DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB)
River and Plateau Committee (RAP)
April 13, 2021
Virtual Meeting via Teleconference and Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening....2

M-91 Issue Manager Team Update....2

Advice #308 Response Discussion....6

Open Forum....7

Committee Business and Future Meeting Topics....9

Attachments....10

Attendees....11

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.

DRAFT

Opening

Gary Younger, US Department of Energy (DOE), stated that the meeting will be recorded, providing the required disclosure per Washington state law.

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, welcomed meeting participants. Due to the use of a new meeting platform, Ruth, with assistance from Gary, proceeded to provide the participants with guidance on the use of the new platform and protocols to follow when engaging in discussion.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) and RAP Chair, provided a formal opening and welcomed meeting participants.

Stan Branch, DOE, announced that this meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Tom Sicilia provided supporting information, clarifying the HAB's role and providing reference documentation that included the HAB Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the DOE Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Policies and Procedures Desk Reference.

The RAP committee adopted the meeting summary for its February 2021 virtual meeting with a minor edit from Liz Mattson of Hanford Challenge.

Ruth Nicholson announced that a new HAB facilitation contract has been awarded and is currently undergoing transition. She introduced the new team and discussed the new HAB Library location.

The meeting was then opened for questions; clarifications were made regarding access and amenities of the new HAB Library location, the reasoning and methodology of HAB committee meeting recordings, and the reasoning behind the cancellation of the April Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meeting.

The committee discussed further the cancellation of the TWC meeting. Bob Suyama, Benton County, clarified that the decision was his; he determined that the planned discussions were not time sensitive, but instead primarily informational. Furthermore, the committee members were not given the appropriate amount of time to review the meeting-related documentation, which would impact the quality of the productivity of the meeting. Shelly Cimon, Columbia RiverKeeper, noted her appreciation for the decision and suggested that the reasoning behind the decision should be a topic for discussion in the upcoming HAB Leadership Workshop.

Estaban Ortiz, GreenLatinos, provided a question regarding committee engagement by prospective board members. Gary Younger provided clarification; prospective members are treated as the public for the purposes of committee meetings. There was not in place a public comment section in the agenda for the meeting, but he suggested it be allowed for this meeting. The committee agreed.

M-91 Issue Manager Team Update

Vince Panesko, City of Richland, provides a presentation on the scope of the M-91 milestone series. This presentation focused on an explanation of the M-91 series purpose and background.

Vince explained that he examined the previous HAB advice given on M-91-related subjects over the previous 20 years. It was determined that the HAB previously advised that all present transuranic (TRU) waste must ultimately be removed from the Hanford Site. In working toward that overall goal, however, the M-91 milestone series only serves as a small subset of the overall effort. As a result, examination of the M-91 milestone series will seem incomplete and cannot effectively be used by an individual that is unfamiliar with the overall subject matter. It does not effectively convey essential information in regard to overall scope, background, and definitions.

Vince stated that he would focus on defining the scope and definitions as part of his presentation, and noted that the M-91 series contains a requirement for publishing an annual project management plan (PMP). The M-91 scope consists of:

- Removal of the retrievably stored waste from the burial grounds.
- Dispose of the mixed low-level waste (MLLW) and transuranic mixed (TRUM) waste in storage.

He stated that when these milestones are complete, DOE will have successfully treated the MLLW and TRUM waste offsite for disposal. Vince concluded, on this point, that as stated the M-91 goal is relatively consistent with previous HAB advice.

Moving into a more detailed steps within the M-91 scope, he examined the requirement for MLLW and TRUM to be contained in above ground storage as of June 30, 2009, prior to packaging and transport to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). However, for a period of time, WIPP was shut down. This has resulted in pushback from DOE, stating that milestone dates cannot be consistently achieved when dependent on organizations from outside the Hanford Site. In this case, the Hanford Site controlling organizations have no control over WIPP's performance.

M-91 only applies to retrievable stored waste (RSW) within four specific burial grounds:

- 218-W-4B
- 218-W-4C
- 218-W-3A
- 218-E-12B

He noted that, within this set of burial grounds, only a small number of trenches contain TRU waste. He examined the definition of RSW within the M-91 Milestone Series. The definition of RSW delineates waste by the date it was placed in the burial ground trenches, and provides exception for deteriorated waste containers where retrieval presents risk to workers. He proceeded to discuss additional points of interest within the examined definitions.

