



MEETING MINUTES

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)

Full Board Meeting

November 6, 2024

Hybrid Meeting – In-person and via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates	2
Round Robin Discussion	9
EM SSAB Fall Meeting and National Cleanup Workshop Debrief.....	11
Committee Reports	13
New Member Check-In	14
Board Business	16
Public Comment	17
Meeting Recording	17
Attachments	17
Meeting Attendees	18

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

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).

Josh Patnaude, HAB Facilitation, provided an administrative review, went over the Board's meeting ground rules, and notified participants that the meeting was being recorded.

Susan Coleman, Public at Large representative and HAB Chair, welcomed participants and provided opening remarks. She invited both in-person and online participants to introduce themselves, then acknowledged that it was Native American Heritage Month. She recognized the long-standing contributions of the Native American Board members on the HAB and their historical connection to the Hanford Site.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

US Department of Energy

Brian Vance, DOE, expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to speak. He started off by introducing the leadership team of the Hanford Site. He said DOE tries to periodically bring everyone on the team out to the Board meetings to provide an opportunity for them to hear discussions and have conversations on breaks with the HAB members. The leadership team members included:

- Brian Stickney, Deputy Manager for the Hanford Site
- Brian Harkins, Assistant Manager for Mission Support
- Heather Dale, Assistant Manager for River and Plateau
- Ricky Bang, Deputy Assistant Manager for Tank Waste Operations
- Chris Grubbs, Assistant Manager for Procurement
- Pam Zimmerman, Chief of Staff
- Rich Buel, Acting Director of Communications
- Mark Silberstein, Chief Counsel
- Corey Lowe, Assistant Manager for Safety and Environment
- Greg Jones, Chief Financial Officer
- Deanna McCranie-Alves, Acting Assistant Manager for Safety and Quality

Brian began his presentation (*Attachment 2*) by explaining the cleanup mission at the Hanford site and discussing key site activities, which included delivery of safe and secure operations, demolishing retired facilities, and treating contaminated groundwater. He highlighted the broad range of activities carried out on the site every day and explained how the DOE categorizes the site into three key product lines: tank waste treatment and disposition, risk reduction (including demolition and remediation projects), and base operations and infrastructure. He emphasized that all three are critical to their success at Hanford.

He also went over DOE's focus areas for the leadership team which included health and safety of the workforce, striving for constructive stakeholder/Tribal relationships, and to enhance DOE/contractor teamwork. He said the focus areas have remained consistent and have been core to their ability to guide the transformation they are leading at the Hanford Site from the traditional demolition and construction site back to more of an operational site with the start of the tank waste treatment right around the corner. He said it has enhanced their ability to safely, efficiently, and predictably deliver the progress that is so important to the site team and the Tri-Cities community in the Pacific Northwest. He stated that they continue to strive to operate as a unified Hanford enterprise team across the department.

Notably, as of October 1, DOE's site offices became the Hanford Field Office, marking the transition from two separate field offices—the Richland Operations Office and the Office of River Protection—into

a single entity. From DOE's perspective, the change to that 20-year operational structure will allow them to more effectively function as one team driving the mission at the Hanford Site. He also highlighted the six contractors working alongside the DOE team to collaboratively execute the mission:

- The Tank Farms contract, previously held by Washington River Protection Solutions, transitioned to a new contractor partner, H2C, on October 21. H2C is a limited liability corporation led by BWXT, with Amentum and Fluor as partners. H2C will undergo a 120-day transition period and is scheduled to take over the Tank Farms mission in February 2025.
- Bechtel, DOE's Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) contractor, will continue in this role through the hot commissioning of the low-activity waste side of the plant. H2C is anticipated to take over this scope in 2026. He explained that this transition will occur in two phases: first, H2C will assume responsibility for the low-activity waste side, while Bechtel will continue with the design and construction of the high-level waste facility beyond H2C's transition on the low-activity side.
- Inomedic, DOE's occupational health care provider, was relatively new to the site team, having just started on January 1.
- Navarro ATL took over the 222S Lab in April 2021. He commented that they do a tremendous job, both at the lab and as a partner with all the other site contractors.
- CPCCo runs the risk reduction portfolio as of January 2021
- HMIS does sitewide services, site integration, and infrastructure work, as of January 2021.

Brian discussed the increases in the site budget from fiscal year (FY) 2022 to FY2024, as well as the total cost of cleanup from 1989 to 2023, which amounted to \$65.8 billion. He noted that the current DOE team on site consists of 307 employees, with about 200 additional support contractor staff, bringing the total to ~500 employees. In January 2024, a badge count totaled 13,044, making them the largest enterprise employer in the Tri-Cities.

He also highlighted that subcontracts total about half a billion dollars annually, which he views as a critical part of the economic foundation DOE provides in the Tri-Cities. Brian emphasized that changes in the economy are an important factor in their operations and that the DOE team seeks to leverage these changes for activities beyond the core mission of the site.

He described DOE's "engagement arena" as a broad and diverse stakeholder and tribal environment that they operate in everyday with an aggressive outreach program to ensure they are building awareness, getting the facts and data out to as many as they can about the work they do at Hanford. Building these relationships and keeping everyone focused on what is important, such as the health and safety of the workforce as they execute the mission, helps when challenges arise.

Next, he talked about the mission areas, the main three being:

- **Tank Waste Mission Area:**
 - The Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) system resumed operations, proceeding to treat its ninth batch since operations began. He said they expect to have more than 800,000 gallons at the end of this month when the batch is complete. This treated tank waste will then be ready when they start hot commissioning next year at the Direct Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW).
 - Matt Irwin, Acting Assistant Manager and a member of the leadership team, was absent due to his involvement in a DFLAW Cold Commissioning Management Assessment (CCMA) being conducted by DOE. He noted that the contractor had also completed their own CCMA last week. These assessments are part of the readiness activities to ensure that conditions are set for the start of cold commissioning at the WTP, which involves introducing chemical hazards to the plant. He explained that the contractor's CCMA had gone well, and that the team is currently working

through the plan. Six pre-starts were identified in the draft, and both the DOE team and the contractor are addressing any issues that may arise. He expressed satisfaction with the outcome of the assessments and confirmed that they remain on track to begin cold commissioning in the next month.

- Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) has been undergoing maintenance and system upgrades since 2022. They are working through a final material issue with a sump, though that was not related to the equipment installed to support the DFLAW operations. He said they expect ETF to start a campaign within the next two weeks to start demonstrating the capabilities of all the new systems. He said they are permit complete, 77 for 77.
- He expressed appreciation for the support DOE gets from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in advancing toward DFLAW commissioning. He mentioned a celebration they will be having with their regulator partners to recognize an over ten-year effort that required 500 or more permit actions with the support of over 700 people.
- Regarding the Test Bed Initiative (TBI), he announced that they completed the treatment of 1,961 gallons of tank waste from tank SY-101, a week ahead of schedule. He said currently there is laboratory analysis going on that will take 120-130 days to evaluate the constituents of the treated tank waste to ensure it meets the waste acceptance criteria for Texas and Utah's licensed and regulated repositories. The transportation of this waste to be grouted at the disposition sites should occur next spring.
- Over 50% of tank A-101 was retrieved, which is the first tank in the A tank farm. The evaporator is going through some upgrades and they expect their first campaign next spring to get the evaporator back operating after several years of upgrades and material corrective actions.
- The Tank Integrity Program continues to do its job very well.
- They are progressing the design of the High-Level Waste Facility toward unlimited construction and that project continues to be going very well also.
- Brian said from a holistic negotiations perspective they are in the process of developing a response to comments delivered during the public comment period that ended September 1. He said DOE, Ecology, and EPA would like to be done with these responses by the end of the calendar year but since they are all going to go through an administrative change it could be pushed to early next calendar year.
- **Risk Reduction Mission Area:**
 - Operational acceptance testing would soon begin at the Waste Encapsulation Storage Facility (WESF) for all the equipment that has been installed. This testing is a crucial step before moving the 1,936 cesium and strontium capsules from storage pools to dry storage. They expect to begin moving the first capsule in 2025. He mentioned that a full-scale mockup is already in place at the Maintenance and Storage Facility (MASF), where they are working through procedure development, training, and other preparations. He pointed to a picture on the slide showing workers performing a readiness activity: moving a large cask around on the truck port using air skids, in preparation for the actual operation.
 - The K Basin is now completely grouted and no longer contains any water. He noted that risk to the Columbia River has been fully mitigated, a process that was completed in August 2024.
 - Groundwater program completed its tenth year in a row of treating 2 billion gallons per year.

- 200 West pump and treat just went through an upgrade, increasing its operating capacity from about 2,500 gallons per minute to 3,400 gallons per minute and enhancing their ability to accelerate the cleanup of the groundwater in the Central Plateau area.
- Pump and treat stations along the River Corridor continued to operate effectively.
- 324 Building continues to progress through inactivation activities. He said they are on track to provide the focused feasibility study to EPA at the end of November. A full update would be provided to the HAB in the future.
- **Infrastructure and Base Operations:** He said infrastructure and operations were not always appreciated but were vital for DOE's success. He explained that this covered water, power, sewer, roads, IT, cybersecurity, and safety and security features, such as the HAMMER training facility, Hanford patrol, and Hanford fire. Activities included:
 - Central Plateau Water Treatment Facility will be complete within the next few months and then go into a nine- to twelve-month commissioning period. He said he hoped to have this in operation by end of 2025 or early 2026.
 - The North Loop that would provide power to the site remains on track to be energized by May 2025 in conjunction with Columbia Generating Station refueling outage. He explained that this would enhance the reliability of power to the site and WTP to make sure power continuity is maintained to heat the melters.
 - He said for the roads DOE continues to take input from the Traffic Safety Committee. Route 2S and a portion of Route 11A have been reconfigured from a four-lane divided configuration to a two-lane divided configuration. Amy Basche and the HMIS team are currently looking at the newly striped one lane road on 2 South to see if they can increase the speed limit to help with some of the traffic on site.
 - DOE increased HAMMER Training Facility investment in 2024 to ensure the center could be maintained and continue to support their needs on the site.
 - Hanford Fire Department dealt with three fires on site over that summer, affecting about 100 acres. He said they did a phenomenal job, and no assets were at risk.

Brian went over a list of recent and upcoming public outreach dates including the previous Hanford Site 5-year plan public meeting that was held on October 9, Nez Perce Tribe tour October 30, and an upcoming fall intergovernmental meeting December 4-5.

He ended with discussing the outlook for 2025 which included:

- A complete and executed Holistic Agreement
- Vitrification of low activity waste at WTP, with all supporting facilities and infrastructure in operation
- Shipment of treated tank waste to the disposal sites in Texas and Utah under TBI
- Complete A-101 retrieval and the start of a second A Farm tank retrieval
- Evaporator campaigns that support single shell-tank retrievals
- A new contractor taking on its role under the Tank Waste Operations contract
- Initial capsule transfers from WESF storage pools into dry storage
- Shovels in the ground at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) Supercell 11
- The eleventh year of treating 2 billion gallons of groundwater will be completed
- Energization of the new North Loop
- A completed water plant, possibly operating by end of the year

- Shovels in the ground for new 200 East fire station construction
- Continued progress on 324 Building
- Ramping up transuranic (TRU) waste mission to be able to meet shipping requirements in 2028
- Progressing High-Level Waste Facility design and construction

He emphasized that none of these current or future projects would be possible without the support of the Department's contractors, regulatory partners, the community, and Congress. He also expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to share this update with the HAB.

