



MEETING MINUTES

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)

Full Board Meeting

May 7, 2025

Hybrid Meeting – In-person and via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates	2
Draft Advice on Site Infrastructure	11
Holistic Agreement.....	12
Hanford Tank Waste Operations & Closure, LLC	18
Round Robin Discussion	19
Board Reports	22
Board Business	25
Public Comment	27
Meeting Recording	29
Attachments	29
Meeting Attendees.....	29
Appendix A: Site Infrastructure Advice, As Adopted.....	32

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

Meegan Tripp, US Department of Energy (DOE) representative and Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), introduced herself and announced that she would be taking over for Jennifer Colborn. She also introduced Scott Green, DOE, who will serve as the backup DDFO when she is unavailable to attend meetings.

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

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

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates

US Department of Energy (DOE)

Mat Irwin, Assistant Manager for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) at the Hanford Field Office, began by stating that the mission remains unchanged: to safely and effectively treat tank waste and carry out environmental remediation at the Hanford site. He also noted that key activities—such as demolishing retired facilities and treating contaminated groundwater—and focus areas like enhancing DOE/contractor teamwork have remained consistent.

He mentioned that the Hanford team included various prime contractors, with Hanford Tank Waste Operations & Closure (H2C) being their most recent edition.

He went over DOE's funding and said that they will be receiving their 2025 official budget here in the near future but that the numbers referenced on *Attachment 2*, slide 4, fully support their priorities for 2025.

Tank Waste Mission Area

Mat began by discussing the steam plant at the 242A-Evaporator. He noted that, so far in 2025, the evaporator has completed two campaigns, freeing up 440,000 gallons of double-shell tank (DST) waste space. A recent completed transfer has positioned them to begin a third campaign within the next month, which he described as very exciting. Once that campaign is complete, they will be able to resume retrieval operations at tank A-101.

He also mentioned the ongoing Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) campaign that was at 2.4 million gallons treated and continuing to progress on a steady basis.

He discussed the ammonia trucks that arrived at WTP in March, containing 6,300 gallons of ammonia to support the commissioning string and operations life cycle. He said this was safely received and they have exercised procedures and processes to support that new hazard at the plant.

Mat said they are currently progressing through the cold commissioning stream which includes nitrate feed, conditioning the carbon beds, and preparing for the Environmental Performance Demonstration Test (EPDT) later this summer, leading up to hot commissioning in August. He noted that it is a very exciting time at WTP and for the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) program and added that they will continue to provide updates and news releases throughout the summer.

Next, he addressed the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), which is preparing for its readiness review in order to receive immobilized low-activity waste (LAW) containers from WTP once it enters hot commissioning under the DFLAW program.

He also highlighted significant upgrades to the 222-S Laboratory and noted the recent completion of the DOE's Test Bed Initiative (TBI) shipment, which sent 1,962 gallons of treated LAW to facilities in Utah and Texas. He reported that the material was received and offloaded, and the empty totes were currently in transit back to Hanford. Additionally, he said that the contractor's Operational Readiness Review for DFLAW had just begun and was expected to last about a week. Once the results were in, they would address any identified issues and begin preparing for the DOE Readiness Review, which is expected to take approximately four to six weeks.

Risk-Reduction Mission Area

Items that Mat mentioned in this area included:

- Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF): A photo of the Canister Storage Area was shown on *Attachment 2*, slide 6. Mat noted that the facility had recently completed its operational readiness review. While there are still a few minor issues to address, they will soon begin transferring WESF capsules into canisters and placing them into dry storage on the pad.
- 200 West Pump and Treat Facility: The insulation of the air stripper tower is expected to be completed later this year. Once finished, this upgrade will increase the facility's capacity by approximately one-third, allowing for a higher groundwater pumping and treatment rate.
- 300 Area: A focused feasibility study for the 324 Building has been completed and the public comment period will occur within the next month. This step will help gather feedback to support planning and eventual execution of decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) activities at the 324 Building.

Infrastructure and Base Operations

Mat spoke about the recently completed water treatment facility which is currently in its commissioning and start-up phase. He also discussed radio upgrades underway on site to improve communications, as well as upgrades to the electrical distribution system. These electrical upgrades are expected to enhance the site's long-term reliability.

Recent and Upcoming Public Outreach

Numerous items were mentioned regarding current and upcoming public outreach. These included:

- June 23-July 23 (tentative): 324 Building Record of Decision (ROD) amendment (30-day comment period)
- July 9 (tentative): 324 Building hybrid meeting
- August 13: Congressional Staff Tour
- August 13-14: Full HAB meeting
- August 19: Speaker engagement with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Washington Department of Ecology

Stephanie Schleif, Program Manager for the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) Nuclear Waste Program, began by giving an overview of the topics she would be discussing during the presentation (*Attachment 3*). She then proceeded to give a leadership update and announced John Temple as their new Waste Management Section Manager. She said this role covered three different projects: Air

Permit, Waste Management, and Facility Transition. John introduced himself, went over his background, and said he looked forward to working with the HAB and engaging with everyone.

Outreach & Education

Stephanie discussed multiple recent outreach events, collectively reaching 700 people. A few of these were:

- Yakima Arbor Fest
- Earth Day at the Reach Museum
- Tri-Cities Salmon Summit
- Pasco Cinco de Mayo Festival

Upcoming events mentioned were:

- May 17: Return to the River Salmon Festival in Walla Walla
- July 1-2: Mock Hanford workshop with Boys & Girls Club. Stephanie invited HAB members to participate in this five-hour event, which will take place in North Richland and include lunch. If any HAB members are interested in attending, she encouraged them to contact an Ecology staff member or email Hanford@ecy.wa.gov.

Holistic Agreement Next Steps

An update was provided on the Holistic Agreement and the steps moving forward. It was noted that the Holistic Agreement was signed earlier this year between the DOE, Ecology, and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Links to the final agreement, as well as updates to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), are available on [Ecology's website](#). She said they are currently in the implementation phase, which included a 60-day public comment period on the draft Supplement Analysis for Hanford's West Area Tank Treatment Mission. This comment period runs from March 24 through May 23. Ecology is reviewing the draft and plans to submit comments as well.

In addition, she said Ecology anticipates that DOE will soon open a public comment period for the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) determination, which will also support the same project. Ecology will review and provide comments on that as appropriate.

Another ongoing negotiation that Ecology is involved in, related to the Tank Waste Mission at the Hanford Site, concerns Appendices H (Tank Retrievals) and I (Tank Closures) under the TPA. As part of the settlement agreement signed last year by the Tri-Parties, they agreed to enter into confidential mediation discussions to explore whether they could reach an agreement on updating these two documents. She said that Ecology continues to meet with DOE to pursue these discussions.

M-15, M-16, M-85 Milestone Negotiations

Stephanie mentioned that the soil, groundwater, and facility milestones also have ongoing negotiations. She said in December 2024 they signed an agreement in principle with the Tri-Parties to negotiate these milestones and the estimated schedule was to sign a tentative agreement for an update to the major milestones and applicable interim milestones in November 2025.

She also mentioned that, while the Holistic Agreement is final and they are assessing where additional funding is needed to support the Tank Waste Mission, there are other priority efforts underway across the site. This includes work that Mat discussed earlier, such as key facilities and groundwater projects.

She said EPA appreciates the ongoing conversations amongst the Tri-Parties to ensure priorities are being set, even when DOE is not receiving adequate funding.

Ecology Compliance Activities

She explained that, between January and March 2025, they issued two compliance reports. One for the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System (LAWPS) and one for the Central Waste Complex and Waste Receiving and Processing Facility (CWC/WRAP). She said these reports are available on Hanford's website under the [Administrative Record](#) and included information on whether any non-compliances were identified and needed to be resolved. During the same timeframe, seven inspections had been conducted. She noted that these compliance inspections routinely assessed the facility's adherence to regulated areas, including process information, security, personnel training, and operating records.

Public Involvement Opportunities

Stephanie reviewed numerous upcoming public involvement opportunities, the most current being the Notice of Intent public meeting for the proposed Contact-Handled Waste Processing Facility. The meeting was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on May 7 at the Richland Public Library and was also available virtually.

Hanford Sitewide Permit Renewal Status

The last update Stephanie shared was the status of the Hanford Sitewide Permit renewal (Revision 9A). She stated that Ecology staff and the permittees are actively working to complete the remaining portions of the draft renewal. She said responses to comments from the public, Tribal Nations, and permittees are also underway and a 120-day public comment period was also scheduled for 2025. She explained that the renewal would include 52-unit groups covering Operating, Closure, Post-Closure, and Corrective Action unit groups, along with standard conditions, attachments, and supporting documents.

US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Dave Einan with EPA said that he did not have many updates to discuss but did want to mention that there will be upcoming reorganization plans for EPA. He assured everyone that the Superfund/Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and local office were not going away; the office and management were committed to the Hanford cleanup. He said in August, EPA's regional administrator, Emma Pokon, still planned on coming to speak with the HAB and would be joined by Casey Sixkiller, Director of Ecology.

Since the last HAB meeting, EPA approved the sampling and analysis plan for studying benthic microorganisms along the 100 BC Area. He said this was a requirement of the ROD and will help answer questions about the ecological risk assessment and performance of the remedy.

He noted that DOE submitted and released the preliminary assessment conceptual model report for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) at Hanford and EPA is working through that information.

Other things that were upcoming, besides what Mat had mentioned earlier, was the construction of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) supercell. He said this should be starting soon and would take a few years to complete.

For the Holistic Agreement topic, he did not have much to add beyond what Stephanie already shared. He agreed that the discussions around funding, the importance of the tank waste mission, and other critical work being done at Hanford were all part of a broader effort they were trying to coordinate together.

