

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
TANK WASTE COMMITTEE MEETING  
October 7, 2009  
Richland, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions ..... 1  
242-A Evaporator..... 2  
Waste Management Area - C Performance Assessment (PA)..... 6  
Committee Work Plan..... 8  
Action Items / Commitments ..... 11  
Handouts ..... 11  
Attendees..... 12

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

**Welcome and Introductions**

Larry Lockrem, Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair, welcomed the committee, introductions were made and the committee adopted the August meeting summary.

Larry provided an update on the presentation from Shirley Olinger, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) on the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) design and safety controls. He said Shirley plans to brief the TWC on this topic in November and the committee will need an issue manager (IM). The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) is currently looking at long-term support of WTP and moving forward with glass vitrification. One area of concern is that the hot cell will not have the capacity to support the WTP. Larry said the number of control valves increased from 3,000 to 21,000 valves and controls so a supplementary containment for these systems is needed, mainly because of the hydrogen operation portion of the plant. Larry said the risk of having the facility go down is an issue that needs to be mitigated, since hydrogen build-up could lead to potential contamination. Larry said a materials at risk evaluation to potentially reduce the number of valves from 21,000 to 14,000 is underway. A second area of concern is reducing the number of limiting conditioning operations (LCOs), which require daily routines. Larry said Shirley will provide a more detailed presentation on these issues, and he suggested having DNFSB also come to the committee meeting to give their perspective on these issues.

Mike Korenko said he was appreciative that Shirley took the time to provide a briefing on this issue and said, considering that \$1 billion has been spent on WTP design he did not expect that many surprises to be found during the evaluation. Mike said he was overwhelmed by the high number of LCOs. He said phosphate glass may be considered

as an option, which could be a positive development since Yucca Mountain has been delayed or closed. Larry said there was a WTP management team meeting during which iron phosphate and moving forward with re-evaluating the amount of glass that will go through the system was discussed. Mike said the driver scenario was too conservative and a disastrous seismic event would lead to a buildup, which could be a public risk and increases the risk to the worker. He said Shirley was asked to provide the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) with a document that defined the assumptions and said it would be helpful for the Board to issue advice on the topic. Rob Davis said there are huge consequences for these issues and there is a great risk with the public perception that this is reducing the number of safety-compliance elements so the plant can reduce costs and timelines. He said the perception that the plant is being made less safe is an issue the HAB needs to keep in mind if the committee decides to develop draft advice.

### **242-A Evaporator**

Vince Panesko, the IM for the 242-A Evaporator, provided an update on the 242-A Evaporator Environmental Assessment (EA). He said the TWC has been concerned about safe operations of the evaporator, which plays an important role in providing a concentrated feed stream for the WTP. The evaporator must operate beyond 2015, and Vince said since it was built with 1970s-era technology the potential problems with having this facility fail must be identified. The 242-A Evaporator EA was recently released, which Vince said raises questions about the need for an EA to upgrade a facility and the timing of the EA. Vince said the TWC did not know there would be an EA on the 242-A Evaporator, but it was related to American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funding. He said many upgrades included in the EA were left out of the funding plan and some deficiencies in upgrades are surprises.

Woody Russell, DOE-ORP, provided an overview of the 242-A Evaporator EA. He said the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is a process for federal agency actions, with the exception of areas where the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) is involved. Woody said there is a distinction between CERCLA and NEPA projects, primarily from the standpoint of public involvement. For NEPA, there are three forms of documentation – the Categorical Exclusion (CX) for simple projects such as characterization, the Environmental Assessment (EA) for activities where it is not clear whether there will be a significant impact, and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for activities that will constitute a significant impact. CXs are not reviewed by the public, although Woody said DOE plans to make these available on its Web site beginning in December. EAs must be distributed to state governments and tribal agencies, and while there is not a requirement for public involvement, public comment has been conducted for some EAs. Woody said EAs either have a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) or there are significant impacts and an EIS is required. EISs must have a public comment period and require much more stakeholder involvement.

Woody reviewed how the 242-A Evaporator EA is related to the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). He said a CX could have been used for the 242-A Evaporator but, since the evaporator is a subject in the TC&WM EIS, DOE wanted to make sure to introduce it as an interim action EA. Moving forward on a decision on upgrades to the evaporator would not have precluded decisions in the TC&WM EIS. Woody said DOE could have waited for TC&WM EIS to be finalized and a record of decision (ROD) issued, but since stimulus funds were available DOE decided to move forward with the interim action EA. Woody said there were no significant impacts found and DOE will most likely proceed with a FONSI.

Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP, reviewed upgrades supported by ARRA funds. For the 242-A Evaporator, \$17.5 million worth of upgrades will be completed between now and 2011. Tom said the upgrades focus on the reliability of the system, including an inventory of spare parts and upgrading instrumentation, which is old and outdated. Tom said DOE also plans fabrication and installation of the exhaust system, completing phases two and three of the instrumentation upgrade, installing condensate leak protection, and completing asbestos abatement. An additional activity is updating the essential drawings. Tom said for the 242-A Evaporator DOE plans to update approximately 500 drawings.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- John Price, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said when the state or other entities take action (e.g., issue a dangerous waste permit to a treatment, storage and disposal facility) they are required to comply with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), which is a state parallel to NEPA. He said when Ecology is permitting hazardous waste units like the 242-A Evaporator a SEPA analysis is needed. John said the NEPA analysis for the 242-A Evaporator resulted in a FONSI. Ecology provided comments on the draft EA and may potentially take action on the SEPA side, as the existing permit has a possible gap in legal coverage. John said the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) EIS provided SEPA coverage but assumed the 242-A Evaporator would only operate through 2005. He said the state supports continuing operations of the evaporator and believes there would be more risk to the environment if it does not operate. John said Ecology did not agree with the no-action alternative in the EA because no-action scenario should be to continue running the evaporator without upgrades, but the no-action alternative in the EA stops operations of the 242-A if the proposal is not accepted. Vince commented that the no-action alternative also included building new tanks, which he did not agree with. Woody said this is a good point.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Vince asked the schedule for the EA. Woody said it will hopefully be completed by the end of October.
- Dick Smith remarked that an update of a different facility completed a couple of years ago did not require an EA and he thinks an EA should not have to be required to update operating facilities. Woody said NEPA regulations require an EA when

upgrades can extend the life of a facility. He said a great deal of activity is taking place due to ARRA funding, and DOE decided to complete one NEPA document that utilizes stimulus funds and provides the opportunity to use ARRA funds in the future.

- Mike asked whether DOE had to complete an EA to upgrade the tank farms. Woody said an EA was not completed because those upgrades were covered under the TWRS EIS, which was prepared in the late 1990s. He said DOE has completed three supplemental analyses of this work, including the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). He said EAs are being considered for DOE-RL activities that may be completed with ARRA funding, such as closure of solid waste and the non-radioactive dangerous-waste landfill, but this is the only EA for DOE-ORP activities. DOE just sent a notice of intent (NOI) for an EA that includes dismantling 90 buildings in the 200 and 400 Areas, which are relatively clean buildings. He said that EA will be released in early November with a 30-day comment period.
- Dick asked whether the EA will include the proposed new landfill for construction materials. Woody said DOE is still scoping whether this will be included, but he thinks it makes sense to include it.
- Larry commented that the tank farms do not have to go through the NEPA process because they have been operating under an EIS since 1990. He asked if the 242-A Evaporator must complete the NEPA process because it was supposed to stop operating in 2005. Woody said this is part of the reason. He said the TWRS EIS did not include upgrades and said the evaporator would stop running in 2005. He said considering this and that the 242-A Evaporator is being analyzed in the TC&WM EIS, an EA seemed to be the best choice.
- Jeff asked what the TWRS EIS said about tank-farm operations. Woody said the TWRS EIS said a separate evaporation process would not be needed. John said there is also a difference between the TWRS EIS and the TC&WM EIS. Woody said the TWRS EIS talked about tank farm operations in support of treatment, and this was also a concern in the supplemental analysis. The TWRS EIS included a facility that could process 10 percent of the volume and 25 percent of the activity with phase two having multiple facilities. He said the TWRS EIS was outdated and the TC&WM EIS was needed to examine closure and supplemental treatment.
- Vince asked if the site is still operating under the TWRS EIS. Woody said it is, but he expects that the TC&WM EIS will supersede this document once a ROD is issued.
- Rob asked how many campaigns are expected from the 242-A Evaporator with the upgrades. Tom said he does not know this, but can find out this information from the project team.
- Rob asked if all of the upgrades will improve the decontamination factor of the 242-A Evaporator. Tom said he thinks the goal is not to improve the evaporator, but to ensure its reliability.
- Al Boldt commented that Woody's presentation said the cost of the updates would be \$17.5, but this is not consistent with Tom's presentation on ARRA funding. Woody said he does not know the total cost, but his presentation included activities the

contractor hoped to complete during the next couple of years. Tom said he can also find the amount of base and ARRA funding allocated to this effort.

