not impact CGS operations. He stood by the milestones.

Alternate wording was offered to encourage the investigation of the site and complete the preliminary remedial design.

As the remainder of the advice was reviewed, additional minor edits for clarity were made. Following edit implementation, the Board was offered the opportunity to review the resulting content.

Board Action

Susan Coleman asked if there was consensus on the document as edited. No objections were noted and the advice was approved. The advice, as approved, is included in *Appendix A*.

Committee Reports

Cleanup and Risk Mitigation Committee

Tom Sicilia, Cleanup and Risk Mitigation (CaRM) Committee chair, explained that CaRM met in January and heard presentations on TRU waste and groundwater. The next meeting was planned for March with presentations anticipated on the progress at 100N and 100K areas, as well as an update on the 100K West basins.

As a follow up to that presentation on TRU waste, an IM team meeting to consider TRU waste draft advice was planned for mid-March. Depending on the results, the CaRM committee could also meet in April to review and determine if that draft advice should be presented to the full Board.

Tank Waste Stewardship and Treatment Committee

Rob Davis, Tank Waste Stewardship and Treatment (TWST) Committee chair, explained that during the TWST's January meeting, Erik Nelson and Jason Gunter from DOE and Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS), respectively, provided a tank integrity overview. The overview served as an introduction for newer committee members, while others had an opportunity to address their specific concerns, such as concrete spalling and exposed rebar. Rob thought it was a good discussion and appreciated learning about the new equipment being used within the tank integrity program.

In the TWST's upcoming March meeting, the committee would be hearing an update on DFLAW progress. Rob looked forward to learning more about the startup of the next melter. The committee would also learn about System Plan 10, something anticipated by that committee for a while. He invited interested HAB members to join that discussion, noting that those that reviewed the document were amazed by the options discussed within System Plan 10. Further, he hoped to explore the option of convening an IM team to provide comment on System Plan 10.

Land Use, Infrastructure, Waste Disposition, and Safety Committee

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC) representative and Land Use, Infrastructure, Waste Disposition, and Safety (LIDS) Committee chair, discussed the January LIDS meeting that covered Hanford Site infrastructure and TRU waste, which was a joint topic with CaRM. The next meeting would cover traffic safety. She remarked upon the importance of that topic, explaining that just the prior week there was a traffic accident on site in which her friend was killed. She encouraged HAB members and others interested to review the HAB's previously submitted advice on traffic safety (HAB Advice #301) and the associated response from DOE in preparation for the next LIDS meeting in March.

Community Outreach and Engagement Committee

Tracie Arnold, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees representative and Community Outreach and Engagement (COE) Committee chair, stated that the committee met in January and would do so again in March. In January, COE discussed resources for new HAB members to provide a less overwhelming introduction to the HAB and Hanford, which included a recommendation that the TPA agencies develop a Hanford 101 presentation. Additionally, the committee heard public involvement updates from each of the TPA agencies, debriefed recent TPA public involvement activities, and provided input on draft FY26 cleanup priorities advice.

The next meeting was anticipated to be primarily focused on looking at Washington State's Healthy Environment for All (HEAL) Act. The committee also intended to look at revisions to the way in which communications were distributed to HAB members.

National Liaison Report

Pam Larsen, HAB national liaison, provided the national liaison report. The report is included as *Appendix B*.

Other Discussions

Tom Sicilia noted that the HAB's annual work plan was developed during the HAB's leadership workshop, which was scheduled for June of 2024. He suggested that committees not meeting in April make time on their March agendas to discuss what they may want to see included in the HAB's FY25 work plan.

Bob Thompson, City of Richland, was interested in the methodology used in the selection of system plan options and if the bases for those selections were transparent. Rob provided a brief explanation and suggested that Bob review the introduction to the System Plan 10 document and join the TWST's upcoming discussion on the topic. Ryan Miller offered to provide a link to [System Plan 10](#).

Overview of the Tri-Party Agreement, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Tri-Party Agreement

Michael Turner, Hanford Mission Integration Solutions (HMIS), introduced himself and his co-presenter, Stephanie Brasher, HMIS. Michael explained that he handled the Office of River Protection (ORP) side of the TPA while Stephanie handled the Richland Operations Office (RL) side.

Michael led a presentation (*Attachment 5*) to provide the Board with an overview of what the TPA was and how it was structured, the enforcement authorities granted to regulators under the TPA, and the significance of milestones within the TPA.

He explained that the TPA, as it was commonly known, was officially called the *Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order*. The "Tri-Parties" associated with the TPA were DOE, Ecology, and EPA. He provided a brief overview of the implementation of environmental regulations governing the Hanford Site, from the enactment of the *Atomic Energy Act of 1946* through the late 1980s and early 1990s, when the TPA was created and the *Federal Facility Compliance Act* was enacted.

The TPA was established as a legal agreement to achieve compliance with the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act* (RCRA) and CERCLA. It established responsibilities in reporting, change

management, and public involvement; served as a pathway for RCRA permitting and closure; and contained dispute resolution processes.

Michael described the structure of the TPA document, reviewing the primary sections and subsections in the legal agreement and associated attachments. The Action Plan, the second attachment, was substantial enough to include its own appendices. It was noted that Action Plan 10 (AR-27710), the present iteration, was 397 pages long.

He explained that the lead regulatory agency for a milestone could be either Ecology, EPA, or a dual-lead combination of the two. That decision of who would lead was determined by the regulators. Those regulatory agencies were granted the right to bring enforcement actions against DOE's contractors or subcontractors where terms and conditions of the TPA were not in compliance.

Stephanie provided a review of the work schedule, defined within Appendix D of the TPA Action Plan. She noted that it contained the work milestones and was the most commonly negotiated section of the TPA. She explained the difference between the milestone types. Major milestones were enforceable and typically represented long-term priorities of over five years. Those major milestones were used as the basis for interim milestones and target dates. Interim milestones were also enforceable and represented work spanning time periods of less than five years, while target dates typically represent near-term work of up to 18 months. She reviewed the major milestones associated with ORP and RL.

The milestones and status were tracked and reviewed during manager meetings. As the status of an item had the potential for subjective interpretation, a series of status codes were defined.

Configuration management was maintained for the TPA, with potential changes being assigned classes based on the type or magnitude of the change. A Class I change represented a change to a major milestone or a change to the Legal Agreement portion of the TPA, while Class III represented a change to a target date or supporting schedule. Each class had a different level of approval required, from TPA signatories at Class I to project managers at Class III.

Milestone changes were determined through a TPA negotiation process. Prior to negotiations, an agreement in principle was often issued that defined the scope of negotiations. Negotiations would conclude with the parties entering a tentative agreement that outlined the proposed changes. Classes I and II changes could require public review or comment, based on the significance of the change. Public involvement was conducted prior to issuance of a final change package, which would contain the public comment provided.

