FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

TANK WASTE COMMITTEE MEETING

November 18, 2009

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

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 everyone and introductions were made. Larry reviewed the agenda. The October meeting summary was approved by the committee.

Pam Larsen said the River and Plateau (RAP) Committee is doing issue manger work on the Central Plateau Cleanup Strategy and asked that all Board members review the notes from the recent Committee of the Whole meeting, and the notes from the sounding board at the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) meeting to make sure they are accurate.

Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS)

Dirk Dunning asked who would like to be part of the issues manager group for the TC&WM EIS. Ken Gasper, Mike Korenko, Al Boldt, and Harold Heacock volunteered.

Dirk said the committee has not had time for an issue managers meeting. This topic came up at the Board meeting and on Executive Issues Committee (EIC) call. Dirk said an idea was discussed to hold a Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting to provide a high level overview of the EIS. That meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 15. Dirk said the Board is also talking about having contractor do a review. Larry said the statement of work for the contractor review was just finished and went to the Department

of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) for review. Larry said there were concerns over how to expedite the contract and the suggestion was made to use EnviroIssues as a contracting mechanism. EnviroIssues will review candidates and expedite the contract; nominations are due by November 20. Cathy McCague said the timeline that had been discussed was to bring the consultant to the River and Plateau (RAP) and TWC committee meetings in January, then to the February full Board meeting, and in March a special Board meeting would be held for advice.

Dirk said the issue manager group would have to meet via phone/e-mail to divide up the analysis work. The issue manager group will also be responsible for developing the January meeting format. Last time the Board dealt with the EIS, a two day meeting was held at the Federal building. The first day a sticky wall system was used to organize issues and assemble comments. The second day was devoted to turning comments into suggested advice principles.

Schedule of events:

- December 15 TPA workshop – higher level issues, review of alternatives, public input, assumptions
- January meeting with joint TWC/RAP committee – technical issues and draft advice; concurrent issue manager work (tentatively either January 19, 20 or 21)

Dirk asked for thoughts from the agencies on how this schedule would work.

Regulator Perspectives

- Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, said she might have a conflict with the January workshop date. She will check her calendar and follow up with Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP, and Lori will let the committee know. Mary Beth said it has been awhile since DOE-ORP has reviewed the alternatives with the Board so she recommend starting with this review first. Mary Beth said they are also thinking of providing a short explanation of how DOE compared the alternatives. Mary Beth said they would ask people to solicit their questions the first part of December and that would be part of the workshop that is happening the second week of December.
- Jeff Frey, DOE – Richland Operations Office (RL), asked if the committee wanted RL to participate in this process. Dirk said yes, the committee would like the process to be as open as possible for anyone that wants to be involved, including agencies and regulators.
- Madeleine Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), asked if Ecology' opinions on the EIS should be shared during the workshop in December or at a later meeting. Dirk thought the workshop should be at a higher level and the meeting in January could be used to talk through specifics including Ecology's perspective. Others suggested Ecology show how it navigated the EIS to reach those opinions and relate how Ecology's participation in it led to resolving the concerns in Washington v. Bodman.

Committee Discussion

- Maynard Plahuta thought that the joint committee meeting with TWC and RAP would only need to be one day.
- Dirk asked if the Public Involvement Committee (PIC) had thought about the structure for the December meeting. Steve Hudson said they had only just started talking about it. Mary Beth said she hoped the workshop would be more informal dialogue rather than presentations. Mary Beth said she would like to work through some examples and get feedback on the structure.
- Ken Niles asked that DOE-ORP cover the major assumptions used in the EIS during the workshop. For example, Ken said if DOE is assuming having a place for high level waste (HLW) that is a big assumption that should be explained. Mary Beth asked if Ken thought the issues should be framed at the policy level. Ken said yes.
- Maynard asked if the assumptions in Central Plateau Cleanup Strategy will include some of the same assumptions as the EIS. Mary Beth said it would from a land use perspective.
- Larry asked when the consultant was scheduled to give the preliminary report. Cathy said the contractor would provide a briefing in February at the Board meeting. Larry said he thought the original contract called for ten weeks and asked that the contract be shortened to six weeks.
- Pam Larsen said that the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) change packages will be issued in December. Pam said the timing could affect the EIS because DOE would like to commit the change packages by the end of the year and bring them to the Board in January. Lori clarified that DOE-RL was issuing an agreement in principal in December.
- Pam suggested that the issue managers look at the EIS advice from the Board in 1995. Mary Beth said she has the comment response document from the solid waste EIS if anyone wanted to look at it. Mary Beth also said she was planning to look through past advice. Mary Beth said there were probably things that were not applicable anymore because of the changes in process and analysis. Mary Beth said she would glance through the document and let the committee know if there was anything useful. Larry said there is a summary of all the advice the Board has provided on the EIS in the contractor statement of work. The issue managers will review this list of advice and EnviroIssues will also provide this list to Mary Beth.
- Dirk said the EIS is more than 6,000 pages and weighs 40 lbs. Dirk asked if there are additional documents referenced in the EIS that the issue managers should be aware of and provide to the consultant. Mary Beth said they tried to make the reference documents easy to find. Mary Beth said if the consultant is looking for something, she can point them in the right direction. Dirk asked that the issue managers work through him to make any documents requests.
- Rob Davis suggested establishing protocol for advice elements using a numbering system. Rob said if everyone uses the same standards it will ensure that all of the comments have been covered and people will not duplicate work. Rob suggested

