MEETING MINUTES

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)
Full Board Meeting
August 13, 2025
Hybrid Meeting – In-person and via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

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

Opening

Meegan Tripp, Deputy Designated Federal Office (DDFO) and DOE representative, opened the meeting.

Josh Patnaude, HAB Facilitation, provided an administrative review, notified participants that the meeting was being recorded, and went over meeting ground rules. It was also mentioned that since alternates were now allowed to sit at the table, they would receive yellow name tents to clearly identify their role for the purposes of consensus and questions.

Susan Coleman, Public at Large representative and Chair of the HAB, welcomed participants, asked for everyone online and in person to introduce themselves, and provided an overview of the agenda including new Board leadership elections.

She also noted that several HAB members were terming off, making this their final full Board meeting. These members are:

- Pam Larsen, Benton County
- Robert Thompson, City of Richland
- Charlie Kronvall, City of Pasco
- Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Nez Perce Tribe
- Kermit Mankiller, Nez Perce Tribe
- Brisa Guajardo, Tri-Cities Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
- Christina Mackey, Providence
- Larry Brandt, Public at Large
- Bradley Bricker, Public at Large

Susan acknowledged their dedication and service to the HAB and expressed that they would always be welcome to attend future full Board meetings, as well as subcommittee meetings, to support the HAB if they choose. She noted that thank you letters from the agencies had been prepared for each of them in recognition of their contribution.

Agency Leadership Dialogue: Introductions

Emma Pokon, Regional Administrator for US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10, said that as a public servant and agency leader, meetings like these were both wonderful and grounding. They remind her of the importance of the work being done and its impact on the community, as well as on the many stakeholders invested in the site's cleanup. She expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be present today, for the support she receives from the Region 10 team, and for the chance to learn more about the site and the importance of maintaining progress.

She said she enjoyed the Hanford tour, which allowed her to explore the facility and see various aspects of the work firsthand. During the tour, she visited the 324 Building and voiced EPA's support for the preferred alternative, the decoupled approach. She noted that immediately after assuming her role as Regional Administrator in February, her team emphasized the importance of gaining a solid understanding of key priorities, with Hanford at the top of that list. She said the more she learns, the more she appreciates why.

Looking ahead, she said she was eager to hear from the HAB and to continue working collaboratively with Region 10 staff, the US Department of Energy (DOE), and Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) to ensure continued progress at the site.

Heather Bartlett, Deputy Director for Ecology, began by thanking the HAB members for their time, dedication, and meaningful engagement. She emphasized that Ecology places a high value on community involvement and expressed admiration for the commitment of the HAB members, calling their contributions as an informed public truly remarkable.

She acknowledged the significant level of commitment involved and expressed her gratitude for everyone's participation. She said that working for Ecology and being based in Lacey, Washington has allowed her the opportunity to work closely with Stephanie Schleif and her team, tour the site, and stay regularly updated on progress.

She highlighted that the fall will mark a major milestone for the Hanford cleanup: the start of Direct Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW) operations and the beginning of vitrification, which has been decades in the making. For those who have followed the project over the years, she said, this is a moment to appreciate how far things have come. These advancements, she added, provided new momentum and further emphasized the need to continue advocating for sufficient federal funding to support ongoing cleanup efforts, one of Ecology's top priorities.

Heather also mentioned the upcoming transition of strontium and cesium waste, referred to as "the glowing water" coming to an end and going into dry storage, calling it another remarkable achievement. She reflected on the innovation and collaboration happening on-site, particularly in partnership with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), and highlighted that many of these developments are happening on the Hanford Site for the first time.

Another key focus for Ecology, she said, is going to be the release of the Site-Wide Permit, expected to go out for a 120-day public comment period this fall. She commended the staff at Ecology for their dedication and the strong working relationships they have built with DOE, noting that many have dedicated their careers to the Hanford mission.

She concluded by expressing her excitement to be part of this pivotal moment and her willingness to answer any questions moving forward.

Board Questions

Ed Parsons, Public at Large, asked about the new administration's executive orders that could have a high potential of impacting the results at the Hanford Site and felt this was important to put on future agendas for tracking. Examples he gave were the Sunset Clauses and the 1:10 regulation ratio. He hoped that the answer was "not a lot of impact" but wanted to know if there was awareness with EPA and DOE that those orders were currently in progress and what was happening with the organizations at this point relative to the Hanford site.

Emma responded that it is difficult to see immediate impacts from recent federal directives, such as the 1:10 regulation ratio. She emphasized that Region 10 staff remain fully committed to the Hanford cleanup and to ensuring the site reaches a safe and stable condition.

She explained that much of the regulatory work influenced by these directives would likely be handled at EPA headquarters. As she understood it, Region 10 would begin to see some of that work reflected in their workload over time. She also noted that the existing statutes governing cleanup remain in place, and the Region 10 team remains dedicated to carrying out a thorough and credible cleanup effort at the Hanford site.

Brian Harkins, DOE, commented that he would respond to Ed's question during DOE's specific Q&A time.

Ed felt that this was something that the Board needed to address on an ongoing basis to get feedback from the organizations on what is going on.

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland, said that for over 40 years he had worked on cleanup on the Hanford Site. He wanted to acknowledge Emma's comment about cleaning stuff up and asked why there was not a process to get rid of the Waste Identification Disposition System (WIDS) database. He said the baggage of the WIDS sites is probably 10,000 items that keep getting reviewed over and over. He felt that there should be a process to get things removed from WIDS and that it was a burden for anyone doing paperwork on site. He thought that this was one thing that could be done to make things better and help get to the end.

Emma responded that she was not familiar with the WIDS database specifically but noted that in her previous role, every item, whether controversial or not, had to be documented. She acknowledged that this kind of system could certainly be a source of frustration for various reasons. She suggested there might be some inefficiencies in requiring ongoing attention to items that have already been addressed or eliminated. At the same time, she pointed out that cleanup standards can evolve as new scientific information becomes available. In that context, maintaining a record of past conditions can be important for reevaluating decisions and ensuring ongoing compliance. She said she saw both benefits and drawbacks to maintaining such a database and felt it was a valuable conversation to continue. She expressed interest in discussing it further with her team to better understand the issue.

Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation, commented that Yakama Nation is still actively using WIDS data in some of the work that they are currently doing.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), explained that the WIDS database includes all known or suspected waste sites and that there is a formal process for closing them out once cleanup is complete. He noted that a form is signed by the Tri-Party Agencies to officially close out a waste site after a Record of Decision (ROD) is implemented. While the site remains in the WIDS database, its coding is updated to reflect that it had been cleaned up or closed out. In other words, he said it still appears in WIDS but is marked as closed. Richard asked Tom to show him an example of a site that has been closed, and Tom agreed to do so.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, expressed frustrations with the slow-paced cleanup efforts. He emphasized that all parties need to work together more efficiently to accelerate progress. Rob pointed out that every day without cleanup it increases the risk of tank leakage, as many of the tanks were already far beyond their intended design life. He noted that 20 vessels have already leaked and stressed that there should be no obstacles preventing the removal of waste and advancement of cleanup efforts.

Rob highlighted the development of new technologies and urged that they be deployed and made operational as quickly as possible. He stated the bureaucratic processes are the only thing standing in the way, and while he acknowledged their complexity, he believed it was crucial to start improving efficiency. Reflecting on his long term on the Board, he expressed disappointment that despite 25 years of effort, meaningful cleanup had still not been achieved. He urged EPA and Ecology to do their best in keeping the HAB informed and up to date on what was going on.

Emma responded by saying that she shared Rob's impatience, noting that a sense of urgency has also been expressed by EPA headquarters, particularly regarding the Superfund program and the slow pace of on the ground cleanup. At the same time, as a lifelong career public servant, she defended the value of bureaucratic processes, explaining that they often ensure thoughtful review and careful planning, which

can result in better, safer outcomes. She emphasized the principle that "sometimes slow is fast," depending on the circumstances.

That being said, Emma acknowledged the Board's concerns and agreed that there is a need to evaluate where efficiencies can be found without compromising the integrity of the cleanup. She agreed that Rob's concerns are valid and said that striking the right balance between efficiency and thoroughness will be an ongoing national effort for the Superfund program, as they strive to improve how the work is done.

Heather said that she agreed with Rob in principle. In practice she mentioned the Test Bed Initiative (TBI) that was an example of an effort to shorten the bureaucratic process. She felt there was some value in "going slow to go fast." She said not only was this technology leading edge they do not have places in the world that have necessarily done this. She said they are also thinking about the regulatory framework in which they can go ahead and do some of this work. She acknowledged it has been decades in the making but the things that they have coming up this fall were examples of how they could continue to push through. She said the priority was to ensure sufficient funding for DOE at Hanford. Currently she said they made it above $3 billion but in order to remain on the trajectory to hit the cleanup, as it is scheduled out to the 2080's, they are going to need more than $6 billion. She said DOE needs sufficient funding in order to deliver on commitments identified in places like the holistic agreement and the tank waste mission, wherever they have work to do.

Rob agreed that funding was critical and every year that they speed things up they would be saving billions of dollars. He said they need to stop asking for extensions.

Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interests, directed his comment to Ecology, expressing concern that DOE may run out of funding before cleanup efforts are completed. He thanked Ecology for advocating for DOE funding and site cleanup and encouraged them to continue doing everything they could to support the effort. Heather responded that Ecology has a strong voice, especially when advocating collectively to Congress. She noted that several congressional members were highly engaged and work hard to secure funding for Washington State and the Hanford Site.

Ed remarked that he anticipates pushback from the administration, citing the recent executive order directing the EPA and DOE to remain cost neutral going forward. Despite this, he believed Hanford stakeholders, including the agencies and the Board, had a solid rationale to move forward and that it was time to introduce fresh ideas.

Heather agreed, stating that she supports making adjustments as needed. She expressed optimism that upcoming successes could generate new momentum and perspective. While acknowledging that funding changes may not happen in the next year or two, she emphasized the importance of highlighting long term taxpayer savings through timely investment and progress.

Pam Larsen, Benton County, thanked the agencies for what had been accomplished so far.

Ed revisited his earlier point about the executive orders, stating that it was clear the intent was to reduce spending. He suggested that if the overall direction was set and a framework was in place, then they should change the framework on how they were doing business. He emphasized that cost reductions should come from more efficient operations.

He also mentioned a forum focused on potential changes to radiation, health, and safety standards for across the EPA, DOE, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and noted various ongoing efforts in that area. Ed expressed skepticism that DOE would receive all the funding needed to complete site

cleanup and stressed the importance of being prepared for that possibility. Finally, he inquired about the September 1 deadline related to the Sunset Clause and asked for an update on that progress.

Emma responded to Ed by asking for more detail on what he meant by "changing the framework." She also inquired whether he had specific ideas or recommendations for what EPA should be considering.

Ed replied that the topic would be better suited for an offline discussion due to its complexity and potential length. He noted that the US approach to radiation protection standards was as much as 50 years behind the rest of the world and said they were going to take that opportunity to fix many of those issues. He expressed willingness to meet with Emma later to continue the discussion but again reminded her that it could be a lengthy conversation.

Chuck Torelli, City of Kennewick, being a previous Hanford employee, recalled animosity between the regulators, DOE, and the contractors. He felt that the Holistic Agreement was a huge step forward in establishing relationships and trust.

Emma expressed her appreciation to Brian Harkins, acknowledging that when he stepped up into his acting role, he made the effort to open a line of communication with her. From her perspective, she felt DOE had done well in reaching out early to establish a relationship.

Rob pointed out the importance of the five-year plan, noting that it provided a clearer picture of where DOE was heading. He felt the plan effectively separates priorities into risk reduction and cleanup, and then infrastructure, which he believed everyone now understands.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America, thanked EPA and Ecology for taking the time to tour the site, gain insight into the cleanup process, and share their commitment to working towards the cleanup.

Agency Leadership Dialogue: Hanford Site Updates

US Department of Energy

Brian thanked everyone for the opportunity to attend and provide updates on Hanford . He shared that it was an exciting time as they looked ahead to the startup of the vitrification plant operations and the work that will follow. He also expressed his appreciation to Susan and Miya for their leadership and contributions to the Board, and he acknowledged and thanked the outgoing members for their efforts in supporting Hanford's progress and assisting DOE in the decision-making process. Lastly, he recognized the current members of the HAB and said he looked forward to working more closely with them in the future.

Brian's began his update by discussing the site map and emphasizing the ongoing priority of safely cleaning up the Hanford Site. He stated that the importance of the mission had not diminished, the need to safely clean up the site and protect the workers, the public, and the economy remained critical. He noted that everything people love and value about the Pacific Northwest depended on the continued progress of the Hanford cleanup effort.

