



MEETING MINUTES

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)

Full Board Meeting

February 12-13, 2025

Hybrid Meeting – In-person and via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates	2
Public Comment	9
Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2027 Cleanup Priorities	10
Subcommittee Reports.....	11
Round Robin.....	12
PHOENIX 101	15
Board Business	17
Meeting Recording	18
Attachments	18
Meeting Attendees.....	18
Appendix A: Cleanup Priorities Advice, As Adopted.....	21
Appendix B: National Liaison’s Report	22

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

Kelly Snyder, US Department of Energy (DOE) and Designated Federal Officer (DFO), introduced Jennifer Colborn, the new Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB, Board) and then Jennifer opened the meeting in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). She also reminded everyone to assume noble intent and adhere to the operating ground rules.

Josh Patnaude, HAB Facilitation, provided an administrative review, notified participants that the meeting was being recorded, and went over meeting ground rules. He also reminded members that a mentor list was available to assist in any questions anyone may have regarding the ground rules or anything else of concern.

Susan Coleman, Public at Large and Chair of the HAB, welcomed participants, provided opening remarks, and invited introductions of those appearing in person and virtually.

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

US Department of Energy (DOE)

Brian Vance, DOE, began his presentation (*Attachment 2*) with an overview of the site's mission and key activities, including waste site remediation. He also outlined the DOE Leadership Team's focus areas, such as strengthening an operations-based culture and enhancing teamwork between DOE and the contractors.

Within Hanford's team of site contractors, he announced that Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) would soon be replaced by Hanford Tank Waste Operations & Closure (H2C), led by Carol Johnson. This transition will take effect on February 23, 2025.

Addressing the budget, Brian confirmed that no changes had been made and that operations would continue under a continuing resolution (CR), at least until March 14. With uncertainty beyond that date, he emphasized their commitment to advancing key mission areas as planned.

He also highlighted the current DOE badge count, which stood at 13,000 as of January—10,000 of whom are prime contractors and 2,000 to 3,000 subcontractors. As the largest single employment enterprise in the Tri-Cities, he underscored the workforce's significant contribution to the region's economic foundation.

He proceeded to describe the site as having three distinct product lines: tank waste, risk reduction, and base operations/infrastructure.

Tank Waste Mission

Within the tank waste mission Brian highlighted that they met their Direct-Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW) cold commissioning milestone and completed the cold commissioning management assessment, each by the end of 2024. He said their main focus has been on a couple of areas, one being to improve the proficiency of their operations team (specifically in one-melter and two-melter operations) at the Waste Treatment Plant's (WTP) Low-Activity Waste (LAW) Facility. They want to make sure everything is working smoothly and that the team knows how to operate the equipment properly. He said, even though they did not have radiological content in the LAW Facility at that time, they introduced radiological controls in January. It was more of a cultural and procedural transition to get the operators in the mindset to be able to function in that type of environment. With hot commissioning coming up he felt doing this early was the right step.

From a material perspective, one area he talked about was the ammonia system repairs. He said they brought ammonia into the system in December for pressure testing and discovered material issues with the gaskets and some of the valves. Since then, they rebuilt the entire system, including all gaskets and valves, except the last set which was received that same week. He said they are on track to add ammonia to the system by the end of February and then add nitrates to the plant as part of the cold commissioning program in March. This would create the nitrous gases associated with the off-gas system, which will be the first chemical hazard that they will be working through. After that, he said, they will continue through the rest of the cold commissioning program as they work towards hot commissioning.

Beyond DFLAW, he stated that the Effluent Treatment Facility (EFT) operations resumed in November. He said they were continuing to work through some issues and have done 40 upgrades over the last several years to get the system ready for the DFLAW team. Upgrades were on track for completion in time to support DFLAW operations before 2026.

He said the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) was working towards their readiness process to support operations.

For DFLAW, he said their team has done an excellent job of coordinating and integrating with multiple contractors over the years and that he was pleased to report that all parties are on track. He said it has been a highly productive effort and wanted to make sure everyone recognized how well the teamwork has come together.

He mentioned that the High-Level Waste (HLW) Facility design was progressing ahead of schedule and that they will continue the limited construction activities associated with low risk work, like shield doors, roof structures, and concrete slabs. He said they have been able to effectively take lessons learned from not only DFLAW, but other capital projects around the complex to pressure test their plan for the HLW Facility moving forward. Also, being able to take workers from the LAW side and move them over to the HLW side set them up for a very successful HLW project from now and moving forward in the program.

On the Tank Farm side, he said the evaporator had completed its readiness evaluation by DOE and they are on track for the first evaporator campaign since 2019, anticipated in late March or early April. He said this was important because it creates the opportunity for them to progress with tank retrievals. In the A Farm, A-101 is partially complete and after the second batch in A-102, which was just started, they will pause A-102 and all retrievals while evaporator work is completed.

The Test Bed Initiative (TBI) operations completed last October with just under 2,000 gallons extracted, treated, and placed in the transportation containers for shipment later that year. A sample analysis was completed in January and all requirements for the repositories in Texas and Utah were met, meaning they are on track to be able to ship once the weather permits. At that time, they will do some outreach with Texas, Utah, and the intervening states to communicate the “benign” nature of what was being transported: just under 2,000 gallons of radioactive liquid in robust containers being transported on Department of Transportation (DOT)-standard vehicles. Brian explained this was a process of education and outreach to build trust and confidence for 2028 and beyond related to the holistic negotiations, 22 tanks in 200 West, and the start of shipping to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

Risk Reduction

Brian went on to discuss the testing being done at the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF). He explained the coated concrete structure outside of WESF (pictured on slide 6) where they are going to move the large concrete casks filled with the cesium and strontium capsules. He said the operational acceptance testing on all the equipment installed in WESF is going very well. He believed operational

testing would be completed by early March. Then, they would transition into operational readiness activities.

The first cesium capsule would be shipped from the storage pool to dry storage by the end of the calendar year, though DOE hoped to accelerate that process to October or November. He said they still have to go through the full readiness process, emphasizing that the concrete storage pad would be part of that process. Thanks to the process and procedure training at the Maintenance and Storage Facility (MASF) mockup, Brian had high confidence that the system and team will be ready to meet that timeline.

He mentioned that they were about to start the excavation of Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) Supercell 11, which will give additional space for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) side of their cleanup, supporting demolition of the K Basin, 324 Building, and other facilities demolitions around the site. He informed everyone that the design was complete and similar to Supercell 10. He hoped to see groundbreaking sometime in the summer. He said the time to establish the cell is usually 30-36 months from start to finish.

Next, he said the focused feasibility study for the 324 Building was reviewed by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Central Plateau Cleanup Company (CPCCo) was now working through comment resolution. A public comment period was anticipated sometime later that year.

At this point he said the 324 Building has remained stable so they will continue to have downstream wells to insure nothing is moving. Their excavation plan includes building deactivation and demolition that will erect the structure and then excavate the soil. He felt this was a safe and sound plan for the workforce and community.

The groundwater program he said continues to do very well with added capacity at the 200 West groundwater station. This year the well will top out at half a billion gallons more capacity for the program which is already treating over 2 billion per year. He said their focus was on the mass removal over gallons targeted so that the contractors could focus on the actual risk reduction from the contaminated groundwater.