using G for General Comment (versus Technical Comment), page number, and initials; for example, a general comment, on page 125 by Rob Davis would be labeled G125-RD.

- Dick Smith said after having the EIS for a week, he was not sure if what the Board was asking of the consultant was reasonable. Dick said the consultant scope focused on looking at how the EIS had dealt with HAB values, both groundwater and soil. Dick read part of the consultant scope of work: "Review proposed remediation alternatives, focusing on transparency, how consistency of results was applied to alternatives." Dick thought this was a reasonable request, but was not sure how a consultant would do that.
- Dick said the modeling is too complicated and was not sure if it was worth having the consultant get into that. Dick said the modeling was applied to all of the alternatives consistently and with a document of this size you have to take some things on faith. Dick did not think it was worth the time to look at those types of details. Jeff said DOE had quite a few independent reviews of the modeling and they made an effort to make sure the modeling was done appropriately. Jeff agreed with Dick that spending time on that would be arduous when there are other things to look at.
- Pam asked if DOE would share their approach of validating the model. Pam thought there would be a public interest in that. Jeff said he was just addressing the question of how comfortable DOE is with the EIS. Jeff thought Pam's suggestion would be a good idea and said he thought this was something RL could bring to the discussion that ORP would not.
- Mary Beth confirmed that the modeling was used consistently across the alternatives and cumulative impacts. Mary Beth said over the years, as people got focused on certain elements, they would ask themselves whether the item would make the decision over the alternative different. Mary Beth said in order to produce the EIS, they had to decide when to move forward, or they never would have produced the EIS. Mary Beth said they tried to outline where they made these choices so people can understand what was done and why. Dirk thought it would be helpful to have someone talk through those choices at the workshop. Mary Beth said she would prefer to do that after the workshop for those that are interested, to help provide context for the graphics in the EIS, but she did not want to make it part of the workshop because it will take away from the high level focus.
- Dirk said PIC needs to talk through what this meeting should be about. Ken Niles said PIC has not gone into detail on the workshop. Ken said what Mary Beth said about maintaining a high level focus with some examples sounded like what the committee was thinking. Mary Beth suggested that the committee should select a few issues as examples to focus on.
- Gerry Pollet thought that the public would be interested in the human health effects and impacts. Gerry felt that the assumptions for exposure scenarios in the model would be important to address. Gerry said the State chose to sue over the groundwater model, but the human health analysis also had issues and it would be good to understand how that has changed.

- Pam said there was a concern during the last EIS about certain types of waste being ignored. Pam said the Board is hoping that all waste at Hanford will be included in the analysis of the human health and ecological impacts. Gerry asked where this would be located in the EIS. He said he found it in tank residues but was expecting a whole summary. Mary Beth suggested looking in the in the cumulative section. Gerry suggested that the committee should work on how to present this information to the public. Dirk suggested adding this topic as an item to discuss in December.
- Dirk said he, Larry, and Pam would work together on the structure of the December meeting.

River Protection System Plan, Rev. 4

Ken said DOE is identifying planning improvements in the System Plan 4 revision including an aluminum removal facility and a second low activity waste (LAW) facility to minimize sodium addition to the WTP and to treat all the LAW contained in the tank farms which would shorten the mission duration and lifecycle cost. Ken said these are two significant changes that the committee will want to follow up on. Ken said the planning assumptions indicate two assumptions that are different from the EIS; the first is the cesium/strontium capsules, and the second is the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) sodium. The capsules are assumed in the Systems Plan to be sent to a repository, where the EIS assumes Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) processing is required. Ken said the plan will now be updated annually so there will more opportunities to comment.