He shared that DOE recently completed what is being called the "Big Dig", which involved removing a significant amount of diesel contaminated soil in the K Area, located near the river. He explained that, in addition to radiological hazards, Hanford also faces serious chemical risks, particularly due to its proximity to the river.

While preparing for vitrification, DOE has worked to reduce some of these river related risks, and he noted that substantial progress has been made. Closing the K Basins was a major milestone, but he

emphasized that the work was far from over. The focus now shifted to addressing the greater risk posed by the tank waste mission and continuing efforts to reduce the dangers associated with the waste stored in those tanks.

Brian explained the "cleanup" by using key figures to show some of the progress achieved and what's still happening at Hanford (*Attachment 2, Slide 3*). He said it was the 12th year in a row that they have treated more than 2 billion gallons of groundwater which has dramatically reduced the plume, changed the waterflow in a positive wat underneath the site, and recovered a tremendous amount of chemicals. He said the groundwater treatment was very important to the protection of the river and the public.

Brian went over details on the current activities going on at the site. These items were:

- Moving radioactive capsules from underwater storage in an aging facility to nearby dry storage
- Starting vitrification low-activity waste
- Shipping Test Bed Initiative liquid for off-site disposal in April 2025
- Loadout of contaminated soil

He also went over DOE's priorities for the future. These four things were:

- 24/7 operations at the Direct-Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW) Facility
- To modernize the water supply/pump stations that are currently on the river, built in the 1940's.
- Grout waste for off-site disposal
- Begin deconstruction of the 324 building

In closing, Brian went over recent and upcoming public outreach opportunities which included:

- Public Comment Period: June 9 - Aug.18: 324 Building record-of-decision (ROD) amendment (comment period extended from 30 to 70 days)
- August 13: Congressional Staff Tour
- August 19: Speaker Bureau Engagement with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Board Questions

Tom asked whether DOE was concerned that, during demolition of the 324 Building, the water used for dust suppression could breach what he referred to as the "umbrella" (the building itself) which currently prevented water from reaching the waste and potentially moving it toward the river. He also asked if there had been any consideration of constructing a temporary structure over the 324 Building before demolition, so then they could both be taken down minimizing the dust suppression.

Brian responded that there is serious concern about the use of water for dust suppression during the demolition and disposal (D&D) of the 324 Building. He emphasized that they must be extremely cautious and are considering alternative technologies to suppress dust without using water. He stated that water from the D&D activities cannot be allowed to enter the soil, and DOE is actively evaluating how to carry out the demolition while mitigating that risk.

In response to Tom's second question, Brian explained that the issue becomes one of structural feasibility. While D&D has been performed on building of similar size without an external structure, the solid contamination concerns at this site demand extra caution. He noted that temporary structured have been used in the past for this reason. For this specific demolition, he said the team will need enough space to accommodate both the excavation area and the large equipment being used inside the enclosure but with the soil concerns they have to be very careful. This is why he said in the past they have used temporary structures. For this demolition he said they need enough space to cover the dig area and the size of the equipment being used in there.

Pam commented that Brian's presentation was very encouraging and that she was impressed to hear the regulatory agencies optimism about working with him and his leadership. From a personal level she appreciated his interest in the HAB and willingness to work with them.

Ed thanked Brian for his presentation, commenting that "grout" often conjures images of typical construction concrete in people's minds, which the grout being discussed is much more capable. Brian took the opportunity to discuss grout further, explaining that it was a material tailored to Hanford's waste streams and locked down those specific contaminants.

Ed also noted that he previously worked in commercial vitrification, where he saw an issue with controlling precipitation in the resulting material. He commented that it may be helpful to have feedback mechanisms in place to track that potential issue.

Miya asked if Brian could share more information about the recent incident at the Tank Farms that led to a week-long safety shutdown, during which non-essential operations were paused and all-hands meetings were held with the workforce and management to discuss the recent spike in events potentially effecting safety. She said that this incident was referenced in a recent Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) report and was curious about what was learned from the event, why it occurred, and how the related safety issues have been addressed.

Brian confirmed that the shutdown was prompted by a number of low-level events, such as an employee tripping over a parking bumper and breaking their knee. More broadly, he said, the team was experiencing process-related issues, instances where procedures were not followed or where there was a lack of proper respect for established protocols.

He emphasized that in the nuclear safety environment, their safety basis relies on very specific controls. When those controls are not followed, it raises serious concerns, as it could potentially lead to significant events. Fortunately, in this case, all of the issues were identified and reported before becoming actual incidents. However, Brian noted that these events should not have occurred at all, given the extensive training, established procedures, and layers of defense in place. The fact that these safeguards did not always prevent the issues revealed a deeper cultural concern.

"You have to have respect for what is going on out there," he said. "If you take the risks or the process lightly, you could end up with an event, damaged equipment, or someone getting hurt."

Brian explained that the contractor initiated the pause in work independently; it was not directed by DOE. During the shutdown, they held a series of meeting with staff to assess the situation. Brian participated in some of these meetings, with others attended by his team. The goal was to ensure the culture was on the right track, understand the root causes of the behaviors, and figure out how to move forward.

He said the discussions were impactful in helping the team understand why certain actions were taken and believes that, overall, the process has led to a positive outcome.

Richard said that his questions were in regard to the test bed initiative (TBI). He asked if the containers were returned to the site and if there had been any surprises in the process. Brian responded that no, they were disposed of at the disposal site because they were one time use only and that there had not been any surprises during the process.

Richard also wanted to know if there would be an economic analysis done of the difference of per gallon going to the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and per gallon going to grout. Brian responded yes, it has already been done and should be available for the public. Brian also commented that, without a doubt, grout would be cheaper.

Chris expressed interest in the 24/7 operations at DFLAW. He asked, given all the commissioning that has been completed so far, and what is planned prior to the start of routine hot operations, how many of the 25 different unit operations need to function as if full scale operation were already underway?

Brian responded that it was not a straightforward question to answer. He explained that the DFLAW is further along in the commissioning process, while on the Tank Farm side, they have demonstrated everything up to the point of transferring waste through the pipeline to WTP. He said they are very close but have not yet transferred radioactive waste to the WTP facility.

Rob asked whether there was a comparison of the grout used at the two facilities that received the TBI waste, and whether they encountered any of the same issues. Brian said he had little knowledge in regard to this but explained that the focus was on demonstrating the viability of transporting liquid waste to the disposal sites and meeting each site's waste acceptance criteria.