Washington State Department of Ecology

Edward Holbrook, Ecology, announced that he was now the Deputy Program Manager with the Nuclear Waste Program.

He mentioned that they were fully staffed in the public involvement (PI) department and getting reengaged with events around the Tri-Cities and throughout the state. In his presentation (*Attachment 3*) he mentioned multiple upcoming events including Let's Talk about Hanford, November 13 and Jefferson Elementary Science Night, November 14.

He moved on to the next slide, which focused on the Tri-Party negotiations. He provided details about the release of the Holistic Agreement, the associated public comment period, and the public meetings held in Richland, Olympia, and Hood River. He also mentioned consultations with the Yakama Nation and the Nez Perce Tribe. He noted that they are currently working on responses to the public comments, as well as addressing the consultations and letters received from the tribes.

Other negotiations that he mentioned that were ongoing were the M-15, M-16, and M-85 milestones. He said Ecology had been working with DOE and EPA on these milestones since the beginning of 2024 and they were almost complete.

Next, he provided an update on Tank T-101, which was declared an "assumed leaker" on August 15, 2024. He noted that Ecology is continuing to work with DOE on response actions and that they hope to have a resolution soon regarding how to address the situation.

He mentioned that Ecology had conducted inspections across the Hanford Site to ensure compliance and listed several reports that had been issued, including one on the 242-A Evaporator in September and another on B Plant in October. He noted that many additional inspections were carried out during the same period, but the reports for those inspections have not yet been issued. These included inspections at Energy Northwest, Columbia Generating Station, and PUREX.

He discussed upcoming opportunities for public involvement, including public comment periods for four items. These included the Class 2 Permit Modification for the LAWPS for the Tank Side Cesium Removal Mechanical Connection issues which would be open for comment from October 7-December 12, 2024, the Class 2 Permit Modification for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant to add an existing room in Low-Activity Waste Vitrification Facility from January 13-March 14, 2025, and the draft renewal of the Perma-Fix Northwest Dangerous Waste Permit would be open for comment from January 27 to March 14, 2025. In addition, the Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Survey would be released in January 2025. He expressed that they are looking forward to engaging with the public on these issues.

Edward said they continue to make progress on the Hanford Site-wide Permit renewal, noting that 33 unit groups have been completed so far. He mentioned that Ecology is working with DOE to finalize the remaining units and is looking forward to moving them into permit production soon, followed by a public comment period. He confirmed that the 120-day public comment period is scheduled for early 2025.

US Environmental Protection Agency

David Einan, EPA, congratulated Brian Vance and the work his team has been doing at the Hanford Site. He began his presentation (*Attachment 4*) by discussing the background of EPA including their primary mission which was to protect human health and the environment as well as mentioning numerous policies and programs they use to support that mission. He said that EPA's main headquarters was in Washington D.C. EPA is a nationwide agency with 10 regions, the Pacific Northwest is Region 10. He explained that Region 10 was headquartered in Seattle, WA and proceeded to go over different levels for the region and the Hanford Project Office representatives.

David commented that EPA was the regulatory authority for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) cleanup, which is also known as the Superfund. He explained that Superfund was established under the assumption that the "polluter pays," though there were restrictions around such use when applied to federal sites.

He said there are three types of Superfund sites: private, fund-lead, and federal facility. He provided detail on each, clarifying that Hanford was labeled as a federal facility.

He mentioned numerous detailed priorities that EPA had, which included ensuring protection and completion of cleanup along the River Corridor, implementing current Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) schedules and milestones for cleanup, 100-K and 100-N Area. He also talked about some of the demolition work that was done in the 100-K Area and showed pictures of the 117-KW filter removal and demolition.

In the 300 Area, he said they are working with DOE on the feasibility study and the Record of Decision (ROD) amendment for the 324 Building, with tribal consultations and public comment expected by spring or summer of 2025. He explained that the amendment will provide an opportunity to revisit the remediation of 300-296 to ensure they have the best cleanup approach that protects workers, the public, and the environment.

He also mentioned that remediation design for 618-11, located near Energy Northwest, is expected to be completed within the next five years. Lastly, he highlighted priorities in the Central Plateau area, including ERDF and the completion of the Supercell 11 design. He emphasized the importance of public involvement through the HAB, public outreach, and stakeholder engagement.

Board Questions

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), thanked the agencies for their updates and inquired whether the HAB would be engaged early in the upcoming CERCLA 5-year review process. David responded that the next review is not due until 2027, so they likely would not dive into details until late 2025. He noted that he does not expect many surprises in this next review but offered to share information as the process progresses.

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland, wanted to comment that Ecology should not be proud of a 20,000-page document and that it was totally unmanageable. Edward Holbrook said he appreciated Richard's comment and looked forward to any public comments when the Rev 9A permit goes out for public comment in 2025.

Ed Parsons, Public at Large, thanked Brian Vance for the site tour the previous month and asked about the upcoming vitrification renewal. He wanted to know what was being done to address the precipitation of additives that fall out after the vitrification attempt. Brian said that he was unsure but that this would be a good question to provide through the HAB process to get the correct person to come in and provide an answer.

Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interests, enquired about what David had said about 3,500 gallons per minute flowing through the system and asked Brian Vance if there was an increased performance goal for CPCCo that will go beyond 2 billion gallons per year due to the increased flow through the 200-West pump and treat system. Brian answered that DOE and CPCCo are trying to shift from gallons treated to waste removed from the aquifer as a metric. He said it is not always about pumping clean water through but making sure the wells are in the right place to pull the contaminants out of the ground. The additional capability gives them the ability to enhance the process, which equates to about 500 million more gallons per year. He said they will look to optimize that but whether they go much higher in gallons treated is not really the focus but more about making sure the mass removal is there to provide a little more capacity and flexibility in the Central Plateau.