- Al said the existing ROD includes replacing the evaporator in 2005, and this EA is for an upgrade in the next year or two. He said he expects that the TC&WM EIS will evaluate wiped film evaporators as well. He asked the cost of all of this work. Tom said the wiped film evaporators were never meant to replace the 242-A Evaporator, and since it is a mobile system it will not have the same scale as the 242-A Evaporator in terms of throughput. He said the system will pull the slurry out of the riser, go through the re-boiler and wiped film evaporator, then go back into the tank. Al expressed concern that when retrieving tanks simultaneously the 242-A Evaporator becomes the limiting factor for retrieval. He suggested that having multiple wiped film evaporators is a better solution.
- Larry said Vince's previous presentation included the schedule for 242-A Evaporator campaigns. He suggested that the committee re-address this scenario and look at the baseline and where it is going in the future. Vince said the schedule showed that the evaporator will not be operating often in the next decade. When the WTP starts in 2019-2020, the evaporator is under pressure and must complete many campaigns in a row. Larry said the issue was not the number of 45-day campaigns, but keeping the facility staffed between campaigns.
- Vince asked whether the TC&WM EIS looks at alternatives for the evaporator. Al said he does not think this is included in the TC&WM EIS. Vince commented that the total cost for all of the 242-A Evaporator upgrades are needed so the TWC can compare these to other cost options. Woody said all of the projects are listed in the EA, but this does not mean DOE will complete all of these. He said the idea for NEPA documents is to provide a scope of work that could potentially be completed.
- Vince asked whether there will still be a document that lists the upgrades to 242-A, or whether the EA is that document. Woody said he does not know and will have to find this out.
- Vince said the 242-A Evaporator was built in 1977 and was upgraded in 1990, 2004 and the 2007-2008 timeframe. He said it would be helpful to have a timeline of this and the motor-control items that should be replaced every 10 years. Vince said since the facility has a certain design life and there are issues such as ammonia and off-gas that are not compatible with the evaporator's brass and bronze materials, it appears that the facility is not operating within its design specifications.
- Rob asked whether Ecology will consider permitting the off-gas from the evaporator. John said Ecology has permits for hazardous-waste facilities and an air-operating permit for all of Hanford. He said he is not familiar with what is included in the air permit, but he could find out. Rob said the TWC would be interested in state oversight of off-gas materials.
- Rob said the site is limited to having 65 megawatts of power available and WTP will take up a huge part of this. He asked if it is possible to get another 10 megawatts for the site. Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP, said WTP is already at 65 megawatts, and he is not sure this is the site's limit.

- Rebecca Holland said a great deal of equipment was recently removed from the raw water building. She asked whether this material would be excess or if it will go to the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) since there was asbestos on the valves. Tom said from what he understands all of this equipment will go to ERDF.

### **Waste Management Area (WMA) C Performance Assessment (PA)**

Vince provided an overview of the WMA-C PA. In 1988 DOE began doing PAs and in September DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Ecology and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) participated in an assessment on the context and general conceptual model. He said a PA was completed for single-shell tanks (SSTs) and Ecology wrote a number of comments on the document. Vince said DOE should be careful that the WMA-C PA does not conflict with the TC&WM EIS since a ROD is needed before a PA. He said DOE is taking the PA seriously and he has been impressed with the process. Vince said during the September session the participants learned that the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) will be used because dangerous waste sites must be closed using dangerous waste regulation. PAs are part of an ongoing process and are maintained throughout the closure process.

Vince reviewed the primary purpose of the last assessment context workshop. He said one consideration is that any materials in the vadose zone will start moving as soon as any movement into the groundwater is planned. He said one option is grouting, which provides a peak of 10,000 years. He said an NRC representative suggested not spending a great deal of money on characterizing the vadose zone. Chris Kemp, DOE-ORP, said he thought NRC suggested that relying on characterization of the vadose zone without input on features, events and processes and determining uncertainty is important. Dirk said he understood that he said what happens in the vadose zone will ultimately get to the groundwater, so decisions should not be made based on the groundwater. He said looking at how long it will take for materials to reach the groundwater is helpful, but ultimately this will reach a steady state. Vince said another key point at the September session was that, due to 14 unplanned releases, it is important to look at components outside the tank. He said materials that are grouted in the tanks create a longer transition to the environment.