He emphasized that regardless of the method, they must show that the waste can be safely disposed of once it arrives as its destination. He noted that, under the Holistic Agreement, grouting is allowed, but accumulation is not. In other words, any grouted waste must have a designated disposal location and be capable of being shipped off-site. The intention was to avoid accumulating grouted waste onsite without a clear disposal path.

Brian said they successfully demonstrated off-site capability by transporting the liquid waste and working with the receiving facilities. They documented the treatment process and shared lab results with DOE, confirming that the treated waste was well within the receiving sites' waste acceptance criteria. That, he said, was the real value of the effort. Looking ahead, Brian acknowledged that there is still a lot more work to be done.

Miya asked if Brian could provide an update on the Tank Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) system and the ion exchange safety issue raised by the DNFSB. Brian said the issue is still under review and that he did not have all the answers yet. However, he noted that he had seen workers on the pad last week, indicating that the area remains accessible.

He explained that the concern involves the ability to properly vent the heat and gases generated during the ion exchange process. While he did not have any current updates, he expressed confidence that the team would be successful in resolving the issue. Miya asked him if he thought the new ion exchange columns would have to be redesigned and he said no.

Rebecca thanked Brian for his leadership and commitment to the HAB. She said it has given her a new outlook for the direction of the Board moving forward.

Miya recalled the DNFSB report from June 27th, which noted the presence of acids in the system that could lead to failure of the carbon bed vessel and other components in the off-gas system. She remarked that this sounded like a corrosion issue and asked Brian to explain it in more detail and whether it was something that could be resolved.

She also mentioned reports of unexpected high nitrogen oxide concentrations, which led to restrictions on the nitrated feed at the LAW facility. She asked if this contributed to the milestone being pushed to October and if he could provide more details on this topic as well.

Brian responded that they are still learning a lot about the plant. He said the testing was intended to provide concentrations that exceeded what would be seen during normal operations, in order to stress the off-gas system and identify any weaknesses. Through the testing, they discovered a few unanticipated issues, including the acid presence and high nitride oxide concentrations.

Regarding the acid issue, Brian explained that they are currently assessing how concentrated the acid is and whether it is localized versus a broader issue. Sampling of the carbon beds is underway, and while the worst-case scenario would involve replacing the media, that decision has not been made yet.

He emphasized that the plant's startup process was designed to be deliberate and methodical, allowing for testing under both normal and extreme waste loading conditions. The team has already learned a great deal about how the systems behave in real-world conditions, including identifying design elements that did not perform as expected. As a result, they have had to adjust some processes and add new capabilities. He stressed that there is still much more to learn, which is why the startup approach will be very slow. Brian expects this learning and optimization process to continue for the next year.

Miya asked how much time would be required if the carbon bed media did need to be replaced. Brian said the job would take about three weeks, which would have a significant impact on the schedule.

She also asked about the reoccurring ammonia releases. Brian explained that when ammonia was first introduced into the system during startup testing, they found that some of the installed valves, many of which had been sitting unuse for an extended period, had small leaks. These were detectable and had to be addressed. The team tightened valve stem materials and, in some cases, replaced components. He also recalled an incident where a painter accidentally bumped and opened a valve. However, he stated that the system is now working well with no ongoing leaks.

Tom asked how the lessons being learned at DFLAW over the next year are being incorporated into the ongoing engineering and design work for the High-Level Waste (HLW) facility. He specifically inquired about the level of integration between the DFLAW and HLW teams.

Brian responded that the two teams are highly integrated. Lessons learned from both the construction and operational phases at DFLAW are being fed in real time into the HLW facility design. He noted that the current approach for HLW involves "weathering in" the facility. This meant installing major equipment and enclosing the building while focusing on completing the design prior to full scale construction.

The milestone for the HLW facility is to complete the design and develop a high confidence cost estimate by 2028. Brian emphasized that the lessons learned from LAW have already helped reduce projected costs for HLW. He also mentioned that some personnel currently working on LAW are expected to transition to the HLW effort once that facility moves into its next phase.

Chuck was wondering, due to the current low-key safety issues, if there were plans to enhance to Facility Representative Program by increasing coverage in certain areas. He also asked if contractors would be implementing variations of a senior supervisory watch.

Brian said that the facility representatives are a key component being the eyes and ears of DOE. He said they have lost some due to the recent workforce reduction, but efforts are underway to refill those roles. In the meantime, DOE has cross qualified other technically qualified personnel to help support the facility representative duties.

Regarding senior supervisor watch, Brian confirmed that this has already been implemented for certain activities. It was one of the first corrective actions taken when the Tank Farms contractor began to see early signs of performance issues. However, he acknowledged that the effectiveness of the senior supervisory watch had diminished over time, which ultimately contributed to the recent safety pause.

Miya asked Brian to discuss recent instances where workers in the Central Waste Complex (CWC) were encountering leaking or corroding containers while repackaging. Brian explained that containers containing transuranic (TRU) waste were undergoing repackaging in preparation for shipment to the

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Those containers had been in storage for so long that they had breaches, meaning material could be detected from outside the container. However, it was confirmed that there was no spread of contamination or worker exposure uptake. Each container found was controlled, surveyed, and verified to ensure there was no contamination spread. Brian stated that these events enforced the need to progress toward shipping TRU waste off the site.

Rob asked about a necessary redesign for the glass formers/feeders: what was the solution, were they confident in that solution, and would it be applied to HLW as well? Rob also noted that ammonia was a necessary component in the vitrification process to destroy nitrogen oxides. Brian did not have the details of that solution, but he was confident that applicable lessons learned would be applied to the HLW facility.

Pam asked for confirmation on TRU waste shipment date. Brian stated that quality assurance was ongoing with shipments anticipated to start in 2028 and shipment volumes increasing in 2029.

Miya asked if Brian has a sense of when the waste incidental to reprocessing (WIR) for the West Area Risk Management (WARM) Project would be available. Brian did not.

Ed asked if there was any news of a Site Manager appointment. Brian said he did not know what would

Laurene Contreras, Yakama Nation, thanked Brian for his time and commitment to ensuring that the Hanford Site resources were protected. She asked if there were any project delays experienced as a result of recent personnel changes or staff reductions. Brian said that, in short, they were doing their best. He did not believe any projects were experiencing delays at that point, but expected that future projects would not be able to meet timelines without additional help, such as WARM or AMPS.