Base Operations and Infrastructure

Brian said the water treatment plant construction would be complete within the next month. For the next 8 to 9 months after that they will be preparing to transition the plant into operations. In the meantime, they will continue to use their 1943 water plant. He said that, even though this plant does not have the capacity for the future and is harder to maintain, it does a really good job and they continue to get awards for the purity of water produced.

He mentioned they are on track to energize the new powerline in March, which would enhance power redundancy and reliability to WTP and the Central Plateau. The new power feeder lines installed in the 100 K Area were also part of the upgrade to help enhance the reliability of the power systems on site to ensure they maintain electrical distribution.

He said there was a lot of utility work going on in the 200 W Area tied to electricity to support future 200 West tank farm needs. They also have electric distribution work going on in the 200 East tank farms to meet the power requirements for WTP for the HLW Facility when they get to the construction phase. In addition to the extensive electrical work, additional infrastructure work was ongoing related to water and sewer systems and IT infrastructure.

He discussed the road work on 2S and 11A and the configuration being changed from two lanes each direction to one lane each direction. With this change he said they were hoping to utilize the inner area of

the road where it was more stable so they could maintain the speed limit and provide road access to the site without having to do major upgrades in infrastructure. He said roads will eventually be in the plan for upgrades but not at this time due to the reality of the budget.

He said they are moving forward with the new fire station in the 200 E Area and plan to break ground this year. This decision was based on the need for a fire station in a more strategically located area, which could help reduce response times during emergencies. He also said they continue to work closely with the City of Richland on cooperative and mutual aid agreements to make sure they continue to meet response times as well as support for not only the southern part of the site, but also where they see potential risk being greater in the future.

He emphasized how the HAMMER Facility has been invaluable to their team and mission, ensuring the workforce is thoroughly trained to manage hazards. He noted that the budget has been increased in recent years to guarantee the necessary support for training and equipping employees to perform their work.

Lastly, he mentioned recent and upcoming public outreach events including:

- WTP LAW container Class 2 public meeting, Jan. 29
- Tri-City Regional Chamber of Commerce, Feb. 26
- Fiscal year 2027 Cleanup Priorities public meeting, March 5

Washington Department of Ecology (ECY)

Edward Holbrook, Department of Ecology (ECY) Deputy Program Manager for the Nuclear Waste Program, gave an outline of what was going to be discussed (*Attachment 3*):

- Outreach and Education
- Tri-Party Negotiations
- Compliance Activities
- Public Involvement
- Hanford Sitewide Permit Update

Ryan Miller, ECY, mentioned the previous limitations ECY faced with outreach and education, due to staffing, had since been resolved and Ecology was fully able to support those efforts once again. Multiple events, recent and upcoming, were listed including the Tri-Cities Sportsman's Show and Kids Engineering Day at Mark Twain Elementary. He said these events give them the opportunity to have good conversation with members of the public about the cleanup at Hanford. Since November 2024, ECY was able to reach a little over 450 people.

Edward discussed the holistic agreement and steps to come. He said that on December 19th the parties issued a responsiveness summary on the holistic agreement and news release to announce that to the public. Also issued were the agencies' separate response letters to each of the tribal nations that had commented on the agreement. The final TPA changes to the consent decree could be found in [Hanford's administrative record](#).

The next steps of the agreement will include reviews of the DOE Waste Incidental Reprocessing (WIR) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Supplement Analysis for the 22 tanks in the 200W Area. He said ECY will review and comment on these documents as appropriate.

He mentioned that ongoing TPA negotiations are currently taking place, including discussions on the M-15, M-16, and M-85 milestones. Once an agreement is reached, new milestones will be set. Since these are major milestones, they would be considered a significant action under the TPA agreement, and he

believed that would also justify having a public comment period. He said ECY looks forward to continuing negotiations with the other parties, coming to an agreement, and establishing a future public comment period.

Next, Edward gave an update on the Agreed Order associated with B-109, T-111, and T-101. This was signed with DOE in 2022 and an addendum to the Agreed Order was signed in 2024 for T-101. One of the action items included developing a leak response plan for future leaking tanks. He said DOE and ECY are currently close to finalizing their review and updated draft of that response plan.

He said ECY also signed milestones that will establish retrieval dates for B-109, T-111, and T-101. Those had not been established in the past and, as part of the agreed order and addendum, DOE was required to utilize their system planning and review the practicability of going after these tanks early for full retrieval. DOE and ECY reviewed the System Plan, including the practicability assessment required in this particular System Plan, and concurred with the analysis on retrieval of those tanks to be set for December 30, 2040.

He explained a few nuances with some of these milestones. DOE would be required to continue to evaluate through the system planning as new information becomes available, such as DFLAW or West Area Risk Management (WARM) startup. He said ECY will continue to work with DOE as new System Plans become available and provide scenarios to identify efficiencies in the retrieval process for those three tanks.

Another milestone that was agreed upon was that DOE would go after some of their other assumed leaking tanks on the Hanford Site. Edward pointed out that DOE's monthly report showed 57 of the single-shell tank (SST) systems as either assumed or active leakers. As part of the ongoing negotiations, ECY and DOE agreed to go after three assumed leaking tanks within S, SX, and U tank systems as part of the 22 tanks they must retrieve already as part of the holistic agreement.

He continued to talk about ECY's compliance activities and reports that had been issued between November 2024 and January 2025, with six inspections in total being done. He said that the Hanford Site was identified as a large quantity generator that has over 400 satellite and 70 central accumulation areas for dangerous waste along with 30 treatment storage and disposal facilities that are inspected on an annual basis. As part of the performance partnership agreement with EPA, ECY is required to inspect 20% of the central accumulation areas each year. He said these inspections included things such as: waste analysis plan, process information, security, and operating record.

Upcoming public involvement opportunities that were mentioned included:

- Jan. 13 - Feb. 12, 2025: Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Survey
- Jan. 13 - March 14, 2025: WTP's LAW Facility export bay Class 2 permit modification
- Jan. 27 - March 14, 2025: Draft Renewal for the Perma-Fix Northwest Dangerous Waste Permit
- Feb. 6 - March 24, 2025: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Perma-Fix Northwest

Edward discussed the Hanford Sitewide Permit, Rev. 9A Renewal status and said ECY continued to work on completing the remaining actions. This permit will include: 52 Operating, Closure, Post-Closure, and Corrective Action unit groups and be about 20,000 pages in total. At this time, he said they have completed 33-unit groups and are working hard to complete the remaining portions of the draft renewal. Once they get closer to this completion, they will provide an early notification of the dates for the 120-day public comment period.

US Environmental Protection Agency

Dave Einan, EPA, wanted to remind everyone that the focus should be on celebrating the significant amount of cleanup that has already been done and not focusing primarily on what still has to be completed. He mentioned that one of EPA's main priorities was the M-15, M-16, and M-85 negotiations and also noted that EPA had a new regional administrator, Emma Pokon, that is expected to start February 24.

Board Questions

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), had a couple of questions on the DFLAW ammonia system. He wanted to know what lessons were learned on design life or service life of the gaskets and what would happen if they had to be redone in the hot glass making phase. Brian responded that they learned a lot of lessons such as what type of material was acceptable for gaskets. He said they worked hard to de-risk activities across the site and was not sure why the ammonia system was not recognized as a potential risk. It went through several testing stages, from a nitrogen purge through the initial pressure test before finding the small leak on December 20. He said this was a miss for the team and its Bechtel partner. They are now looking beyond this to make sure there are no surprises as they move forward into the commissioning process.