He explained the significance of dates that are associated with the stated TRU waste definition. Prior to 1970, TRU waste was defined as "waste with known or detectable contamination of transuranium nuclides." In practice, that meant that any and all waste that came from a certain selection of on-site facilities, including the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), was considered to be contaminated. All of this waste was buried in plastic-lined cardboard boxes. An important point to consider regarding this definition is that none of the waste buried at this time was measured.

He proceeded to examine a change in storage methodology that occurred in March of 1970. At this time, TRU waste placed in retrievable storage that would allow the waste to be retrieved within 20 years. The new storage method consisted of packing waste into 55-gallon steel drums, though they were not sealed. Instead, they were buried and covered in dirt. The drums have since been to discovered to be corroded and are no longer considered RSW.

In 1973, the TRU waste segregation limit was established at 10 nCi/g of TRU isotopes. This change occurred during early development and adoption of analytical equipment capable of measuring the contents of the waste containers. This limit was changed to 100 nCi/g in 1982. As a result of this change, much of the waste buried between 1973 and 1982, considered to be TRU waste at time of burial, no longer fits the TRU waste definition. For clarification, he examined the definition of contact-handled (CH) RSW. This is defined as a waste container with a surface dose rate of less than or equal to 200 mrem/h.

Moving on from definitions, Vince examined the PMP that describes implementation of the M-91 Milestones, with the most recent revision issued in September of 2020. The PMP consists of eight sections, with the first being a project overview. He provided a quick overview of Sections 3 through 6. Within these sections, there is a stated deadline of final shipment to WIPP with a deadline of the year 2050, with complete CH RSW retrieval and designation from 218-W-4B, 218- W-3A and 218-E-12B burial grounds expected by 2039, and complete retrieval of remote-handled (RH) RSW by 2048. He noted that Section 3 contains an overview of the initial and remaining volumes of RSW within the related burial grounds. Section 5 clarifies additional milestone dates related to certification and shipment of TRUM waste. Section 6 defines storage capacity metrics and dates for removal of all storage containers from a selection of sites.

He noted that, to this point, M-91 is are consistent with previously issued HAB advice. He then moved his presentation back to Section. The section provides milestone dates for the engineering studies through for retrieval, processing, certifications, and shipment/disposal of RH MLLW and RH TRUM waste, along with dates for the subsequent design and identification of facilities to reach the treatment, storage, and disposal. He noted that, with the varied waste storage methods and contents of the waste, this is a challenging process that requires interface with personnel that were initially involved in packaging and disposal to fully understand. Further, he noted that many of the stated studies have occurred previously; these are referenced in the appendices of the PMP.

Moving to Section 7, he noted that HAB Advice #285, issued September 10, 2015 requested that the M-91 milestone process be expanded to provide "global continuity" with other TRU waste cleanup activities. He explained that TRU is present in many other facilities throughout the Hanford Site, but the associated retrieval, storage, and disposal is covered by other milestones. He explained that, within Section 7 of the PMP, DOE has attempted to address previous HAB concerns of global continuity. This section does not address the M-91 milestones, but instead provides a listing of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) closure activities that will generate TRU waste for offsite shipment.

In conclusion, he determined that the M-91 Milestone Series, as written, are responsive to HAB concerns. He identified two primary topics for follow-up: first, the examination of the new facilities that will need to be built for ultimate disposition of RSW to WIPP by 2050, and second, examination of global continuity, considering the TRU waste that comes from other CERCLA processes.

Committee Discussion

Vince asked for questions and comments from the Committee.

Tom Sicilia, ODOE, suggested consideration of a plutonium-themed meeting in the future and proposed October of 2021 as a potential date, noting that lead time should be sufficient for the subject matter experts (SME) to prepare.

Shelly Cimon asked Vince for his opinion regarding the expansion of analogous waste sites in regard to global continuity. She noted that the Hanford Site was highly successful in previous cleanup efforts utilizing previous economic stimulus money as a result of advance planning. For the burial grounds governed by M-91, she believed that a well-defined strategy is needed. Additionally, she asked about the need for waste characterization and the associated challenges in finding funding for characterization.

Vince noted that this was a topic he hoped to examine. He recognized the challenges in characterization; waste sites are highly variable, with waste being characterized a single square foot at a time. In the history

of the Hanford Site, particularly in the 1940s through the 1950s, waste disposal procedures were not followed closely, if at all. Production was the primary focus rather than procedure. As a result, the waste content, and even location of waste containers, throughout the site is not definitively known.