Board Questions

Susan Coleman asked DOE to address the changes they have had in leadership. Mat answered with the following information:

- Brian Harkins: Acting Deputy Manager for the site and leading the site. He said DOE Environmental Management (EM) is working on finding a permanent replacement for the Hanford Manager
- Assistant Manager (AM) level:
 - Mat Irwin for WTP
 - Heather Dale for River and Plateau
 - Ricky Bang for Tank Waste Operations (TWO)
 - Vanessa Turner for Mission Support
 - Dave Kemp for Finance and Budget
 - Chris Grubbs for Procurement
 - Corey Low for Safety and Environment

Susan asked Dave about a rumor that she had heard about EPA taking some layoffs and wanted to know if he could give any input on that. He answered that most of the folks in the Environmental Justice (EJ) and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) program have been on administrative leave and were given notices that there was an intent for a reduction of force. He confirmed that he could not say the rumor was not true but that there has not been any impact to the local office at this time.

She proceeded to ask about a report (GAO-21-73) from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) regarding DOE's priority recommendations. She referenced a 2021 recommendation concerning the process for assessing contaminated soil and the potential role of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in that process. On the GAO website, there was mention of a mediated session in 2024 between DOE and the State of Washington to address the soil assessment issue. It also stated that, in order to fully implement the recommendation, DOE needed to resolve this disagreement with the State of Washington. She noted that this was the first time she had heard about it and expressed curiosity about what was going on.

Mat said that he did not have an answer to that question. Stephanie said she appreciated the report number and would need to review the recommendation before being able to respond.

Stephanie believed this referred to the update she gave earlier about the ongoing negotiations on TPA appendices H and I and the effort to update them. She explained that the parties are currently engaged in confidential mediation, supported by a third-party facilitator. As long as they continue to receive support from DOE, EPA, and the mediator, these discussions will remain active. She also noted that there are plans to hold tribal listening sessions this summer to hear input from the tribes on the proposed updates to the appendices. Stephanie told Susan she would conduct additional research on the GAO report and its recommendation.

Mat added that, from the perspective of Appendices H and I, he would characterize the process as ongoing efforts to reach alignment.

Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation, asked for clarification on DOE having compliant level funding. Mat responded that DOE has funding for all of the work planned for this year. He explained that while DOE regularly submits a compliant (or requested) budget, the actual funding received often differs. However, that does not necessarily mean they are unable to complete all the planned work for that year.

Stephanie said they calculate the complaint number based on information provided in the Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report. She believed the 2025 report was out for public input and noted that Ecology was reviewing it as well. Based on the Lifecycle Report from 2022, she said Ecology calculates the complaint budget for DOE for fiscal year (FY) 2025 to be around \$4.5 billion. She explained that Mat's point is that DOE is making do with what is appropriated by Congress, and while they are grateful for the funding they receive, there is a gap—which is why milestone negotiations are ongoing.

Rose felt it was important to keep awareness out there regarding the complaint budget and that they still are not getting the funding needed at the site to be compliant.

Pam Larsen, Benton County, said that she was thrilled with TBI moving forward, the material had reached Texas and Utah and that the WESF casks are arriving to get the cesium and strontium in the right containers for long term storage. She mentioned there was reference to a new Central Plateau water treatment facility and asked if this was a new one besides the one already in the 200 Area. Mat answered yes, this was a new facility to replace the existing, aging facility.

Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge, asked if someone could explain the high and low estimates that came out in the new Lifecycle Report and what specifically causes the high estimates to be at six billion dollars through 2100 and beyond. Mat said he could not get into a lot of detail on the Lifecycle Report but that the range is based on treatment flow rates from different facilities. These minimum and maximum rates they expect the facility to operate are added up across the site for both of those variables. Basically, he said these numbers change based on performance.

Miya's second question was related to West Area Risk Management Project (WARM) and the Holistic Agreement. She recalled that during the public comment period last July, various figures were being mentioned regarding the volume of waste to be grouted. Since the release of the draft Supplement Analysis, that number has increased significantly and she was seeking clarification on the reason for the volume increase and how the numbers are referenced at different stages of the process.

Mat responded that he was not directly involved but explained that the original number was a general estimate. The figure of 32 to 39 billion gallons was determined after negotiations, when they identified the specific tanks—approximately 22 to 24—that would be involved. The level of detail in the estimate affected the projected waste volume.

Stephanie did not have much to add except that Susan Dahl from Ecology, who has been reviewing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Supplement Analysis, would be attending later and be a good person to answer that question in more detail. Mat agreed with Stephanie and mentioned Ricky Bang with TWO would also be there to give more insight.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, expressed frustration over how long it has taken to remove waste from Hanford. He also stated that extending the life of the hose-in-hose transfer systems was one of the critical activities for 2025 and asked what was being done regarding the risk with radiation damage, etc. to ensure they can. He mentioned that work to extend their use was already scheduled for completion this year. Mat responded that Rob should revisit the question once Ricky Bang was present, as he would be better positioned to provide a detailed answer. From his own perspective, Mat said that hose-in-hose systems have been used extensively in various retrieval activities and throughout the Tank Farms. He added that there is a technical basis supporting the conclusion that extending their use is both viable and appropriate.

Rob mentioned the mock-up at AVANTech and asked for DOE to speed up the process of allowing the HAB members to do a walk through. He said DOE told him that they are not ready yet for this to happen.

Mat had no knowledge of this but wanted to add a comment to Rob's expressed frustration with the waste removal progress. He said that the formal operational readiness review was completed and they would be moving those capsules this summer, which he felt was progress and wanted to make him aware of.

Rob said his other concern was the use of the adaptive milestones and how it was so easy to extend the lifecycle seven years in a five-year plan. He asked how they were being used and how are they not being used as an excuse to not meet their goal. Mat answered by saying that he felt that this was a good topic to have a more focused discussion on.

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland, asked about the current hazards at WTP following the delivery of ammonia. He wanted to know if there would be alarms in place, similar to those used for chlorine in the 200 West Area.

Mat responded that there are sensors installed on the skid and along the ammonia line, which also includes a metering device to limit the amount that can flow to the LAW Facility. Additionally, there is a monitor in the ammonia dilution room at the LAW Facility. He noted that protective measures are in place, such as bollards and specific procedures for how the tanks are filled. Personal protective equipment (PPE) and monitoring are used during tank filling and when placing them into service. While the setup is similar to the chlorine system used in the water plant, it is not identical. He added that ammonia plays a critical role in the treatment process because it is used to mitigate NOx emissions generated when tank waste is processed in the melter. Richard asked if the alarm was a separate system used outside of the site and Mat answered no, that it was integrated with the control room at WTP and would be monitored there. He did say they were integrated with the Emergency Management team at Hanford Mission Integration Solutions (HMIS).

Richard asked Dave if bioreactors were the reason for the new air strippers at the pump and treat area and Dave clarified that the bioreactors were for treating nitrate and the air strippers are for pulling out the carbon tetrachloride.

Matthew Campbell, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, asked if there were any plans for the totes that were being returned to Hanford. Mat said that the totes would be placed in a storage unit. He added that there are no current plans to reuse them, and they may or may not be used in the future.

Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interests, recalled Mat saying that hot commissioning was expected to begin in August and asked when it was anticipated to be completed. He also inquired whether operations would transition directly to H2C or if there would still be an extended hot commissioning phase.

Mat clarified that when he referred to "hot commissioning," he was talking about the completion of the sprint run. Initial hot commissioning is expected to begin in mid-July to allow certification to be completed in early August. He explained that this phase is defined by introducing enough tank waste and glass formers to fill the melter's melt pool with actual tank waste. The process starts with simulants, and it takes five batches per melter to produce a full canister of ILAW tank waste. This five-batch process is expected to occur within a two-week period.

Mat added that hot commissioning will then continue, transitioning into what they call "tank waste treatment operations." He said they have an extended hot commissioning contract modification that allows Bechtel and Waste Treatment Completion Company (WTCC) to operate the DFLAW Facility for up to 18 months at DOE's discretion. The intent is for Bechtel/WTCC to operate the facility for some time before transitioning to H2C. He emphasized that the goal is to identify the right time for this

handoff—one that minimizes impacts to both WTP’s progress on the High-Level Waste (HLW) design phase and H2C’s operational readiness.

Chris had a second question about the 2025 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report that Miya had referenced. He noted that the report assumed the melter’s lifetime would be about 2.5 years and asked what the actual expected lifespan might be.

Mat responded that the melters are expected to last a bit longer than that. He explained that each melter has a projected operational life of about 5 years, but they are scheduled to be changed out every 2.5 years to ensure reliability and maintain continuous operation. He did say to keep in mind that these numbers are based off of using only the tuning feed in the melters and not factoring in the actual tank waste and how it will affect the melters over time.

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC), recalled a “take cover” back in November due to an ammonia leak and Brian Vance gave an update at the last full Board meeting, indicating that there was a problem with the O rings but they were going to be repaired. Two weeks ago, there was another “take cover” from an ammonia leak and she asked if Mat could give them an update on that.

Mat explained that the ammonia leak in the 200 East Area last November was caused by gasket degradation. In response, they replaced the gaskets and packing on all the valves. The vendor also informed them that some loosening of the packing could occur due to seasonal temperature changes.

For about two months following the repair, there were no further leaks. However, a few weeks ago, an ammonia alarm was triggered on the skid. Upon investigation, they found that the ammonia levels did not exceed the emergency action threshold and did not warrant a full “take cover” for the 200 East Area. However, as a precaution, a local “take cover” was declared within the WTP facility until the hazard could be fully assessed.

Industrial Hygiene (IH) staff conducted air monitoring, and at a distance of 30 meters from the skid, no ammonia was detected. Further inspection revealed that the packing on one of the valves was looser than specified. That day saw temperatures ranging from 75°F during the day to 45°F at night, and Mat noted that this kind of environmental cycling between seasons can affect torque levels. They now plan to check valve torque before major seasonal changes.

He also acknowledged the need for better communication regarding precautionary “take cover” events. These incidents currently do not appear on the Hanford Site app, but Bechtel is working with HMIS to implement a notification system—similar to the one used for weather delays—so that workers are informed. He emphasized that even precautionary events impact site traffic and operations, so timely communication is important.

Miya asked when the waste that had been shipped off-site would be grouted, as well as what the grout-to-waste ratio and resulting volume increase would be. She also wanted to know whether both facilities would be reporting that information back to DOE, whether it would be made publicly available, and when that might occur. Mat said that he did not know the treatment schedule but that she should follow up with Ricky that afternoon to get better details.