Where milestones were at risk of being missed, DOE had defined steps to take with associated timelines. The dispute resolution processes differed between EPA and Ecology.

Michael explained that the Consent Decree differed from the TPA. While consent decrees were agreements or settlement issued by a court, the TPA was a consent order, which were legally binding agreements entered into by two or more parties willingly. Consent decree milestones are handled in the same manner as TPA milestones.

The Consent Decree was in place resulting from a series of technical difficulties related to the operational startup of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) and retrieval of the Hanford Site's single-shell tanks (SST), which had set milestones for 2011 and 2018, respectively. The Consent Decree was issued after the State of Washington sued the federal government after the Tri-Parties failed to reach an agreement through milestone negotiations. The Consent Decree established new milestones for tank

waste retrieval and commissioning of a low-activity waste treatment facility. The Consent Decree had its own tracking and reporting requirements.

Under the TPA, the Tri-Parties are required to maintain Administrative Record (AR) files for each cleanup decision or permitting action. At a minimum, all documents that form the basis for selection of a final action must be included within the AR. DOE is responsible for maintaining the Hanford AR for the TPA and CERCLA, while Ecology maintained the official RCRA AR. At the time of presentation, the Hanford AR contained more than 100,000 records.

Michael explained that the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) associated with the TPA outlined guidance for public comments, public meetings, fact sheets, and more. The processes defined within the PIP were consistent with RCRA and CERCLA guidance. Additionally, it outlined tribal government consultation in relation to Hanford activities.

It was noted that, while not one of the Tri-Parties, the Oregon Department of Energy led Oregon's interests in Hanford Site issues. It attended TPA meetings and maintained a relationship with DOE as outlined in an associated memorandum of understanding.

In conclusion, Stephanie noted that the presentation (*Attachment 5*) included links to the related document sections, definitions, and other resources. For members interested in learning more, she encouraged members to reach out to her or Michael for help.

Theresa Howell, Ecology, introduced herself as Ecology's compliance and regulatory assistant section manager. She noted that John Price used to call the TPA the "get-along agreement," which she felt was apt. It established how work would be done and how the Tri-Parties would cooperate to get that work done. She stated that Stephanie and Michael were experts on the TPA that helped her out on numerous occasions. She appreciated that help and the presentation.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Annette Carlson, Ecology, congratulated the HAB on 30 years, noting that she attended the first meeting of the HAB 30 years prior.

Annette noted that her presentation might include unfamiliar terms and that the slide deck (*Attachment 6*) included definitions at the end. She explained that RCRA provided the basis for Washington State's authority to regulate dangerous waste at Hanford and got its authority to do so from the EPA. Ecology worked with EPA on regulatory issues and decisions, where Ecology had the authority to administer and enforce a state-level hazardous waste management program under RCRA. EPA's Seattle office was responsible for RCRA issues, while its Hanford office dealt with CERCLA and TPA aspects. Under RCRA, Washington State's authority is equivalent to the federal program.

Ecology regulated dangerous waste under the associated Washington Administrative Code (WAC) and dangerous waste components of mixed waste, as well as the requirements for treatment, storage, and disposal of those wastes. Ecology maintained responsibility for the protection of human health and the environment. However, Ecology was not responsible for radioactive materials and waste, which was managed by DOE.

Though she would not discuss the items in detail during the presentation, she noted that there were other permits in place at Hanford including the Air Operating Permit and water permits. Additionally, Ecology's Nuclear Waste Program also oversaw permits outside of the Hanford Site, including those at the Perma-Fix Northwest waste storage and treatment facility and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. She encouraged members interested in learning more to reach out to Ryan Miller.

She explained that RCRA permitting was tied to the TPA, as discussed in the prior presentation, and noted that the Hanford Sitewide Permit was initially submitted in accordance with TPA milestones.

Annette reviewed the history of the Hanford Sitewide Permit, starting from its issuance in 1994. Presently, the Hanford Site was operating under Revision 8C (Rev.8C) of that permit, while Rev.9 was expected to serve as a renewal of that permit in later in 2024. Rev.9 was initially transmitted in 2012 but has since been revised to address over 5,000 public comments that were received. She provided a high-level overview of how the most recent revision, Rev.9A, differed from Rev.8C and the initial submittal of Rev.9.

Ryan noted that he previously discussed public engagement plans for the Rev.9A public comment period with the COE and the former Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) Committee. The upcoming public comment period was planned to span 120 days. Several public outreach methods were being planned leading up to those comment periods.

He explained that those methods included meetings with the tribal nations, public informational meetings online and in-person, and public hearings. Public hearings were different from informational meetings where public comment could be taken during those hearings. Those meetings and hearings would be conducted throughout Washington and Oregon. Additionally, supporting educational materials were being developed to support effective public comment and included a dedicated Rev.9A website, “baseball cards” summarizing unit groups, and one-page fact sheets on various topics.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Roberto Armijo provided a presentation on CERCLA (*Attachment 7*), otherwise known as Superfund, to provide the Board with an introduction to cleanup actions governed by the act. He explained that CERCLA was intended to address cleanup of sites contaminated with uncontrolled hazardous substances. It provided legal authority to respond to release or the threat of release of such hazardous substances to the environment and to impose liabilities to Potentially Responsible Parties (PRP). He noted that it established the Hazardous Substance Trust Fund, known as the Superfund Tax, which had been recently reinstated and would be in effect through 2031.

Within Superfund was the National Priorities List (NPL), a list of the highest priority sites where releases of hazardous substances have occurred in the US. Those sites were scored by the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which warranted their placement on the NPL. The Hanford 100, 200, and 300 Areas were listed on the NPL. The 1100 Area, the Horn Rapids Landfill, has previously been listed but had since been removed from NPL. He emphasized that the order in which sites were placed by the HRS did not determine a site’s priority or impact funding.

In reviewing the Superfund regulations, Roberto noted that CERCLA Section 120 was specific to federal facilities. State governments participated in planning and selection of remedial actions and, where tribal interests may be affected, tribal governments were offered consultation. EPA served as the lead regulator but allowed states to supervise cleanup at federal facilities. Executive Order 12580 delegated response authorities to federal agencies for releases at their facilities as “lead agency.” The lead agency provided the on-scene coordinators and/or remedial project managers for those sites.

For Hanford specifically, Roberto reviewed a “TPA Cheat Sheet” within the presentation, which outlined the authorities of EPA and Ecology under the TPA. Among recent, relevant CERCLA documents were the Hanford CERCLA Five-Year Review and the 100-BC Record of Decision (ROD). Upcoming

CERCLA items included amending the ROD to address the 300-296 soils due to changed site conditions as well as RODs for the 100-K and 100-N Areas.