Steve Wiegman, Public at Large, provided the next question. Steve asked if there is a baseline that can be defined for TRU waste activities; is there a critical path that can be monitored to track progress, or is this effort headed for further slips?

Vince responded by stating that Sections 4 and 5 of the PMP are intended for that purpose, however, he noted that the milestone dates are dependent on factors out of the Hanford Site's control, giving the example of WIPP's shutdown. He explained that retrieval and handling of TRU waste cannot be effectively scheduled due to uncertainty regarding the content of the M-91 burial grounds. Challenges that operations would face cannot be effectively predicted. He recognized that the previous HAB advice asked for schedules, but believes it cannot be done due to lack of information on actual burial ground contents.

Tom Sicilia noted that though cleanup activities cannot be effectively scheduled, the milestone dates are still important; they keep the task in mind and on track towards completion. Steve Wiegman stated that he understands the importance of the milestone dates, however, notes that a critical path schedule would be valuable for short-term activities.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, stated his concerns on two primary issues. First, he noted that Vince did not discuss the timeline and volume of waste that is illegally stored and uncategorized. He expressed concern that HAB advice and discussions need to focus on the urgency of characterization and retrieval of such waste. He emphasized that the risk of this waste remaining in-place is very high. Second, he stated concern about the idea of the board accepting the notion "four islands" of mixed waste in the burial grounds, due to lack of documentation related to these. He noted that groundwater and monitoring data suggests chemical content in other trenches.

Vince responded that Section 6 of the PMP addresses areas outside of the burial grounds. Gerry stated that allowing the containers to remain in place until the Section 6 milestone dates is "waiting for disaster," noting that the containers have leaked. Vince agreed with the sentiment and explained that this is a subject of discussion going forward, referencing the volume of buried waste remaining to be dealt with.

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, asked if the M-91 Milestone Series deals with 300-Area RH waste. Vince stated that yes, it does, referencing Section 3 of the PMP. He noted that RAP will need to examine the methodology for disposition of this waste in the future.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland, commented that though the status of this project is alarming, the Committee needs to consider budget constraints. Many other DOE-managed sites face the same problems as those being examined. Considering the priority issues faced at the other sites, this work needs to be carefully planned and ready for immediate performance when requesting funding.

Larry Haler, Public at Large, commented that when working at Hanford in 1974 as an operator, his duties included disposal of waste into the trenches. He reiterated that what went into these trenches was not clearly defined and expressed concern as to the contents that came from certain reactors, such as the N-Reactor.

Next Steps

Tom Sicilia moved to discuss the next steps. He stated that the M-91 topic is a potential topic for an Open Forum in the future, and many plutonium-centric topics will be added to the work plan in the future, likely for the following year.

Advice #308 Response Discussion

Leading into an Open Forum discussion, Tom Sicilia noted discussion of the HAB Advice #308 would typically occur during the full board meeting, but the group did not reach that point during the previous opportunity. As a result, he called for comment by to determine if the response if considered sufficient or should be further discussed by the Executive Issues Committee (EIC).

Vince Panesko voiced disappointment with the response. He noted that, in regard to DOE's response on use of grout for the 291-B cell, it did not fully address the advice. There is not sufficient evidence provided by DOE that the method is safe. Additionally, he stated that it is unclear how the action will alter the final remediation of the site. Vince stated that he hopes to further discuss grouting for stability.

Tom Sicilia acknowledged Vince's concern regarding the advice, however, he noted that DOE's other responses to grouting indicate that there will be further engineering study to assess its efficacy and safety. He also noted, however, that he would feel more comfortable with a sand or gravel fill due to ease of removal while still being effective in preventing collapse. Tom invited comment from US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) representatives present at the meeting.

Craig Cameron, EPA, noted that the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) is the regulatory lead for this item. However, he noted that he felt the questions raised by the Committee are legitimate. He would prefer the use of a fill that does not impact future remedial actions and does not affect the waste designation of the material in the filters.

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, stated that Ecology provided a similar response, and the comment has since been closed.

Tom Sicilia stated that the discussion should be further explored by the full HAB during its upcoming meeting in June.

Tom Galioto, Public at Large, requested a chance to comment. He stated that he fully understands concerns about use of grout for risk minimization and stabilization of waste, however, he particularly appreciated that DOE responded specifically to each point of the HAB advice.