Jian-Shun Shuen, DOE-ORP, provided an overview of the changes to System Plan in revision 4. Jian-Shun agreed with Ken that there have been significant changes in the planning assumptions. Jian-Shun said their simulations indicated that they need a second LAW facility with two times the capacity of the WTP LAW design. Under this scenario, about two-thirds of low-activity waste would go to second LAW and about one-third of the LAW would go to the original LAW facility. DOE is also planning to implement a sodium management strategy using a lithium hydrotalcite process. Jian-Shun said all tank farm feed would go through an aluminum removal facility (ARF) first, and then the feed would be sent through WTP pretreatment.

Jian-Shun said another change to be aware of is that remote handled transuranic (RH-TRU) waste will go to WTP rather than the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Jian-Shun said it is doubtful that the RH-TRU would meet the requirements of WIPP, and if DOE-ORP were to send remote handled TRU to WIPP they would have to quarantine three double-shell tanks. Since double-shell tank (DST) space is at a premium from fiscal year 2018-25, quarantining three DST would force the SST retrieval schedule to slip. Jian-Shun said the last significant change gives credit for intentional blending. Jian-Shun said System Plan 3 sequenced the SST retrieval process for more incidental blending and this is not considered for System Plan 4; therefore DOE-ORP decided to use more intentional blending to reduce glass quantity.

Jian-Shun summarized the accomplishments of the new System Plan which included aligning the performance measurement baseline, meeting the end date and cost goals, meeting the near term single shell tank (SST) retrieval goals, and changing the retrieval strategy to a farm by farm approach. Jian-Shun said when they started on System Plan 4, they had two goals: they wanted to treat all tank waste by 2045, and wanted to limit costs to no more than $62 billion total. DOE provided guidance by suggesting the addition of an aluminum removal facility and by allowing the contractor to take credit for intentional blending waste feed. DOE assumes the risks for those assumptions. DOE – Environmental Management (EM) is providing funding for ORP to deal with the sodium. The DOE-ORP baseline for the next four years (2009-13), will include funding from EM-21 for testing and demonstration of the lithium bayer process. After that, DOE-ORP will have a capital project for procurement and construction.

Jian-Shun said System Plan 4 meets all near term retrieval schedules, it includes nine additional SST retrievals, completes C Farm and 9 additional SST retrievals in 2017 (which beat the criteria by five years), and treats all tank waste by 2045. Jian-Shun outlined the technology needs in System Plan 4. He said they still need to demonstrate a technology for SST retrievals for hard heels. DOE-ORP is working on a robotic arm technology for retrieval that shows promise. For supplemental treatment, a second LAW facility has been identified as the preference but there is still a chance DOE-ORP may consider other possibilities. DOE-ORP also needs to develop technology for tank closure, glass formulation, waste mobilization, mixing, and sampling.

Jian-Shun said in planning, DOE assumed WTP will meet full design capacity but they will not know if this is true until the plant is operating. Jian-Shun said DST space is tight and they will have over allocated DST space which restricts the SST retrieval. DOE-ORP will meet near term retrieval milestones, but they will be behind in the long term because of DST space. Jian-Shun also said they know that the effluent treatment facility (ETF) capacity is insufficient and there is a question about ETF's ability to treat all the technetium and iodine contained in the secondary waste. Jian-Shun said DOE-ORP and DOE-RL are working on an ETF upgrade which will increase capacity and the ability to treat technetium and iodine. Jian-Shun said they expect blending to reduce glass quantities and careful planning in staging and sequencing can help the schedule. Jian-Shun said one way to improve blending is through a feed characterization project. DOE-ORP is considering consolidating SST waste in some SSTs as well which would help manage overall tank space.

Regulator Perspectives

- Ed Fredenburg, Ecology, introduced Dan McDonald who would be his replacement as the Ecology representative to the HAB from now on. Ed said Ecology reviewed System Plan 4 and sent seven pages of comments to DOE. Ed summarized these points. Ed said the comments focused on how to get ready for revision 5. Ed said a general comment Ecology provided was that systems modeling is important in the planning process. Ed said the Kosson Report came out a year ago and recommended switching from bulk vitrification to second LAW. It also recommended good systems

modeling tools to evaluate alternative scenarios. Ecology was supportive of that and is looking forward to revision 5. Ed said originally there was a planning case and an unconstrained case in the System Plan; the baseline case came along later. The baseline case represents what has been agreed to in a consent decree and TPA milestones. Ed said the baseline case assumption was to finish retrieval by 2047. Ed said the DST space was not modeled as a constraint, and without a plan to deal with that issue DOE cannot meet the deadline. Ed said DOE needs to improve the modeling tool to include planned blending. Ed said DOE did not have time to overhaul the model for System Plan 4 but is hopeful they will do so for System Plan 5.