Chris provided an overview of the WMA-C PA, and said there has been good participation from the HAB, NRC, Ecology, the Nez Perce and the State of Oregon. He said at the September meeting Dr. Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce, presented his conceptual model, and the participants will continue to collaborate and provide feedback on it. He said future workshops will discuss soil inventory in the tank farm, both in shallow soil and the deep vadose zone. Vince said Marty LeTourneau, DOE-Headquarters has been through three PA activities and said Hanford is unique because it has more stakeholder involvement and interest. Chris said Marty would like to give a presentation to the HAB in November on how DOE wants to do this PA and what has been learned from other sites.

Vince said the previous PA workshop included discussions of facilities, underground tanks, and characterization, especially at T-Farm. Plumes can be illustrated spatially, but the question is where the plume is coming from and C Farm does not have much information or characterization on the 14 unplanned spills. Vince said Dr. Sobczyk provided an effective presentation on uranium in B/BX Farms, which was an example of a plume with uranium and its lateral movement. Vince said he and Dirk are working to demonstrate how lenses divert the material sideways. He said a dry well could be contaminated, and contamination could be coming from a variety of different tanks, which is complicated by the movement of the material. Dirk suggested that this could be a topic at a future TWC meeting, including a discussion of how numerical codes have a difficult time producing results that show what is happening in the soil. He said this relates to the question of barriers and how important they are.

Vince said another important question is the highest concentration of the material in the tank that leaked, and what happens if a pH chemically bonds to and changes the soil. He said the soil may behave differently if it has been subject to a leak, and in order to model this, samples must be taken to understand the chemistry of the soil. Vince said the next workshop on the PA is in October and he will report back on the progress of the work to develop a model.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Beth Rochette, Ecology, said Ecology's role is to ensure DOE complies with dangerous waste and cleanup regulations. She said Ecology works to ensure compliance and focuses on dangerous-waste components of the tank waste. Ecology had hundreds of comments on the SST PA and is now going through all stages of the comments before the document is written. She said Ecology is hopeful this process will be effective.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Larry said Mike Connelly, Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS), provided a CD of modeling that shows plumes and migration. Mike said the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) has been doing tank modeling, but what he has observed is that radioactive material changes the rock format, making certain materials move more deeply. He said the contaminants that interact with rock are uranium, cesium and strontium-90. Contaminants such as nitrates move with the water. Mike said when WRPS has completed characterization for drilling the plume technetium and cesium and nitrate has been found deeper in the plumes. He said there is a disconnect since technetium-99 is approximately 100 feet above the water table but contamination is in the groundwater.
- Pam Larsen commented that RCRA leads to clean closure and the site is not going to have clean closure. Vince said there are two closure options – clean closure and landfill closure. Dirk said the portion of RCRA that assesses individual risk like the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) has a comparable process for deciding costs, risks and impacts to determine the appropriate closure standard.

- Pam asked whether the WMA-C PA is being used as a model for other tank farms. Chris said if the process works well there is no reason DOE could not come up with an abbreviated process, but DOE will have to work with the other agencies to do this.
- Jeff said Dirk commented that barriers are questionable due to lateral flows, and asked whether a potential comment on the Consent Decree is that the four barriers should not be mandatory. Dirk said he does not know whether they should be mandatory. He said barriers reduce the flow rate through the soil, but there are layered soils that are tilted at Hanford. If contamination comes from above, it flows down the layer through the waste and off to the side. Dirk said barriers do not intercept all water, so the question is determining the path of water flow and how the system works.
- Rob asked if it is possible to amass enough knowledge to determine where to put barriers especially since conditions change as decisions are being made. Dirk said that is an important question. Vince suggested that barriers should be a future topic
- Mike commented that the HAB issued advice in January that DOE should complete a system analysis, including capstone modeling. He said assuming the solution space is known and the risk of the release is higher than the risk of what is in the tanks, this may shift DOE's approach to the EIS and clean closure. Ken Gasper said the structure of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and closure have a clean-to 99-percent scenario, but if this is not achieved a PA is required. He said the TWC recently heard about the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report asking DOE to look at how they are retrieving tank waste in the context of the risk-cost tradeoff. He suggested that there should be a discussion at a future TWC meeting about how DOE will address the concern raised in the GAO in light of the PA topic. Chris said there are cost and risk elements included in the Consent Decree, which is out for public comment. Steve said the GAO report carried forward ideas from a 2008 report that question DOE's tank knowledge. One idea was the SST Integrity effort, which led to the expert panel. The report requested DOE do a quantified risk assessment every three to five years with the regulators to determine environmental effects that factored in risks. Steve said he does not know if the GAO looked at this effort, but the 2009 recommendations are more specific as far as how DOE should do this report. Steve said DOE has not addressed all of the concerns in the 2008 report, but could brief the committee on what DOE has ultimately decided at a future meeting.
- Harold suggested that the TWC also read DOE's response to the report, as it does a good job of addressing the issues raised by the GAO.