Pam recommended that DOE look into putting someone from the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) staff at the Federal Emergency Operations Center. Mat said that the EOC does have local representation when they declare events at the Benton County level. Pam explained that she was talking about a representative for the Benton County EOC going to the federal EOC and Matt confirmed they did have

that spot but currently it was not filled. Pam suggested that it get filled. Mat said he would pull the string on that.

Rob noted that during a fall 2024 HAB presentation, it was discussed that the glass former system was not functioning properly. Since it is now clearly operational, he asked how the issue was resolved.

Mat explained that there were short-term, intermediate, and long-term solutions.

- **Short-Term Solution:** The immediate fix was to have the glass former recipe prepared at Three Rivers Terminal (TRT) and then sent to Atkins in the Richland area. Atkins mixes the ingredients into a slurry, which is then sampled and transported by truck to the site. The slurry is received through a connection outside the LAW Facility and is currently being used for commissioning.
- **Intermediate Solution:** While the slurry approach is ongoing, an upgrade is being installed at the LAW Facility. Working with powder-handling experts Thomas & Mueller and J&J, they are replacing the original mixer system with a hopper and feed screw mechanism. This new design eliminates many of the elbows and angles in the original system, which had caused blockages. The material will now drop from the hopper to a screw feeder, be transported horizontally, and then drop directly into the process vessel where it mixes with tank waste before feeding the melters. This modification is expected to be completed in June. Once installed, the system will support both slurry and dry feed delivery methods.
- **Long-Term Solution:** For a more permanent fix, they are evaluating whether to replace the existing silos or adopt an alternative solution. One option is to integrate dry feed handling capabilities into the HLW Facility so it can support both HLW and DFLAW over the lifecycle of the facility.

Mat acknowledged that while the system is complex, it is functional. He also noted that J&J recommended using hoppers with angular bottoms to reduce the risk of clogging, which has been a persistent issue with the cylindrical silos and pneumatic transfer system.

Rob also asked if there was any word on the NUCON vapor efforts and Mat said that he did not have any information but to ask Ricky this afternoon. Ryan Miller, Ecology, spoke up and said they presented on the permit for that, and DOE would be the best to provide an update on that now that the permit has been issued. He also deferred Rob to Ricky.

Follow-up Questions for Ricky Bang

Later in the meeting, Ricky Bang, DOE, offered the opportunity for the HAB follow-up on questions that Mat was unable to answer.

Rob asked if there had been any drop accidents on site. Ricky said that he was unaware of any on the Tank Farm side. Rob commented that he was wondering about the WTP side and asked if someone could find out.

Rob also mentioned that, per the 5-Year Plan, they are supposed to be requalifying all the hose-in-hose transfer lines this year. He asked how they would be doing that. Ricky replied that they are still on schedule with that and have requirements to update Ecology with how they are tracking the hose-in-hose transfers they have deployed. He said there has been no issues that come to mind with the existing hose-and-hose transfer lines.

Rob then asked about reactivating the cross-site transfer lines. He said he sees this as being very difficult and felt they need more than three years to bring them back online. Ricky responded that there are TPA milestones in place: 2030 for the supernate line and 2036 for the slurry line. He emphasized that while these commitments exist, they must still go through the process of inspecting the lines, assessing their

condition, and sharing that information with Ecology. Only after that can the reactivation process move forward. He said he appreciated all the acknowledgement for the challenges that exist in reactivating the cross-site transfer lines and that they will work through this with Ecology.

Miya asked when the TBI waste would be grouted, when they would find out the grout to waste ratio, volume, change, etc. Ricky answered that he does not have a timeline from the vendors, but he heard it would be a few weeks. With TBI being under a Research, Development, and Demonstration (RD&D) permit he thought that this information would be a part of the report to Ecology that is issued at the end of the year. Miya asked if this would be public information, and he was unsure. Ryan spoke up to let Miya know that he would follow up with Suzanne on that and let her know.

Draft Advice on Site Infrastructure

As the leader of the Issue Manager (IM) team that initially developed the draft advice (*Attachment 4*), Richard Bloom provided an overview of the advice content and goals. While the IM team hoped to see commuter safety concerns on the Hanford Site resolved, it was understood that funding for such a project would not be available for some time.

This advice differed from similar advice submitted by the HAB previously, taking the approach of suggesting preparation of the required surveys, documentation, and plans that would eventually be necessary for the project, ensuring that infrastructure improvements could be initiated as soon as those funds became available. Additionally, Richard explained, pedestrian safety continued to be a concern in the 300 Area, as the closely located fire station would remain in operation longer than initially anticipated, which the advice also addressed.

Rebecca Holland contributed that the concerns the advice addressed also had implications for emergency response on the Hanford Site. She provided examples of recent events on the Hanford Site, such as an ammonia release event that brought Hanford traffic to a standstill, impeding traffic both on and off the site for hours. She invited questions and comments.

There were several “to be decided” items remaining in the draft that the HAB addressed.

- **Addressees and Recipients:** It was determined that the letter would be addressed to Brian Harkins, DOE’s Acting Manager for the Hanford Site. Vanessa Turner was offered as another recipient at DOE, along with the standard list of CCs.
- **Advice Title:** It was suggested during initial advice development that the title associated with HAB Advice #319, *Traffic Safety*, did not adequately convey what the HAB hoped to communicate with that advice. There was an outstanding action in the new draft advice to determine a more appropriate title to suit the content. The title of *Protect the Safety of Hanford Site Commuting Worker* was chosen to convey a request for action and clarify the goals of the advice content.
- **References:** In the draft document, there was a comment on content added during the LIDS subcommittee review that provided a suggested reference to support that content. The HAB decided to implement that reference in the final document.

Following resolution of the outstanding action items, additional concerns were addressed:

- Regarding the second advice point, it was noted that “to address” did not clearly call for action. Following clarification of the nature of the pedestrian safety issues in the 300 Area, that advice point was modified to include a request for evaluation.
- DOE’s response to HAB Advice #319 was described in the draft background section as being “inadequate.” The HAB discussed whether that description would come off as an attack or if it was merited, with several members supporting its inclusion. Following deliberation, the wording was

changed to clarify that the response failed to address the advice points listed in #319. The goal was to communicate that the HAB wanted clear responses to each point, so that if a point in the advice could not or would not be implemented a reason why would be provided.

Board Decision

With all questions and concerns resolved, HAB members were invited to confirm their support for the advice as edited (*Appendix A*). In confirmation of consensus, three seats elected to abstain:

- Kermit Mankiller, Nez Perce Tribe. Kermit clarified that he had no issues that needed to be resolved with the advice as written, but did not feel he had the context necessary to support.
- Matthew Campbell, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation. Rose explained that she elected to abstain as they would have the opportunity to comment on any resulting work through the Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act) process instead.

The advice was adopted by a consensus of the remaining seats present.

Holistic Agreement

Suzanne Dahl from the Ecology Nuclear Waste Program introduced herself as the Tank Waste Treatment Section Manager. She is involved in anything having to do with treating or disposing of tank waste.

Ricky Bang introduced himself as the Acting Assistant Manager for DOE's TWO. His areas of responsibility included Tank Farms, 222-S laboratory, tank waste storage, treatment and receipt of secondary waste from the WTP facilities.

Michelle Mullin, with EPA Region 10, introduced herself as the Senior Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Policy Advisor and lead negotiator for EPA through the last stages of the Holistic Agreement.

Suzanne recalled giving a briefing to the HAB last year about proposed changes to the TPA and Consent Decree. That proposed agreement then went through public comment and tribal consultation, and then a public comment responsiveness summary was issued prior to the agreement being finalized last January.

She explained that the purpose of this briefing was for the TPA agencies to provide an informational briefing on the final Holistic Agreement for the tank waste cleanup at Hanford (*Attachment 5*). This would include an overview of the agreement, and changes and updates that were made.

Background was given, which included:

- June 2020: TPA agencies began federally mediated negotiations to identify agreeable path forward for Hanford tank waste retrieval and treatment mission
- April 2024: Agencies announced agreement
- January 2025: Agreement finalized

Ricky discussed the geographic layout shown in *Attachment 5*, slide 4. He pointed out the WTP, located at the bottom of the slide, along with several LAW facilities currently in the commissioning phase. Just west of those facilities is the HLW area, which he noted is one of the elements addressed in the Holistic Agreement. Further west, he highlighted the Tank Farms, explaining that the AP Farm is where tank waste is treated and fed to the WTP. He also discussed the single-shell and double-shell tank farms shown on the diagram—single-shell tanks (SSTs) represented by green boxes (specifically noting A and AX Farms), and double-shell tanks represented by blue boxes.

He noted that most of these farms were located in the 200 East Area, which, along with the WTP, is covered under the Holistic Agreement. He added that the agreement also addresses the 200 West Area, located approximately 7-8 miles further west of the 200 East Area.

200 East Area

He said the WTP area includes several major facilities, including the LAW and HLW facilities, with both the DSTs and SSTs located in the center of the area. He noted that the AP Farm (a DST farm) is where much of their treatment activity takes place. A and AX Farms (SST farms) are where retrieval activities are underway or identified in the Consent Decree and Holistic Agreement.

200 West Area

Ricky said that in the 200 West Area is where they will see more activity ramp up as part of the Holistic Agreement. There is one DST farm (SY) and six SST farms (SX, S, U, TX, and T). Ones that he said would be mentioned quite a bit in the presentation would be SX, S, and U.

Suzanne said that all three parties would agree that the Holistic Agreement was a realistic and achievable course for continuing the cleanup of 56 million gallons of radioactive and chemical waste that is located in underground storage tanks at Hanford. The agreement set the course for tank waste retrieval and tank waste treatments, at least through the 2040 timeframe. She explained this agreement was educated by various documents along the way:

- An alternative analysis for the high-level treatment mission
- System plan documents that occur every three years, providing a systematic look at what the whole lifecycle looks like at the Hanford Tank Farms and the waste treatment
- TBI which included an environmental assessment, waste incidental to reprocessing (WIR), and an EPA variance given to be able to treat the 2,000 gallons that was part of the TBI

She mentioned that the Holistic Agreement has three parts: Settlement Agreement, changes to federal Consent Decree, and changes to the TPA.