- Ed asked if DOE-ORP is considering the recommendations from the independent technical review of modeling tools for retrieval and treatment of Hanford tank waste. This includes integrating the Hanford Tank Waste Operations Simulator (HTWOS) used by WRPS and the WTP Dynamic Flowsheet Model used by BNI, since both use G2 software, although BNI's Dynamic Flowsheet model is much more detailed than WRPS' HTWOS model of WTP. Jian-Shun said they are working on some of the recommendations. The contractor is currently reviewing the G2 model tools and its important attributes will be screened for discrepancies between the HTWOS model. The contractor is also improving the HTWOS model.
- Ed said that the first time Ecology had a briefing on the lithium bayer process, the lithium hydrotalcite product was going to LAW as a glass former. Ed said System Plan 4 has the lithium hydrotalcite product going to secondary waste, but that ORP had not shown that would meet regulatory requirements for disposal. Ed said HAB Advice #209 recommended lifecycle cost estimates for each alternative. The baseline scenario costs are included, but not the other alternatives.
- Ed said Ecology's last concern was about the sodium management plan. The previous System Plan called for studies to be completed by 2011, System Plan 4 says 2013, with Critical Decision 0 (Justification of Mission Need) in 2014. Ecology is concerned in delaying a supplemental treatment decision and thinks DOE-ORP should start earlier. Jian-Shun clarified that the package for CD-0 approval would be prepared early to obtain DOE approval by FY 2014.

Committee Discussion

- Pam said if the ARF facility would be online by 2022 that is three years after WTP startup. Jian-Shun said WTP will not be in full capacity operation until 2025. Jian-Shun said they will need to do caustic leaching in WTP Pretreatment Facility for the first few years.
- Pam asked if ORP is considering new blending tanks. Jian-Shun said they are not planning to construct new tanks, so blending will need to be managed through operations in DSTs. Jian-Shun said they will have to manage retrieval through staging and will have a few DSTs for blending and mixing. Pam asked if System Plan 4 include a blending facility. Jian-Shun said it does not, it does include a potential for future improvements.

- Mike said the focus had been on sodium because it extends the length of the mission, but nitrate also reduces glass quality. Mike asked what the impact is to waste acceptance criteria using iron phosphate or other technologies. Jian-Shun said tank farms is planning to send waste to WTP and have a set of waste acceptance criteria. There are requirements for acceptance of the glass, glass formulation, maximum waste loading, and minimizing volume. Jian-Shun said WTP glass formulation will have to meet interim disposal facility (IDF) and other glass performance assessment requirements.
- Mike said everyone has known there would be a space issue in the DSTs. Mike said it seems highly improbable that mixing will work without a separate facility. Mike suggested that if a blending facility was built, it could include DSTs. Jian-Shun said the contractor is currently doing a DST space management plan to better manage space. Jian-Shun said DST space will slow down SST retrieval but the impact to the schedule for treating all waste is minimal. They will have sufficient stage feed for WTP and the only impact is to the SST retrieval.
- Keith Smith asked if there are chemical compatibility requirements with mixing. Jian-Shun said there are; any waste transfer will run through a waste compatibility assessment program to ensure compatibility.
- Dirk asked what assumptions were used about pipelines in HLW. Jian-Shun said there is a requirement for completing a series of testing to determine critical velocity requirement. If waste transfer velocity is higher than the critical velocity, no waste will settle. Dirk suggested that ORP assume the majority of pipeline waste is processed.
- Rob Davis asked when a decision would be made on ARF. Jian-Shun said in fiscal year (FY) 2010-13 ORP will have EM-21 funding to do technology development. The schedule is to approve the CD-0 in FY 2014.
- Ken suggested that the issue managers follow up on this topic with a meeting to review System Plan 4. Ken asked committee members to send any additional questions they have to Harold, Dirk or Ken for the issue manager meeting. Ken asked that committee members consider what improvements should be made for System Plan 5.
- Harold suggested that the issue managers focus on process system requirements and not the technical details of the plan due to time constraints.
- Cathy asked if the committee would like a follow up agenda item in January on this topic. Ken thought that would be a good idea and suggested bringing it to the EIC in December to identify an appropriate time to bring to the full Board as well.

Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) Design and Safety Control Update (joint topic with Health Safety and Environmental Protection Committee)

Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, provided an update on the WTP design and safety control. Shirley said they are currently 50 percent complete at WTP for engineering; the design is

90 percent complete. Shirley said an issue came up a year ago when changes were being made to the piping and vessels. Shirley said ORP had assumed they would have to meet hydrogen piping design criteria. In 2007-08, the design was coming to fruition and it became clear they were going to have to install approximately 53,000 new pieces of equipment to meet the stringent design criteria. Out of the 53,000 there were about 21,500 pieces that were safety type equipment. Shirley said this raised a red flag during her review and she directed the team to go back to square one to see how this situation occurred.

Shirley said the team found that a lot of the equipment had to do with conservative material assumptions that were used when ORP was considering privatizing WTP. In 1997, there were a lot of things happening and the design was only conceptual. Back then, Shirley said ORP did not know as much as they do today about how they would feed the plant. They also did not understand as much about the total population of what is in each tank. In order to be conservative at the time, ORP used the highest radiological rating for the material they expected to find in the tanks and assumed the worst feed possible would be going to WTP. That waste configuration does not exist today, but at the time that material configuration did not impact anything in the design. What drove the design was the hydrogen issue in piping and vessels. Shirley explained that the complex has a passive design strategy and includes features that would take care of a hydrogen event. Shirley said from 2002 to 2007 they went from a passive strategy to an active strategy which added all of the safety components.

Shirley said ORP commissioned a team to look at whether they were doing the right thing by including the 53,000 pieces of new equipment. Shirley said the design created a plant that could have had as many as 100 limiting conditions of operations, which is a huge number and created a systems planning problem. Shirley said they had to balance all of the risks while making sure the program could actually function. Shirley said they spent a lot of time on this and involved the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) because they did not want to make changes if they did not have to. Shirley said the additional equipment would have created an unsafe work conditions because the hot cell was already constructed and was going from 3,000 to 21,000 pieces of safety equipment. This meant they would have to locate equipment outside of the hot cell where workers would be located. Shirley said that would have created eighteen bulges outside of the C5 ventilations which could have exposed workers. To address this issue, Shirley said they updated their material at risk (MAR) inventory from an overly conservative approach to a more realistic feed approach. Shirley said ORP and the DNFSB believe that this is still safe and they are addressing the design requirements for the hydrogen piping and vessels.

Shirley said ORP commissioned the studies last year and engaged the DNFSB in April through December. Shirley said the testing that was completed proved that a detonation event was not likely to occur in a two inch diameter pipe. Shirley said they also believe they have enough evidence for a four inch pipe as well. Shirley said there are no active components in the black cell and ORP is still working to ensure the design is still robust. Shirley said she has briefed all of the Congressional delegates on this issue. Shirley said it is important for people to understand what is happening because WTP is a political

project. Shirley said they want to build something that is going to work and she believes that ORP has been diligent in their analysis. Shirley said she approved a safety evaluation report on October 31, which includes four conditions of approval before the design can be finalized. The approval gave Bechtel the authority to modify the design. Shirley said the end of March is their drop dead date to get the design finalized and go out for procurements. Shirley said there is still a lot of work to do before then, but she is confident they can get there.

Regulator Perspectives

- Ed said Ecology heard about MAR earlier this year. Ed said he thought it was a good idea because reducing the complexity of WTP will allow it to operate more reliably and complete tank waste treatment sooner. Ed said he thought this change would reduce environmental risk because waste could then be removed from non-compliant leaking single-shell tanks much sooner.