Roberto recited the EPA's priorities in relation to Hanford. Those included:

- Ensuring protection and completion of cleanup along the Columbia River
- Continuing groundwater restoration across Hanford
- Continuing progress with characterization and cleanup of sites in the Central Plateau
- Implementing current TPA schedules and milestones for cleanup
- Ensuring appropriate levels of public involvement in Hanford decision-making, information sharing, and overall awareness of site activities
- Supporting national EPA efforts on climate change and environmental justice

Within the presentation slides, Roberto shared photos of the EPA staff at the local Hanford office with a review of the high-level responsibilities those individuals had in relation to Hanford. He noted that they were located at the Federal Building in Richland and happy to see visitors.

Board Discussion

Tom Sicilia thanked the presenters. For the TPA, he asked if there was a master spreadsheet or similar tool that tracked the milestone changes over time. He noted that might be a point of interest to the HAB to see which milestones have slipped the most to consider what might be done to achieve a realistically achievable milestone. Stephanie stated that the associated database used to maintain configuration control was being updated and would likely have that sort of capability. For the time being, she would be able to provide that information for specified milestones.

Tom asked, for Rev.9A, if the completed sections could be released early or if the entire document needed to be released at one time. Annette stated that the renewal would be released as a complete document. Ecology knew from past experience that sectioning portions off was difficult due to how often sections cross referenced one another.

Rob Davis asked what constituted a violation under the TPA. Dave Einan stated that it could be anything from a violation of the terms and conditions to a remedial decision to missing a milestone date. He noted that each of those had occurred in the past and provided examples.

Rob asked how the unit group portions of the Hanford Sitewide Permit were developed, such as how many people were working on those or how input from those performing the related work was considered in creating a 20,000-page document. Annette explained that, when Ecology worked with EPA to guide the renewal following 2012, each portion of the renewal needed to be reviewed against the associated guidance. This was the case for both Part A and Part B of the permit application. She was unsure of the number of people working but explained that each unit group may have 12-15 people sitting in a workshop, which included DOE and Hanford contractors considering deficiencies or changes that needed to be made. Each review of each portion of the permit application took months and needed to be done for each of the unit groups.

Rob commented that System Plan 10 and the permit were already not aligned and it was known that some dates would not be met. He wondered how those might be integrated. Annette explained that the agencies discussed those aspects with one another for awareness, but there was nothing that could be done in permitting until the associated decisions were made.

Miya Burke asked what changes might be seen to the TPA following holistic negotiations and if the Consent Decree would still be relevant. Michael explained that, when those negotiations concluded, a tentative agreement would be established and the public would be provided the opportunity to comment. Those comments would be addressed, then the TPA itself would be updated. Those updates could include a suite of new milestones. He stated that there was potential for changes to the Consent Decree, but he did not know if that was being considered.

Jeff Wyatt noted the consistent challenge in the site receiving a compliant budget and asked about the implications of that in relation to the TPA milestones. Ryan stated that, without a compliant budget, work needed to be prioritized to make the most of what was received. Dave explained that there were related provisions within the TPA. The three agencies would discuss their priorities together, though it was ultimately DOE's budget to spend as appropriate.

Pam Larsen noted the HAB's efforts around the public release of the draft Rev.9. She wondered if the HAB would have the opportunity to look at the information that would be presented to the public. Ryan explained that Ecology had been discussing that and sharing materials with the COE committee to gain informal feedback.

In relation to the TPA, Pam was interested in why certain contractors were assigned enforceable milestones but had no target dates. Additionally, she noted that the Trustee Council was looking at the analysis of the damage done to the Hanford Site and what could be done to mitigate further damage. She asked if that was integrated into the work being done here. Lindsay stated she could not speak to those points and would take those questions back.

McClure Tosch provided background as a trustee. He explained that the Trustee Council was not part of the TPA and was a separate process. The Trustee Council was a legal, consensus-based process resulting from a 2012 settlement. While the Trustee Council's work was funded in accordance with its planned work, it did not have milestones in the same manner as work that fell under the TPA. However, the council strived to coordinate its efforts such that its work fit within the bounds of CERCLA response. Regarding the damage analysis, he stated that so much had happened at Hanford over the prior 70+ years that it was difficult to comprehend and just as difficult to predict the impacts of future cleanup.

Chris Sutton asked if the Rev.9A permit would be able to be downloaded as individual sections versus a single, 20,000-page file. Annette and Ryan confirmed that sections would be able to be downloaded individually in the same manner as the release of Rev.8C.

Miya asked for an explanation of "standard conditions" referenced within the RCRA presentation and the differences between numbered parts of the Hanford Sitewide Permit. Annette explained that Part I described what was required within the WAC dangerous waste regulations. As an example, the Part I of Rev.8C provided requirements for permit modifications and reporting. The Part II conditions were focused on the Part B portions of the permit application and the Hanford-specific considerations. Unit groups within the permit were all within the Parts I and IIs. Those Parts I and II served as the "umbrella," while attachments provided additional information on specifics or supporting conditions such as security, training, or emergency management.

Board Business

Updates on Past Action Items and Requests

Lindsay Somers announced that DOE met with the tribes to discuss the option of a land acknowledgement during HAB meetings. Additional discussions were planned for May.

Regarding HAB alternates, Lindsay provided a short background on alternate participation before and after the COVID-19 timeframe. She stated that the TPA agencies agreed that Board seats should be represented by one member each during Board meetings. Other aspects of alternate participation were still under discussion. The Board would be updated on those results.

Pam Larsen asked if there would be mention of the area settlers in the land acknowledgement. Lindsay stated that she did not hear an update on that portion but would follow up on it and update the Board during its next meeting.

Tom Sicilia asked if there was an anticipated timeline for approval of the HAB's new Operating Ground Rules. Lindsay stated that was still in review by General Council and she would provide an update when available.

Miya Burke asked if, during Board meetings, an alternate member would be able to switch seats with a primary member to speak. Lindsay clarified that the intent was for a primary member to represent the constituency and the alternate member would represent the constituency where the primary member was unavailable. The intent was for a single person to serve as the representative, without members switching seats.

Jeff Wyatt asked how an in-person attendant would be able to coordinate with a remote attendant in determining who was available to speak. Ryan Miller stated that it was his understanding that facilitation would track who was present for a full Board meeting. If the primary was in attendance, the primary would represent the constituency.

Jeff asked what problem was being solved in enforcing such a rule. Lindsay stated that it was in part ensuring equal representation for all seats, noting that not all seats had alternates. Additionally, the practice was in alignment with DOE Headquarters guidance. She clarified that each of the TPA agencies were in agreement on the matter.

Miya noted that committee elections were anticipated for March and asked when an update would be provided on alternate participation in committees or committee leadership. Lindsay stated that the TPA agencies would resume those discussions the following week.

Tom Sicilia noted that there were differences in the planned implementation of alternate participation during Board meetings when compared to the present implementation. Lindsay acknowledged that the implementation evolved.