Tom said there was a panel for tanks waste retrieval technologies that was supposed to start in March and asked if it was still on track. Brian answered that he assumed it was.

Simone Anter, Columbia Riverkeeper, asked if there are any steps being taken to proceed with Secretary Wright's new idea to divert strontium-90 capsules for reuse or any analysis of how this would impact the mission and pace of work at WESF. Brian responded that the current plan being executed was to remove the cesium capsules and then progress into strontium, eventually moving them from wet storage to dry. If there are opportunities with the capsules after they are out of dry storage, he would be more than happy to show people where to come and take those away. There have been several interested vendors and, if they can engage in that process without changing his schedule, then he is okay with that. For now, he said, they are going to execute the program of record, getting the capsules to dry storage, and have additional conversations after that.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, said the HAB was interested in TBI and the analysis that was just finalized. He asked if Brian could describe the waste classification for the liquid. Brian did not have the exact answer for the waste classification but said that the radiological content was almost nonexistent, "benign material". The pretreated waste is within the offsite facilities' waste acceptance criteria. Rob asked Edward from ECY, about the 22 tanks in 200 West and the WIR process. Brian said they would be happy to bring someone back to brief the Board about the topic on the committee level.

Pam Larsen, Benton County, in regard to the holistic agreement, said she believed information would be submitted to the federal court in the spring and wanted to know if there had been any interaction with the court as the agencies proceeded with working through the agreement. Brian said there has been no new submission to the court. The agencies submitted the intended changes to the consent decree to the court on January 7 and the court approved the changes on January 8.

She mentioned that questions had been asked over the years regarding vessels or other equipment in the Pretreatment Facility that could be reused in the HLW Facility or any other place in the complex. She wanted to know if there was any activity along those lines. Brian answered that they will not make any final decisions on the Pretreatment Facility for a few years. Until then, DOE will maintain Pretreatment Facility asset preservation, physical assets as well as engineering and design material, and that final

decision of what to do with the assets will occur later in the decade once they're clear on the future stages of the HLW mission.

Pam commented that the Benton County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) liaison position had been vacant for several years. She stated that the lack of coordination between local EOC, federal EOC, and Energy Northwest was a noted concern by multiple entities. She anticipated that the county would try to reestablish that link in the future.

Larry Brandt, Public at Large, asked about a milestone mentioned by ECY that had been signed and wondered if there was a designation as well as if it had been posted for internet access. Edward said that he would have to get the designation for him, but it was posted on the Administrative Record on the Hanford.gov website and in Appendix D of the Tri-Party Agreement.

Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interests, asked DOE and EPA if they foresee any local impacts from the federal changes going on. Dave Einan, EPA, replied that he had no idea and Brian answered that with everything there is change but they will continue to work with everyone to execute the mission the best they can.

Jim Doherty, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (OHCB), recalled an instance where the previous EPA regional administrator, Casey Sixkiller, addressed the HAB and discussed his priorities with EPA. He found that discussion invaluable and suggested that a similar discussion with Administrator Pokon would be similarly valuable.

Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge, asked if the Hanford tank vapor website under WRPS will transition to H2C. Brian answered that everything that WRPS does will transfer over to H2C after February 23. Miya also asked about the WIR for the 200 W tanks and if he knew when the comment period would start. Brian replied "soon."

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland, asked if there was any consideration for certain disciplines that excluded from a potential reduction of force associated with the transition in federal administration. Brian said there is a process that they go through related to those activities and reductions in which they would have an opportunity for such input.

Richard also asked if the strontium capsules would be separated from the cesium ones once put into dry storage and Brian answered that there may be some mixed later on during transition but that mostly they will be in their own capsules in their own casks.

Rob asked if they had done calorimetry on the WESF capsules to determine the heat. He also wanted to know about what they planned on doing if there was a decay heat issue or a need to retrieve the capsules some point after WESF demolition. What facility would they use at that point? Brian said that all of these factors were considered as part of the planning for their intended approach. He assumed at some point there was a probabilistic assessment done to validate there would be no potential risk, but he did not have those details with him. He said the trick was to evaluate all possible scenarios and probabilities to understand potential consequences, and then do the best possible in design to mitigate or eliminate all that you can foresee. He mentioned that if there were more details to share, DOE could look at having one of their experts come and discuss it at a subcommittee meeting.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest, commented that one of the key issues that Heart of America Northwest has been following is the leaking tanks and making sure that they are being reported as soon as possible, per the agreed orders and milestones in the site permit. She wanted to know what the timeline was for DOE to identify and retrieve the three assumed leaking tanks. Edward answered that the

timeline is identified in System Plan 10, located in the [Hanford Administrative Record](#). As part of those milestones, DOE was required to do an analysis in B and T Farm in particular. That analysis had identified that starting retrieval of those tank farms was beyond the major milestone date of December 31, 2040. He believed that B and T Farms were analyzed to be retrieved around 2050, which included all tanks inside these farms.

Due to the major milestone date associated with this, ECY and DOE agreed to identify the date as Dec.31, 2040 based on the System Plan and analysis that was done. He said they will continue to monitor that as DFLAW comes online, creating space in the DST system, and as WARM comes online. Until the space is available to retrieve waste out of B and T farms, early retrieval is not practicable. As part of the agreed order and addendum, intrusion mitigation and interim retrieval actions to try to remove liquid from these tanks would be explored.

Amber asked what the timeline might be with the alternative approaches. Edward said that one of the action items discussed was coming out of the Holistic Agreement. Under that action, an expert panel would consider possible retrieval technologies associated. He said ECY continues to have discussions with DOE to finalize the timelines of all the actions associated with those two documents.

Miya asked about the M-15, M-16, M-85 milestone negotiations and agreement-in-principle signed in December. She thought there had been ongoing negotiations for quite some time and wanted to know what the agreement-in-principle was and what it changed. Edward replied that he did not have the agreement with him, but thought it set some framework to finalize negotiations sometime this year. Dave answered that they have been looking at the more near-term milestones the last few years and realized that M-15 would never make its deadline of June 2026. He explained the agreement-in-principle to set a formal negotiation stage to set new dates for major milestones M-15, M-16, and M-85, and other milestones for the rest of the program.

Public Comment

Dan Serres, public, thanked everyone on the HAB for their time and effort digging into the complicated issues presented. He served on the HAB over a decade prior and learned a lot about Hanford from the same kinds of discussions the HAB was engaging in. He appreciated the candor of the Board member's questions and the context that allowed the members to ask for questions.

He commented that on DOE's presentation, he cautioned against describing the TBI waste as being "very benign." He felt that classification was in the eye of the beholder in "the sense of water," asking what might happen if one of those containers were to tip over and fall into the water. He said he understands they are very confident in the containers they are using, but what the public will be looking for, moving forward, would be the high-level assessment of the chemistry to understand the toxic and radioactive pollution proposed to move over large landscapes, watersheds, and drinking water sources like Spokane's aquifer. He stated that would be one of the main points of concerns for communities: not just the immediate vicinity of a spill, but the possible downstream effects. As an example, what might happen is there was a release into the lower Deschutes River? Where would that waste move over time?