Tom Sicilia agreed, noting appreciation for the timely response that addressed each point individually, but wished that is would have included a discussion of the engineering report that will examine alternatives to grout.

Steve Wiegman, Public at Large, noted that the discussion at hand leads into one that that he would like to see at the next EIC or full HAB meeting. He would like to discuss how to advance the HAB's ability to submit complete advice that, in turn, receives complete responses. He wants to ensure that the advice submitted is clearly understandable to ensure that the HAB will not be surprised by the responses received.

Tom Sicilia noted that the existing process allows for review by the TPA agencies. He stated that the conversation would be advanced during the EIC meeting.

Chris Sutton stated that he did not believe that the definition of "policy-level advice" was clear, and as a result, cannot effectively determine if what HAB advice could be considered policy-level. He believes that the advice provided addresses HAB concerns, but does not always constitute policy-level advice by conventional definitions. He stated that examples from regulatory leaders of policy-level advice would be beneficial, especially for new members, for the HAB to produce advice that can be considered policy-level, while also representing HAB concerns.

The Committee then allowed for public comments on the subject.

Esteban Ortiz, GreenLatinos, recounted his previous experience in working with the federal government. He believes that Washington DC-based organizations are highly policy-oriented. He sees a disconnect between "in the field" personnel experience versus of what is seen in Washington DC. He believes that strong channels of communication must be utilized between the two groups.

McClure Tosch, Yakama Nation Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (ERWM), stated that, under federal law, there is specific language that relates to early removal actions not precluding final cleanup actions. Though it is true that grout can be removed, the waste form would be changed and the waste volume would increase considerably. He expressed worry that, by final remediation of the Hanford Site, permitted space in United States disposal site would run short. As a result, there is a risk of grout removal becoming technically infeasible.

Tom Sicilia responded with appreciation for the advice, noting that when developing the advice, the HAB started with the legal precedent and moved to technical details afterwards. Concluding, he noted that the Committee has determined potential talking points for the following EIC meeting.

Open Forum

Tom Sicilia stated that there is an item that he hoped to bring up based on a subject from a previous Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC) meeting. PIC is working on advice regarding how documents are added to the TPA and then communicated to the public, which includes a technical aspect relevant to the RAP Committee. The document initially was available to the public prior and the HAB before 2016. The HAB previously issued advice on the subject, though new sections have since been added. Tom requested a technical briefing on the additions to the document. He expressed that PIC's advice is focused on how the related information is communicated to the public, and invited members of the RAP Committee to join the related Issue Management (IM) team to provide discussion and advice that focuses on the technical aspects of the document.

Vince Panesko elaborated on the subject that the IM team is examining. They feel that DOE is not proving the HAB with adequate information. Among the related documents, there are several that are published annually relevant to RAP concerns, including a groundwater report, environmental monitoring report, and updates to the Composite Analysis as an annual requirement. He stated that, for the HAB to be sufficiently educated on the recent developments, the DOE must take these annual changes and present new results summaries or handouts such that the HAB can effectively disseminate the new information to the public.

Tom Sicilia followed up, noting that this topic is related to the Committee of the Whole (COTW) topic that was agreed upon the prior year.

Vince brought up the topic of the Composite Analysis and its importance in leading to end-state analysis. He noted that there are a series of documents related to the current version of the Composite Analysis, for which the HAB has not yet received the most recent update. He hoped that DOE will provide the Committee with a presentation on the latest updates. Among the areas of concern is that, within these documents, plutonium is not included as a long-term issue due to having a low coefficient of distribution. However, it is known that there are liquids mixed in with the plutonium-contaminated waste. He stated that it is highly concerning that the Composite Analysis omits plutonium as an issue.

Additionally, Vince noted that though the document provides a rough idea of plutonium locations and quantities, it does not provide a complete plan for what to do with it. Documents that deal with plutonium

cleanup often do not relate to one another. He proposed a future topic that examines total plutonium inventory and complete cleanup strategies.

Chris Sutton followed up Vince's request for a briefing on the Composite Analysis, noting that he would like that briefing to be combined with the topic of a cumulative impact evaluation. He noted that the related modelling software is being used for both purposes.

Tom Sicilia noted that he's working to get a presentation on all topics related to groundwater, including the Composite Analysis and the cumulative impact evaluation.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, moved to discuss the topic of total risk budget in relation the Hanford end-state and wondered if there was documentation that defined it.