Brian; short answer, we're doing our best; don't believe we've delayed any projects, though we see projects in the future that we won't be able to meet timelines without additional help, like WARM. DOE was actively working to get that help, working to identify and prepare for future workloads, and working with contractors to move workloads around where feasible.

Public Comment

Dan Serres:

"My name is Dan Serres. I'm the advocacy director for Columbia Riverkeeper. Simone Anter couldn't be here today. She's normally sitting in our seat along with Professor Black. I used to be on the Hanford Advisory Board, and I just wanted to say thank you everyone who's here for all your work. And for the questions you've asked, the last DNFSB report was surprising, I think. And so Miya's sort of pointed questions, I think, I want to just echo those and that whoever's out there constantly having to deal with leaking alpha radiation in the Central Waste Complex, that work is really important, macro encapsulating it and taking care of it. So, we appreciate the people who are out there doing that.

I also just want to say that we appreciate everyone on the HAB who's rounding off. Pam Larson, a long time ago, we were standing on the edge of ERDF [Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility] when I was a young, young man, with a higher voice. And you were just like 'there's a lot of dust out here and let's go back to the bus.' And I just really appreciated that advice. So, thank you for your work and thank you for being here."

HAB Leadership Elections

For each open HAB leadership position, Josh reviewed the nominations received where willingness to serve was confirmed:

- HAB Chair: Susan Coleman
- HAB Vice Chair: Miya Burke
- National Liaison: No nominations received

Two nominations were offered for National Liaison: Rebecca Holland and Laurene Contreras, each confirming willingness to serve.

Where there was one nomination for a position, each member in attendance was asked to confirm the nomination. HAB members were invited to vote for their preferred candidate for National Liaison.

Results

Susan Coleman was recommended as HAB Chair by consensus. That recommendation would be forwarded to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies for confirmation.

Miya Burke was selected as HAB Vice Chair by consensus.

Rebecca Holland was selected as National Liaison.

Rebecca thanked everyone for their vote and mentioned that Richard would now be moving into the acting Chair position in the LIDS committee. She invited anyone interested in the Land Use, Infrastructure, Waste Disposition, and Safety (LIDS) Chair or Vice Chair position to reach out to her or Richard.

Draft Advice on 324 Building Path Forward

Tom, the Issue Manager (IM) team lead for development of the draft advice, provided background on its development and an overview of the resulting draft. He noted that there was a lot of engagement in its development, but the participants did not come to consensus on a preferred alternative for remediation. As a result, the advice was targeted toward considerations the TPA should consider once an alternative is selected in areas such as environmental protection, incorporation of lessons learned from similar projects, and worker health and safety.

Concerns and questions were invited. Significant changes resulting were:

- Statements focused TRU/TRU mixed were removed in favor of targeting ERDF waste acceptance criteria.
- Noting similar projects completed as other DOE sites, it was advised that lessons learned be considered from across the complex, rather than across the site
- Edits to address potential fire risk

Concerns considered but ultimately not addressed included:

- The potential for orphan waste creation
- Acceptable cleanup levels, as it would impact the 2013 Record of Decision (ROD)

Additional editorial changes were made.

As part of the discussions, Rose explained that Yakama Nation had concerns around how waste is being classified, and as a result, treated. Yakama Nation did not believe that much of the waste would meet ERDF criteria and, instead, met the definition of HLW per the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Yakama Nation

felt that should be an applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARAR) for consideration as part of the ROD. She clarified that concern did not conflict with the content of the advice, as written, but she wanted the HAB to be aware of those concerns, unresolved issues, and ongoing conversations between Yakama Nation and the TPA agencies.

Results

The advice was adopted by consensus. Because Yakama Nation had concerns with waste classification not identified as part of the advice, that seat offered a signing statement alongside its confirmation: *Yakama Nation concurs with advice from HAB as written, however continues to work with the Tri-Parties on waste classification.*

Board Reports

Subcommittee Reports

Community Outreach and Engagement (COE)

Amber, COE Chair, recapped the June agenda noting that it included a presentation on upcoming public involvement activities, including the 324 Building comment period, and the results of the public involvement survey. She also mentioned that they discussed the Rev.9 public involvement materials and asked Ryan Miller, Ecology, to provide an update.

Ryan said he did not have much to add at that time but expressed appreciation for the Board members' feedback. He shared that he was excited to begin the comment period soon and would inform the HAB once dated were confirmed.

Amber also noted that COE leadership elections were held resulting in her re-election as Chair, while the Vice Chair position remains vacant. She encouraged anyone interested in the Vice Chair role to reach out, with future discussion planned for the next subcommittee meeting.

Additionally, Amber highlighted that in June, the group provided input on the upcoming leadership workshop and scheduled their next meeting for September. That meeting will include a discussion with Ecology on the Healthy Environment for All (HEAL) Act and the related community engagement plan. Ryan confirmed that Chelsea Batavia from Ecology headquarters will be speaking on that topic.

Cleanup and Risk Mitigation (CaRM)

Tom, CaRM Chair, reported that CaRM also had elections in June and he was re-elected as Chair and Jim Doherty, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, was re-elected as Vice Chair. He mentioned giving a book report on the Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report as it related to cleanup in June, but that a majority of the meeting was about the 324 Building Advice. He said in September they have a full agenda that consists of PNNL talking about their deep vadose zone sequestration studies and a follow up from Jason Capron from DOE regarding what is upcoming for decisions and cleanup on site. He said they will also be talking about the comprehensive milestone negotiations for cleanup (M15, M16, and M85) which is all the characterization and clean up milestone packages. He said the Tri- Party agencies are working on finalizing that change package in the next year or so. He noted there should be some comments and advice for that because there will be a public comment period once it is finalized.

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

Rebecca Holland, LIDS Chair, recalled that at their June meeting, the subcommittee received presentations on ERDF and Supercell 11, the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), as well as discussed items to bring to the upcoming leadership workshop. She also noted that elections were held, and both she and Richard were re-elected as Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. Lastly, she announced that there would be no subcommittee meeting in September.

Tank Waste Stewardship and Treatment (TWST)

Rob, TWST Chair, shared highlights from the last subcommittee meeting, including an update on the WTP and a presentation on the Advanced Modular Pretreatment System Project (AMPS) and "Grout 101." He noted that the Grout 101 discussion sparked further interest in a request for DOE to provide a presentation in regard to transporting waste offsite. Rob also requested the results of the Environmental Performance Demonstration Test (EPDT) for the Low Activity Waste (LAW). Both of these requests were formally presented to the DDFO.