Pam Larsen, Benton County, shared her enthusiasm towards the progress that had been made, especially with WESF, and thanked Brian for the recent tour opportunity. She recalled a litigation that involved a federal judge years ago and wanted to know if they will have to go back to the federal judge for approval of the holistic agreement. Brian replied yes, one of the elements of the agreement is a revised Consent Decree document, which they will take back to the court when Ecology and DOE agree on the final language in that agreement.

Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge, asked about the date mentioned in the holistic agreement that involved making a decision about 22 tanks at the end of the year. She wanted to know if there had been any analysis done yet or if they were waiting to do response to comments and finalize the agreement before starting those. She requested a timeline for when the finalized agreement and response to comments would be released. Brian answered that the process has already started but said the date will depend on the public comments and then the TPA agencies will decide a date at that time.

Miya asked, when the response to comments is issued, if the final settlement agreement will come out at the same time or later and Brian replied “later.”

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, said that his main concern was how long decisions were taking. He wanted to know what DOE is doing to try and speed up the process. Brian replied that he did not dispute that it has been a little bit of a slow start for the cleanup. He expected that they should see some acceleration with the new partnership approach within DOE and with their regulatory partners as well. He said success breeds success and they just have to stick with it and they will start to see improvements accelerating the mission.

Richard wanted to follow up on Rob’s comment and agreed that nothing happens quickly at Hanford, but he appreciated Brian’s comment that they have to keep working at doing things better, faster. He said he looks forward to supporting some of the actions through CERCLA because CERCLA is designed to consolidate issues into one spot to get things done faster under a CERCLA action memo.

Larry Brandt, Public at Large, also said he was frustrated with the speed of action as well as the length of the TPA timeline. He would like to know some of the specifics about what discussions were held, reasons for the delays, and what actions can or cannot be taken. Edward said that in addressing T-101 they are looking at the actions taken in response to B-109 and T-111 to see how those actions can support the T-101 response. He said they are working with DOE in finding a resolution and path forward to this and look forward to announcing soon.

Rob mentioned that the system plans feature six scenarios, though none of those consider retooling the Pretreatment Facility. With the 6 billion dollars that have been invested, he wanted to know if they could capture that investment and reuse it. He asked why it is not listed as one of their options. Brian answered that it would be a decision to be made later.

Jim Doherty, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, expressed that he felt the HAB needed to support the Tri-Party Agencies. He asked Brian how much he expected things to change at the state or federal level with the administrative changes happening. Brian said that his job is to ensure that, when giving transition briefings to new administration or DOE members, he advocates for the current course and demonstrates its success. Jim asked if Ecology had the same stance. Edward stated, similar to what Brian had mentioned, that their mission stays the same regardless of the changes to administration at the state or federal level.

Chris said that one way they can support the Tri-Party Agencies was by putting out advice every year on what the Board feels is the most important work DOE can do two years down the road and gets it into the budget cycle. He said it gets sent to a wide range of people, including Washington State senators and representatives, and he thinks helps to get the funding that the TPA agencies would like to see. He then mentioned an upcoming Issue Manager (IM) team kickoff meeting regarding potential HAB cleanup priorities advice, indicating what the HAB's most important work priorities for DOE were.

Round Robin Discussion

What is the one thing you would really like to know about Hanford cleanup?

Pam Larsen said she would like to have a presentation on the potential for TRU waste to be shipped off site in 2028. She hoped the assets in the pretreatment building were going to be used. Her main concern was with the remediation in 618-11 impacting the operations at Energy Northwest and she was interested to hear more about that.

Chris said he would like to know the timeframe for deciding how supplemental waste is going to be treated: would it be grouted on site or transported as liquid and grouted off site?

Spencer Harris, Kadlec, said he hoped to better understand the timeline of the mission. What does long term look like and how long will it go on.

Richard Bloom did not have anything particular he was interested in knowing but did mention to the new members that the HAB can make a difference and has affected change in the past.

Aaron Siefken, Central Washington Building Trades, wanted to know why they do not use HAMMER for the WTP as well.

Rob Davis prefaced his question by stating that, at some point, the cost of remediation may one day outweigh the "cost of the risk." He believed that the total projected cost of cleanup, projected to continue for over 100 years, was an unreasonable ask of the country. His question was: what happens when the money runs out?

Matthew Campbell, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), was curious about how the holistic agreement framework would be applied to the cleanup.

Kathy DeBois, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, did not have a question but wanted to thank the Board the chance for members to get out their concerns.

Susan Coleman said she was interested in the current and future plans or opportunities to turn over portions of the site to the local communities. Where are they today with that planning?

Miya Burke wanted to know how decisions that are being made today, especially with the administration change and changes that will come with that for Hanford cleanup, will impact future generations and what the site will look like when cleanup is done.

Jim Doherty echoed what Susan and Miya mentioned and said he would like to know where they were on the high-level waste and finding a final resting spot for it. He wanted to know if they were considering retrofitting the pretreatment plant or building a new one or something else.

Tom Sicilia said he would like to know the degree and extent of contamination in the subsurface.

Charles LoPresti, Washington League of Women Voters, said there is a lot of technical knowledge that is guarded about cleanup, and he wanted to know how that knowledge was curated and made available to the general public and other sites that do cleanup. How could this knowledge be used worldwide and who is in charge of keeping track of that?

Brian Ivey, Public at Large, wanted to know why Hanford is not grouting their own single-shell tanks, especially the assumed leakers, right on the spot.

Ed Parsons wanted to know what the final cleanup will look like and what it looks like when everything is cleaned up.

Larry Brandt wanted to know more about the transport of low-activity and toxic materials. He also wanted to hear from the Department of Transportation to see what their feelings are regarding these subjects. He said he is uncomfortable with grout and does not like that each subcontractor has their own formula for grout.

Chauné Fitzgerald, Women of Wisdom, said that she had a concern for the definition of what cleanup was and what kind of resources were available for the residents who have been affected by some of the cleanup and the processes.

Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Nez Perce Tribe, answered that they were wondering if there was a “plan B” if the projected waste disposal outlined in the TPA is not achieved or high-level waste vitrification cannot be done. She also wanted to know where the waste was supposed to go since DOE has no repository yet.

Larry Haler, Public at Large, said his main concern would be what the new administration’s priorities would be and if they will include cleanup at Hanford.

Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation, wanted to know how the cleanup will impact the availability of resources to Yakama Nation and if cleanup will allow Yakama Nation to return to their lands and utilize treaty resources.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest, thought it would be great for the HAB to know what other community members would like to know about Hanford cleanup. She felt this would give the HAB a better chance to be involved in outreach.

Laurene Contreras, Yakama Nation, said from her perspective she would like to know how they are going to transport what is already here and what they are going to do with the waste. She said they do need a repository somewhere.

Matt Hendrickson, ODOE, said that he was interested in the disposition of the tanks and wanted to know what will be done with them once they are empty: will they be grouted and left in place? Also, will the Central Plateau ever have public use in the future?

Chris additionally added that every three year the [*Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report*](#) is issued by DOE. He said the next one should come out sometime in early 2025 and that it was a good resource for people to look at the entire scope of work that needs to be done and the timeframe and cost to accomplish the work.

Jim also mentioned that he would like to know more about the possibility small modular reactors on site and the progress toward those. He also asked about the possibility of expediting the application process for a new member to the Board which would be his alternate.

Chuck said he would like to see a report on the effects of ongoing climate change on the Hanford cleanup results.

Brian wanted to know, if they cannot grout high-level waste, why?

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Fall Chairs Meeting and National Cleanup Workshop Debrief

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Fall Chairs Meeting

Miya Burke provided an update on the fall Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) meeting. She explained that the EM SSAB is a network of citizen advisory boards under DOE, with Hanford being one of them. She noted that these meetings, held twice a year, offer an opportunity to learn about cleanup efforts and unique challenges at other sites, including a site tour and a meeting of board chairs. Miya also mentioned that the next meeting was anticipated for April 21 in Richland, featuring a public tour of Hanford.

She confirmed that there were no recommendations brought up at this meeting to bring back to the board, so she was just giving an informational briefing. The visit included a tour of the Oak Ridge site, where she learned:

- At the Y-12 National Security Complex, where thermonuclear devices are made, the original mission during World War II and the Cold War was to enrich uranium using calutrons. Later, they processed lithium for use in hydrogen bombs. She noted that this section must coordinate with the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and its ongoing mission, which could potentially delay some cleanup projects if conflicts arise.
- The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), the largest national lab in the complex in terms of budget and number of employees, originally focused on producing plutonium. She mentioned that ORNL has a graphite reactor museum, similar to Hanford's B Reactor Museum. This section also includes the National Lab Campus, located near the original plutonium production facilities. She explained that while ORNL is smaller than Y-12, it has the highest levels of radiation and many highly contaminated buildings.
- The East Tennessee Technology Park, once home to the gaseous diffusion plant, has since been demolished, and the land has been transferred to private companies. She explained that the main environmental challenge at Oak Ridge is mercury contamination, with 22 million pounds of mercury having polluted the creek that runs through the site and its floodplain. She also mentioned a building that contained a quarter of a million pounds of mercury. In contrast to Hanford's wide open space, she noted that the site had many buildings, facilities, and utilities bunched together and real estate was limited.

She mentioned that DOE is currently clearing land and demolishing buildings from Y-12's previous mission to make way for new structures that will support current defense and security missions, as well as replace outdated facilities that can no longer be upgraded. In the ORNL section, similar work is being done to clear buildings and contaminated sites.

The site has one disposal facility for low-level waste, primarily for construction debris, and a classified landfill for materials that the US government does not want others to see. She noted that the landfill is open for just 30 minutes every Thursday.

She also mentioned that Oak Ridge's mixed low-level waste cannot be disposed of on-site and is sent to Nevada, while their high inventory of TRU waste is currently being processed at ORNL. Additionally, she highlighted that Oak Ridge's groundwater is just ten feet deep in some areas, with some locations having groundwater as shallow as one foot. Due to the large amount of rainfall the site receives annually, managing the groundwater is one of their biggest challenges for cleanup.

Updates from the chairs meeting were:

- Kelly Snyder, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), shared that the advisory board guidance document, DOE Manual 515.1-1, will be getting updated and become an order. This order would be out within the next six to twelve months. She said that some of the changes will affect the EM SSAB Desk Reference as well as the HAB Operating Ground Rules. Due to this, HAB leadership has been asked to hold off on discussions regarding the recently received edits DOE has given them on the Operating Ground Rules document.
- DOE Headquarters received the website recommendation that was written during the spring EM SSAB chairs meeting, which was awaiting a response.
- The US Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued [a report in August regarding DOE's engagement with stakeholders, tribal nations, and state government](#) and offered three recommendations for improvement. One of those recommendations called for evaluation of the operation and effectiveness of EM's SSABs. It was confirmed that the statement of work for that evaluation was under development, so it was not yet known who would be conducting the evaluation. Miya encouraged everyone to read the GAO report on stakeholder engagement.
- Rob Rimando provided an update on EM's technology program, highlighting several innovations tested at Hanford. These included the tank sidewall crawler, as well as exoskeletons and exosuits designed to provide added support and strength to workers performing tasks requiring overhead work. He also shared an update on the use of artificial intelligence (AI), specifically its application in analyzing groundwater monitoring data.
- Sarah Schaffer gave a briefing on how Uranium-233 inventory at Oak Ridge was being repurposed as medical isotopes for cancer treatment research.
- Justin Marble gave an update on Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and TRU waste. He mentioned they have been in operation for 25 years and that WIPP is currently about 44% full but that will never completely fill up and will never meet the Land Withdrawal Act limit. He said that WIPP gets added onto as needed and every time new panels are needed, they update the regulatory documents as well.
- Julia Schenk gave an update on transportation and talked about different compliance, safety, and evaluation programs conducted for transportation carriers, packaging certification programs, transportation planning and management tools, and training programs. She said that trucking is the main mode for transporting waste, but some is sent by rail and air with additional restrictions; Department of Transportation approves the final route.