Settlement Agreement

She discussed numerous things that were involved with the Settlement Agreement. A few of these were:

- Conducting mediated negotiations for possible updates to the TPA Appendices H (tank retrievals) and I (tank closures)
- Discuss off-site grout disposal conditions, if any, after proposed conditions expire

Suzanne and Ricky moved on to discuss multiple agreement highlights in numerous areas. These included:

Waste Treatment Plant

- Maintain existing time frames for starting tank waste treatment: LAW in 2025 and HLW in 2033
- Revise milestones for pretreatment and full operations of plant after starting treatment of HLW

Treating High-Level Tank Waste

- Use direct-feed approach for immobilizing HLW in glass, similar to Hanford's DFLAW program
- Build transfer vault and second effluent management facility to support treating HLW

Retrieving Tank Waste

- Maintain schedule in Consent Decree for retrieving waste from tanks in A/AX tank farms (extending deadlines for Tanks A-104 and A-105 or substitute tanks)
- Change schedule for completing retrieval of waste from Tank A-103 to 2028

Retrieving and Grouting Tank Waste

- Retrieve waste from 22 tanks in Hanford's 200 West Area by 2040
- Grouts low-activity portion of waste for disposal off-site (grouting and out-of-state disposal locations to be determined)

Evaluating Technologies and Storage

- Evaluate and develop new technologies for retrieving tank waste
- Design and construct 1 million gallons of capacity for multipurpose storage of tank waste (operate by 2040 in 200 West Area)

Some additional highlights captured in the holistic agreement include:

- Activating cross-site transfer lines
- Maintain existing milestone for: retrieval of waste from SSTs (2040), closure of SST system (2043), and treatment of all tank waste (2047)
- Revision of above end dates after HLW treatment begins

Suzanne said that before moving on to questions, she wanted to highlight changes made to the agreement following the public comment period, consultation, and discussions with the HAB. One concern she recalled was that the Supplement Analysis would be made available to the public, but its release was not aligned with a milestone that required a decision on whether tank waste from the 22 tanks would be grouted on-site, near-site, or sent to a receiving disposal facility. The concern was that the analysis should be available for public review and comment before any decision was made. As a result, the milestone was moved out by approximately six months, to December 2025. Ricky believed this milestone was for DOE to select an alternative treatment technology for the 200 West Area.

Michelle wanted to ensure that the HAB understood that when the DOE makes a decision to grout and dispose of waste off site, such as in the case of TBI, EPA would be responsible for issuing a variance from the RCRA land disposal restrictions. This variance would be based on a petition submitted by the DOE. She explained that the process involves DOE proposing what it wants to do, submitting a formal request to the EPA, and then working collaboratively with the EPA to develop a petition that is acceptable to both parties.

Board Questions

Miya asked about the public meetings held last summer regarding the Holistic Agreement. At that time, the volume of waste being discussed was significantly lower than what is now mentioned in the Supplement Analysis. That new analysis references 22–24 tanks and 32–39 million gallons of waste. In contrast, H2C's supplemental data report mentions 44 tanks. Miya wanted to understand the reason for this change in volume and what the total volume would be if all 44 tanks were included.

Ricky explained that these differences came up during development of the NEPA Supplement Analysis for the 200 West Area. The variation in numbers depends on the assumptions used for different types of environmental evaluations—such as transport or disposal. For example, when evaluating transportation impacts, they consider the maximum possible volume to account for worst-case scenarios, which is why

numbers like 32 to 39 million gallons are used. A higher volume translates to greater impact in terms of air emissions and truck traffic.

In contrast, other evaluations might focus on concentration rather than volume. A lower volume of waste might have higher concentrations of contaminants, which could result in different types of environmental impacts. Ricky noted that they generally use the 32-million-gallon figure when referring to the 22-24 tanks. The volume estimates can also change depending on whether you are discussing waste from SSTs alone or the full process of transferring SST waste into DSTs. Since they need to empty the SY Tank Farm (DSTs) to receive SST waste, the numbers can shift depending on how that process is accounted for—ranging from 15-25 million gallons up to 32-39 million.

As for the 44 tanks mentioned in the H2C report, that includes all tanks in the S, SX, and U Farms, while the 22-24 tanks are only a fraction of those. Ricky said he was unsure of the total volume of waste for all 44 tanks.

Miya asked if Ricky could walk them through the documents needed to move forward with the WARM project and the grouting of the waste. Ricky explained that for retrievals, they will continue following their existing processes. When it comes to tank waste treatment, off-site transport, and disposal, he said they are using the TBI project as a model for the necessary regulatory documentation for the West Area. For TBI, this included NEPA documentation, a WIR determination, Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) treatment variance, and the associated permits. He expects the documentation for the West Area Tank Treatment mission will be very similar.

Suzanne agreed with Ricky overall but added more detail. She noted that air permitting and dangerous waste or RCRA permitting would be required for several different facilities. Additionally, there would need to be a permit modification for upgrades to the DSTs at the SY Farm.

She also mentioned the installation of a new Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) system in the West Area, which would be a new unit added to the sitewide permit. Depending on where the waste is ultimately solidified, there may or may not be an on-site solidification facility—if there is, it would be considered a new permitted activity. Finally, she said there would also be designated load/unload areas. These could either be part of an existing facility or require a standalone RCRA permit, depending on the final design and layout.

Michelle noted that another permitting type of document that would most likely be needed was Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) approvals, which are issued by EPA.

Miya said there was also mention of a business case analysis last summer and wanted to know if that had already happened and whether it was publicly available. Ricky said he believed the business case analysis for grout was completed and if you look back at the expression of interest that Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) put out last fall/winter, it contained DOE's request for vendor commercial data for route options. He said there was a grout industry day held in February 2025 where commercial vendors presented their capabilities for grouting treated LAW. The business case was still in development based on the information they have available and has not been issued. Miya asked if it was an internal document that the public will not be able to see, and Ricky said he would have to check on what they plan to do with it and get back to her on that.

Brian Ivey, Public at Large, wanted to know if the goal was to grout and transport offsite all of tank waste in the West Area. Ricky responded that the plan was to retrieve, grout, and transport waste from at least the 22 tanks they were currently committed to. Decisions regarding the remaining tanks would be made in coordination with EPA and Ecology.

Brian asked if the cross-site transfer lines were still necessary and Ricky said yes, the transfer lines were still needed to get some of the West Area sludge over to East Area to maximize efficiencies with treating the tank waste. Suzanne added that they were still needed for the supernate associated with T Farms. Ricky agreed that it gives the most operational flexibility for the site. Suzanne said the waste that is applicable to being grouted and shipped off site as LAW are the supernate liquids and salt cake. The sludge is primarily a HLW feed.

Rob Davis asked if they were still leaving the sludge in the 22 tanks or if they were completely cleaning them out. Ricky said they will retrieve those tanks which would include any sludge they can retrieve from them. The sludge would then be separated and stored in the DST until they would transfer it over to the East Area or WTP HLW treatment. Rob commented that he felt there was still going to be a whole lot of supernate in that transfer that is not dissolved.

Rob asked whether there was still interest in separating the A, B, C, and D waste in West Farm and how that would be managed, given that many of the waste types are incompatible. Ricky answered that they will have a strategy that is developed as a result of the Holistic Agreement to be able to do that within the AP tank farm.

Rob also expressed frustration about the pace of progress. He noted that numerous expert panels have already weighed in on the best methods for waste extraction, and now there is talk of convening yet another panel. He questioned the need, saying he doubts any new answers will be found and does not understand the delay when so much information and experience already exist.

Ricky replied that the retrieval milestone for the A Tank Farm remains unchanged. They will continue retrieving waste from both the A Tank Farm and the 22 tanks committed to in the West Area. If technologies to retrieve waste from A-104 and A-105 are not available, DOE will shift to retrieving two additional tanks from the S, SX, or U Farms instead. This would still meet the overall goal of retrieving the same number of tanks in the East and West Areas by 2028 and 2040.

As for the expert panel, Ricky acknowledged Rob's concerns but emphasized that even if no new technologies are identified, it is still important to evaluate the current state of available technologies. The goal is to ensure DOE is using the best possible approach for retrieving waste from A-104 and A-105. He stressed that this is not a delay in tank retrieval—just a decision about which tanks will be retrieved within the established timeframes.

Suzanne added that the panel is specifically intended to help identify technology options for the two particularly problematic A Tanks. Rob asked if it had to do with the segregation of the tank and Ricky answered that it has to do with the tank conditions: the tank bottom, the interferences within the tank, and the challenges with the tank liner.

Rob said they spent a lot of time designing WTP to avoid thermal excursions because of the mixing of different types of waste. Suzanne spoke up to confirm that Rob was going back to his first question regarding segregating the feed envelopes A, B, C, and D being the sludges. Rob acknowledged a lot of effort has been put into the HLW vitrification development based on the different classifications of that waste.

Matt Hendrickson, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), commented that if DOE could get headquarters to move WIR along that would be much appreciated. He said he would like to see that process completed, including the public comment period, before Milestone M-62-64 is due at the end of the year, as it would help clarify which facilities are needed.

Matt then asked whether the expert technology panel meetings would be open to the public so that stakeholders could review the discussions. He also inquired about DOE and EPA's thinking and timelines related to the treatment variances. Specifically, he wanted to know whether they were approaching the variances on a tank-by-tank basis or by entire tank farms, and how that might affect the overall timeline for issuing the treatability variances.

Ricky responded that he did not recall what the milestone specifically committed to in terms of public access to the expert panel. He noted that Ecology would be participating in all expert panel meetings but said he would follow up with more information on the public access language and the LDR variance. At this time, he did not have a timeline for when decisions would be made regarding the LDR variances. Michelle added that from EPA's perspective, they would be approving or disapproving the petition.

Chris said he did not understand the answer Ricky gave to Miya regarding the different volumes of liquid waste. Ricky clarified what he had said earlier and said they had committed to retrieving 22 tanks out of 44 total tanks in 200 West Area. He said they had not identified which of the 44 tanks they are going to retrieve and each of the tanks have different volumes and constituents.