Rob Davis expressed his frustration over the alternate participation, stating that he felt that the restriction on alternate participation damaged the concept of HAB alternates.

Amber Waldref expressed that each organization should have the ability to choose which of its members spoke for its position on a subject. She felt that would not negatively impact Board conversations to add more voices and that the onus should be on the primary and alternate members to communicate with one another and coordinate to ensure that the seat's position was put forward. She stated her disagreement with enforcing the participation rules and felt that further conversation was needed on the topic.

Miya expressed disappointment, stating that she thought that the Board or its leaders would be involved at some level in the related discussions.

Pam Larsen agreed with Rob's sentiments, recalling previous relationships between her seats' primary/alternate member relationships. In the past, her alternates brought expertise in certain subject

areas. She expected it would be incredibly frustrating not to be able to speak as an alternate when they brought specialized knowledge or perspectives on a topic.

Bob Thompson commented that the change appeared to be a top-down push such that the HAB could not control the dialogue. Instead, those at the top would control that dialogue. He felt that the HAB either needed to be clearly an independent board or not one, noting that he believed it was initially meant to be one during its creation. He stated that the role of the Board as stated by John Wagoner did not appear to be the case in the present. He stated that, if the process was not broken, one would only want to change it in such a way if they wanted to limit not only who the constituencies are, but who could speak for those constituencies. He clarified that was how it appeared and there could be well-intentioned reasons for the change. However, he suggestion that the Board continue to consider and discuss the changes.

Brian Moreno, Public at Large, wondered if the Board could freely open conversations to “public comment,” effectively allowing everyone to participate in conversations. Where there were Board decisions to be made, those could be limited to individual seats. Lindsay explained that formal Board meetings needed to adhere to the specific parameters of FACA, so that idea was not viable. However, she noted, the subcommittee meetings did not need to adhere to those same rules.

Larry Brandt wanted the rules to be reconsidered, stating that there had to be some structure that allowed for wide exchange of information. He felt that there was no advantage in limiting participation. He suggested that the HAB could try to come up with proposed rules to permit substitutions.

Brisa Guajardo asked if the rules existed and were not being followed versus being recently developed. Ryan explained that those rules were in place but were not being enforced. He noted that the term limits for Board membership were another example of a rule that was in place for decades, but only recently enforced. He clarified that alternates were able to participate in instances where the primary was unavailable.

Multiple members proposed scenarios in effort to clarify what made a member “unavailable.” Ryan clarified that the agreement was that, where a primary member was unable to attend or unable to participate in a meeting, the alternate member could represent the constituency in the primary’s stead.

Steve Anderson felt that limiting participation seemed contrary to the HAB’s purpose.

Rob felt that determination of unavailable seemed to be a matter of judgement and perception by the individuals shepherding the HAB’s processes. He felt that, through that same level of judgement, allowances could be afforded.

Lindsay appreciated the feedback provided. She asked that the HAB continue to operate with integrity and adhere to the appointment letters, where roles of each member were defined. She stated that those rules were clear. She encouraged members to collaborate to determine a unified position held by each constituency, so that the constituency’s representative comes to the meetings with agreement on what will be shared or asked.

Jeff commented that his alternate was a rancher in Umatilla County, whereas Jeff was a retired engineer living in Portland. He stated that the two of them had different perspectives that he expected would each be valuable to hear. As a seat, however, they would coordinate to maintain one vote toward reaching HAB consensus. He felt that the decision by the TPA agencies was cutting off those different perspectives and that was counter to the TPA agencies efforts to learn and communicate the perspectives of the public.

Kermit Mankiller felt that the seats should be afforded the opportunity to be represented by the individual member that was most able to bring forth its organization appropriately. He felt that it should be the responsibility of facilitation to recognize the appropriate member to speak for each seat.

Larry Brandt noted that potential issues such as an alternate member serving as a committee representative during committee reports being unable to speak. Ryan reiterated that committee leadership for alternate positions was under discussion.

Ryan clarified that he and Lindsay were listening to the comments provided and would take those back to their respective agency leaders to support their continued discussions on the matter. He noted that those discussions were not just happening locally but were being coordinated with DOE Headquarters as well.

Tom stated that everyone on the Board was there to act with integrity and had noble intent. He noted that there was a difference in members having different viewpoints from one another versus having a different opinion from the seat. He noted that the appointment letters, to him, did not seem to provide clarity and was open to interpretation, explaining that his idea of “unavailable” was different from other interpretations he heard over the course of that discussion.

Tom requested that the TPA agencies formally define “available.” He noted that was similar to a previous request for a “high-level policy advice” definition.

Bob stated that in looking at FACA, he was unable to find anything that suggested that the agencies could make a determination on who could speak as a member or constituent of an advisory board, alternate or otherwise. The only relevant statements he saw within FACA was that the agencies were granted power to make decisions, and that power was seemingly being used in ways that the Board was not used to. He expected that the struggle people were having was that the rule seemed to conflict with the role that the Board members believed themselves to have. He commented that advice could be helpful if the time was taken to listen to that advice. However, he felt that limiting voices that contributed to such advice appeared to be a means of exerting control. He was interested to learn who was making those decisions on the agencies’ behalf and on the Board’s behalf, reiterating that FACA, by his reading, did not provide the authority to determine who could or could not speak.

Chris Sutton recalled a previous discussion on the topic where Rose Ferri provided perspective on behalf of the Yakama Nation. As Chris recalled it, she had explained that the primary and alternate were each appointed with the expectation that they would be able to freely express the views within their individual areas of expertise. His key takeaway was that, where primaries and alternates bring different areas of expertise, it benefitted everyone to hear from an expert on a topic. Without those expert opinions, the Board could miss valuable insights that could impact how the Board ultimately voted. He acknowledged that the alternates could speak during public comment but stated those comment periods were too far removed from the individual topics to be impactful.

Michelle Holt explained that, in her case, she was unable to participate on each committee that her organization would care to join due to time constraints. If her alternate was able, she would not only want that alternate to participate in her stead, but also have the opportunity to serve in committee leadership. She considered that to be an instance where she would be unavailable as she would not have the time to serve as a committee chair. She noted that the COE was chaired by an alternate and was doing well in that role. While she was dedicated to supporting that chair, she was unable to dedicate time necessary to chair.

Administrative Business

- **Board Engagement Survey:** Brian Moreno discussed an idea brought up in the prior HAB meeting related to Board engagement. In follow-up discussions, a bank of questions was developed for a survey that would be sent out to the Board. Those responses would then be developed into a report that would go to the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) for use in determining potential next steps. Tom asked if the report would be archived in some manner. Susan stated that was a matter of discussion for the ESC.

Susan asked HAB members to watch for and fill out the survey as it could be valuable for the Board going forward.