Rob reported that elections were held, and both he and Chris were re-elected as Chair and Vice Chair.

Chris added that a major decision was coming up which involved whether DOE will ship supernate offsite in liquid form to be grouted elsewhere or build a facility onsite to grout the waste before transporting it. Acknowledging that this is a key policy decision for DOE, he expressed interest in hearing any advice or ideas from the Board on how to structure input or recommendations on the matter.

National Liaison's Report

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

Board Business

Emergency Operations Center Drill Debrief

Rebecca noted that this drill was one of several she observed over the years and was pleased to see that many of the lessons learned from prior drills were implemented. As an example, she noted that the mock press conference included several "plants" in the audience to increase the pressure on the speakers. She invited perspectives of the other participants.

Miya thanked Meegan for the opportunity and hoped other HAB members would have the opportunity in the future. She found the way information about the scenario trickled in was fascinating. The information was not given to participants up front: they started with learning about a commercial plan crash and progressively got specifics as to where it occurred and its impacts, with those specifics potentially being inaccurate or updated throughout the process. She felt reassured by the capabilities and actions of those involved.

Pam explained that, prior to her retirement, she participated in several similar drills. She emphasized the importance of the Washington Department of Health's role, observing wind direction and potential airborne contaminants that could impact surrounding agricultural lands and setting barricades.

Charles LoPresti, Washington League of Women Voters, stated that this was his first observation of such a drill and was impressed how well controlled everything was. He felt that controlling chaotic situations would be the most important thing to master. He learned a lot by being there.

Tom noted that he was in attendance, not as an observer, but a participant coordinating Oregon's response, as Oregon is within the 50-mile exclusion zone. That included coordination of the response for Oregon Department of Health Radiation Protection Services, which would send crews to monitor air on the Oregon side of the Columbia River, as well as coordination of Oregon's agricultural department in Umatilla and Morrow counties. In this drill, the air was not blowing toward Oregon, but they still considered potential scenarios such as reports of a "glowing cow." To account for such a situation, they identified portal monitors that could ensure a cow was not radioactive and now have that plan and contact in place. They also considered the possibility for evacuation and how to temporarily house tens of thousands of people. He explained that these drills did not just test the people involved, but the plans and procedures as well.

Ed cautioned against declaring drills "successful." Recalling past fire emergencies, the impact of outside agencies attempting to interject themselves was very disruptive. Real life conditions introduce new, unanticipated challenges.

Rebecca noted that she worked several real emergencies in her time at Hanford. She acknowledged that real emergencies are totally different and wondered if there might be a way to include more workers in such drills or operations to bridge the disconnects that occur in real situations. Rebecca concluded, thanking DOE for allowing the HAB to observe.

Action Item Update

Susan asked for updates on two past items.

Regarding the Tribal land acknowledgement request, Laurene clarified that Yakama Nation continued to work with various agencies on that request, which was important to them. She noted that hiring freezes and staff reductions at DOE resulting in vacant Tribal Liaison positions, impacting their ability to coordinate on the request.

Susan recalled a request from December of 2023 in which it was suggested that the Tribes could provide a "101" briefing to new HAB members on Tribal interests and concerns in relation to the Hanford Site. The next planned HAB meeting in October would be the first for newly seated HAB members. She asked if that was something the Tribes would still like to pursue. Laurene stated that she could not speak for all the Tribes but confirmed that it was something that Yakama Nation would like to move forward with.

Action: Josh would reach out to each of the Tribal representatives on the HAB regarding a potential Tribal briefing.

Calendar Review/Upcoming Meetings

Meegan explained that a workshop would be held the following day for HAB members to plan the upcoming fiscal year, including determining support necessary from the TPA agencies and outlining the pathways to delivering the requested advice. Additionally, the HAB members were invited to a tour of the Advanced Modular Pretreatment System (AMPS) mockup.

Upcoming meetings included subcommittee meetings on September 9 and 10, followed by new member orientation on October 7, and a full HAB meeting placeholder on October 8 and 9.

Other HAB Business

Meegan passed out a form to HAB members, asking for input on the most common acronyms used or heard. Her team planned to put together small reference cards for HAB members based on the results.

Meeting Recording

https://youtu.be/q_9pRYhvaYY?si=1LIIga3vinqzv9Uh

Attachments

Attachment 1: Meeting Agenda

Attachment 2: DOE Presentation

Attachment 3: Draft Advice on 324 Building Path Forward

Meeting Attendees

Board Members (P) and Alternates (A):

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland* (P)	Jim Doherty, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board* (P)	Pam Larsen, Benton County* (P)
Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge* (P)	Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation (A)	Charles LoPresti, WA League of Women Voters* (P)
Matthew Campbell, CTUIR	Chaune' Fitzgerald, Women of Wisdom (P)	Jesus Mota, Columbia Basin College* (A)
Susan Coleman, Public at Large*	Spencer Harris, Kadlec* (A)	Ed Parsons, Public at Large*
Laura Contreras, Yakama Nation (P)	Matt Hendrickson, Oregon Department of Energy (A)	Chris Sutton, Local Environmental Interest* (P)
Kevin Danby, Grant and Franklin Counties* (P)	Rebecca Holland, HAMTC* (P)	Chuck Torelli, City of Kennewick* (P)
Rob Davis, City of Pasco* (P)	Michelle Holt, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments* (P)	Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest* (P)
Kathy DeBois, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees* (A)	Brian Ivey, Public at Large*	

Others:

Richard Buel, DOE	Heather Bartlett, Ecology*	Erica Thornton, AttainX
Edward Dawson, DOE	Cole Caldwell, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo*
Mark French, DOE	Moises Guevara, Ecology	Kathryn Roberts, H2C
Brian Harkins, DOE*	Edward Holbrook, Ecology	Cynthia Bounds, HMIS
Meegan Tripp, DOE*	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Stephanie Brasher, HMIS
Geoffrey Tyree, DOE	Daina McFadden, Ecology	Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
	Sharlett Mena, Ecology*	Michael Turner, HMIS