He acknowledged those were difficult questions to answer that might be glossed over by using the TBI example as a proxy for the remaining millions of gallons in the 22 tanks. He emphasized that this was one of the main concerns for communities was not the radioactivity, but potential for release and the impacts that would have on the people of those communities.

He understood that the people were working on those projects at a higher level than he understood. He commented that the information related to the Holistic Agreement was coming rapidly, but the people that would be in the path of this material for the long haul deserved a voice on the discussion.

Additionally, he expressed his appreciation for the information shared on WESF and the history of strontium capsules being vetted in the past. He appreciated that question being posed.

He commented that the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and other documents that the HAB was being asked to comment on was “a lot.” He was impressed by the effort, but suggested that the agencies might consider extending that public comment when it comes to Perma-Fix, due to the need for a comprehensive understanding of the overlapping challenges, such as development in that area; impacts to air, water, and the environment; and, most of all, the people that live, work, and have access to those places.

He learned a lot from the folks that envisioned MASF, implementing the idea of taking care in the actions being done and practicing everything before taking action. He stated that idea came about due to the collaboration between the federal government and the Tribes. He was impressed by the willingness to take a step back when realizing something was “out of step” with what was being practiced, like the situation around the 324 Building. He encouraged people to read EPA’s comments on that topic, which he felt would provide important context on how the HAB would offer input on priorities in the future.

Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2027 Cleanup Priorities

Chris provided a comprehensive overview of the draft advice (*Attachment 4*) content, organization, and goals. He let everyone know that it was critical to get the advice passed at this meeting, as the advice would support DOE’s budget request in the coming months. The board reviewed the draft, posed questions of clarification, and made only minor edits.

Board Decision

Following a full review and all points of clarification were resolved, HAB members were invited to confirm their support for the advice as edited (*Appendix A*). The advice was adopted by consensus.

Additional Discussions

Rob commented that other countries around the world were dealing with issues similar to those faced by Hanford. He wanted to ensure that Hanford did not let itself become “siloed” and ensure it was tracking global innovations in waste containment, treatment, and disposal. Kelly responded to Rob’s comment and let him know that there is an international program at DOE Headquarters within the Office of Environmental Management that works closely with other nations to ensure they are communicating with each other. She said they do lessons learned and are having active conversations.

Tom spoke up and asked Kelly if that organization was available to do a brief to the Board. Kelly said she could make sure the HAB got a copy of the [international Program presentation](#) from [the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board \(EMSSAB\) chairs’ meeting](#). If the HAB still wanted more information, DOE could look at getting a speaker to talk more about the program.

Subcommittee Reports

Cleanup and Risk Mitigation (CaRM)

Tom, CaRM Chair, reviewed past meeting topics, which included the cleanup plans for 100K and 100N, their Records of Decision (RODs), and planning challenges based on the changing regulatory environment.

He said there was a lot of good discussions that created some new Issue Manager (IM) teams if anyone was interested in joining. One of those IM teams was looking at the draft Proposed Plan for the soil contamination under the 324 Building, which would be meeting right after the Board meeting to talk about their next steps.

He reminded everyone that the next CaRM meeting would be in March and one of the upcoming topics on the agenda was going to be about groundwater.

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

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC) representative and LIDS Chair, discussed the most recent LIDS meeting and mentioned that it was fairly short. They went over DOE's response to their traffic safety advice, #319, which led to the committee deciding to issue another piece of advice. She said they appointed Richard, the LIDS vice chair, to be the issue manager for that advice. Richard spoke up to say that he already had the new draft advice ready and would like to get the IM team together to have a 10-minute review in preparation for the next LIDS meeting. Rebecca suggested doing so after the day's Board meeting was over. She said that their next LIDS meeting would be in March.

Relevant to the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) process noted under the Waste Site Characterization item in the HAB's Cleanup Priorities advice, Richard mentioned that one thing that he felt they should bring to LIDS was the Waste Identification Documentation System (WIDS), which he did not see being closed in a timely matter. He felt they needed to reduce some of the administrative burden that was out there and improve the system.

Tank Waste Stewardship and Treatment (TWST)

Rob Davis, TWST Chair, discussed the recent tank waste processing update and reminded everyone that they could find this presentation on the HAB website.

He said a TWST IM team was looking at the System Plan and found a lot of discrepancies between the holistic agreement, System Plan, and the 5-year plan. He recommended offering advice on the System Plan. The last advice offered on that topic was followed up with a round table discussion and a lot of people got to voice their opinion. Even though it is a very large document, he encouraged everyone to review it. Susan spoke up to say that Ryan Miller and ECY have requested an opportunity to come to the TWST subcommittee to talk about the System Plan details. Ryan confirmed what Susan said was accurate and that he felt there were a lot of misunderstanding and misconceptions. He said they are working with DOE to see when they can get System Plan subject matter experts to come and talk to TWST.

Rob also mentioned the Environmental Performance Demonstration Test (EPDT) was anticipated to be complete within the following months and looked forward to hearing about its success.

Miya mentioned there was also a recent update given on DFLAW and Direct-Feed High Level Waste (DFHLW) from Paul Schroder and Tom Teynor.

Community Outreach and Engagement (COE)

Amber Waldref, COE Chair, recalled their last meeting and the discussion on the TPA Public Involvement Survey. ECY presented all the different ways they were doing outreach and the COE subcommittee gave feedback on specific groups ECY could reach out to as well.

She said they also discussed other key topics such as an update on upcoming public comment periods and HAB Board engagement ideas to get members more familiar with each other. A lot of great ideas were shared and she wanted to thank Rebecca and Miya for organizing an after-hours get together for the members. She appreciated the informal gatherings and asked for members to give feedback to herself and Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (BFCOG) representative and COE Vice Chair, on organizing and improving engagement activities. She mentioned they also talked about Round Robin discussions being a way for members to engage around the table, give input, and possible ideas on questions that would be good for dialogue.

She commented that regional meetings were discussed and DOE said they are not planning a regional meeting outside of the Tri-Cities that fiscal year. The COE suggested that a regional meeting would add value when there was an open comment period of interest to the community, allowing the community to attend the meeting, share comments, and engage with the Tri-Parties. If there is an upcoming public involvement opportunity the HAB could follow up with DOE about having a regional meeting at that time.

Amber let everyone know that the next COE meeting would be in April, rather than March.

Michelle said that she had information to share with the COE and LIDS subcommittees pertaining to traffic safety, located on the BFCOG website (bfcog.us). On the home page there was a link to a safety map and program called PINPOINT that allows individuals to go in and mark locations on a map where they experience traffic safety concerns. The BFCOG was in the process of developing a comprehensive safety action traffic plan on behalf of the Tri-Cities and all the data given will be put into the plan. She said this was a great opportunity for people to share traffic issues and safety concerns that they have been experiencing.

Tom reminded everyone that the elections process for subcommittee leadership would begin in the March/April timeframe and to reach out with any questions. HAB Facilitation confirmed that nominations were anticipated in March/April and elections would be in June.

National Liaison's Report

Pam Larsen, HAB National Liaison, provided the National Liaison Report. This report is included as *Appendix A*.

Round Robin

How can we encourage more open collaboration within the HAB?