- **Rev.9A Workgroup:** Following from a previous comment, the idea of a workgroup for a Rev.9A response was discussed. Tom volunteered to lead the resulting workgroup.
- **System Plan 10 IM Team:** Rob suggested creating an IM team to consider System Plan 10 public feedback. The IM team would be sponsored by TWST.
- **Potential May Regional Meeting:** Susan explained that DOE, in cooperation with facilitation, proposed Hermiston, Oregon as a potential regional meeting location. However, due to the preferred meeting space availability in May, the meeting dates would need to shift. The other option for May would be to stay in the Tri-Cities and adhere to the initially planned dates.

Several Board members suggested reconsidering regional meeting plans such that it would occur later in the year and in a location further from the Tri-Cities, such as Spokane, Seattle, Portland, or Hood River. Lindsay agreed to take back the request for a September regional meeting. She shared the perspective that Hermiston represented a community affected by Hanford where the HAB had not held a meeting in the past.

- **30th Anniversary Reception:** Board members thanked and applauded Susan and Miya for organizing and hosting a 30th anniversary reception held during the evening of February 6.

Public Comment

No public comment was offered during this meeting.

Meeting Recording

Day 1: <https://youtu.be/nLQaqeH2IB4?si=yMZtF8ODecfZCrbV>

Day 2: <https://youtu.be/hui9rKvEIOA?si=PBIHnM2HWGu3WO7w>

Attachments

[Attachment 1: Meeting Agenda](#)

[Attachment 2: Department of Energy Photographs](#)

[Attachment 3: Ecology Update Presentation](#)

[Attachment 4: Draft HAB Advice on FY2026 Cleanup Priorities](#)

[Attachment 5: DOE Presentation – Tri-Party Agreement Overview](#)

[Attachment 6: Ecology Presentation: RCRA and Permitting at Hanford](#)

[Attachment 7: EPA Presentation: CERCLA \(Superfund\) 101](#)

Meeting Attendees

Day 1

Board Members and Alternates: Primary (P) and Alternate (A)

Steve Anderson, Grant and Franklin Counties (P)*	Brisa Guajardo, Tri-Cities Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (P)*	Brian Moreno, Public at Large*
Simone Anter, Columbia Riverkeeper (A)	Rebecca Holland, HAMTC (P)*	Rob Parmelee, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (P)*
Jessica Black, Columbia Riverkeeper (P)	Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (P)*	Jacob Reynolds, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (P)
Richard Bloom, City of West Richland (A)	Tim Kovis, Public at Large*	Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy (A)*
Larry Brandt, Public at Large	Pam Larsen, Benton County (P)*	Dan Strom, Benton-Franklin Health District (P)*
Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge (P)*	Michael Lee, Columbia Basin College (P)*	Chris Sutton, Public at Large*
James Conca, TRIDEC (P)*	Charles LoPresti, Washington League of Women Voters (P)*	McClure Tosch, Yakama Nation (A)
Susan Coleman, Public at Large*	Kermit Mankiller, Nez Perce Tribe (A)*	Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (P)*
Rob Davis, City of Pasco (P)*	Joe Mathieu, Public at Large	Jeff Wyatt, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (P)*

Others:

Richard Buel, DOE	David Bowen, Ecology*	Laura Caulfield, AttainX*
Jennifer Colborn, DOE	Neil Caudill, Ecology	Tyler Oats, Bechtel
Edward Dawson, DOE	Ambika Chakravartty, Ecology	Gretchen McDonnel, Cayuse Environmental
Cameron Hardy, DOE	Edward Holbrook, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo*
Carrie Meyer, DOE*	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Cynthia Bounds, HMIS
Lindsay Somers, DOE*	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
Brian Stickney, DOE*	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Brian Vance, DOE*	Dave Einan, EPA*	Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
Amanda Velasquez, DOE	Megan Perkins, DOH*	Shyanne Palmus, HMIS*
		MaryAnne Wuennecke, HMIS*
		Derek Miceli, WRPS
		Nikki Huntington, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board*
		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
		Kelsey Shank, theEDGE

		Wayne Barber, Weapons Complex Monitor
		Liz Mattson, Public, Hanford Challenge
		Gabriel Behnee, Public, Nez Perce Tribe*
		Matt Lynch, Public, Nez Perce Tribe
		Bethany Close, Public, TRIDEC
		Steve Wiegman, Public, Old People [sic]*
		Dib Goswami, Public
		Laura Hanses, Public
		Robert Quirk, Public*
		Dan Solitz, Public
		Mike
		"Spring"
		Lacey Mansius, HAB Facilitation*
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facilitation*
		Judie Talbot, HAB Facilitation*

Day 2

Board Members and Alternates: Primary (P) and Alternate (A)

Steve Anderson, Grant and Franklin Counties (P)*	Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (P)	Jacob Reynolds, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (P)
Simone Anter, Columbia Riverkeeper (A)	Tim Kovis, Public at Large*	Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy (A)*
Tracie Arnold, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (A)	Michael Lee, Columbia Basin College (P)*	Dan Strom, Benton-Franklin Health District (P)*
Larry Brandt, Public at Large	Charles LoPresti, Washington League of Women Voters (P)*	Chris Sutton, Public at Large*
Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge (P)*	Pam Larsen, Benton County (P)*	Bob Thompson, City of Richland (P)*
Susan Coleman, Public at Large*	Kermit Mankiller, Nez Perce Tribe (A)*	McClure Tosch, Yakama Nation (A)
Rob Davis, City of Pasco (P)*	Joe Mathieu, Public at Large	Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (P)*
Brisa Guajardo, Tri-Cities Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (P)*	Brian Moreno, Public at Large*	Jeff Wyatt, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (P)*

Rebecca Holland, HAMTC (P)*	Rob Parmelee, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (P)*	
-----------------------------	--	--

Others:

Lindsay Somers, DOE*	Annette Carlson, Ecology*	Laura Caulfield, AttainX*
	Edward Holbrook, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo
	Theresa Howell, Ecology*	Cynthia Bounds, HMIS
	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Stephanie Brasher, HMIS*
	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Patrick Conrad, HMIS
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Dana Cowley, HMIS
	Dave Einan, EPA*	Sergio Galeana, HMIS
	Geoff Schramm, EPA	Michael Turner, HMIS*
	Jane LePage, DOH*	MaryAnne Wuennecke, HMIS*
		Nikki Huntington, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board*
		Bradford Sharpless, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
		Liz Mattson, Public, Hanford Challenge
		Bethany Close, Public, TRIDEC
		Li Wang, Public, Yakama Nation
		Dib Goswami, Public
		Robert Quirk, Public*
		Dan Solitz, Public
		Brian Bay
		Lacey Mansius, HAB Facilitation*
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facilitation*
		Judie Talbot, HAB Facilitation*

* Denotes that the individual signed in or was otherwise noted as attending the meeting in-person.