National Cleanup Workshop Debrief/National Liaison Report

Pam Larsen began by asking HAB Facilitation whether the GAO analysis of the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) had been shared with the HAB and requested that it be included again in this week's *HAB Happenings* newsletter.

The September 17-18 workshop was hybrid, allowing Pam to attend remotely, for which she thanked DOE. During the workshop, Secretary Jennifer Granholm discussed several key accomplishments, including progress at Hanford to address tank waste and the launch of the Cleanup to Clean Energy Program. She emphasized the importance of partnerships for the success of the cleanup mission and DOE's obligation to engage communities, tribes, and industry stakeholders to ensure their voices are heard. Granholm highlighted numerous successes resulting from these partnerships, such as STEM-based

apprenticeship opportunities and efforts to protect natural resources in collaboration with tribal nations. She also mentioned plans to transform cleaned-up land at EM sites into some of the world's largest clean energy projects, with locations in Washington State, Nevada, and New Mexico

Chuck Fleischman, chair of the Energy and Water Appropriations Budgets Committee and the House of Representatives, spoke and expressed confidence that the upcoming budget would pass, including funding for cleanup sites to support ongoing work. He emphasized his commitment to ensuring that the continuing resolution is passed to maintain progress on the cleanup efforts.

Pam said that the next speaker was Candice Robertson, who oversaw the environmental clean-up program and the one that Brian Vance, Hanford's site manager, reports to. She provided a link so that everyone could watch Candice's presentation: [EM Progress and Priorities](#).

Next, she said that Matt Irwin and Brian Hartman, Bechtel's Project Director for WTP, discussed the detailed work at the WTP, highlighting the partnerships at the site that are key to achieving success in the mission. They also outlined the future steps for the vitrification of tank waste.

She mentioned that the Los Alamos Field Office managers highlighted new technology designed to improve the accuracy of waste classification processes. The Universal Drum Assay and Segregation System, developed in the United Kingdom, is currently being tested at Los Alamos with potential for application at other sites across the complex.

A session on AI was highlighted, featuring a panel from the Savannah River National Laboratory. The panel discussed how machine learning, data analytics, and AI could revolutionize the environmental cleanup mission. The Savannah River Director emphasized that their industry is "extremely data-rich" and that they are working to find practical ways to apply machine learning, data analytics, and AI to make the data more useful. He stated that their primary goal is to improve worker safety, followed by enhancing productivity. They noted that the operations within EM present a vast, untapped potential for AI applications. In conclusion, the panel emphasized the need to reach a point where they can effectively process data and generate new insights, allowing them to make more informed decisions.

Pam said that community leaders, regulators, and other attendees at the conference were interested in DOE topics beyond the environmental cleanup program. They received a briefing on DOE's efforts to build interim storage facilities for spent nuclear fuel through consent-based siting, as well as a deep geological repository to replace the Yucca Mountain site. She emphasized that it is a high priority for DOE to establish these facilities in communities that choose to host them. Susan Coleman added that there was a discussion on Hanford where Brian Vance moderated the panel and representatives from his staff as well as each contractor was there. She said it was interesting to hear where Brian sees the site going in the future.

Committee Reports

Cleanup and Risk Mitigation Committee (CaRM)

Tom Sicilia, CaRM chair, mentioned that they met last month and had an informal briefing on the 324 Building. He also noted that they discussed the concept of "risk" to the committee, aiming to gather ideas on what the agencies might want them to bring forward as advice.

He let everyone know that Jim Doherty was the new vice chair of the committee and the next CaRM meeting was going to be in January, likely including a groundwater discussion.

Land Use, Infrastructure, Waste Disposition, and Safety Committee (LIDS)

Richard Bloom, vice chair of LIDS, mentioned that they are still awaiting a response to their traffic safety advice. He also spoke about the upcoming beryllium update and noted that they are working to arrange a briefing on the annual environmental report to explain how DOE contractors monitor the site.

Rebecca Holland, LIDS chair, raised a concern about the construction on Old River Road. While she acknowledged the improvements made to the road, she pointed out that with the new two-lane configuration, there is no passing, and there are no safe areas to pull over for passing. She emphasized that this makes the road unsafe and suggested that speed limit signs be added. She requested that this issue be discussed at their next committee meeting.

Tank Waste Stewardship and Treatment Committee (TWST)

Rob Davis, TWST chair, said they had a really good meeting this last month regarding cold spray. He mentioned the 2025 workplan being finalized and questions that they hope to be answered in the upcoming meetings. In January he said they will get a report on the progress of the tank waste operations, TSCR performance, TBI, and leaking Tank A-101.

He reminded the Board that there was an IM team meeting the following day to discuss System Plan 10.

Other Discussions

Rebecca Holland asked Pam if there were any future meetings that she felt the HAB may be interested in listening in on and Pam mentioned that there is going to be a series of workshops dealing with siting for repositories. She said that the information had been sent out within the last two weeks giving information if anyone wanted to sign up.

She said that DOE Headquarters knows they need to do something about this and that it will take a long time. She said there is a model in Finland that took them years to put together but that it has been successful. Tom Sicilia also mentioned that Canada was doing a consent-based siting for their repository.

Rob made a comment that just because a community decided to site a repository there, he wanted to know about the state's power and potential to overrule. Pam said that the state would be involved in any technical analysis for the appropriate geology and circumstances.

Tom Sicilia commented that things they could do, not as the HAB but as members, was to take advantage of the upcoming comment period on the legacy waste definition for TRU. He said this comment period will be open until January 3 if anyone wanted to read up on that information.