Committee Discussion

- Pam asked how many new equipment pieces ORP will have under the new conditions. Shirley said she did not know yet, but thought it would be much less. Shirley said there are different categories of nuclear equipment, and they were able to remove the redundancy for nuclear safety. They will not know the final number until they do the final design systems. Shirley said most nuclear facilities are designed to 2,500 year seismic event. Shirley said they had assumed twenty of the WTP vessels in the hot cells would detonate under a seismic event which was very unlikely. Shirley explained that the dose to the public drives what equipment you need to be protective.
- Keith said he heard there may be cost overruns due to higher costs for construction materials than what was anticipated. Shirley said the steel prices went up because China was buying up a lot of steel for dams. During the baselining process in December 2006, DOE-ORP assumed a certain rate for labor and materials, and that went up significantly. Shirley said this will have an effect on their management reserve. Shirley said they have $3 billion in contingency and reserve that is funded. Shirley said they are concerned about using too much of the reserve because commissioning will be a high risk, but they are looking at ways to mitigate that. Shirley said she does not think they will go over budget, but they have to be diligent and manage the risks every day.
- Harold asked if the changes affect the throughput of the plant. Shirley said she did not believe so.
- Tom Carpenter asked where the sweet spot is in terms of balancing complexity and maintaining safety. Shirley said as a general rule if you can demonstrate it is safe, then less is more. If you cannot prove it is safe, then you have to have it.
- Mike said there is a tendency to forget about natural lifetime requirements. Mike said some equipment only has a one year lifetime. Mike asked if ORP has looked at the functional lifetime reliability of the equipment to ensure parts will last longer to

reduce the number of people going in to do maintenance. Shirley said technology is getting better and better and she recently heard her design team found pumps that would last 8,000 hours. Shirley said she thought Mike's point was valid and they would continue to look at it.

- Rob agreed that the requirements for reliable lifetime of materials are a good area of focus for DOE. Rob said this has to do with conservatism above and beyond the codes. Rob said in general, agencies accept the responsibility of the codes but there is a lot of other conservatism out there you can use. Rob listed commercial grade dedication as an example of a level of conservatism. Shirley said this is what hurt the nuclear industry; in the last ten percent of getting a plant operational and doing the last quality assurances, they could not prove the plant had the pedigree necessary. Shirley said she would rather do that work now and prove it is safe ahead of time. Shirley said accidents happen in the nuclear industry, DOE never thought they would have a spill at Hanford, and they did. Shirley said the goal is to identify the elements that are over the top and can be removed, but there are many elements that will remain in the case of a bad situation. Shirley said they are also considering what it will take to keep the plant running for 40 years.
- Rob thought that it would be good for the committee to get an update on this in the spring when there is more information.

Action Items / Commitments

The committee discussed their work plan and upcoming topics.

Mike suggested that the SST integrity workshop results, 242-A Evaporator and C Farm Performance Assessment, and Performance Engineering Platform test results all could be delayed until February/March because the committee will be busy in January.

Dirk also agreed with Mike about hearing the results of the workshop and noted that the committee should hear about the C Farm Performance Assessment (PA) when Vince Panesko is available. Lori also noted that the committee has previously requested Marty LeTourneau from DOE-Headquarters provide a review of the PA process to the full Board

Lori said they would like to talk with the committee about an effort to reclassify tanks from known leakers to non-leakers. Dirk suggested doing this in March along with the SST expert panel topic.

Mike asked when it might be appropriate to talk with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) about waste definitions. Dirk said the NRC has not officially asked for input yet.

Al Boldt said he would like an update on SpinTek and asked if EM-21 will be onsite when this request is made. Al thought that ORP did not work directly enough with it to be able to brief the committee. Al said this topic is not time critical.

Issue managers for the System Plan will meet with ORP staff in December to review Rev 4. Committee members should submit any questions to Ken, lead issue manager.

Larry, Pam and Dirk will have a conference call with Lori in early December to provide input to the TPA workshop on the EIS. Committee members should submit any questions/issues they would like addressed at the workshop to Dirk.

EnviroIssues will provide list of advice in the EIS statement of work to Mary Beth Burandt. EIS issue managers will also review this list of advice.

Mary Beth Burandt will check her schedule to determine her availability for a joint TWC/RAP committee meeting in January focused on the EIS. Suggested dates are January 19, 20 or 21.

Handouts

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

- System Plan Revision 4, Jian-Shun Shuen, DOE-ORP, November 18, 2009.
- Waste Treatment Plan Design and Safety Control Update, Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, November 18, 2009.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Harold Heacock	Liz Mattson
Tom Carpenter	Steve Hudson	Ken Niles
Rob Davis	Mike Korenko	Maynard Plahuta
Sam Dechter	Pam Larsen	Dave Rowland
Dirk Dunning	Susan Leckband	Dick Smith
Ken Gasper	Larry Lockrem	Keith Smith

Others

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP	Ed Fredenburg, Ecology	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, MSA
	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Tom Crawford, WRPS
		John Britton, WRPS
		Bill Hewitt, WRPS
		Fiona Meinert, WRPS
		Elisha West, WRPS