Note: Remote participants for this hybrid meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams, while in-person participants were asked to sign in on paper. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.

Appendix A: Fiscal Year 2026 Cleanup Priorities Advice, As Approved

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Steve Anderson, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Joseph Mathieu, Rob Parmelee, [Gerry Pollet](#), Robert Quirk, ~~[Gerry Pollet](#)~~, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Dan Strom, Chris Sutton, Tom Sicilia, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Jeff Wyatt

Version #: 9

Date Revised: ~~021/0623~~/2024

Update the version number and revision date with each iteration.

Letter Heading:

To: Brian Vance (DOE)
David Bowen (WA State Dept. of Ecology)
Dave Einan (EPA)

Subject: Fiscal Year 2026 Hanford Cleanup Priorities

The Hanford Advisory Board's (HAB's or Board's) primary mission is to provide informed and actionable advice to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), collectively known as the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies.

The Board advises the TPA agencies to prioritize the following critical activities for fiscal year (FY) 2026. The activities are summarized below with more detail in the FY2026 Critical Priorities Table:

- Report annual environmental remediation and safety objectives for the forthcoming year and provide a year-end assessment of the past year's targets.
- TPA agencies should respond to and publish all comments, and regularly schedule opportunities to engage with the public.
- Allocate funding for HAB meetings with complete attendance from all Board members and alternates.
- Develop/implement/communicate a TPA long-term workforce plan.
- Complete the hot commissioning of the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) facility.
- ~~Evaluate greenhouse gas emissions and identify strategies to~~ Evaluate alternate energy sources for the steam generators at the DFLAW. ~~reduce/offset the carbon footprint of the DFLAW facility.~~
- Address the extent of contamination ~~at~~ under the 324 Building through an amended Record of Decision or other Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) product.
- Proceed with the full deactivation, demolition, and removal of the 105-KW Fuel Storage Basin.
- Accelerate groundwater remediation efforts in the River Corridor.
- Develop methods to remediate contamination in the Central Plateau deep vadose zone.
- Implement the approved Record of Decision remedies for the 100-K and 100-N areas.
- ~~Initiate~~ Accelerate the certification and shipment of certified transuranic (TRU) waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Steve Anderson, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Joseph Mathieu, Rob Parmelee, [Gerry Pollet](#), Robert Quirk, ~~[Gerry Pollet](#)~~, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Dan Strom, Chris Sutton, Tom Sicilia, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Jeff Wyatt

- ~~Complete a preliminary design for the~~ [Complete an investigation to support a preliminary design for](#) remediation of the 618-11 Burial Ground.
- Use contaminated soil to minimize the demand for clean fill in the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility.
- Establish disposition pathways for orphan waste streams.
- Accelerate transfer of Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) cesium and strontium capsules to dry storage.
- Assess technologies to remove or stabilize interstitial liquids in the waste storage tanks.

Background

This advice largely mirrors the goals outlined in DOE's current Hanford Site 5-Year Plan (Reference 1) as well as DOE's presentation of the 5-Year Plan to the public on October 24, 2023 (Reference 2). A key assumption of the advice is that DOE will request a compliant budget for FY2026, and that this advice will be provided to Headquarters with the budget request as required by EM-1 ([Reference 3 – Ike White's memo](#)).

In addition to the activities identified in the 5-Year Plan placemat, the Board stresses that key projects addressed in the following table require funding in FY2026 to ensure they are completed on time or expedited to shorten project duration. The Board has consistently emphasized the importance of advocating for and requesting funding sufficient to meet all regulatory milestones and significantly shorten the duration for completion of cleanup activities.

Advice:

The Board reliably supports the agencies' request that its membership represents the project's best interests to its constituent organizations, elected officials, and the general public. However, the Board notes the response has not historically met Board expectations. The Board advises DOE to provide a response that complies with DOE Office of Environmental Management (Reference 4) guidance. The Board also requests a consolidated point-by-point response to this advice from the TPA agencies. The Board would be open and willing to workshop the content of the response with the TPA agencies to ensure expectations are met.

The Board recognizes the importance of assuring the safe, secure, and compliant management of Hanford's critical resources and the maintenance of infrastructure, safeguards, and security. It is imperative that DOE continue to prioritize and implement Hanford worker and public safety practices. And, to ensure that a stable, highly qualified workforce is available to safely execute the project to completion, the Board advises the agencies to develop/implement/communicate a long-term workforce strategy as noted in advice point C-d below.

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Steve Anderson, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Joseph Mathieu, Rob Parmelee, [Gerry Pollet](#), Robert Quirk, ~~[Gerry Pollet](#)~~, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Dan Strom, Chris Sutton, Tom Sicilia, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Jeff Wyatt

The table below summarizes the Board’s recommended cleanup priorities for FY2026. Note that activities in the 5-Year Plan identified to be completed prior to FY2026 are not listed in this table.

FY2026 Cleanup Priorities

Item	FY2026 Cleanup Priority Aligned with 5-Year Plan Goals
Core Operations	
C-a	Reporting: In a comprehensive public-facing product, develop and communicate at the outset of each year measurable annual cleanup and safety targets/goals for the work to be performed that year. At year’s end assess and communicate in a transparent manner the degree to which those annual cleanup and safety targets/goals were met.
C-b	Public Involvement: Respond to and publish any comment received during a public comment period. Regularly schedule opportunities for the TPA agencies to provide education and meaningfully engage in dialogue with the public.
C-c	HAB: Work with the HAB’s Executive Steering Committee (ESC) to establish funding for the HAB to ensure the execution of four full Board meetings annually, one regional meeting, and committee meetings with the full participation of Board members and alternates and issue manager meetings as required.
C-d	Workforce Issues: Develop/implement/communicate a TPA long-term strategy to assure a stable, highly qualified workforce. This strategy should cover all facets of recruitment, training, development, succession planning, and retention efforts to safeguard institutional knowledge, expertise, and efforts to protect worker health and safety. ⁵
Waste Treatment	
WT-a	DFLAW : Complete the hot commissioning of the DFLAW facility and transition to 24/7 tank waste vitrification operations, with a goal of optimizing throughput to exceed the nominal production capacity of 21 metric tons per day of vitrified glass.
WT-b	Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Initiate an assessment of CO2 emissions and alternatives to reduce/offset the carbon footprint of the DFLAW vitrification facility. Evaluate alternate energy sources for the steam generators at the DFLAW.
Risk Reduction	
R-a	324 Building: Amend the 324 Building Record of Decision to address the extent of soil and groundwater contamination beneath the 324 Building, meet the obligations of TPA

⁵ HAB Consensus Advice #305; February 6, 2020:
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/2020224_Workforce_Advice_Signed_v3_000074.pdf