New Member Check-In

Nearing the conclusion of the first full HAB meeting of the fiscal year, newly appointed HAB members were invited to voice remaining questions about the HAB process or thoughts about the orientation, onboarding, or similar concerns.

Brian Ivey asked if anyone had discussed patching and reusing the AY-102 tank to create more storage space. Ryan Miller from Ecology responded that there was no one in the room able to answer that specific question today but assured that the agencies would note it and provide a response at the next TWST meeting.

Brian mentioned that he struggled with knowing when to share his thoughts and when to simply listen. He also expressed a desire to get to know everyone a little better.

Kathy DeBois made a similar comment that she also was just trying to figure out where she fit in and that she needed to know more about what was going on with the HAB.

Matthew Campbell commented that the tour was helpful and orientation was good.

Aaron Seifken thought the site tour was great and that orientation was done well, and it was nice to run through everything to see how the Board process works. As a new member he said listening, picking up on how things work, and moving forward as you get comfortable was the best way for him to learn his role on the Board and be able to represent the people.

Spencer Harris, said it has been very enlightening for him since he has not had any involvement with Hanford in the past. He enjoyed the orientation and thought the breakout sessions were helpful. He said he is still trying to learn the acronyms and thought a book on those would be helpful. His big questions to the Board were what they need from him, how can he help, and what can he bring to this group. He is happy to help but thought he needed more direction on how.

Kevin Danby, Grant & Franklin Counties, said he agreed with Spencer and added that he felt like “he jumped on a speeding locomotive” and was desperately trying to catch up. He said he was also trying to absorb everything at this point.

Alan Key, Grant & Franklin Counties, said he was also just soaking everything in and that he was excited to learn.

Matt Hendrickson, ODOE, offered advice to the new members, sharing that what helped him most in the beginning was staying engaged and asking questions. He emphasized that with the diverse range of people on the Board and their involvement with the IM teams, new members’ questions are likely to be answered. Matt also mentioned that the System Plan had been particularly helpful to him and noted that there would be an IM Team meeting tomorrow to discuss it, inviting new members to join if they were interested.

Chauné Fitzgerald said that this was her first meeting so she felt that she needed to catch up. She hoped to learn more about the committees to get more involved and give more input on some of the issues. She said she is interested in sharing different views from her coworkers that will support the EPA initiatives with environmental justice and some of the focus on the community. She said that Susan was very helpful in explaining some of the requirements and commitments of being on the Board and that she was going to make sure to make herself available.

Shir Regev, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, said that she appreciated the orientation and everyone going out of their way to make the new members comfortable. She mentioned that she learned a lot from listening to representatives from other stakeholders because it is a different view than what she is used working on site. She thought finding younger people to be on the Board would be helpful, which could require adjusting meeting times.

Brian had a few suggestions. He asked that presenters explain acronyms when being used. For new members, he encouraged them to ask any questions they might have, there is no such thing as a stupid question. He felt that for breakout sessions people should introduce themselves in greater detail, so participants get to know where everybody was coming from.

Ed Parsons said overall he thought it was a good process. He said he is still trying to find his feet in this organization and what he can add and how he can utilize his time appropriately to meet goals and mission within the group.

Rob Davis spoke up to say that there are no bad questions and to ask freely. He also recommended for the new members to get on the HAB website and go over past presentations to gain knowledge and basis for questions.

Lindsay Somers said that a link to Hanford's acronyms database was added to the online chat and recommended for anyone that does not have it, to save it. Josh Patnaude also reminded everyone that there is an acronyms list and glossary included in the HAB member resource binder.

Susan Coleman invited established HAB members to offer advice to those new members.

Pam reminded everyone that HAB Facilitation distributes weekly newsletter that gives updated information about what is happening at Hanford and HAB including informative links, and dates for upcoming meetings.

Chris Sutton mentioned that Tom Sicilia, chair of the CaRM committee, puts out a RAP sheet with the latest documents that the TPA agencies published relative to the Hanford site and that it is also located on the [HAB webpage](#).

Rebecca Holland thought that the tour was good and liked having the breakout sessions to talk about the subcommittees. She agreed with Brian that everyone should be giving more detail about themselves with introductions.

Jim Doherty suggested that new members try to conform the HAB to their needs, rather than the other way around.

Richard Bloom said that everyone brings different aspects, concerns, and technical information to the HAB and that the main key is for the Board to help DOE to be successful.

Lindsay thanked everyone for their input and reminded them that this was a citizen advisory board, not a technical board, and all input is valued. DOE appreciates all the time and energy that members volunteer to the mission.

Board Business

Miya Burke shared that they had compiled a list of current members who are willing to serve as mentors to new members and encouraged new members to reach out with any questions. The list included Miya, Susan Coleman, Tom Sicilia, Chris Sutton, and Dan Solitz (a former HAB member). Other HAB members were invited to volunteer. Ryan Miller from Ecology clarified that he was not on the list because he is not a HAB member, but he made it clear that he is available to offer insight if needed.

HAB Action Item Status

Susan explained that there was a recent proposal to change the dates for the August/September meetings on the FY2025 calendar. The proposal would shift the August committee meetings to September and the September HAB meeting to August. Lindsay Somers confirmed that DOE agreed this change was feasible. The HAB meeting could be scheduled for August 13-14 and the committee meetings could move to September 9-10. The calendar change was adopted by consensus.

Susan also mentioned that the FY2025 work plan had been approved, with the understanding that tribal holidays would be added later. Additionally, the three terms regarding work plan items—*action*, *advice*, and *informational*—would be defined at a later date. Tom requested a commitment from the TPA agencies on when these definitions would be finalized. Ryan responded that while it was a high-priority action item, he was not sure if they could have that complete by the next HAB meeting. Lindsay explained that the agencies had been too busy to meet and discuss the definitions. However, she mentioned that the Hanford Tribal Office had provided additional holidays, which HAB Facilitation would be adding to the calendar along with the change to the HAB's meeting dates.

Susan asked about the status of the land acknowledgment statement request. Lindsay said that this was shared at the September Board meeting and that it was being worked with the tribes through the Hanford

Tribal Office and they would provide an update when they have reached an agreement. She said there is nothing the HAB needs to track on the land acknowledgment at this time, but she would get an update from Karen Lutz.

Susan said that, just for awareness, there was a discussion at a previous HAB meeting regarding the extension of her chair position and the agencies did agree to extend the term to the end of September so that now all leadership terms are the same.

Calendar Review/ Upcoming Meetings

Chris Sutton said that there would be an IM Team meeting the following day to discuss the upcoming advice on cleanup priorities for FY2027. He welcomed new and established HAB members to attend.

Rob Davis explained that at the IM Team meeting on System Plan 10 they would review different scenarios and discuss the next steps for the team. He noted that the Holistic Agreement outlines a path not currently addressed in the System Plan, which would need to be incorporated. Rob described the System Plan as both a planning document and a tool for evaluating the budget and long-term costs associated with Hanford cleanup. He added that there are six main options within the plan that project timelines and costs through to the end of Hanford's operational life, which is projected for 2136 or 2138.

Pam confirmed with HAB facilitation that links would be provided for those who wanted to attend the IM Team meetings on November 7.

Facilitation mentioned that the next committee meetings were January 15-16 and February 12-13 for the next full Board meeting.

Lindsay announced that HAB membership applications are due by December 6 and shared that this would be her last meeting as the Designated Federal Officer (DFO). She stated that Kelly Snyder would be stepping in as the Acting DDFO until a new one is appointed. Lindsay also mentioned that MaryAnne Wuennecke from HMIS and Laura Caulfield from Katmai would continue to support HAB operations, ensuring that any questions are directed to the appropriate person for response.

Due to DOE being without a DDFO, Lindsay said that Hanford will not be able to host the spring EM SSAB meeting. The meeting will now be held at the Nevada site with the date remaining the same, April 22-24, and Hanford will then host the fall meeting October 28-30.

Lindsay thanked everyone for the opportunity to work with each of them and said she looked forward to seeing the great work the HAB will accomplish in FY 2025 and beyond.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Meeting Recording

<https://youtu.be/DirPEyVYqIw?si=Xg145lkzH-GBIQDw>

Attachments

Attachment 1: [Meeting Agenda](#)

Attachment 2: [DOE Update Presentation](#)

Attachment 3: [Ecology Update Presentation](#)

Attachment 4: [EPA Update Presentation](#)

Meeting Attendees

Board Members (P) and Alternates (A):

Simone Anter (A), Columbia Riverkeeper	Jim Doherty (P), Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board*	Michael Lee (P), Columbia Basin College*
Kristie Baptiste-Eke (P), Nez Perce Tribe	Rose Ferri (A), Yakama Nation	Charles LoPresti (P), Washington League of Women Voters*
Jessica Black, Columbia Riverkeeper, Primary	Chauné Fitzgerald (P), Women of Wisdom*	Kermit Mankiller (A), Nez Perce Tribe
Richard Bloom (P), City of West Richland*	Larry Haler, Public at Large	Ed Parsons, Public at Large*
Larry Brandt, Public at Large*	Spencer Harris (A), Kadlec*	David Reeploeg (A), Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC)
Miya Burke (P), Hanford Challenge*	Matt Hendrickson (A), Oregon Department of Energy*	Shir Regev (A), Non-Union, Non-Management Employees
Matthew Campbell (A), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation*	Michelle Holt (P), Benton-Franklin Council of Governments	Tom Sicilia (P), Oregon Department of Energy*
Susan Coleman, Public at Large*	Rebecca Holland (P), Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council*	Aaron Siefken (P), Central Washington Building Trades*
Laurene Contreras (P), Yakama Nation	Brian Ivey, Public at Large*	Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interest*
Kevin Danby (P), Grant and Franklin Counties*	Alan Key (A), Grant and Franklin Counties*	Chuck Torelli (P), City of Kennewick*
Rob Davis (P) City of Pasco*	Pam Larsen (P), Benton County*	Amber Waldref (P), Heart of America Northwest

Others:

Ricky Bang, DOE*	Annagrisel Alvarez, Ecology*	Laura Caulfield, Katmai*
Heather Dale, DOE*	Ambika Chakravartty, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo*
Greg Jones, DOE*	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Stephanie Brasher, HMIS
Deanna McCraine-Alves, DOE*	Edward Holbrook, Ecology*	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
Eric Ruesch, DOE HQ	Theresa Howell, Ecology*	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Mark Silberstein, DOE*	Jeffery Lyon, Ecology*	Michael Turner, HMIS
Lindsay Somers, DOE*	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	MaryAnne Wuennecke, HMIS*
Brian Stickney, DOE*	Stephanie Schleif, Ecology *	Destry Henderson, WRPS
Gary Younger, DOE	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Jennifer Roberts, WRPS
Pam Zimmerman, DOE*	Daina McFadden, Ecology	Virona Mehta, Bluepath Labs
	Sarah Williams, Ecology	Katie Roberts, Longenecker & Assoc.*
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald

	David Einan, EPA*	Kelsey Shank, theEDGE
	Cascade Galasso, EPA*	Wayne Barber, Weapons Complex Monitor
	Tom Rogers, Washington Department of Health (DOH)*	Matt Labarge, Public
	Jane LePage, DOH	Matt Lynch, Public
		Gabe Bohnee, Public
		Richard Evans, Public
		Anthony Smith, Public
		Dan Solitz, Public
		Li Wang, Public
		Chandra Flores, HAB Facilitation*
		Josh Patnaude, 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.