Matthew Campbell asked for confirmation that the effluent from the HLW Facility would go directly to the Tank Farm to be treated later. Suzanne confirmed that during the initial startup phase of DFLAW, that was correct, the effluent would be sent to the Tank Farm. However, she added that within a few years, the high-level evaporator system was expected to be constructed and brought online. Once that happens, the effluent would instead pass through the evaporators. She explained that a portion of the effluent would bypass the top section of the evaporator system and be sent to the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility at the Hanford Site to be managed as secondary waste. The remaining material, the evaporator bottoms, would be recycled back to the melter. The goal is to maximize the incorporation of radionuclides into glass.

Matthew then asked about the expected volume and radioactivity of the initial effluent. Ricky and Suzanne both confirmed that those numbers were not yet available.

Miya said she was surprised to see strontium-90 removal referenced in the Supplement Analysis, as she had understood that strontium was not being removed by the TSCR system. She noted that the document indicated a 96.8% removal rate and asked what studies had been done on tank waste to support the claim that the ion exchange columns can remove that much strontium.

Ricky responded that he believed the ion exchange media used in TSCR is capable of removing strontium, possibly because strontium and cesium compete for binding sites on the media. He noted there may be Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) studies that support this, but asked Miya to submit her question as a formal comment so DOE can respond with the appropriate technical justification.

Suzanne added that the original work done between DOE and the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to develop the WIR framework included certain expectations for the LAW side.

One requirement was to remove as many radionuclides as possible, with a specific focus on cesium removal.

Another element was the need to filter particles, since strontium can be present on the particles. She explained that the TSCR system includes a filtration step before the ion exchange column to capture these particles. If the strontium is in soluble form, it can also bind to the cesium ion exchange media.

She said it has been a part of the design of the pretreatment facility, TSCR facility operating in 200 East, and future TSCR facilities that there is a filtration process that happens prior to the ion exchange column

and captures particles that strontium could be on. She said if it is soluble strontium it binds with the cesium ion exchange media along with the cesium.

Hanford Tank Waste Operations & Closure, LLC

Phil Bridenbach, Chief Operating Officer for H2C, went through his background at the Hanford Site and previous employment at Savannah River. He gave a company overview for H2C, which he explained was the new tank operating contractor at Hanford, including all involved contractors and contractor support. (*Attachment 6*) He explained that H2C had three partnering companies which are: BWXT, Amentum, and Flour and 4 teaming subcontractors that were selected due to their specific skill set. These were:

- DSSplus for their specialty in chemical safety
- DBD who are experts in process modeling
- Longenecker and Associates who are excellent in areas of environmental and contractor assurance processes
- Intera who has strong expertise and local knowledge in environmental modeling

He went through the contract by the numbers and explained this was a 45-billion-dollar contract, being DOE's largest contract. It has a 10-year duration with an option of a five-year extension and currently has total of 2,850 employees and subcontractors. He explained this was an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contract meaning it is made up of task orders that are developed as the contract progresses.

Since the contract began in February, the contract performance has been going very well and from a safety perspective, there has been no injuries. They have started issuing subcontracts with plans to award \$136 million in total with \$83 million to small businesses. Some of these include local companies such as American Electrical, Highline, and Apollo.

He went on to talk about the Hanford Tank Farm layout which included 177 underground waste storage tanks: 149 SSTs (pictured in blue) and 28 DSTs (pictured in green) on *Attachment 6*, slide 5.

He said it is an exciting time at Hanford as the mission continues to evolve, which was one of the reasons he chose to come onboard. He described the current mission as focused on processing, treatment, and hazard reduction, highlighting several ongoing operations—especially those involving the SSTs, where the hazards are most significant.

He outlined the following multi-step process that H2C would follow:

- Step 1: Remove material from the SSTs.
- Step 2: Transfer that material into the DSTs.
- Step 3: Create space in the DSTs using the 242-A Evaporator, which concentrates the waste by evaporating liquid. The resulting supernate (or “overhead”) is then sent to ETF.

This evaporation process creates additional space in the DSTs, enabling continued retrieval from the SSTs. However, he noted that this process only allows for a limited amount of space creation. As a result, the next phase TSCR is being developed. Through TSCR, they can process the waste and remove a large portion of the radioactive material, creating LAW.

The LAW will then be treated through the DFLAW system, anticipated to begin operations in the July/August timeframe. He emphasized how exciting this is, as it represents the gradual transfer of high-risk material from the SSTs into a more controlled and treatable form in the DSTs.

He mentioned that since H2C arrived in February, they have successfully restarted ETF, which had not been operational for three years. So far, it has processed over 2 million gallons of material. Additionally,

they restarted the evaporator, which had been offline for six years. He said they have completed two evaporator campaigns to date, creating over 400,000 gallons of space in the DSTs. He also acknowledged that WTP did an excellent job laying the groundwork for these successes.

He shared several photos illustrating the processes he discussed and expressed excitement about continuing Tank Farm operations. He noted they are preparing to start up the vitrification plant this summer and begin sending out material.

Lastly, he discussed the four focus areas:

- Culture and process transformation
- Disciplined, reliable, and continuous operations
- Readiness for WTP startup and transition to H2C
- Training and Development

He also reviewed H2C's vision, mission, values, and key behaviors.

Agency Perspective

Ricky said that DOE was pleased to bring H2C onboard as the prime contractor to support the tank waste mission. He acknowledged the significant successes and improvements made since their arrival—particularly within the workforce—and expressed enthusiasm about continuing the partnership moving forward.

Board Questions

Chris asked, “In terms of process control and consistent and continuous operations, what are the biggest concerns that you have?” Phil answered that his biggest concerns were that they get an outlet for the waste. He said it is very important that the vitrification plant comes online so that they have a mission; without that, there isn't one.

Rebecca asked whether there are plans to integrate members of the current workforce into the vitrification plant. Phil responded that yes, there will be a consolidation of the workforce at some point in the future. He noted that, in his experience, it is best to keep individuals in roles where they already have expertise. Over time, however, movement across positions will occur. He added that training programs will be in place to support employees who choose to transition into different roles.

Brian said in his opinion, being a former WRPS worker, the newer people were lacking a lot of tribal knowledge. He felt there was not enough “new and old” workers following each other around. He also mentioned HAMMER was one of the best training facilities in the country and that it was important for a high percentage of H2C worker trainers to be down there. Phil agreed with him and said he thought it was a great strength of that program.

Round Robin Discussion

What does your constituency or organization expect to get from the HAB?

David Reeploeg, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), answered that currently TRIDEC was a lead economic development organization in the Tri-City area but originally, back in the 60s, had more of a federal advocacy role, advocating for consistent funding for Hanford's, at that time, plutonium production mission and other economic diversification opportunities tied to federal mission in the Tri-City area. TRIDEC's mission since then, even though they still advocate for Hanford funding, has evolved to become more of a traditional economic development organization. Their main focus now is advocating

for site cleanup and the funding that requires. David said one thing that weighs on his mind is the Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report. He felt like the timeline and numbers did not add up. The report shows they would need anywhere between 5-12 billion dollars a year until 2086 which he thought was not realistically achievable. He believed there was an opportunity for TRIDEC and the HAB to make one of their major focuses how they can collectively bring down cost and schedule for cleanup. This was a high priority to him to look at what some of those opportunities may be.

Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, said they are a regional planning organization made up of the cities, counties, port districts, transit agencies, and local governments for two counties. She said their primary role is to help them access state and federal funding for projects like infrastructure, transportation, and economic development. Having a seat on the HAB helps her organization listen in on what is happening in the region that could impact the economy or transportation. She feels that they are also a good resource for the HAB to give back regional data that may be helpful to Tri-Party agencies or other partners.

Rob Parmelee, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, noted that his position is somewhat in a gray area. He explained that there are many different contractors on site who face concerns such as safety risks, potential leaks, and impacts to their personal lives or the environment—issues that directly affect them. From his perspective, it is challenging to determine how the HAB can effectively communicate with those workers. With H2C coming to Hanford, one of the biggest concerns among workers is the upcoming transition and what it will mean for them. Rob stated that he does his best to share the information he hears at HAB meetings with the people he interfaces with.

Pam replied that she meets with the Benton County Commissioners annually to give them a report on what the HAB had done throughout the year and what advice the HAB has addressed.

Miya said that HAB meetings provide a valuable opportunity to learn what is happening on site. She explained that this information allows her to bring insights back to Hanford Challenge and communicate it in a way the public can understand. Hanford Challenge shares updates from HAB briefings and other developments at Hanford on their website to help keep the public informed.

She also noted that the HAB offers opportunities to build relationships with other members, which can lead to potential partnerships outside of the Board. Miya emphasized that, without the HAB, there would not be another space fostering that kind of collaboration.

Susan, as a Public at Large representative, said her constituency was everyone she interacted with like her hairdresser, auto mechanics, or landscapers. Her membership made her better able to answer questions and help pass information on so that they are better informed citizens. She felt that verbal communication was even more important today because not everyone reads the newspaper; most nowadays are relying on social media and the internet.

Rebecca is part of HAMTC which represents about 3,500 union workers on site. She said their number one priority is the health and safety of the workers, which is something she said she is really passionate about, being a worker herself. She takes information back to her work group and the President of HAMTC to make sure that everyone has adequate information about what is going on at Hanford. She said she will bring specific questions or concerns from HAMTC back to the Board as well. She enjoys getting clarification for people and is passionate about protecting the workforce.

Brian represented Public at Large, sharing information with neighbors, friends, and former co-workers. He said he feels like the HAB gives him the opportunity to be one step ahead of the game with all of the information that is shared.

Rob Davis said that he represents the City of Pasco and meets with them twice a year to give a presentation about the general progress that is being made on site. He also answers city council questions about rumors, accidents on site, site exposure to the river, and soil contaminating the drinking water on the other side of the river. With the rapid growth in construction in Pasco, contaminated drinking water and air quality has been a huge concern for them.

Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interests, said that while he does not report to a specific organization, he meets weekly with a group of about 15 retirees from PNNL and Hanford. He noted strong interest among them in the tank farms, and especially the Vit Plant and waste processing efforts. When he shares updates from the HAB with this group, the same two questions consistently come up: *Why is it taking so long?* and *Why is it costing so much?* He added that he rarely hears concerns about long-term environmental impacts or what the site might look like in 40-50 years.

Chris also mentioned that his wife is active in the quilting community, and he shares HAB information with members of that group as well. Interestingly enough, he said they raise the same two questions.

Aaron Siefken, representing Central Washington Building Trades Council (BTC), explained that the BTC, which includes 17 affiliated construction groups, prioritized worker safety, cleanup of the site, and the related recommendations it can provide. After HAB meetings, he brings the information back to the BTC and shares it with members of IBEW, the union he was a part of. The BTC then shares that information with their respective unions. With about 15,000 members across Central Washington, their goal is to stay informed, ensure their voices are heard, and use the information from the HAB to help educate their members on issues affecting the site.

Chuck Torelli, City of Kennewick, said his biggest use for the HAB was to get information for council meetings, promote importance of Hanford engagement, and to educate fellow council members.

Matt Hendrickson, being a part of the ODOE said that he is very involved in the HAB and trying to add to conversations. He said one thing he likes to see and expects from the HAB members is active involvement. He likes using the HAB as a gateway to get subject matter experts that can illuminate them on certain issues that affect the Columbia River and transportation. These issues, he believed, are important to his constituency and Oregon.

Spencer Harris, Kadlec, said what he brings back is typically focused on the workforce and any changes to the workforce that they can best prepare for to serve the community from a healthcare needs standpoint.

Kermit from the Nez Perce Tribe said they receive valuable information and perspective from the HAB. While they have their own interactions with the DOE and their own set of priorities, it is important for them to also understand the perspectives of others—especially on technical issues. He emphasized that it is helpful to know how people closer to the site are seeing the implications of the actions being taken.

He noted that they work to identify where their interests align with others but also rely on the HAB to help pinpoint issues that directly affect them. Through this, they can better understand the impacts and explore possible responses. On a personal note, he shared that being part of this process offers an opportunity to engage with others, get to know the key players, and find common ground not only professionally but personally as well. Finally, he mentioned that they plan to appoint another alternate before his term concludes this fall.

Kevin Danby, Grant and Franklin Counties, noted that due to the distance, he does not have frequent direct involvement. However, he has been looking for a topic to bring back to the county commissioners.

He said he appreciated the H2C presentation and expressed interest in finding a way to share that information with the Grant County Commissioners.

Larry Brandt, Public-at-Large, shared that he lives downstream along the Columbia River and regularly communicates with the local community, particularly fishermen and conservation groups. He said he meets weekly with a local commercial fishing group and tries to share information about HAB activities but often cannot answer the questions they raise.

According to Larry, the group frequently asks about toxins potentially reaching the river—whether the levels could shut down the fishing industry or pose a risk of poisoning to people. He expressed concern that there is a sense of fear and frustration in the community over what they perceive as a “wait and see” approach by DOE and Ecology when it comes to leaking tanks.

He noted that the local mindset is to identify problems, fix them, and move on—so many residents struggle to understand why the Hanford cleanup has taken so long and why so little information is shared publicly. One local fisherman even questioned why, if there are monitors on the Columbia River to detect toxins, the data is not made available to the public on a monthly or yearly basis.

Matthew Campbell, representing CTUIR, said there are two key things they expect to gain from participating in the HAB. First, having a seat at the table allows them to advocate for their community’s interests in the cleanup process and the long-term stewardship of the site. Second, access to updated information on upcoming projects and future cleanup efforts enables them to better understand the path forward. This information is essential for keeping their leadership informed and for determining when tribal members will be able to return to the site and exercise their treaty rights.

Rose Ferri agreed with what the other tribal representatives said earlier and added that it gives the tribes a secondary opportunity to have a voice.

Simone represents Columbia Riverkeeper which is a nonprofit organization that is an advocate for river cleanup and tribal rights. She said she enjoys having access to subject matter experts, hearing what is going on at Hanford, and getting information prior to it being released to the public.

Board Reports

Subcommittee Reports

Tank Waste Stewardship and Treatment (TWST)

Rob Davis, TWST Chair, discussed the upcoming June agenda which included presentations on grout and the TBI results. He noted that a grout scientist from PNNL would be presenting and that HAB members have compiled a list of questions about grout that they hope will be addressed during that time.

Community Outreach and Engagement (COE)

Michelle, COE Vice Chair, mentioned that the last subcommittee meeting was held virtually and noted that she found it to be much more efficient. She expressed support for continuing to hold future meetings in this format.

At the meeting, they reviewed TPA agency public involvement opportunities and held a brainstorming session focused on member engagement. They also recapped the lunch/coin question from the last Board meeting. Additionally, there was a robust discussion about the role and feasibility of gathering community input on issues such as staff and budget reductions. The group explored how such feedback

could be collected and incorporated into their advice-writing activities. They also discussed the work plan for next year and reaffirmed their commitment to working with Ryan on the Rev. 9 updates.

She went on to thank Rob Davis for coordinating a breakfast prior to the day's meeting as another way for members to connect outside of the regular meeting. She also mentioned that she would not be continuing in her leadership role as Vice Chair and her position was available for anyone interested in being nominated.

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

Rebecca Holland, LIDS Chair, recalled at the last meeting they had drafted their site infrastructure advice that was passed earlier in this meeting. She also noted that she looked forward to getting a response back from the agencies.

The June LIDS subcommittee meeting agenda would include presentations on the IDF and the ERDF. Rebecca expressed concern with the meetings now being only virtual and her ability to attend virtually. DOE and Ecology offered locations that she could travel to for technology access and assistance, if needed.

Cleanup and Risk Mitigation (CaRM)

Miya Burke, HAB Vice Chair, spoke on behalf of the CaRM Chair, Tom Sicilia. She reported that in March, the CaRM subcommittee discussed the technical impracticability evaluation for an iodine groundwater plume beneath the ERDF. An update on WESF was also provided.

Miya noted that during the upcoming June virtual subcommittee meeting, CaRM plans to explore potential advice on the 324 Building, conduct elections, review the work plan, and hold a focused forum. So far, only one topic has been requested for the forum—discussion of the Lifecycle Report. Miya encouraged anyone with additional topic suggestions to reach out to HAB Facilitation or Tom directly.

National Liaison's Report

Pam Larsen, HAB National Liaison, provided the National Liaison Report. Updates she gave for roles within the DOE were:

- New Secretary of Energy, Chris Wright.
- Nominated for leader of the EM program is Tim Walsh. He is the Assistant Secretary of Energy.
- Roger Jarrell current Assistant Secretary and Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, who is currently acting in both of these roles, will be staying on as the Deputy Assistant Secretary.
- Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Field Operations, which all of the site managers report to, is Gregory Sosson.
- Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary is Kristen Ellis
- Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Corporate Services is Dae Chung

She volunteered a copy of the organizational chart to anyone that wanted it.

She said that on May 2, the White House released its 2026 Discretionary Budget Proposal and read a portion. For the EM Program, activities at 14 active cleanup sites, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico, the EM top line was being reduced by \$389 million. She said this was because Savannah River was being moved from Environmental Management to Nuclear Energy or someplace else. She confirmed they would not be under the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

She said the Office of Science Budget reduced funding for climate change and “green new scam research.” The budget is maintained for US competitiveness in priority areas such as high-performance computing.

Overall, she said the main thing that is important to the Board is that, for EM the budget is whole and for Hanford, they will have the same appropriation in 2026 as they had in 2025.

She gave a quick summary of accomplishments from last year from the other sites. They included:

- Savannah River Site received authorization to operate the South Stone Disposal Unit #9 and completed all major concrete placements
- Oak Ridge completed soil remediation at East Tennessee Technology Park
- Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office (PPPO) finished deactivation of the X333 process building and removed an additional 1 million pounds of R114 refrigerant
- Idaho continued Naval Reactor Facility demolition of two historic and defueled naval nuclear propulsion plants
- WIPP completed construction and began commissioning of the safety significant confinement ventilation system. She said this was the new ventilation system that was supposed to be operational in 2026.
- Los Alamos retrieved site reduced and repackaged 158 buried corrugated metal pipes containing cemented transuranic waste

Pam shared that, for awareness, she compiled a number of how many federal workers have left the Hanford site since the first of the year and said it was in the ballpark of 75. She also said there were still a couple dozen federal workers that were in the 45-day period where they can still consider departing. She wanted everyone to put this in context in terms of how many federal workers there are in total which she believed to be 300-400.

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting Debrief

Miya shared that the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) spring chairs meeting, originally scheduled to be held in Nevada, was instead held virtually in April due to travel restrictions.

The group was briefed by Greg Sosson (on behalf of Roger Jarrell), who focused primarily on energy and cleanup initiatives. He stated that the Trump administration was “laser-focused” on making the government cleaner, more mission-driven, efficient, and faster.

Miya noted that the board was presented with a letter drafted by the Paducah Board addressed to the incoming EM-1 nominee, serving as a welcome from the EM SSAB. She explained that this is standard practice when a new EM-1 is appointed, and the letter would be sent once the nomination is officially confirmed.

Other briefings included:

- Justin Marble and Kristen Ellis provided an overview of waste classifications, definitions, and disposal facilities—both federal and commercial.
- Updates on reuse projects across the complex, such as efforts to repurpose nickel from the Portsmouth and Paducah sites for electric vehicle (EV) batteries.
- Steve Trischman and Mariana Dubose gave a budget update. They noted that EM requested over \$8 billion for FY2025. The continuing resolution is carrying the FY25 enacted number into calendar year 2025. DOE has been granted greater flexibility in allocating funds across sites. Specifically, the FY25 request for Hanford was \$3.1 billion.

- April Kluever provided a briefing on PFAS. She mentioned an updated PFAS assessment report is expected in late 2025. Miya explained that the report will summarize the results of surveys conducted in January 2024 across 46 DOE program sites, including Hanford. EM has coordinated extensive work on PFAS, including:
 - Workshops with national lab experts in PFAS research and design.
 - A feasibility scoping study to trace PFAS sources.
 - Quarterly PFAS roundtables involving DOE sites, headquarters, and national labs.