	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Jordan Firestone, Inomedic Health Applications
	Steve Needles, Ecology	Laura Caulfield, Katmai*
	Ben Prueitt, Ecology*	Brent Harvey, Street Legal Ind.*
	Stephanie Schleif, Ecology*	Wayne Barber, Exchange Monitor
	Sarah Williams, Ecology	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Kelsey Shank, theEdge
	Laura Buelow, EPA*	John Stang, Exchange Monitor
	Anne McCartney, EPA*	Robert Csillag, DNFSB
	Emma Pokon, EPA*	Rob Staton, Akima*
	Geoff Schramm, EPA*	Matt Merritt, Akima*
	Calvin Terada, EPA*	Gabe Bohnee, Public
	Jane LePage, WA Department of Health	Craig Cameron, Public*
	John Martell, WA Department of Health*	Ambika Chakravartty, Public
	Megan Perkins, WA Department of Health	Al Farabee, Public*
	Tom Rogers, WA Department of Health*	Matt Lynch, Public
		Liz Mattson, Public
		Robert Quirk, Public*
		Daniel Serres, Public*
		Dan Solitz, Public
		Wyatt Gove
		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: HAB 324 Proposed Plan Advice, As Adopted

DRAFT ADVICE: Path Forward for the 324 Building

Originating Committee: Cleanup and Risk Mitigation

HAB
Hanford Advisory Board

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Tom Sicilia, Al Farabee, Brian Ivey, Charles LoPresti, Chris Sutton, Dan Solitz, Jim Doherty, Kevin Danby, McClure Tosch, Miya Burke, Pam Larsen, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Rose Ferri, Simone Anter, Susan Coleman

Version #: 3 **Date Revised:** [05/19/2025]

Letter Heading:

To: Brian Harkins (DOE)
Stephanie Schleif (ECY)
Laura Buelow (EPA)

Subject: Path Forward for the 324-Building Removal and Remediation

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

The HAB has long advocated for action (Reference 1) and supports DOE's efforts to safely and effectively remove the 324 Building and remediate the underlying contaminated soils. This advice to the TPA agencies does not choose one of the remedies, as both presented options will result in the removal of contamination and reduction of risk to the river and region. The 2006 Removal Action Work Plan (Reference 2) and 2015 Remedial Action Work Plan (Reference 3) in conjunction with the 300 Area Record of Decision (ROD) (Reference 4) are high-level documents. Solutions to the concerns below are not sufficiently discussed in these generic 300 Area plans. It is the Board's advice that, following selection of a remedy, DOE should consider the following when developing site-specific Remedial Design/Remedial/Removal Action Work Plans and Waste Management Plans for the 324 Building and 300-296 Waste Site:

- When DOE updates the site-specific plans, incorporate concerns raised during the Proposed Plan public comment period.
- Use lessons learned from prior building removal actions to manage potentially contaminated building materials.
- Use waste classifications and other regulatory tools to assure the 324 Building materials and contaminated soils meet the Waste Acceptance Criteria at Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).
- Develop a contingency plan for permitted interim safe storage, separation, and treatment in the event that ~~mixed transuranic waste or high-level waste~~waste outside of ERDF acceptance criteria is identified to ensure that there is an appropriate disposal/storage facility readily available to accept the waste before initiating operations. ~~This interim safe storage could provide a home for temporarily orphaned waste.~~

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Tom Sicilia, Al Farabee, Brian Ivey, Charles LoPresti, Chris Sutton, Dan Solitz, Jim Doherty, Kevin Danby, McClure Tosch, Miya Burke, Pam Larsen, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Rose Ferri, Simone Anter, Susan Coleman

- Use lessons learned from covered excavations and operations at the Hanford Site and elsewhere in the complex to ensure the 324 Building Health and Safety Plan is protective of hazards to the workforce associated with airborne soils and contamination spread as well as extreme temperatures, fire risk, and other environmental conditions.
- As conditions change during removal and remediation, confirm that the monitoring well network is adequate to ensure protectiveness of human health and the environment.

Background:

The 324 Building is located in the 300 Area of the Hanford Site, 1,000 feet from the Columbia River and less than a mile from the northern border of the City of Richland. The facility was constructed in 1966 and provided a venue for a substantial body of research involving highly radioactive materials including waste. During a 1980s project to vitrify highly radioactive waste which had strontium-90 and/or cesium-137 added to it to simulate high-level waste, the liquid spilled on the floor of B Cell. In 2010, investigations supporting disposition of the facility identified highly dangerous levels of radiation in the soils under the hot cell, likely associated with the earlier spill. Based on the best information at the time, a complex remedy was developed to safely remove the contamination from under the building and prevent the spread of the radionuclides. In 2022, during the final stages of preparation, a previously unknown area of soil contamination was identified outside of the reach of the remote excavator. DOE and EPA, the lead regulatory agency on the project, determined that the best path forward was to conduct a Focused Feasibility Study (FFS) (Reference 5) in support of a Proposed Plan (Reference 6) to amend the 2013 revised ROD.

The FFS and associated Proposed Plan present two options for cleaning up the site: a “coupled” and a “decoupled” removal and remedy. The coupled remedy would rely on the shielding of the building to remove the high activity contaminated soils that the equipment can reach, then demolish the building, and build an enclosure to reach the rest of the contaminated soils. This option would remove some contamination sooner but would take longer overall. The decoupled option would remove the building and then construct an enclosure over the waste site to minimize risk of contamination spread. DOE has selected the decoupled option as the preferred alternative, as it is estimated to be less expensive and to be completed a few years faster. While the Board advocates for action, there is no consensus on support for a specific alternative. While DOE’s preferred option is potentially less expensive and faster, some Board members raised concerns related to potential exposure to airborne dust in the temporary enclosure, worker comfort, temperature concerns, and limited protection/shielding from the contaminated soils. Examples from Rocky Flats and the tank retrieval programs were given as potential concerns.

There is additional uncertainty based on the nature of contamination and disposal pathways for soils from the waste site. DOE takes the position that the contamination is high activity waste which can be disposed at the on-site Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) landfill. DOE also notes that there may be unanticipated materials which could assay as mixed transuranic waste. In addition, there are persistent questions as to whether some material may be considered high-level waste. The question of high-level waste is not necessarily a simple one, and the potential exists for a protracted discussion or legal challenge as to the nature of the waste. Included in the advice are two strategies to mitigate the risk of this delay or the potential that the waste is later determined to be classified as high-level.