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Steve Anderson, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Joseph Mathieu, Rob Parmelee, [Gerry Pollet](#), Robert Quirk, ~~[Gerry Pollet](#)~~, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Dan Strom, Chris Sutton, Tom Sicilia, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Jeff Wyatt

Item	FY2026 Cleanup Priority Aligned with 5-Year Plan Goals
	Milestone M-016-85, and ensure downgradient cesium and strontium levels in groundwater are closely monitored.
R-b	105-KW Fuel Storage Basin: Proceed with the full deactivation, demolition, and removal of the 105-KW Fuel Storage Basin as per TPA milestone M-016-181 (09/30/2026). Concurrently, begin the soil remediation process beneath the 105-KW Fuel Storage Basin, in accordance with TPA milestone M-016-186 (09/30/2026).
R-c	Groundwater Protection: Accelerate groundwater remediation efforts in the River Corridor through source reduction and by enhancing the efficiency of extraction well networks and Pump and Treat facilities in accordance with the M-024 series of milestones.
R-d	Deep vadose zone contamination: Submit the 200-DV-1 lab treatability test report in accordance with Milestone M-015-110E and develop a toolkit of treatment methodologies tailored to the specific characteristics of contamination in each deep vadose zone on the Central Plateau.
R-e	100-K & 100-N Records of Decision: Implement the remedies specified by the Records of Decision for the 100-K and 100-N areas.
Waste Management	
WM-a	TRU Waste: Initiate Accelerate the certification and shipment of certified TRU waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.
WM-b	618-11 Burial Ground: Continue the planning process for the remediation of the 618-11 Burial Ground (TPA milestone M-016-088). Complete an investigation to support a preliminary design for remediation of the 618-11 Burial Ground. The resulting preliminary design should align with Energy Northwest and be submitted to EPA in 2026 in accordance with TPA milestone M-016-88-T01.
WM-c	Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility: Utilize contaminated soil from waste sites within the Central Plateau and River Corridor (e.g., OU 200-IA-1, the 207-A South Retention Basin) to reduce the need for clean fill for void-fill and compaction in the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility. Expedite characterization and remediation of waste sites to ensure an adequate supply of contaminated soil.
WM-d	Orphan Waste: Establish disposition pathways for Hanford waste streams currently without a designated disposal site (aka orphan wastes), including TSCR ion exchange columns, WESF capsules (TPA milestone M-092-20A), and German logs. The list of all orphan Hanford waste streams should be compiled and prepared for public comment in 2026 to ensure transparency and community involvement in the decision-making process.

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Steve Anderson, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Joseph Mathieu, Rob Parmelee, [Gerry Pollet](#), Robert Quirk, ~~[Gerry Pollet](#)~~, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Dan Strom, Chris Sutton, Tom Sicilia, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Jeff Wyatt

Item	FY2026 Cleanup Priority Aligned with 5-Year Plan Goals
WM-e	WESF: Accelerate transfer of cesium and strontium capsules to dry storage. (DOE 5-Year Plan delayed TPA milestone M-092-21 from 08/31/2025 to 2026)
WM-f	Tank Liquids: Complete an analysis of alternatives for technologies that will remove and/or stabilize free and interstitial liquids in the waste storage tanks, including (at a minimum) physical and chemical sequestration, freezing, and evaporation using superheated steam injection and/or coils.

Note: The organization of the table largely tracks DOE’s 5-Year Plan goals and does not reflect a priority ranking.

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Steve Anderson, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Joseph Mathieu, Rob Parmelee, [Gerry Pollet](#), Robert Quirk, ~~[Gerry Pollet](#)~~, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Dan Strom, Chris Sutton, Tom Sicilia, ~~[Dan Solitz](#)~~, Jeff Wyatt

References:

1. Hanford Site 5-Year Plan (2023-2028); August 15, 2023:
<https://www.hanford.gov/flipbook/Hanford%20Site%205-Year-Plan%202023/#>
2. Hanford Site 5-Year Plan Presentation; October 24, 2023:
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/Hanford_5-Year_Plan_2023_presentation_FINAL_10-24-23.pdf
3. Reference 3 – Ike White’s memo
4. Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Policies Desk Reference, US Department of Energy, April 2023; Page 16: <https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/EM-SSAB-Policies-Desk-Reference-April-2023-FINAL.pdf>
5. HAB Consensus Advice #305; February 6, 2020:
https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/2020224_Workforce_Advice_Signed_v3_000074.pdf

Attachments:

1. [List applicable attachments]
2. [List applicable attachments]

[Additional Sections]

Add additional sections as needed.

[Text]

WIPP Begins Mining New Waste Disposal Panel for First Time in a Decade - Carlsbad NM

Renewed state operating permit enables crews to start work

CARLSBAD, N.M. — Just before the new year, there was a ribbon-cutting at EM's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

At the event, a multi-ton mechanical mining machine clawed through the ceremonial ribbon and began cutting a new disposal panel out of a 250-million-year-old layer of salt beneath the New Mexico desert.

It's the first time in a decade that crews have started mining a new disposal panel at the nation's only deep geologic waste repository for transuranic waste.

The new Panel 11 is the first of two waste emplacement panels approved earlier this year by the New Mexico Environment Department as part of a 10-year extension of WIPP's operating permit. The new panel does not represent an increase in the scope for WIPP; the waste to be emplaced in Panel 11 is within original congressional volume limits established for the waste repository.

The creation of new panels allows safe and compliant emplacement of waste to continue from generator sites throughout the United States, supporting DOE's environmental cleanup and national security missions.

The process of mining a panel

Located 26 miles southeast of Carlsbad, WIPP permanently isolates defense-generated transuranic waste 2,150 feet underground in panels mined out of an ancient salt formation. The facility has been disposing of transuranic waste since 1999.

Approximately 120,000 tons of salt rock is mined to create a panel, which consists of seven rooms. Each room measures 300 feet long by 33 feet wide by 14 feet high. It takes about two years to cut and outfit a panel.

Workers are currently emplacing waste into WIPP Panel 8. Panel 8's first room, Room 7, has been filled and emplacement activities have moved to Room 6.

Panel 11 is connected to the rest of the WIPP facility by new pathways that stretch nearly half a mile from the existing mine to the west, connecting not only the new panels but a new air intake shaft key to increased ventilation in the WIPP underground.

Mining crews use a mammoth-sized, highly efficient continuous miner that cuts into the salt rock with a rotating drum, which can be elevated. Standing behind this cutting head, an operator remotely controls the machine, which has the capacity to generate 10 tons of salt per minute. Gathering arms move the salt onto a belt that carries it to a truck for use elsewhere in the underground or to a hoist that carries the salt from 2,150 feet underground to a salt tailings pile on the surface.