April also reported that 100% of DOE sites have conducted drinking water analyses. In March, a specific report was released addressing PFAS presence and use—both historical and current—at the Hanford site. Miya asked the HAB facilitation team to include [this PFAS report](#) in the weekly HAB update.

EMSSAB Business Discussion

Following that, Miya said the group discussed board business. They were informed that membership packets are currently on hold from being submitted to DOE Headquarters, as the templates are being updated to align with new rules under the current administration. Despite this delay, there was optimism that the membership packages would still be approved on time. Any HAB membership packages that are due to expire will be prioritized and submitted to headquarters first.

They also learned that [DOE Order 515.1](#), which directly pertains to citizen advisory boards, was issued in January 2025. In response, Headquarters will update the EM SSAB Policies Desk Reference to comply with the new order. Once that is completed, updates will also be made to local board operating procedures. Until then, the Board continues to operate under the 2008 Operating Ground Rules.

The fall chairs meeting is currently scheduled for October 28–30 and is planned to be held in-person in Richland, including a tour of the Hanford site. However, Miya noted that this could change to a virtual or hybrid format depending on evolving travel restrictions.

Additional Updates

- Kelly Snyder, Deputy Federal Officer (DFO) for DOE, shared insights regarding the GAO report on stakeholder engagement, which included a recommendation related to the EM SSAB. DOE intended to examine the recommendation’s scope in light of the changing environment and new administration but offered limited detail.
- Joceline Nahigian noted that the national engagement strategy and site management portion of the recommendation has been paused due to a government-wide review of operations and effectiveness. Additional information will be shared when available.
- Susan added that she had submitted a request for Justin Marble and Julia Shenk to attend a future HAB meeting and provide a briefing on transportation within DOE. She emphasized that transportation is a significant issue for the HAB, its constituents, and the Pacific Northwest region.

Board Business

Pam asked Meegan if the HAB meetings were all going to be virtual from now on. Meegan responded that Headquarters is only allowing six travel days a year with local approval and budget considerations. The subcommittee meetings were planned to be held virtually but they are still trying to get an answer on that for the full Board meetings. She said she would keep the Board up to date when she knows something from Headquarters.

Pam commented that if everyone locally could meet at a free spot, like the library, and those out of town chose to pay travel expenses, to please consider this as an option. Meegan said she was told that it was all

or nothing for in-person participation because if even one person cannot attend it would have to become hybrid, which they are not allowing at this time.

Rose wanted to clarify that it was an all or nothing situation for the type of meeting and Meegan answered yes, hybrid is denied at this time.

Rob asked about the six events that would be approved for travel and Meegan said yes, in theory. Rob brought up past meetings where they happened in two-day increments and asked if that would be possible since out of towners would still be here. Meegan said no because technically that funding would have to be a separate travel package. Staying an extra day would have extra dollars allocated for a subcommittee meeting.

Rebecca also asked for clarification on the meeting being virtual if not everyone can attend: Does that mean everyone that signed up to be a member on each committee because a lot of people that have signed up never attend. If everybody on the committee is in town and agrees to have meeting at library, she wanted to know if that was ok. Meegan said she would take that question to Headquarters and see what their response would be. If all participants can meet in person she can push for that but, the issue still remains that if someone from out of town wants to participate, hybrid is unavailable. She commented that it has to be fair for everyone.

She explained that they have clear guidance from headquarters that they could try and get full Board meetings in person and they could approve up to six, but would still need to go all the way up to EM-2 for approval on every single meeting.

Susan said that their meetings have to be hybrid unlike every other board, which each have a much smaller geographical area covered, which means not having traveling members like HAB does. Hybrid is important for engagement within such a large regional area.

Brian commented that DOE needs the HAB for public involvement and feels concerned that DOE might be dismantling the HAB.

Rose felt there needed to be some way to figure out who would be virtual or in person for the meetings. She said, for instance, if she was the only one that was going to be virtual for a meeting she would bow out so that the meeting could be in person. She felt she could get caught up later with the notes from that meeting and stressed the importance of in-person meetings.

Meegan said, just to clarify, they will work on getting travel requests approved for full Board meetings to be hybrid moving forward but all subcommittee meetings will be virtual.

Miya said that she did not agree with having only in-person meetings with no virtual option because that would leave a huge group of people out. If the local members want to meet in person, she said there still has to be a virtual option for others to be involved and receive the same information.

Chris asked if they could still have virtual IM team meetings and Meegan answered that if it is already a virtual meeting than there is no change.

Action Item Review

Susan brought up two items that she had been tracking and those were a tribal briefing and the land acknowledgement statement. The tribal briefing, by all three tribes, was supposed to be planned for the first Board meeting of the FY to educate Board members, new and old, of their Tribal governments and what they were all about. The second item came from the HAB request that the land acknowledgement statement be read at the beginning of every meeting. She said this was a little more complex with their

Board compared to others because there are three tribes represented. There has been difficulty in getting the tribes and the agencies to agree on what should be said. The last she heard, the State Tribal Government Working Group (STGWG) was supposed to be starting those discussions.

Rose acknowledged that these actions started about three years ago but that there has been a lot of transition in the groups, management, etc. Previously, she said, the discussions got to a very high level at Headquarters, but with staff turnover, she was concerned that they may have to start the process over. She recommended speaking with the DOE representative and tribal liaison, Kim Ballinger. Rose said she could reach out as well to learn the current status. Meegan asked Rose if she could consolidate all of that information for her.

Leadership Nominations

Susan said that at the upcoming August meeting they need to hold elections for leadership roles. If anyone was interested, they could share their nominations in person or send them via email.

Public Comment

Josh Patnaude explained that public comment was an opportunity for individuals to share their comments and have them entered into the official record. Each person who signed up would have up to five minutes to speak, depending on the number of participants. He also noted that individuals are welcome to amend or submit their public comments in writing. Dan Solitz had a public comment regarding the geological disposal. He said he always thought that the consent-based siting that they were doing for interim storage was kind of a dress rehearsal for geological disposal. He said he noticed that it was dead in the water and there has been no update of the site since the end of the year. He would like a report from DOE on what they are planning on doing. If they are planning on dropping that because of pending legislation that would establish an independent agency to take care of the geological disposal. He said he would like to say that it is indeed a dress rehearsal and Savannah is double stacking their high-level waste glass now and Hanford is making plans to double stack its high-level waste glass. He said it takes so long to get anything done that he thought they should keep forging ahead, even if they would not be involved in the future work, so whoever does it in the future will be able to build on. He finished by saying thank you for considering that.

Dan Serres introduced himself as the Advocacy Director with Columbia Riverkeeper and a former HAB member. He thanked everyone for being there and digging through so many documents, processes, and sharing information that is hard to understand if you are just a member of the general public, and honestly, hard to understand if you are a former HAB member. There are a lot of moving pieces and said he appreciates all the work being done. He also wanted to say he tuned in for a small part of the EM SSAB and the work the Susan and Miya, and for a long time Pam, have done there in those meetings is really appreciated. He said it is really appreciated that those conversations are deep and broad and that he learned a lot. He also wanted to agree with what Pam said about the work at WESF, how important it is and what good news it is that it is moving forward. So to the people who are making that happen, thank you. Lastly, he wanted to say that he heard what Rebecca Holland said about the ammonia leaks and that was very concerning, and he appreciated that those issues were really evolving and the people that speak up and let them know that changing systems impact the health of people who are executing the most important cleanup on the planet, probably. That means a lot to people like him who just listen in from afar and do not see everything that they all see. He also thanked Rose for speaking up for transparent conversation and putting things in terms that folks can understand. He said everyone was doing great work, thank you.

Gerry Pollet said on behalf of Heart of America Northwest he would like to urge that the agenda and materials for tomorrow's, Committee of the Whole (COTW), and as a rule, such materials get posted online for people to be able to easily access. Since notices are no longer being widely distributed, it seems, and in order to review anything for tomorrow's COTW, there is nothing online under the HAB. He said that today's meeting was posted but not tomorrow's and he urged that everything get posted in advance and readily available including the proposed plan and presentations.

Secondly on behalf of Heart of America Northwest, he asked for the time necessary to do comment and review on what is called the Supplement Analysis for the holistic tank agreement. The Supplement Analysis is not actually an analysis as he said he thought everyone already knew, it is an analysis of whether or not an analysis will be done. He said it was gravely disappointing that although the timeline was extended that the Board did not have the opportunity to formally have it on the agenda for today's meeting, the Energy Department obviously knew that it was going to be released in advance of this meeting. He said it is vitally important that they look at and that the public have a forum for discussion as was promised at the public meetings over and over again. That there would be dialogue and discussion about such items as whether or not further analysis of tank leaks is necessary, and transportation including the transportation routes for about 40 million gallons of waste which works out to be numerous shipments every single day for decades. He said there has been no discussion of having dialogue in Spokane, where truck routes may be, or through Oregon and the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation. So, he urged the Board to take a look at this and say: "We would like time to provide information. To provide advice on what analysis is necessary to make informed decisions and for the agencies to honor commitments to have actual dialogues along the transportation corridor with routes specific analysis, which is not present nor committed to."

Dylan Janney introduced himself as a concerned citizen with a deep interest in public policy. Today he wanted to propose an urgent solution to protect the Columbia River, the Yakama Nation, Tri-Cities, and the ecosystems from the Hanford site's ongoing risks. Building 150-foot-deep concrete vaults around all 19 tank farms. He said this plan addresses critical gaps in the DOE's cleanup strategy. It aligns with the 2025 Hanford Lifecycle, Scope, Schedule and Cost Report and ensures immediate safety while supporting long term goals.

Dylan shared that, the 2025 LCR (Lifecycle, Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report) projects cleanup costs around \$364 to \$589 billion, extending through 2086, a 61-year timeline that leaves the community vulnerable. The 177 aging tanks, 60-80 years passed their design life, have approximately 1 million gallons of radioactive waste, contaminating 2-3 million cubic yards of soil, up to 150 feet deep. Plumes migrate one to two feet per year towards the Columbia River just five to seven miles away. A seismic event could release 2-5 million gallons, accelerating river contamination for 25-250 years, endangering the Yakama Nation's treaty rights, the Tri-Cities drinking water, and the salmon populations.