Vince noted that this information was included in the initial Composite Analysis, last updated around the year 2000, and is difficult information to find. He stated that the difficulty in finding this information, and its ability to be understood by the public, may be a topic for the HAB to examine and provide advice on. Furthermore, if a defined risk budget has been exceeded already, operations should not be continued, as continued operations could make things worse. Without the definitions, there is no way to prove that the risk budget has not been exceeded.

Liz noted that a public meeting that may be of interest to the Committee would occur on April 30, 2021, which included the opportunity for questions and answers regarding the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis alternatives for non-time-critical removal actions for seven aging Tier 2 buildings/structures in Hanford's 200 West Area. She thanked the DOE for providing the public meeting. Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, agreed to make an announcement to the HAB.

Shelly Cimon noted that there is a common thread of the need for the HAB to build its knowledge base. In that respect, she would like to hear from all the TPA agencies regarding their needs and expectations from the Board, as well as what they believe the most important issues are for the HAB to examine. She believes that the DOE planning to add tutorials into the HAB agenda is a great idea. If DOE cannot build the HAB's understanding of its expectations, the HAB cannot, in turn, create good advice. To that end, the HAB needs to focus more on tutorials, using the example of document retrieval using the Phoenix platform.

Shelly also stated that she believes it is important to understand the permitting process that the DOE goes through in conjunction with Ecology; she feels that the permitting process serves as a benchmark for understanding how DOE and the regulatory agencies get work done and move toward readiness for startup and operations.

Chris added that, in consideration of new HAB membership, that a tutorial on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process would be highly beneficial. He noted that it is a very formal process involving many documents, some of which have public comment periods. Furthermore, it would be beneficial for HAB membership to understand how CERCLA requirements differ from Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) requirements. Tom Sicilia recalled a related presentation that had previously been presented to the HAB, which may serve as a starting point.

Tom Galioto stated that Hanford cleanup end states are a critical area for increased HAB attention, specifically by the RAP Committee, as much of the released low-level waste will be coming from the Central Plateau area. He stated that everything that the HAB does should be focused on the goal of reaching the final end-state, and the public should be aware of what that vision consists of. He encouraged

the HAB to address the topic in detail. Tom Sicilia responded, stating that there is a related IM team and it is considered to be a board-wide topic. Ruth Nicholson also contributed, noting that the IM team is more akin to a workgroup, as it also includes TPA agency staff.

Tom Sicilia invited additional comments. The Committee agreed to move to the next agenda item.

Committee Business and Future Meeting Topics

Tom Sicilia provided an overview of the current state of HAB operations, noting that some things that should be happening are not. He acknowledged that the HAB operations are under considerable constraints due to a number of factors, including remote work, contract transition, new chair appointments, and other recent changes. He noted that Committee agendas have been sparse, possibly as a result of all the recent changes, but that the Committee has achieved much despite the present challenges.

Tom Sicilia stated that he has a goal for the Committee to create agendas utilizing the three-month look-ahead. He hoped that the Committee could arrange for other agency experts, perhaps from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) or Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), to provide technical presentation in order to create informed advice. Tom Sicilia called for additional topics related to improving HAB operations, along with topics the Committee believes need to be added to the work plan.

Steve Wiegman noted the difficulty in a committee presenting an issue to the full Board in a timely matter. He would like to consider means of allowing the committees to act on issues without waiting for the full Board consensus. Tom Sicilia explained the previous method, which consisted of committees submitted public comment on issues that could not receive full Board consensus, though not on behalf of the Board. He noted that this method does not hold the same value as a Board consensus advice and comment.

Steve Wiegman noted that DOE has stated that it would consider HAB comments whenever they is provided, however, he worried that they would have less impact if provided outside of designated comment periods. He wants to specifically explore ways to empower committees, expressing frustrations heard from others that the Board is inhibiting their work in some ways. Tom Sicilia noted that the issue is that of scheduling and planning, potentially alleviated by better communications with TPA agencies.

Ruth Nicholson recalled previous means of exploring short-turn issues, such as Round Robin or Sounding Board format meetings. Summaries of the discussions in these meetings would in turn be provided to DOE, not as a representation of consensus or agreement, but as a representation of perspectives of those in the room. With current methodologies, the meeting recordings may instead be provided, ensuring that no statements are reframed or misrepresented.

Shelly Cimon noted that, in the past, agencies have come to the HAB in the past requesting an immediate response, resulting in Round Robin events. Tom Sicilia added that the Committee has previously submitted “stormboards” as an informal submission.