Mining at WIPP is timed so that a panel is only ready when it is needed for waste emplacement. This is because the natural movement of salt causes mined openings to close. In fact, panels are mined slightly larger than the desired size to account for this closure. This is the salt rock behavior that will eventually permanently encapsulate the waste.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Achieves Best Shipment Season in 10 Years

EM team looks to continue success into 2024

CARLSBAD, N.M. — During the calendar year of 2023, the team at EM's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) had its best shipment performance in 10 years, continuing the cleanup of sites in New Mexico and across the country.

In 2023, WIPP received 489 waste shipments from generator sites throughout the country, compared to 272 shipments in 2022. It's the best shipment total since the facility received 724 shipments in 2013.

Several factors enabled the increase in shipments, including:

1. Increased coordination with generator sites, which make the waste available for packaging and certification through the DOE-established Central Characterization Program;
2. More transportation support with mobile loading unit teams at generator sites and shipment drivers;
3. WIPP operational efficiencies gained by opening a new, uncontaminated set of underground storage rooms, known as a panel. Waste is disposed of in a set of panels located nearly one-half mile below the surface.

WIPP's highest shipment total was 1,142 in 2006, with the lowest being 44 shipments in 1999 when the underground waste repository opened.

Since it began operations in 1999, WIPP has received more than 13,790 shipments, totaling over 75,480 cubic meters of waste emplaced. Per the U.S. Land Withdrawal Act, WIPP is limited to 175,000 cubic meters of waste over its lifetime.

While legacy waste from the EM Los Alamos Field Office remains a high priority, EM's Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site has traditionally been the most prolific generator, with more than 7,000 shipments so far over the course of its cleanup mission. See a related story in this EM Update issue on the cleanup program's significant progress in reducing the transuranic waste inventory at the INL Site.

WIPP is the nation's only repository for the disposal of transuranic waste generated by nuclear defense activities. Salado Isolation Mining Contractors manages and operates the WIPP site for EM.

Hanford Finishes Building Disposal Facility for Tank Waste Treatment Mission

RICHLAND, Wash. — Crews with EM Richland Operations Office contractor Central Plateau Cleanup Company recently completed construction of the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), a key component of the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste Program to treat the Hanford Site's tank waste.

The IDF is an engineered landfill that will allow for safe disposal of vitrified, or immobilized in glass, low-activity waste from Hanford's Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant when it begins operations.

The IDF consists of two expandable disposal cells totaling 1,345 feet wide, 2,151 feet long and 42 feet deep, with a waste disposal capacity of nearly 1.2 million cubic yards.

To protect groundwater under IDF, the disposal cells are lined and outfitted with equipment to collect water from rain, snowmelt and dust suppression — known as leachate — that filters through the landfill. Two 400,000-gallon storage tanks at the facility hold the leachate until it is sent to an onsite facility and treated to remove contaminants.

The IDF is scheduled to receive its first containers of vitrified waste for disposal in 2025.

EM Names Erik Olds as Deputy Manager at Oak Ridge

OAK RIDGE, Tenn. — EM recently announced the reassignment of Erik Olds from EM’s communications director to the Oak Ridge Site deputy manager.

Olds will oversee day-to-day operations of OREM’s environmental cleanup and stewardship mission and other activities.

He brings extensive headquarters and field leadership, project and program management and policy experience to his new role. Olds has worked for DOE for more than 31 years and has served in a variety of assignments, including EM acting chief of staff, deputy project integration manager for the multi-billion dollar Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste system at the Hanford Site, and chief of staff for both the Richland Operations Office and Office of River Protection at Hanford.

Prior to his leadership roles at Hanford and EM headquarters, Olds served at the Yucca Mountain Project in Nevada for the defunct Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. He holds a bachelor’s degree in public relations and a master’s degree in communications studies from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

DOE’s Oak Ridge Reservation occupies more than 32,000 acres within Anderson and Roane counties in East Tennessee. They have cleanup responsibilities across the reservation, they are removing risks and hazards, enhancing safety, opening land for redevelopment, and enabling important science and energy research and national security missions at ORNL and Y-12.



Erik Olds will serve as the Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management deputy manager after leading communications for EM in Washington, D.C.

Hanford Contractors Earn Incentives With Energy Saving Upgrades

RICHLAND, Wash. — Energy conservation efforts at the Hanford Site continue to earn incentives through the Bonneville Power Administration’s (BPA) Energy Efficiency Incentive program.

Incentives are cash rebates for energy saving projects. Contractor Hanford Mission Integration Solutions (HMIS) works with other Hanford contractors for the EM Richland Operations Office and Office of River Protection to identify qualifying projects and submit those to the BPA.

As the cleanup mission progresses and Hanford embarks on new, energy-intensive treatment missions, saving energy and accomplishing the mission in the most efficient way possible is key to supporting future cleanup work.

The financial incentives earned by each contractor go back into the project or facility budget that made the upgrades, allowing more money to directly fund the cleanup mission and future initiatives.

Most of the Hanford Site's incentives in the last two years came from energy-efficient LED lighting and improvements to electrical transmission lines. The upgrades earned Hanford contractors \$190,679. That is equivalent to 884,902 kilowatt-hours saved — enough energy to power 1,000 homes for a month.

Hanford Site contractors have earned \$1.66 million in incentives since the program began in 2012. Annual energy savings associated with the improvements are approximately 6.8 million kilowatt-hours, enough to power those 1,000 homes for almost eight months.

Upgrading aging infrastructure isn't the only way for Hanford contractors to earn financial incentives. New construction, such as Hanford's Central Plateau Water Treatment Facility and offices at its 222-S Laboratory, provides the opportunity for contractors to earn BPA incentives by exceeding energy-efficiency construction requirements.

EM Crews Mark Significant Waste Reduction Milestone at Idaho Project

IDAHO FALLS, Idaho — EM has made significant progress in reducing the transuranic (TRU) waste inventory at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site's Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP), fulfilling a commitment to the State of Idaho.

Over the last year, EM and INL Site cleanup contractor Idaho Environmental Coalition (IEC) successfully reduced the overall TRU waste inventory at AMWTP by 22%, or 9,331 waste containers. They sent more TRU waste shipments to EM's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico in calendar year 2023 than at any point over the last decade.

When the contract began in 2022, the remaining TRU waste inventory at AMWTP was stored in over 39,000 containers onsite. As of this month, the inventory is just below 30,000 containers.

Each TRU waste shipment that leaves Idaho represents meticulous planning, careful collaboration with DOE and state partners and safe execution on the part of the workforce.

TRU waste is comprised of debris, residues, soil and other items contaminated with radioactive elements — largely plutonium — that have atomic numbers greater than uranium. This year, EM and IEC will continue to treat, characterize and ship TRU waste stored at AMWTP. They expect to continue sending as many as 12 TRU waste shipments per week to WIPP.

Information drawn from DOE-HQ publications. Contractor quotes eliminated.