### **Committee Work Plan**

The committee discussed updating its work plan for fiscal year (FY) 2010.

#### **Committee Discussion**

- Rob said he would like to see a presentation from Department of Health and Ecology on how and what they are going to permit at WTP, including the air-permitting process.



- Pam said the TC&WM EIS will be an important focus topic. Larry said a statement of work for the TC& WM EIS was submitted to Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP. They will set up a meeting to understand and determine the kind and level of support the HAB will need to review the EIS. Larry said the committee was told the TC&WM EIS would be released October 30.
- Rob asked whether advice on the TC&WM EIS will come from the TWC. Pam suggested that it may be similar to the Board's budget advice. Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, suggested that the TWC could plan for reviewing the TC&WM EIS at its next meeting and make a recommendation to the Board on this process. Pam said the committee should also look at how the Board reviewed the last EIS, for which the HAB did a workshop and focused on comments from regulatory agencies.
- Larry said that System Plan Revision 4 is a potential topic for November. Ken is the IM for this topic. Cathy said it may be helpful for DOE if IMs met, reviewed the document and identified issues for DOE. System Plan Rev. 4 is currently available online. Cathy will re-send the link to the report to the TWC.
- Dick asked whether the committee needs a baseline before reviewing the System Plan. Cathy said the baseline presentation will include elements from System Plan Rev. 4. Dick asked whether the current baseline will be distributed to the committee. Lori said DOE-ORP will provide a briefing in November on the draft baseline. She said this will not include all of the elements in Rev. 4. Steve said he can find out how much DOE-ORP can share of its baseline. Larry said even without the baseline the committee can look at System Plan Rev. 4 and formulate questions. If the baseline is not available, the TWC can do a follow-up discussion after their initial presentation. The IMs for this topic are Ken, Dirk, Dick and Harold.
- Larry said the draft report on the Performance Engineering Platform (PEP) has been released. He said he is not sure whether this is ready for a November briefing. Lori said it can be tentatively on the schedule for November, and she will follow up with the committee leadership
- Larry said DOE-ORP was to issue a report on the recommendations from the SST Integrity Workshop. Steve said it was issued the previous week. Rob Davis is the IM, and will obtain a copy of the report. Lori said it was posted online and will forward the link to Rob. She said it would be best to do this in December, after Rob has had a chance to review the document. Steve said one item in the report is to implement recommendations, and DOE-ORP has 90 days to do this.
- Larry suggested the WTP design and safety control update take place in November. Al said he would like a DNSFB presentation on this as well. He said it is important to keep this issue at the policy level. Mike said DOE agreed to give the TWC documents that define the scenario, which needs to be reviewed before the committee draws conclusions about this issue. Dirk, Harold and Al are the IMs for this issue, with support from Mike, who is also on the Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP).