Susan said that this question's focus was on how the members of the Board could encourage more interaction and collaborate amongst the members. She said a side benefit of this discussion would be determining how they, as a group, would better collaborate with the agencies and the public.

Ed Parsons, Public at Large, asked what she meant by collaboration. Susan replied that everyone brings different experiences and perspectives to the table. That give-and-take dialogue, learning from each other, is what helps them build an end point they all can envision.

Chuck Torelli, City of Kennewick, said that one of the things he noticed was that he did not know how to get a hold of anyone. He thought that access was key.

Josh commented that HAB members were invited to provide their contact information for inclusion in a HAB member contact list. Copies were available in the room and could be requested at a later date.

Larry said the topic was a commonly asked question and, to determine the starting point, they would need to identify and address the reasons why people are not talking on a regular basis. He said these reasons could be things like distance or lifestyles and they need to find a way to work around these issues to get a group to collaborate.

Tom thought that the mentor program and other events to meet off camera to talk and get to know each other was a great start. He said you cannot collaborate with someone you do not know. He also believed having the contact list was a plus for getting in touch with other members and recalled a time when the ability to get in touch with other members was not easy because you had to go through the proper channels first. He also thought it would be interesting to do committee “office hours” where there is a set time each month where members of the committee can meet and chat to build that frequency of contact.

Kelly spoke up to explain why those “channels” had been put in place and she said that it was to make sure all pertinent information regarding potential advice was being recorded. Due to the HAB being a FACA board, she said there were specific record keeping policies that had to be followed. This included having the DDFO involved to make sure proper records were kept in case any recommendation for advice came up in these conversations.

Chris said that when he distributed the second draft of their Cleanup Priorities advice, he received a few emails back letting him know that those members did not participate because they did not know enough to add to the advice. He felt this was significant, especially with new members, because if people do not feel they know enough, they will withdraw.

Richard thought that the way to get more collaboration was to have common goals. He thought it would be a good idea for the HAB to establish an annual goal in regard to making things better, one which he thought should be to expedite cleanup.

Pam said that there should be more socializing opportunities because that is how friendships can be formed and have been formed in the past. She thought that person-to-person interactions give a more positive feeling about working together with someone you do not know very well. She also mentioned the range of issues at Hanford were fewer than before, giving fewer items to get engaged in.

Ed asked if the HAB felt that there was a problem with their collaboration as a group or if it was something minor that needed to be fixed. If so, then they need to understand what the problem is so that it can be fixed. He feels like there is something holding them back from collaborating but that they need to identify what it is.

Amber mentioned that when she started as a new member, due to everything being virtual because of COVID, it was really hard to figure out the subcommittee structure and how to engage. She said now that there are in-person and hybrid meetings they are moving in the right direction. She also thought that the Cleanup Priorities advice that they all agreed on could be a baseline for working on those key priorities together and holding the TPA agencies accountable. She felt the other important decision they make is about their work plan for the year and said that would be a great opportunity to loop in the new members to mentor and get them involved.

She appreciated having a Chair that tries to reach out and get people involved. She felt the leadership team and committee chairs and co-chairs could probably do better job at encouraging people to get involved with some of the committee work. Her question to the HAB was: “How do we encourage people to come to the meetings or get on a task force or IM team?”

Michelle said, for her, there were three factors that influence how satisfied they feel trying to get work done as the HAB. One factor she said was individual motivation or reason for being there. She said most of the people on the HAB have some sort of history with Hanford and their knowledge and expectations for how much influence they can have as the HAB would be different than someone like her who represents a government entity or has less experience. Those who are not coming from a Hanford background can get really overwhelmed by all the technical details and conversations.

Another factor she felt was that there is some miscommunication between the agency partners and HAB members on how and why we want to get things done. She felt that the more they continue to reinforce the intent and purpose of the HAB, it would help them collaborate better.

Rob thought that, following a presentation in a subcommittee meeting, they should do a Round Robin and see what people thought about what they had just heard. He thought this would help fill in the blanks while it was still fresh in their memory and would help a lot with collaboration. He said the collaboration should be focused on what brings the most to the Board.

Chris said he heard a lot being said on what the HAB can do to encourage collaboration amongst each other. He thought what was missing was what each individual member could do. People join the HAB to participate and be an active member and he felt they, as an individual, needed to take responsibility to participate. In the HAB bylaws there is an expectation that each member will participate. This is the element that he thought was missing.

Brian Ivey, Public at Large, answered that side conversations have really helped him. As a new member he had no idea what he was walking into and after the meetings are done would appreciate an email or phone call to communicate about how things went. He said now that he is retired, he sees more of the big picture of everything happening out on site. His thought was that maybe they could pass a notebook around for anonymous questions for those that do not feel comfortable asking. Even after being out there for 30 years, he said there are still things he did not know and would feel stupid asking.

Laurene Contreras, Yakama Nation, agreed that it was important to be able to communicate with everyone and understand where they may be coming from. She had little time to attend over the past year, so she was a little overwhelmed hearing about the cleanup and that it will be going on beyond her grandchildren’s lifespan. As a tribal member, she said they look at it differently as a result of their beliefs. She said the Tribe has a vested interest in protecting the land and she felt that they should be teaching the history moving forward.

Pam said that she looked forward to things turning around and the HAB being fun again.

Rebecca said much like the work on the Hanford site, things have changed over the years. She likes to see the progress that the Board has made but it is very different from 22 years ago when she started. Back then she recalled the regional meetings giving an opportunity for the Board members and leadership from the TPA agencies to spend time together and collaborate. She said it was like an “open door policy” where they could all just sit around and have a conversation outside of the meetings. She said she misses that and the fun things that used to happen even in the meetings themselves. She said she appreciates the work that is being done and the people that actually care about the workforce, which has to be first and foremost on everyone’s minds.

Michelle took the opportunity to extend compliments. She noted that the COE committee had the benefit of support from staff that aligns with its work, so they are able to work together to get reports and updates and to develop a rapport and relationship with them, which was great. She also wanted to recognize Ryan, as an agency partner, that always goes above and beyond to engage with everyone inside and outside of the meetings and to always be accessible. Lastly, she wanted to give kudos to Josh, to recognize how he has “gotten out of his shell” over the last three years and acknowledge that he has done a great job taking control over the last few months.

Rob asked for the HAB members to recall DOE’s earlier presentation and what was absent that the HAB wanted to know more about. One thing mentioned was an update on the 324 Building. Rob said this was one way that the members could collaborate, along the lines of Brian Ivey’s suggestion: by saying what they did not understand or what they wanted to know more about. Michelle spoke up to say that for her, she “didn’t know what she didn’t know.” When she heard DOE’s update during the HAB’s quarterly meetings, she felt that was generally the same level of generic information that she could get at any public venue. However, she was not sure what to ask without knowing what she should know. She suggested that, instead of hearing about constraints, she would like to hear more about how to move beyond those constraints. As an example, how could the HAB assist DOE in moving beyond the budgetary constraints that impact its roadway improvements? Rob said he wanted to schedule an extra five minutes after each presentation at the next TWST meeting to ask questions about what they need to know. Ed thought that they needed Brian to be more open and direct about the impact of the current administration’s expectations overall from the Hanford site.