The groundwater monitoring reveals a 2-5% contamination at 250 feet with tritium at 2000 PCI or above the EPA current limit. The pump and treat systems remove only 10-20% annually leaving the river exposed. The Holistic Agreement, which was finalized in January 2025, focuses on retrieving waste from 22 SST's by 2040 and vitrifying waste between 2030 and 2060. He said while this is a step forward, it leaves critical gaps unaddressed. The first is the lack of immediate containment. The agreement prioritizes long term treatment but overlooks the urgent need to contain the tanks themselves and the contaminated soil around them. Without vaults, plumes continue migrating and seismic risks remain. The 30-50-year timeline does not match the immediate threat to the Columbia River that these tanks and contaminated soil face.

Additionally, the failure to address the residual waste in the tanks, even after retrieval, 560,000 to 1.2 million gallons of sludge will still remain in the tanks which poses a long-term hazard. The tanks' seismic containment leaves them vulnerable to catastrophic releases.

He said his solution was 150 feet deep concrete vaults, seismically resistant concrete around all 19 tank farms with 5-10 feet thick walls. Building with high performance concrete, bentonite liners, drainage channels, sensors—they will halt plume migration, ensure 95-100% containment in the event of a magnitude 6-7 earthquake and will reduce the public exposure to zero.

He believed that this would cost about \$15 billion for the whole site and would take three to four years to complete. His proposal saves up to \$135 billion over DOE’s current strategy, which is a 30–50-year plan, and it also aligns with the H2C budget.

So, in conclusion, he said, the vaults will eliminate the dismantling risks of the tanks, which will contain residuals. It will prevent further groundwater contamination and will accelerate the retrieval of the waste into the tanks by making it safer and easier to do in the long term. He urged the HAB to recommend a pilot vault at the SX tank farm which he estimated to be about 800 million, taking 2-2.5 years, which will prove the efficacy of these vaults before scaling the entire site. As a policy advocate, he said he would like to collaborate with stakeholders in the area including the Yakama Nation and the Tri-Cities because he believed the DOE’s 61-year timeline was too slow, and we need to act now to safeguard our communities while also supporting the vitrification efforts.

He ended with saying that he would like to make Hanford an offer of proactive containment not just cleanup.

Meeting Recording

https://youtu.be/VbPMVaOTCp0?si=G4Az4z4TGC_3mGjw

Attachments

Attachment 1: [Meeting Agenda](#)

Attachment 2: [DOE Update Presentation](#)

Attachment 3: [Ecology Update Presentation](#)

Attachment 4: [Draft Advice on Site Infrastructure](#)

Attachment 5: [TPA Presentation- Holistic Agreement on Cleanup of Hanford Site Tank Waste](#)

Attachment 6: [H2C Presentation- Hanford Tank Waste Operations and Closure Company Overview](#)

Meeting Attendees

Board Members (P) and Alternates (A):

Simone Anter (A), Columbia Riverkeeper	Rose Ferri (A), Yakama Nation	Kermit Mankiller (A), Nez Perce Tribe
Kristie Baptiste-Eke, (P) Nez Perce Tribe	Spencer Harris (A), Kadlec	Rob Parmelee (P), Non-Union, Non- Management Employees*

Richard Bloom (P), City of West Richland*	Matt Hendrickson (A), Oregon Department of Energy	David Reeplog (A), Tri-City Development Council*
Larry Brandt, Public at Large	Michelle Holt (P), Benton-Franklin Council of Governments*	Tom Sicilia (P), Oregon Department of Energy
Miya Burke (P), Hanford Challenge*	Rebecca Holland (P), Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council*	Aaron Seifken (P), Central Washington Building Trades
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*	Pam Larsen (P), Benton County*	Chuck Torelli (P), City of Kennewick
Laurene Contreras (P), Yakama Nation	Charles LoPresti (A), Washington League of Women Voters	Amber Waldref (P), Heart of America Northwest
Kevin Danby (P), Grant and Franklin Counties	Jesus Mota (A), Columbia Basin College*	
Rob Davis (P) City of Pasco*	Charles LoPresti (P), Washington League of Women Voters	

Others:

Ricky Bang, DOE*	Ambika Chakravartty, Ecology	Tyler Oates, Bechtel
Ed Dawson, DOE*	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology*	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo
Scott Green, DOE*	Cathrene Glick, Ecology	Destry Henderson, H2C*
Mat Irwin, DOE*	Moises Guevara, Ecology	Phil Breidenbach, H2C*
John Moon, DOE	Edward Holbrook, Ecology	Rodney Skeen, H2C
Kathryn Roberts, DOE	Stephanie Schleif, Ecology*	MaryAnne Wuennecke, HMIS*
Kelly Snyder, DOE	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
Meegan Tripp, DOE*	Daina McFadden, Ecology	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Micheal Turner, DOE	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Stephanie Brasher, HMIS*
	Steve Needles, Ecology	Cynthia Bounds, HMIS
	George Peck, Ecology	Laura Caulfield, Katmai*
	Ben Prueitt, Ecology	McKenzie DuBois-Killooy, Street Legal*
	John Temple, Ecology*	Perry Meyer, DNFSB
	Sarah Williams, Ecology	Robert Csillag, DNFSB

	David Einan, EPA	Wayne Barber, Exchange Monitor
	Michelle Mullin, EPA*	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
	Megan Perkins, DOH	Gabe Bohnee, public
	Tom Rogers, DOH*	Dylan Janney, public
	Jane LePage, DOH*	Liz Mattson, public
		Gerry Pollet, public
		Dan Serres, public
		Dan Solitz, public
		Li Wang, public
		David Boothroyd
		Timothy Smith
		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: Site Infrastructure Advice, As Adopted

DRAFT ADVICE: [Title]

Originating Subcommittee: LIDS



Issue Manager Team & Authors: Richard Bloom, Charles LoPresti, Erin Braich, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Susan Coleman

Version #: [43](#)

Date Revised: [0305/0507/2025](#)

Letter Heading:

To: [\[This is who the letter is directed to; Add names, titles, and organizations, as appropriate\]](#) [Brian Harkins](#)

The CC list is separate and provided at the end of the template.

Subject: [\[Advice Title\]](#) [Commuter Safety Phased Approach](#)
[It's Urgent to Protect the Safety of Commuting Workers!](#)
[Protect the Safety of Hanford Site Commuting Workers](#)

Background/Executive Summary:

This is the fourth advice the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB/Board) has issued on traffic safety. In the latest, Advice #319¹, the HAB advised the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE):

- To be proactive in improving conditions facing workers commuting to the site by pursuing expedited funding to expand Route 4S, exploring alternatives in preparation for the resurfacing of Route 4S, and engaging with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to improve traffic flow from SR240 to Route 10.
- To address the emergency vehicle pedestrian safety issues in the 300 Area specific to the 300 Area fire station.

The DOE response (Letter 24-HOC-0109²) to HAB Advice #319 focused on safety and compliance actions related to communications, signage, and the issuance of speeding tickets to improve traffic safety. The response failed to address the specific advice points outlined in Advice #319, including the substandard condition of the road. The DOE response does not acknowledge the advantages of improving commuting conditions for worker recruitment and retention. Studies have shown ([references](#)) that, after a difficult commute, a worker's mental capacity is likely to be significantly reduced, often experiencing decreased focus, concentration, and cognitive abilities due to increased stress, fatigue, and a feeling of being mentally drained, potentially impacting their productivity and performance at work.

Like every major construction project on the Hanford Site, the administrative tasks are significant. The preparation and approval of documentation (preliminary design documentation, site surveys, cultural reviews, Waste Information Database reviews, Environmental Assessments, radiological evaluations, potential air permitting, the potential need for a "take" permit under the Migratory Bird Act, etc.) are far more extensive than the actual construction period itself. Most of these administrative documents can be prepared without full project funding.

Due to DOE's [failure to address the specific advice points in its inadequate](#) response to HAB Advice #319, the HAB is reissuing the Traffic Safety Advice and asking DOE for a point-by-point response to the advice.

Advice:

- The Board advises DOE to be proactive in improving conditions facing workers commuting to the site.
 - The Board advises DOE to prepare administrative documentation, including a project plan, to support the Route 4S expansion in anticipation of future funding.
 - The Board advises DOE to pursue expedited funding to expand Route 4S to a divided four-lane roadway and reduce delays at the Wye Barricade.
 - The Board advises DOE to engage with the WSDOT to improve traffic flow from SR240 to Route 10.
- The Board advises DOE to [evaluate and](#) address the emergency ~~vehicle-vehicle~~/pedestrian safety issues in the 300 Area specific to the 300 Area fire station, which will remain operational for an indeterminate period of time.

References:

1. HAB Consensus Advice #319: Traffic Safety, dated September 12, 2024. Link: https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HAB_Advice_319_-_Traffic_Safety_-_Signed_Final.pdf
2. Letter 24-HOC-0109: Hanford Advisory Board September 12, 2024, Consensus Advice No. 319, Traffic Safety, dated December 5, 2024. Link: https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/24-HOC-0109_-_Letter.pdf
3. Reference 3 <https://www.library.hbs.edu/working-knowledge/commuting-kills-productivity-and-your-best-talent-suffers-most>

Originating Subcommittee: LIDS

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Richard Bloom, Charles LoPresti, Erin Braich, Larry Brandt, Miya Burke, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Susan Coleman

CC/BCC:

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

TPA Agency Representatives

- Roger Jarrell, DOE-EM
- DOE-HFO Representative
- Stephanie Schleif, ECY
- David Einan, EPA
- Meegan Tripp, DOE
- Roberto Armijo, EPA
- Ryan Miller, ECY
-

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

- [Vanessa Turner, DOE-HFO](#)
-
-
-
-
-
-

Requests to Receive Advice

- Jessica Keys, Staff to Sen. Merkley