Vince Panesko stated that the idea of receiving training and annual document updates, focusing in pertinent subjects, is something that the upcoming Leadership Workshop should focus on to enhance HAB membership capabilities. Tom Sicilia clarified for new members that the Leadership Workshop is a meeting of the EIC to discuss Board-wide topics and concerns, determine work plan and calendar for the following year, and provide a chance for members to have their voices heard.

Tom Sicilia moved to examine the HAB and RAP work plans, which are in development, and wanted to ensure that RAP issues are incorporated into the full HAB work plan. He asked members to identify topics of interest that were not present in the current work plan.

The Committee determined that examination of CERCLA and RCRA processes should be added to the discussion. Craig Cameron, EPA, noted that he may have access to a previously-developed presentation on the topic that could be updated and provided for use in a future meeting. Steve Wiegman noted that the presentation would be valuable to the entire HAB and should not be limited to the RAP Committee. McClure Tosch offered to provide a presentation on the Yakima Nation's role in the CERCLA process to anyone interested.

Chris Sutton contributed framing questions to the Central Plateau Characterization agenda item in the work plan and stated that he believes that the agenda item should be moved up in priority.

Tom Sicilia discussed upcoming meetings and topics. He hoped to receive briefs on the 324 Building project and 100K Treatment Study. He noted that he can provide an update on the results of the EIC meeting during the meeting.

Vince Panesko added that he would like a presentation on the plans for waste disposition-related facilities, specifically as the relate to TRU waste handling and related equipment, how those items would be disposed of, and discussion barriers to removal of leaking waste containers in the Central Waste Complex (CWC). Tom Sicilia recognized the issue as a larger concern, but clarified that he was looking for topics specifically for the RAP meeting planned for May.

Liz Mattson asked Vince for clarification on an earlier topic, wondering if sludge processing and transport to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) was included as a topics list. Vince referred back to the PMP for the answer. He again stated that the RAP would need a presentation regarding plans for waste retrieval and storage from single-shell tanks. He noted confusion in the glass conversion process and plutonium sources, wondering if the plutonium waste would come from the Tank Farms.

Tom Sicilia noted that, as work in the Central Plateau moves closer to the Tank Farms, joint meetings between RAP and the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) will need to occur. Vinceo also noted that he wanted to understand DOE's plans for TRU waste retrieval from the tanks and shipment to WIPP. Tom Sicilia added the topic to the planned joint committee meeting.

The committee took a comment/question from the public. Esteban Ortiz noted that the committee needs to ensure that the planned agenda for the May Committee meeting aligned with the content of the meeting in June. Anticipating votes on an infrastructure plan in June, the committee needs to ensure their work plans will be ready to be put into practice at that time. Tom Sicilia referred to discussion of "shovel-ready" projects in the work plan; should new funding become, the Committee plans to be ready for it.

With no further comments, the Committee adjourned.

Attachments

Attachment 1: RAP Committee Agenda

Attachment 2: HAB Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Attachment 3: U.S. Department of Energy Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Policies and Procedures Desk Reference

Attachment 4: (Vince's Presentation Slides)

Attachment 5: M-91 Project Management Plan

Attachment 6: RAP Work Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Shelley Cimon, Primary	Gerry Pollet, Primary	Jeff Burright, Alternate
Tom Galioto, Primary	Jacob Reynolds, Primary	Jan Catrell, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Primary	Bob Suyama, Primary	Larry Haler, Alternate
Liz Mattson, Primary	Steve Wiegman, Primary	Marissa Merker, Alternate
		Vince Panesko, Alternate
		Tom Sicilia, Alternate
		Chris Sutton, Alternate

Others:

Stan Branch, DOE	Diana McFadden, Ecology	Erin Braich
Gary Younger, DOE	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Esteban Ortiz, GreenLatinos
	Craig Cameron, EPA	Patrick Conrad, HMIS
		Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
		Ashley Stubbs, HMIS
		Kali Robson, Yakima Nation ERWM
		Tom Rogers, Yakima Nation ERWM
		McClure Tosch, Yakima Nation ERWM
		Li Wang, Yakima Nation ERWM
		Ruth Nicholson, Street Legal Ind.
		Josh Patnaude, Street Legal Ind.

Note: Participants for this virtual meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the CHAT box of Microsoft Teams. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.

DRAFT