Tom said there isn’t enough time in subcommittee meetings to have the Round Robins that they are looking for. He felt the subcommittee meetings are the places to get more than a “rotary club” meeting and Brian’s messages at the full Board meetings were appropriate because those were intended as a general update. He said the subcommittee meetings are meant for more open collaboration. He also mentioned that there used to be HAB coffee mugs, stress balls, etc. and door prizes for people that showed up. This, he felt, might get people to come back.

Pam said that the presentations are a lot slimmer than they used to be because they must go through headquarters for review. She said DOE might be inclined to share more but they are not allowed to.

Chris thought another thing that would encourage more open collaboration would be for the HAB members to receive more knowledge about the topics that are being discussed. If the HAB knows what they are talking about they will have a better idea amongst themselves on how to come up with advice. He said more knowledge means more participation and better advice from the HAB.

PHOENIX 101

Brett Simpson, Technical Program Advisor with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), introduced himself as the PHOENIX operations lead. He explained that the [PHOENIX application](#) is designed to provide the public with tools to easily access Hanford Site soil, groundwater, and tank waste information.

Brett encouraged new users to consult the User’s Guide and Terminology sections, available under the menu at the top of the page, to understand the technical terms relevant to PHOENIX and its capabilities. He explained that it is intended as a self-service data tool, rather than an analytical tool. PHOENIX consolidates data from several sources to provide user-friendly visualizations, such as maps and graphs. He noted that much of the data within PHOENIX can be exported for individual use.

Brett provided a demonstration of a selection of the PHOENIX capabilities that were likely to be of interest to HAB members. *Attachment 5* was provided as a supplement to demonstration, explaining the various functions and data available from the PHOENIX dashboard.

As he navigated the application, he demonstrated that much of the data presented could be viewed historically, showing how cleanup has progressed over time. Some of those included:

- GIS Explorer provides satellite images of the Hanford Site across multiple years
- Well view provides charts of the contaminants tracked by sampling wells and how those have changed
- The plume animator shows how the extent of the plumes has changed over time. It was noted that data on the depth of the plumes would require a different set of tools.

Additionally, he discussed the Tank Farms Dashboard, which provided users with an overview of the metrics associated with Hanford's waste tanks. Those included the status of tank integrity, assumed contents, volume, anticipated retrieval timeline, and more. He noted that the PHOENIX team works with the tank farms to ensure alignment with Tank Waste Information Network System (TWINS), a tank waste-focused databased managed by the tanks contractor.

Brett invited HAB members to submit any questions they encounter while exploring PHOENIX to him. He noted that an overhaul of the application was planned for the near future with the intention of improving accessibility and scale.

Regulatory Perspectives

Jen relayed that DOE appreciated Brett providing that presentation.

Ben Prueitt, Ecology, invited Board members to submit any questions they might have on how Ecology might use that tool.

Roberto agreed that PHOENIX was a valuable tool. EPA appreciated the presentation.

Board Questions

Chuck asked about the benefit of creating a PHOENIX account. Brett explained that creating an account offered users a few benefits, such as the opportunity to set up workflows or receive notifications when data sets are updated.

Chuck and Larry were interested in public access to TWINS. It was later confirmed that TWINS was not publicly accessible.

Miya asked what the rankings associated with the tanks were for. Brett stated that those indicated how that tank ranked among all 177 tanks in relation to a specific analyte, such as how much plutonium a tank contained compared to the others.

Rob, noting past HAB discussions on "lensing" in the vadose zone, asked if contaminant lensing was shown in PHOENIX. Brett confirmed that there was no 3D profile or graphics of the Central Plateau in PHOENIX and was beyond what the tool could offer.

Rob asked if the depth of the sampling well readings were available. Brett confirmed they are and demonstrated how to find that information.

Rob asked if the effects of tank farm surface barrier installations were seen in analyses. Brett stated those barriers were new and no before-and-after experiments had been done to produce that data yet.

Rob asked where he might go to learn about the effects of pump and treat soil flushing. Brett suggested that Remediation Systems tool from the PHOENIX dashboard would be the best option to see the pump and treat performance over time.

Larry asked what the target user group for PHOENIX was. Brett stated that it was for the technically curious public. One of the goals of the application was to provide transparent data to the public.

Pam encouraged providing additional, up-to-date information on the 300 Area, noting the public interest in the 324 Building. She asked if strontium was seen moving toward the river from the 100-N Area. After demonstrating how to find that information, Brett confirmed that the relevant sampling wells were detecting strontium reaching the river.

Chris asked about the process of updating the data in PHOENIX. Brett explained that PNNL received the data from the Central Plateau and tanks contractors after it was cleared, each with a single point of contact. The mission essential services contract also supported the effort by providing the IT infrastructure for the application.

Richard asked if air monitoring data was available in PHOENIX. Brett confirmed that it was not.

Board Business

Action Items

Susan noted a briefing from the HAB's Tribal representatives was a proposed action from the HAB's winter 2023 meeting. She asked about the status on that item.

Action: Laurene confirmed that a Tribal briefing may be a possibility going forward and agreed to follow up on the item.

It was also noted that the request for a land acknowledgement statement had not yet been resolved.

Upcoming Events

Susan noted that her term as HAB chair, as well as the other HAB leadership terms, would expire on September 30, 2025. Leadership elections for Board Chair, Vice Chair, and National Liaison would need to be held by August in order for the next leaders to start on October 1. Susan would not be running again for Chair as her Board membership term expires September 30, 2026 and she won't be able to serve for the full two years.

Pam noted that this would be her last year on the HAB and she would be unable to continue serving as the National Liaison. Members expressed appreciation for her contributions in that role.

Miya's term as HAB Vice Chair also expires September 30, 2025, but she has expressed interest in running for the Vice Chair position in the upcoming elections.

The next anticipated meetings were for the LIDS and CaRM subcommittees on March 5. COE and TWST were planning meetings in April and the next full Board meeting was anticipated for May 7 and 8. Members were encouraged to put travel requests in early.

Other Board Business

Susan asked about the status of the HAB's weekly email distribution. Jen confirmed that the distribution was put on hold based on guidance from DOE Headquarters. It was not known when that hold might be lifted.

Matthew noted that he found that weekly distribution helpful and asked if an alternative, HAB-only distribution might be allowed.

Action: Jen agreed to see if such an alternative distribution would be allowed and, if so, work with facilitation to develop that.

Chris noted that the HAB previously used Microsoft Teams to share information and suggested that as an alternative to email. That was suggested as a topic for the next Executive Issues Committee (ESC) call.

Meeting Recording

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZUZh0JhqHtU>

Attachments

Attachment 1: [Meeting Agenda](#)

Attachment 2: [DOE Update Presentation](#)

Attachment 3: [Ecology Update](#)

Attachment 4: [Draft FY27 Cleanup Priorities Advice](#)

Attachment 5: [PHOENIX 101 Supplemental Slides](#)

Meeting Attendees

Day 1

Board Members (P) and Alternates (A):

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

Others:

Jennifer Colborn, DOE*	Annagrisel Alvarez, Ecology	Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
Ed Dawson, DOE	Ambika Chakravartty, Ecology	MaryAnne Wuennecke, HMIS*
Cameron Hardy, DOE	Neil Caudill, Ecology	McKenzie DuBois-Killooy, Street Legal
Carrie Meyer, DOE*	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
Kelly Snyder, DOE*	Moises Guevara, Ecology	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Brian Vance, DOE*	Edward Holbrook, Ecology*	Stephanie Brasher, HMIS
	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Debra Killooy, HMIS
	Daina McFadden, Ecology	Micheal Turner, HMIS
	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Laura Caulfield, Katmai*
	Steve Needles, Ecology	Joan Lucas, WRPS
	Ben Prueitt, Ecology	Richard Evans, Cantwell
	John Temple, Ecology	Melanie Snyder, Western Energy Board
	Sarah Williams, Ecology	Wayne Barber, Weapons Complex Monitor
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
	David Einan, EPA*	Rachel Acosta, public*
	Megan Perkins, DOH	Gabe Bohnee, public
	Tom Rogers, DOH	Al Farabee, public*
	Jane LePage, DOH*	Dan Serres, public
		Matthew Weber, public*
		Ross
		Chandra Flores, HAB Facilitation*
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facilitation*

Day 2

Board Members (P) and Alternates (A):

Simone Anter (A), Columbia Riverkeeper	Laurene Contreras (P), Yakama Nation*	Kermit Mankiller (A), Nez Perce Tribe
Kristie Baptiste-Eke (P), Nez Perce Tribe	Kevin Danby (P), Grant and Franklin Counties*	Jesus Mota (P), Columbia Basin College*
Richard Bloom (P), City of West Richland*	Rob Davis (P) City of Pasco*	Ed Parsons, Public at Large*

Erin Braich (A), Benton-Franklin Council of Governments	Matt Hendrickson (A), Oregon Department of Energy	Rob Parmelee, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees*
Larry Brandt, Public at Large*	Michelle Holt (P), Benton-Franklin Council of Governments*	Aaron Siefken, Central Washington Building Trades
Miya Burke (P), Hanford Challenge	Rebecca Holland (P), Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council*	Tom Sicilia (P), Oregon Department of Energy
Matthew Campbell (A), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	Brian Ivey, Public at Large*	Chris Sutton, Local Environment Interest*
Susan Coleman, Public at Large*	Alan Key (A), Grant and Franklin Counties*	Chuck Torelli (P), City of Kennewick
Alfonso Contreras (A), Heart of America Northwest*	Charles LoPresti (P), Washington League of Women Voters	Amber Waldref (P), Heart of America Northwest

Others:

Jennifer Colborn, DOE*	Annagrisel Alvarez, Ecology	MaryAnne Wuennecke, HMIS*
	Jim Alzheimer, Ecology	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
	Ambika Chakravarty, Ecology	Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
	Garrett Day, Ecology*	Dana Cowley, HMIS
	Ben Prueitt, Ecology*	Laura Caulfield, Katmai*
	Daina McFadden, Ecology	Mckenzie Dubois-killoy, Street Legal
	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Brett Simpson, PNNL*
	Steve Needles, Ecology	Melanie Snyder, Western Energy Board
	Sarah Williams, Ecology	Gabe Bohnee, public
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Dan Solitz, public
	Megan Perkins, DOH	Rachel Acosta, public*
	Tom Rogers, DOH	Al Farabee, public*
	Jane LePage, DOH	Larry Cooper
		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.

Appendix A: Cleanup Priorities Advice, As Adopted

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Chris Sutton, Brian Ivey, Chuck LoPresti, Dan Solitz, Ed Parsons, Kathy DeBois, Kevin Danby, Larry Brandt, Matthew Campbell, Matt Hendrickson, Miya Burke, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Susan Coleman, Tom Sicilia

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

Subject: Fiscal Year 2027 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) 2027 that are summarized below and outlined in more detail in the FY2027 Critical Cleanup Priorities Table:

- Maintain active 24/7 vitrification operations of the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) Facility.
- Complete design and initiate construction of the cross-site ~~slurry-supernatant~~ transfer line.
- Implement the 300-296 soil remediation beneath the 324 Building.
- Accelerate groundwater remediation efforts in the River Corridor and Central Plateau.
- Finalize the Records of Decision for the 100-K and 100-N areas while continuing cleanup activities in those areas.
- Initiate/continue characterization and cleanup of waste sites in the Central Plateau.
- ~~Accelerate and c~~Complete the transfer of Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) cesium and strontium capsules to dry storage.
- Accelerate/continue the certification of transuranic mixed (TRU/M) waste to enable full-scale shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in FY2028.
- Widen Hanford Site Route 4S to more safely accommodate increased traffic.
- Initiate construction of the sanitary water system crosstie between the 200 East and West areas.
- Respond to and publish comments received during a public comment or feedback period.
- Improve public education and outreach about Hanford.

BACKGROUND

While this advice recognizes the goals outlined in DOE's current Hanford Site 5-Year Plan (Reference 1) as well as in DOE's presentation of that 5-Year Plan to the public on October 9, 2024 (Reference 2), this advice also presents work that must be prioritized based upon input from the HAB's constituent organizations. In addition to the activities identified in the Hanford 5-Year Plan placemat, the Board stresses that key projects addressed in the following table require funding in FY2027 to ensure they are completed on time or are 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 to significantly shorten the duration of cleanup activities.

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Chris Sutton, Brian Ivey, Chuck LoPresti, Dan Solitz, Ed Parsons, Kathy DeBois, Kevin Danby, Larry Brandt, Matthew Campbell, Matt Hendrickson, Miya Burke, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Susan Coleman, Tom Sicilia

ADVICE

The Board supports the TPA agencies’ request that its membership shares Hanford’s past and continuing cleanup activities with the Board’s constituent organizations, elected officials, and the public. To facilitate these communications by the Board, it would be extremely beneficial for DOE to present to the public 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 DOE should assess and communicate in a transparent manner the degree to which those annual cleanup and safety targets/goals were 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 (including cybersecurity). Accordingly, it is imperative that DOE continue to prioritize, implement, and communicate Hanford worker and public safety practices. DOE should also communicate how the safety culture of the Site will evolve as work continues to transition into an operations mode.

The table below summarizes the Board’s recommended cleanup priorities for FY2027. These cleanup priorities are deemed to be critical based upon the Board’s understanding of the goals and objectives of the Hanford Site cleanup mission. The organization of the table reflects, in general, the structure of DOE’s latest 5-Year Plan (References 1, 2). The Board requests DOE to provide a response that complies with DOE Office of Environmental Management latest guidance (Reference 4). The Board also requests a response to each of the priorities in this advice from the TPA agencies. The Board is open and willing to discuss the content of the response as well as the content of this advice with the TPA agencies to ensure HAB response expectations are met.

Note: The order of items in the table does not reflect a priority ranking.

Item	FY2027 Critical Cleanup Priorities
Tank Waste Treatment Mission	
DFLAW	Maintain 24/7 tank waste vitrification operations with a goal of safely optimizing throughput.
Supernatant Cross-Site Transfer Line	Complete design and initiate construction/repairs/updates to cross-site supernatant transfer line to comply with Milestone M-042-03 by 2030.
Risk Reduction	
324 Building	Assuming the Record of Decision amendment is completed, implement the 300-296 soil remediation and continue to monitor downgradient groundwater for cesium and strontium.
Groundwater Protection	Accelerate groundwater remediation efforts in the River Corridor and Central Plateau through source reduction and by enhancing the efficiency and

Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Chris Sutton, Brian Ivey, Chuck LoPresti, Dan Solitz, Ed Parsons, Kathy DeBois, Kevin Danby, Larry Brandt, Matthew Campbell, Matt Hendrickson, Miya Burke, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Susan Coleman, Tom Sicilia

Item	FY2027 Critical Cleanup Priorities
	throughput of extraction well networks and Pump and Treat facilities in accordance with the M-024 series of milestones.
100-K & 100-N Records of Decision	Finalize the Records of Decisions for 100-K and 100-N, while continuing cleanup activities in those areas.
Waste Site Characterization	Initiate/continue characterization and cleanup of waste sites in the Central Plateau (for example, OUs: 200-SW-2, 200-WA-1, 200-CW-3, 200-BC-1, 200-IA-1) to accelerate submittal of remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) documents.
Waste Management	
Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility	<u>Accelerate and c</u> omplete transfer of cesium and strontium capsules to dry storage.
TRU/M Waste	Accelerate/continue the certification of TRU/M waste to enable full scale shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in FY2028.
Site Infrastructure	
Highway Safety	Initiate widening of Route 4S from 2 lanes to 4 lanes as recommended in Advice 319 (Reference 3)
Sanitary Water System	Initiate crosstie of sanitary water system between 200 East and 200 West Areas.
Public Engagement	
Response to Comments	Respond to and publish any comment received during a public comment or feedback period.
Public Engagement	Regularly schedule opportunities for the TPA agencies to provide education and meaningfully engage in dialogue with the public.

References

1. Hanford Site 5-Year Plan 2024-2029. Link: [5-Year Plan 2024-2029 - Hanford Site](#)
2. Hanford Site 5-Year Plan 2024-2029 Public Presentation) October 9, 2024. Link: [PowerPoint Presentation](#)
3. Traffic Safety (HAB Consensus Advice #319). Link: [HAB Advice 319 - Traffic Safety](#)
4. Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB) Policies Desk Reference, April 2023, Page 16. Link: [EMSSAB Policies Desk Reference](#)



Originating Committee: ESC

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Chris Sutton, Brian Ivey, Chuck LoPresti, Dan Solitz, Ed Parsons, Kathy DeBois, Kevin Danby, Larry Brandt, Matthew Campbell, Matt Hendrickson, Miya Burke, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Susan Coleman, Tom Sicilia

CC LIST

Mark all applicable names/organizations to be included as advice recipients.

TPA Agency Representatives

- Candice Robertson, DOE-EM
- ~~Jeffrey Avery, DOE-EM~~
- Brian Vance, DOE
- Stephanie Schleif, ECY
- David Einan, EPA
- Roberto Armijo, EPA
- Ryan Miller, ECY
- Jennifer Colborn, DOE

Site-Specific Advisory Boards

- Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
- Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board
- Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board
- Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
- Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
- Idaho Cleanup Board
- Portsmouth Site Specific Advisory Board
- Kelly Snyder, DFO

OR/WA Congressional Delegations (to Chief of Staff)

- Sen. Patty Murray, WA
- Senator Maria Cantwell, WA
- Rep. Suzan DelBene, WA-01
- Rep. Rick Larsen, WA-02
- Rep. Marie Gluesenkamp Perez, WA-03
- Rep. Dan Newhouse, WA-04
- Rep. Michael Baumgartner, WA-05
- Rep. Emily Randall, WA-06
- Rep. Pramila Jayapal, WA-07
- Rep. Kim Schrier, WA-08

- Rep. Adam Smith, WA-09
- Rep. Marilyn Strickland, WA-10
- Sen. Ron Wyden, OR
- Sen. Jeff Merkley, OR
- Rep. Suzanne Bonamici, OR-01
- Rep. Cliff Bentz, OR-02
- Rep. Maxine Dexter, OR-03
- Rep. Val Hoyle, OR-04
- Rep. Janelle Bynum, OR-05
- Rep. Andrea Salinas, OR-06

Write-in/Additional

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Requests to Receive Advice

- Jessica Keys, Staff to Sen. Merkley

Appendix B: National Liaison's Report

National Liaison report February 13 2025

Environmental Management Program 2024 Year in review

Savannah River Site – Received authorization to operate the Saltstone disposal Unit 9 (SDU 9) and completed all major concrete placements for SDU 10

Oak Ridge – Completed soil remediation at the East Tennessee technology Park

Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office

Finished deactivation of the X-333 Process building at Portsmouth

Removed an additional 1 million pounds of hazardous R-114 refrigerant from the Paducah Site

Idaho Cleanup Project – Continued Naval Reactors Facility demolition of two historic and defueled naval reactor propulsion plants

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) – Completed construction and began commissioning of the safety Significant Confinement Ventilation System, which is expected to be operational in 2026

Los Alamos Field Office- Retrieved size reduced and repackaged 158 buried corrugated metal pipes containing cemented transuranic waste at Tech Area

New Administration

Chris Wright the new Secretary of Energy is the founder, chief executive and chair of the board of Liberty Energy a Denver-based energy development company specializing in fracking. He is a board member for Oklo, a Silicon Valley based developer for small modular reactors.

During his Congressional hearing he made many comments in support of nuclear energy and the cleanup mission. He acknowledged that much of the issue surrounding the nuclear waste problem is not technical, but rather political. He vowed to work with Congress to find a solution stating that a central part of the long-term disposal issue is going to be local buy-in.

Senator Cantwell asked if he will uphold the Tri-Party Agreement and fight for the budget necessary to maintain the current timeline and cleanup process at

Hanford. He responded, the majority of our plutonium was produced there – not just for World War II, but for the post-war period and our arsenal today. “Hanford gave a lot to this country, and we left behind a mess that needs to be cleaned up.”

DOE Budget Information received the morning of Tuesday February 11

ECA Update 02/11: SENATE LEADS THE CHARGE ON FY2025 BUDGET; and more

From Energy Communities Alliance <bulletin@energyca.org>

Date Tue 2/11/2025 9:01 AM

To Pam Larsen <pambrownlarsen@gmail.com>



SENATE LEADS THE CHARGE ON FY2025 BUDGET

With a looming March 14 deadline on the **continuing resolution (CR; HR10545)** extending fiscal year (FY) 2024 funding, Congress is eager to put together a plan to push through the FY2025 budget. House Republicans, in effort led by Speaker Mike Johnson (R-LA), aimed to roll out the details of a large, one-bill budget resolution last week, ahead of a scheduled committee mark-up this week. However, with the House negotiations taking longer than expected, the Senate is stepping up to lead the charge on passing the budget. **Senate Budget** Chair Lindsey Graham (R-SC) announced last Friday (February 7) that his panel will meet Wednesday, February 12, and Thursday, February 13, to debate and vote on **his proposed budget resolution**. This first bill will pave the way for passing a second bill focused exclusively on the border, defense and energy.

The bill would authorize \$85.5 billion in spending per year — fully offset by spending cuts. Items relevant to ECA members include instructions to the **Armed Services Committee** to propose \$150 billion in spending, and to the **Senate Energy and Natural Resources** and **Environment and Public Works** committees to each find ways to cut \$1 billion over 10 years from programs they are responsible for.