- Larry said the SST Workshop Results briefing could take place in December, as well as updates on the 242-A Evaporator and WMA C PA. Steve will check whether an update on the microfiltration Spintek technology will also be possible in December.
- Al said the committee will want to devote a full day to the TC&WM EIS, and said they need to be careful to not fill up December committee meeting. Larry will confirm the status of the TC&WM EIS with Lori, and some December topics may be pushed out to January.
- Al said the increase of sodium in tank waste is another important issue, and a report on this should be released soon.
- Dick suggested that interim storage of high-level waste (HLW) is another issue. Steve said DOE recently received justification of its mission need, which is the first critical step to defining alternatives.
- Rob said Bill Gay, the new Bechtel director in charge of operations, could provide a presentation regarding WTP schedule and facility.
- Ken said after the TC&WM EIS, follow-up topics include the Bayer treatment program, lithium hydroxide, and long-term and interim storage of HLW and glass waste.
- Rob said the TWC should also add air permitting to the list after the TC&WM EIS is released. He said it is important that the Board have a presentation on the length and breadth of state involvement.
- Al said the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) had a discussion in its meeting on the comments on the TPA Consent Decree. Potential advice principles that came out of the BCC meeting were a request to review public comments and agency responses and accelerating the work scope to bring some activities forward, if possible. Harold said if the agencies sign the Consent Decree by the end of the year this will become the binding overall legal definition of what cleanup is. Al said the Board needs to discuss whether this is timely, as it would need to be addressed in November advice. Mike expressed concern that delaying signing the Consent Decree is not the level of detail the Board addresses.
- Cathy said the BCC also discussed the lifecycle cost and schedule report. The original intent was given to the Board in 2007 and was not reflected in the TPA Consent Decree workshop. Mike said he is not sure how meaningful this is, as the acceleration is only renegotiated every six years. Steve said the primary issue with the lifecycle cost and schedule report was the level of detail provided and the unconstrained budget. He said the BCC discussed the issue that the baseline plans have a reasonable level of detail for the near-term baseline, but the planning packages beyond the near-term are not as detailed and do not necessarily have the best cost estimate applied. The BCC expressed concern that reasonable cost figures are needed and the cost and schedule report does not have enough information for the HAB. Al said the Board has already issued advice on the cost and schedule report and could refer back to this.
- Dick said to develop a reasonable cost and schedule report analysis way below the first level of the project baseline summary (PBS) is needed. Gerry and Jeff Luke are

drafting advice on this issue for the next Board meeting, and this will be circulated to the technical committees.

- Larry said a study is currently being conducted on technology to look at tank farm vapors in real time.
- Larry suggested that the IMs send Cathy suggestions for potential topics for January, February and March.

### **Action Items / Commitments**

- Tom will find out the number of campaigns expected from the 242-A Evaporator with the upgrades.
- Tom will find out the amount of base and ARRA funding allocated to this effort.
- Woody will find out whether there is a forthcoming document that lists all of the 242-A Evaporator upgrades or if the EA is this document.
- Cathy will re-distribute the link to System Plan Rev. 4 to the TWC.
- Lori will follow-up with committee leadership on whether the PEP topic will be ready for the November meeting.
- Steve will check whether an update on the microfiltration Spintek will be ready for December.
- Cathy will update the committee's 6 month work plan and distribute to committee and agency leadership.

### **Handouts**

*NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or [tgilley@enviroissues.com](mailto:tgilley@enviroissues.com)*

- Overview of the 242-A Evaporator Environmental Assessment, Woody Russell, October 7, 2009.
  - TOC Recovery Act Scope Summary Sheets, Tom Fletcher, August 6, 2009.
  - Schedule of Working Sessions, DOE-ORP and Ecology, October 7, 2009.
  - Handout on RCRA Dangerous-Waste Regulations, Vince Panesko, October 7, 2009.
  - Primary Purpose of Assessment Context Workshop, Vince Panesko, October 7, 2009.
  - Tank Waste Committee 6-Month Work Plan, Cathy McCague, October 2009.
  - Preliminary Board Priorities, June Board Meeting Handout, June 4, 2009.
  - Major Areas for Consideration by the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) for 2009-2010, David A. Brockman, Shirley J. Olinger, Dennis A. Faulk and Jane A. Hedges, July 31, 2009.
-

## Attendees

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Al Boldt	Rebecca Holland	Larry Lockrem
Tom Carpenter	Steve Hudson	Jeff Luke
Rob Davis	Mike Korenko	Liz Mattson
Dirk Dunning (Phone)	Pam Larsen	Vince Panesko
Ken Gasper	Sandra Lilligren	Dick Smith
Harold Heacock		

### **Others**

Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP	John Price, Ecology	Molly Jensen, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP (Phone)	Beth Rochette, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Chris Kemp, DOE-ORP	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, MSA
Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP		David Bernhard, Nez Perce
Woody Russell, DOE-ORP		John Britton, WRPS
		Michael P. Connelly, WRPS
		Susan Eberlein, WRPS