Advice:

The Board advises the TPA agencies to proceed with the building removal and waste site cleanup in a manner that is protective of the workforce, the community, and the environment. Either of the proposed alternatives have the potential to accomplish this provided that sufficient planning is incorporated into the action. The Board's advice is to develop or update site-specific plans (Remedial Design/Remedial Work Plan, Removal Action Work Plan, and Waste Management Plan) to complete the work safely and effectively.

The Board advises DOE to consider comments received during the Proposed Plan comment period when updating the aforementioned plans.

The Board advises DOE to use lessons learned from building demolition across the ~~site~~complex, such as the Plutonium Finishing Plant, to manage the contaminated debris.

The Board advises DOE to use waste classifications and other regulatory tools to assure the 324 Building materials and contaminated soils meet the Waste Acceptance Criteria at ERDF.

The Board advises DOE to develop and discuss with regulators a potential interim storage, separation, and treatment area for retrieved contaminated materials should waste outside of ERDF acceptance criteria ~~mixed transuranic or high-level waste materials~~ be identified. The interim storage area should be away from the River Corridor and be engineered to isolate the material from the environment.

The Board advises DOE to use lessons learned from Hanford and elsewhere in the complex to ensure that the 324 Building Health and Safety Plan is protective of hazards to the workforce associated with airborne soils and contamination spread as well as extreme temperatures, fire risk, and other environmental conditions.

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Tom Sicilia, Al Farabee, Brian Ivey, Charles LoPresti, Chris Sutton, Dan Solitz, Jim Doherty, Kevin Danby, McClure Tosch, Miya Burke, Pam Larsen, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Rose Ferri, Simone Anter, Susan Coleman

The Board advises the TPA agencies to ensure that planning documents evaluate whether the monitoring well network is adequate to detect possible changes in contaminant concentrations during removal of the building and contaminated soil.

*Add Yakama Nation signing statement: Yakama Nation concurs with advise from HABS as written, however continues to work with the Tri Party on waste classification

References:

1. Hanford Advisory Board Values, November 2, 2012. Link: https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HAB_ValuesWhitePaper_Attach.pdf
2. Removal Action Work Plan 2 For 324 327 Buildings and Ancillary Facilities, DOE/RL-2005-95, Rev. 0, September 1, 2006. Link: https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/DA03897999
3. Integrated Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan for the 300 Area (300-FF-1 300-FF-2 and 300-FF-5 Operable Units), DOE/RL-2014-13, Rev 0, June 8, 2015: https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/0081153H
4. Hanford Site 300 Area Record of Decision for 300-FF-2 and 300-FF-5 and Record of Decision Amendment for 300-FF-1, November 26, 2013. Link: https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/0087180
5. Focused Feasibility Study for Remedial Action at the 300-296 Waste Site, DOE/RL-2024-33, Rev. 0, May 29, 2025. Link: https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-35052
6. Proposed Plan to Amend the Hanford Site 300 Area Record of Decision for 300-FF-2 to Address Changed Field Conditions at the 300-296 Waste Site, DOE/RL-2024-34, Rev. 0, May 29, 2025. Link: https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-35053

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Tom Sicilia, Al Farabee, Brian Ivey, Charles LoPresti, Chris Sutton, Dan Solitz, Jim Doherty, Kevin Danby, McClure Tosch, Miya Burke, Pam Larsen, Rebecca Holland, Rob Davis, Rose Ferri, Simone Anter, Susan Coleman

CC/BCC:

Mark all applicable names/organizations to be included as advice recipients (in addition to the addressees).

☐ **TPA Agency Representatives**

- ☐ Roger Jarrell, DOE-EM
- ☐ Brian Harkins, DOE
- ☐ Stephanie Schleif, ECY
- ☐ Laura Buelow, 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**

- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....
- ☐ .....

☐ **Requests to Receive Advice**

- ☐ Jessica Keys, Staff to Sen. Merkley

Appendix B: National Liaison's Report

Hanford Advisory Board

National Liaison Report – August 13, 2025

AIKEN, S.C The U.S. Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management has reached another milestone, with concurrence from regulators that the Savannah River Site has successfully removed waste from another highly radioactive waste tank.

Tank 8 makes the sixth tank to reach preliminary cease waste removal (PCWR) regulatory approval in 13 months. EM achieved this latest PCWR regulatory approval over a year ahead of schedule. The tanks will ultimately be filled with grout to be permanently sealed and operationally closed.

PCWR is a regulatory milestone for old-style tanks that designates agreement between EM, EPA, and the South Carolina Department of Environmental Services that, based on preliminary information, there is reasonable assurance that performance objectives for tank closure will be met.

PADUCAH, Ky. — Crews have safely demolished six unused facilities at the Paducah Site ahead of schedule and under budget in the current fiscal year ending Sept. 30, reducing the cleanup footprint by more than 19,000 square feet and supporting future reuse of land and economic development.

The Office of Environmental Management team at Paducah has torn down more than 180 structures to date since cleanup began with a footprint of 560,000 square feet.

LAS VEGAS — The DOE (EM) Nevada Program has commenced well drilling in a remote stretch of the **Nevada National Security Site** (Yucca Mountain), furthering a decades-long mission to document the nature and extent of groundwater contamination caused by historic nuclear testing at the site.

Crews started drilling the first well in May on the Pahute Mesa region of the site so groundwater can be analyzed for contamination and compared with computer modelings.

The drilling supports future closure of the final groundwater corrective action unit at the site. The goal is to demonstrate the reliability of the groundwater contaminant transport model results and provide confidence that the model results can support decisions leading to closure.

The government carried out 928 nuclear tests at Yucca Mountain from 1951 to 1992. Nearly 90% of those tests were detonated underground.

One EM site shares best practices with another to build future workforce

AIKEN, S.C. — Representatives from the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant recently toured the acclaimed Apprenticeship School at the Savannah River Site as they look to launch a similar program to help fill critical positions for the underground waste repository in New Mexico. Launched in 2020 by U.S. Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management and contractor Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, the Apprenticeship Program was designed to address

attrition and establish a robust pipeline for a skilled workforce. The school has graduated over 800 apprentices to date, with 90% of them accepting full-time positions at SRNS.

To meet the growing workforce demands to support the site missions, SRNS plans to hire 2,000 additional employees over the next five years from the Apprenticeship School and Pipeline Programs. The Apprenticeship Program offers three pathways — youth, key skilled technician, and professional and degree-based — to create a pipeline of skilled employees supporting critical missions for the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration."