

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
TANK WASTE COMMITTEE

*August 7, 2013
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1
System Plan 7 – *Part 1, Briefing and Committee Discussion*..... 1
System Plan 7 – *Part 2, Committee Discussion and Potential Advice Development* 6
Double-Shell Tank AY-102 – *Part 1, Briefing and Committee Discussion* 7
Double-Shell Tank AY-102 – *Part 2, Committee Discussion and Potential Advice Development*..... 11
Committee Business..... 13
Attachments 13
Attendees 13

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

Opening

Dirk Dunning, Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee approved the May meeting summary.

System Plan 7 – Part 1, Briefing and Committee Discussion*

Dirk provided some initial comments on the System Plan 7 topic and potential options for the committee’s path forward. Dirk said system planning is a very complex process that requires approximately 18 months to complete, so there are often multiple system planning efforts that occur simultaneously. The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies agreed that scenarios for the system plan would

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

be selected every three years. Following this schedule, any input from the HAB on scenarios for System Plan 7 would need to be submitted by October. Dirk noted that while TWC had time set aside at today's meeting to discuss and develop draft advice on System Plan 7 that could be brought forward during the September Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) meeting and meet the October comment deadline, the information needed to have an informed discussion is not available. Dirk proposed three options for the committee to consider: draft advice for the September Board meeting with the information currently available; wait to offer advice until more information is available and the committee has time to fully consider the issues (even though the advice would be out of cycle with the agencies schedule); or hold a Sounding Board during the September Board meeting (which would require a substantial base of knowledge by each Board members) that could be followed by advice in December.

Dick Smith, issue manager for System Plan 7, provided further introduction to the System Plan 7 topic. Dick said TWC asked the U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) to provide an update on scenario selection for System Plan 7. TWC had also requested that the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) provide an update on how their discussions with DOE-ORP are proceeding.

Dick said there are a number of shortcomings with the System Plan. He said the System Plan has not deviated from the initial design-build contract and there has been a reluctance to make any major changes. The System Plan should consider all feasible possibilities, examining the entire population of issues at the Hanford Site and analyzing the pros and cons to provide a sound basis for decision-making. Additionally, the System Plan does not evaluate uncertainty along the technical path so there is not a good understanding of the risks involved when comparing one path against another. Time and ability to perform should be evaluated in addition to an evaluation of costs. Dick added that it is especially important to include comparative analysis when there are significant deviations from the initial plan. There were changes in System Plan 6 that the Board was not made aware of, such as the addition of a new waste stream that has not been discussed and is not included in the System Plan. Dick said he is concerned that new ideas are being introduced into the system that have not been previously vetted.

Agency presentation

Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP, said DOE is trying to meet the October 31 deadline for choosing System Plan 7 scenarios, but also does not want to move forward with scenarios that do not make sense. System Plan 7 should reflect where DOE is currently without using scenarios that are far outside of the scope. There are many ongoing conversations regarding scenario selection. The Secretary of Energy will be communicating the selected scenarios with the Governor by the end of the summer on September 20. Tom noted that it would be more useful for the Board to focus any advice on efforts related to System Plan 7. Detailed advice focused on System Plan 6 assumptions would be less useful for the agencies than looking ahead toward future system planning efforts.

DaBrisha Smith, DOE-ORP, said TWC was given a presentation in April that provided an overview of the schedule for System Plan 7. She said DOE began planning in late July/early August and DOE is ahead

of schedule but is pausing efforts in order to wait for more information from DOE-Headquarters. Scenarios for System Plan 7 have not been identified or discussed.

Dan McDonald, Ecology, commented that any scenario being considered must be in compliance with the TPA Consent Decree. Much of the discussion today will be speculation since information about the scenarios will not be available until September or even later. When that information does become available, the Board should be very clear on what questions they would like the agencies to answer. The current situation is very different given the current economic and political situation. There is now consideration of using smaller control points that are very specific for each facility. There is talk about increasing money for tank farms with a primary focus on retrieval and a recognition of the need to move forward with WTP as a critical component of Hanford Site cleanup. Additionally, the idea of integration is not well understood and is not being discussed. It would be useful for the agencies to hear the Board's thoughts on integration concerns. Dan suggested that the Board elevate some of these thoughts to policy-level questions. He said there are three factors driving progress at the Hanford Site: cost, scope and schedule. The investment or cost is fixed by Congress and the scope has not changed, leaving schedule as the only factor that can be altered. It is important to understand all the pieces in the system and how to prioritize. Dan said there are nine major technical issues that still need to be resolved, regardless of the scenarios chosen, in order for the system planning efforts to be effective. The Board could consider offering advice about ensuring DOE has adequate funding and has prioritized projects appropriately to accomplish all the goals. The Board should focus on the policy-level issues for any advice it develops, with particular attention to the current funding challenges and overall complexity of issues.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

Q. How much is DOE speaking with Ecology as scenarios are developed?

R. [DOE] The Secretary would like to give the Governor and the state options with an opportunity to voice all concerns before the path forward is finalized, so conversations up to this point have been fairly broad.

R. [Ecology] There are a variety of technical issues, some of which are known and some not. There are also huge funding issues. Ecology is comfortable with their level of communication with DOE on the System Plan; DOE has been available and there have been conversations.

C. The design of the plan and its intentions are very much affected by the assumptions. The idea behind the pretreatment plant is to treat the waste in two separate streams, which has implications from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and where wastes will be deposited. All these considerations have impacts to cost and schedule.

C. The schedule set by DOE creates a challenge for timely advice development from the Board. The Secretary is scheduled to communicate system plan scenarios to the Governor by September 20 but cannot discuss the scenarios before then, meaning that TWC will not be able to discuss scenarios until the October committee meeting. The earliest the Board could submit advice is in December, which does not match DOE's comment cycle. These types of schedule conflicts are a recurring issue for the Board. The agencies should consider altering their timelines to allow more timely comment from the Board and the public.

Q. [Ecology] Ecology will be receiving DOE's scenarios in late September and will then need to develop their own scenarios by the October 31 TPA deadline. When will Ecology submit their scenarios to DOE?

R. [DOE] The goal is for Ecology to provide scenarios by October. DOE has not yet asked for an extension and intends to work toward the October 31 TPA deadline. However, DOE also does not want to move forward with the system plan that is not reasonable.

Q. What are some lessons learned from System Plan 6 that that will be applied to System Plan 7?

R. [DOE] Lessons learned from System Plan 6 include choosing fewer scenarios so the scenarios that are chosen can be analyzed in more detail. Another lesson learned was the need to begin the planning process early. DOE, Ecology and Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) met to review assumptions from System Plan 6 and will continue scrubbing the assumptions in future meetings to prepare for System Plan 7.

C. System plans are completely success-oriented and assume that the entire system will work perfectly every time. There is not a discussion of the impacts if performance is at 80% or 50%. The System Plan also includes a lot of enabling assumptions about the inputs that are questionable or strange but are assumed to be correct. All of the assumptions influence the results. Any discrepancies should be addressed when planning for the next system plan to evaluate actual performance of the system and associated uncertainties.

R. [DOE] DOE begins with a baseline case from the DOE-ORP technical baseline using the developed assumptions. Various cases are evaluated that branch off of this baseline case with the assumption that everything is operating at 100% capacity using the Hanford Tank Waste Operations Simulator (HTWOS) model. Some uncertainty is modeled under other models known as Operations Research that break the information down to assume some failures or less-than-perfect operating capacity.

Models can also assume operation at some percentage of capacity. The Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) is assumed to operate at 70% capacity, which is considered the perfect operational efficiency for the purposes of the HTWOS model.

C. The issue manager notes sent to the committee in advance of this meeting are very complicated and difficult for non-engineers to understand. There is also a concern that members of TWC are asking DOE and the contractors to conduct a lot of work without the knowledge of the rest of the committee. TWC

should have a better balance of committee work from a policy context. Technical conversations should not dominate committee discussions.

R. [TWC] The challenge with this conversation is that TWC is working out of sequence. The issue manager work that would normally occur in advance of committee discussion has not taken place so the detailed discussions that are necessary to understand the policy implications of technical issues are occurring during the committee meeting.

R. Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, suggested that a more policy-minded committee member join the issue manager group.

Q. There are a number of policy-minded questions that are left unspoken because of the focus on technical issues. Answers to these questions, will be helpful to the Board and to decision-makers. These questions include:

- Is the system plan model useful?
- Does the system plan provide information that is helpful to decision-makers?
- Will the system plan help WTP work?
- Will the system plan lead to an effective WTP? If not, what needs to change to get an effective WTP?

C. One of the basic problems with the system plan is that it is based on a design-build contract where a number of technical issues remain unresolved. There is a lot of negative press about the Hanford Site and many people are very skeptical of the entire cleanup project. People would like to see a real baseline with real costs and schedule, which is very challenging when there is no resolution to the technical issues. The Board has always supported the TPA but that might become more difficult when faced with the current funding realities. It is generally recognized that tank waste treatment is needed sooner than anticipated because of the leaking tanks, which likely will receive financial support. However, there is not support for blending tanks because politicians are concerned about adding additional material to the tanks coupled with questions about cost and schedule impacts.

C. Schedule is not the only variable that can be changed. There are two additional dimensions: identifying inefficiencies and cast stone engineering. Macro-level engineering assumptions were built into the early system that can be questioned. The entire system should be re-imagined to challenge engineering assumptions and the way business is done.

C. The committee should concentrate on where the System Plan fits into the bigger picture of successful tank waste treatment. TWC should be having a policy-level discussion about the financial, technical, political and systematic challenges for meeting that goal. In addition to the technical concerns, there are also political and safety culture issues that are a part of everything at the Hanford Site.

C. There are a number of new and emergent issues that TWC will need to consider regarding the assumptions. Does DOE intend to use the assumptions from System Plan 6 as a basis for System Plan 7? If so, it would be helpful to look at those assumptions.

R. [Ecology] For the baseline case, Ecology and DOE can alter the assumptions. There must be a minimum of three cases from each agency for a minimum total of six scenarios. System Plan 6 assumptions will be used, with some modifications, in System Plan 7.

C. Time is another factor for the Board to consider since resolving the technical issues will be time consuming. The WTP may not be operational until 2025 so maintaining control of liquid wastes should be separated from WTP. The DOE National Security and Energy Resources Office has stated that more tanks need to be built at the Hanford Site. The moral obligation of our government is to keep material in the tanks contained to protect future generations. Anything that can help process material would be a contingency that should be used, including a system for blending tanks. The WTP is of no value if all the tanks have leaked by the time it becomes operational.

R. [Ecology] Hanford tank activity has seen the largest spending increase in 2013 from the Office of Environmental Management to address the issue of newly discovered leaking tanks and the essential monitoring for tank maintenance purposes.

C. The mission of DOE-ORP is to retrieve, treat, package and dispose of waste in tanks. There is an avoidance to consider other possibilities for waste treatment other than the proposal for vitrification, which has questionable functionality and operating efficiency. The choice should be re-examined.

R. [Ecology] DOE thought mixing and preconditioning of tank waste was a good idea ten years ago and then moved away from the idea. It has since become a topic of conversation again. One caution about building a pretreatment facility for mixing the tanks would be that such a facility would require years to fund, design, build and meet obligations to protect the environment.

System Plan 7 – Part 2, Committee Discussion and Potential Advice Development*

Introduction

Al Boldt introduced the second part of the System Plan 7 discussion. He had provided issue manager comments to TWC members via email prior to the meeting to help provide information about System Plan 6 assumptions. There are several major points that could be incorporated into potential Board advice based on concerns about the assumptions in System Plan 6. For instance, it is unclear how the recipe for glass used in System Plan 6 was developed. New information indicates that some of the constituents used, such as chloride and fluoride, could affect glass formation. One deficiency in the system plan is that the glass cannot be changed. Two years ago Bechtel indicated that there might be much more glass formed than originally anticipated so the model used in the System Plan will be flawed in terms of the assumed amount of glass created. Another major issue with System Plan 7 is that a new baseline has not been selected because the technical issues with the pretreatment facility have not been resolved. Until a new

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

baseline is established, the System Plan modeling will not accurately reflect conditions. In general, the Board advice should include a point that the System Plan needs more technical rigor with all waste streams fully identified and inclusion of an uncertainty analysis.

Q. What is the basis for the formulations in the documents that were distributed to TWC?

R. [HAB] The basis was in the original request for proposals. DOE identified the waste form as borosilicate glass.

C. TWC should consider assumptions beyond the pretreatment plant; assumptions for the system as a whole should be examined, including the retrieval component, from a high level.

C. [Ecology] Ecology has a list of the assumptions used in System Plan 6 in a checklist format with notes on each. Ecology has given their opinion about needed changes to the assumptions to DOE. These are variations of the baseline and represent Ecology's "worry list." Ecology can provide these documents to TWC.

Next steps

TWC noted that this topic still requires substantial issue manager work to think through the high level assumptions. TWC will not be able to offer advice on System Plan 7 in September since information will not be available in time, but the committee has begun to identify some ideas that could be made into possible advice points for advice at the December Board meeting.

The issue managers will work with DOE to frame the topics and presentation(s) for September, to potentially include a discussion of assumptions, a presentation from DOE on the models used in the System Plan, and a presentation from DOE and Ecology on system planning and the TPA. TWC will need to wait until after September 20 to get complete information from the agencies about the scenarios for System Plan 7. The issue managers for System Plan 7 include Dick Smith (lead), Al Boldt, Dirk Dunning, Meme Samkow, Jeff Luke, and Liz Mattson for the policy aspect.

Double-Shell Tank AY-102 – Part 1, Briefing and Committee Discussion* **Joint with Public Involvement and Communications Committee**

Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP, provided a briefing on the Pumping Plan for Double-Shell Tank (DST) AY-102 and an update on the leak. Tom noted the following points:

- The Pumping Plan provides information on how to remove the supernate and solids within the tank. The process is on standby and could occur at any time. Tank AY-102 does require

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

maintenance of a certain level of liquid because it is a high heat tank. If the tank were to be drained, water would need to be added to maintain the required level of liquid.

- From a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) compliance standpoint, any transfer out of AY-102 would not be permitted. DOE must maintain the compliance and functionality to transfer waste out of tank AY-101 if necessary.
- The basis of the Emergency Pumping Guide is the solids removal process. One shortcoming with this guide is that it only considers leaks that occur in the sides of the tanks. The leak in AY-102 is at the bottom of the tank.
- The plan for retrieval of material from tank AY-102 is very similar to retrieval of the other tanks. There is an approximately 18 month evolution of planning and an eight month retrieval process. Material from AY-102 would be split between two tanks (AZ-2 and AZ-1) and those two tanks would need to be prepped before the transfer occurs. Modified sluicing would be used instead of using a high-horsepower mixer so there will be fewer disturbances to the materials.
- The schedule laid out in Table 4-1 of the Pumping Plan is being actively pursued. The activities in Table 4-2 will begin as change conditions are confirmed. This table illustrates the time required to complete each activity without specific dates. DOE is prepared to remove material from the tank immediately if there is evidence of compromised integrity of the annulus.
- DOE is working to control the environment of the annulus to ensure materials are not being added that could create more issues.
- DOE has not yet received comments on the Pumping Guide from Ecology.

Regulator perspective

Jeff Lyon, Ecology, said Ecology has examined the Pumping Guide and developed comments. Upper management at Ecology is currently deciding how to respond; Ecology has told DOE that tank AY-102 should be pumped immediately. The guidance states material from leaking tanks should be removed “as soon as practicable.” The estimated 19 month preparation time does sound reasonable for sludge removal but the regulations also say leaking material should be removed within 24 hours or within a reasonable amount of time.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

C. Tank AY-102 is a million gallon tank. DOE is required to maintain enough tank capacity in the event that material needs to be drained from a tank. If tank AY-102 is pumped, that additional backup tank capacity will be lost.

R. [DOE] Backup capacity will be lost in addition to the loss of tank AY-102. The loss equates to approximately two million gallons of tank space.

Q. What is the feasibility of repairing AY-102?

R. [DOE] The actual feasibility of tank repair is very low. DOE cannot say definitely one way or the other the practicality of tank repair until the cause of the leak is identified. If repair is possible, DOE should repair the tank. If repair is not possible, the tank will be cleaned and closed.

C. There should be pumping plans for all individual tanks because it is highly likely that additional leaking tanks will be identified. How will pump retrieval be financially supported? What projects will be sacrificed if there is a need for emergency tank retrieval?

R. [DOE] Part of the response to the leak in AY-102 is paid for by a reprogramming of funds. There are concerns about limited funding and a need for prioritization of projects. DOE will also need to reevaluate the Emergency Pumping Guide to consider issues such as what actions will be required if a leak is found below the sludge and how to respond to an event such as an earthquake that could impact multiple tanks.

Q. What is the policy process for determining when and if new tanks should be built?

R. [DOE] DOE is seriously considering actions that need to occur today and what the position of the Hanford Site will be in the future. Current operations have been put in perspective as new information is available. The goal is to maintain progress while meeting environmental requirements. DOE is having conversations about building multi-purpose facilities that would have more DSTs and more capability for mixing and blending.

Q. The Board and the state of Washington are still waiting for DOE-ORP's 2015 budget submittal to DOE Headquarters. That information is necessary to help the Board understand funding priorities for DSTs and tank waste retrieval. The Board was given the 2015 budget submittal from DOE – Richland Operations Office (RL) and was told that DOE-ORP did submit a budget. When will DOE-ORP provide their budget request to the Board and the public before it is submitted to DOE-Headquarters? The Board is especially interested in whether DOE-ORP will be requesting specific funding for retrieving material from the single-shell tanks (SSTs) and for AY-102.

R. [DOE] DOE-ORP is still working on a 2015 budget submittal. The current budget situation is very challenging and there are timing issues that has put the entire budgeting process about four months behind schedule. DOE-ORP is moving through all the steps required to submit an adequate budget to meet the milestones.

C. If there is no new capacity to receive the material, processing will require 14 different transfers through six different tanks, which will cause waste to be mixed and re-aggregated across tanks. There are also transfer lines that mix everything. All these actions will affect the characterization that has been completed on the tank waste.

R. [DOE] AY-102 was the tank that had been planned to feed material to the pretreatment plant, but the plan included 15 total tanks so the loss of AY-102 is not something that cannot be overcome from a feed perspective. There will be an impact to the number of feeds that go into WTP. DOE will either need to identify another tank for the feed or use a different approach, such as using a multi-purpose facility.

C. [Ecology] Tanks that are built for mixing would not be appropriate to use as storage tanks and might not meet the needs of the general community. There are production needs for the tank farms as well as needs for staging, characterization and blending. Characterization for production needs is very different from characterization for sampling. Additionally, storage is required to deal with potential leaking tanks. The Board should consider all the costs and impacts to the program. As of now, it appears that the secondary tank is containing the leak, but there is a risk of the secondary tank failing and causing contaminants to leak into the environment. The effectiveness of retrieval is questionable; DOE should not assume pumps will remain fully operational throughout the entire retrieval process because pumps often fail or only work over a short duration. Installing new pumps and removing dysfunctional pumps would expose workers to contaminants and could exacerbate problems in the leaking tank. Maintaining the temperature in the tank is also a major concern and the consequences are largely unknown.

C. There is a ten year process required for building additional tanks from funding through installation. It would be wise to begin the process today on an emergency basis. In November, the Board advised DOE to build additional tanks.

C. The ideal situation would be to design new tanks with the intended purpose of blending and mixing waste in preparation for shifting the material to the vitrification plant. The tanks currently being considered for use with the vitrification plant were never designed for that purpose so building tanks with that purpose in mind could solve a number of issues.

R. [DOE] The Board should not try to engineer a solution; only recommend a path forward. There will be many differing opinions among engineers and technical experts to be resolved on the details.

C. New tanks will require some sort of supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) because any new tanks will not be included in the current Tank Closure & Waste Management (TC&WM) EIS.

R [DOE] The TC&WM EIS includes plans and analysis for 8 new double shell tanks.

Q. What does DOE know about the secondary shell for tank AY-102?

R. [DOE] On June 20, DOE took samples from the containment pit and had some direct readings of contamination and radiation. The next day DOE followed a conservative approach and announced that there was a possible leak in the secondary containment tank. There have been a number of additional samples taken after June 20, none of which have shown similar contamination. All of the additional samples support the historical perspective and DOE is in the process of trying to prove one way or another if there is contamination. A sample will be taken mimicking conditions of the June 20 sample as closely as possible. There is no information that indicates a breach in the secondary containment of AY-102, other than one high radiation reading. A possible cause for the reading might be cross-contamination of equipment from another area of the Hanford Site. The Pumping Plan does include testing procedures for the secondary liner and recommendations about the length of time material can remain in the annulus before concerns about corrosion begin. Based on all the information available, DOE will determine the actions that need to be taken to minimize risks to the environment. There are a multitude of concerns at the Hanford Site in addition to AY-102, including SSTs that continue to leak. DOE is constrained by scope, cost, and schedule. The scope of cleanup continues to grow while costs are fixed by Congress, resulting in impacts to the schedule and the need for prioritization.

C. The Board issued advice in November 2012 that included a specific recommendation to reconvene the Expert Review Panel to develop a report. The Board would like to see such a report that includes all the findings about AY-102 and the leak.

C. There is a nominal answer for how long a piece of equipment will be able to last and there are also bounding answers in either direction. Tanks are certified to last for a certain amount of time, although they may be functional beyond that timeline. Precautions are taken to ensure equipment does not fail in order to protect the environment.

Double-Shell Tank AY-102 – Part 2, Committee Discussion and Potential Advice Development*
Joint with Public Involvement and Communications Committee

Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, noted that the draft AY-102 advice that was brought to the June Board meeting did not reach consensus and was sent back to TWC for further consideration. The committee decided to revise the advice based on concerns that were voiced during the Board meeting and try to reach committee consensus on a draft to bring forward to the September Board meeting. Hillary provided the latest version of the draft AY-102 advice (Attachment 3). The committee reviewed the draft advice on-screen and made revisions to each advice point to reflect concerns heard during the meeting. TWC also added new advice points, broadening the advice to include all tanks of concern (e.g. SSTs), not just AY-102.

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

C. One major concern with the advice was that DOE cannot complete the recommendations. Board advice should be reasonable and achievable. It is encouraging to hear that the Expert Review Panel was convened again and is looking at the DST issue.

C. One major tenant of this advice that cannot be supported by all Board members is the recommendation to immediately pump AY-102. It is important to maintain extra tank space in the event of an earthquake or other major incident that could lead to multiple tank leaks. There is a second shell in tank AY-102 that appears to be containing the leak. Many of the other tanks at the Hanford Site do not have that secondary shell; those tanks are of much greater concern. If more tank space was available, it would be advisable to start pumping tank AY-102 immediately. Otherwise, backup tank space should be maintained.

C. The advice could be broadened to include the concern about storage space for SST materials; the first part of the advice only focused on AY-102. The Board should include a discussion about available options for the SSTs.

C. The tanks are continuing to age and there is a major concern about deterioration coupled with the capacity to handle any leaking materials. There is not a lot of confidence in the ability of secondary tanks to contain materials over time.

C. There are several tanks that may be leaking. Funding to retrieve all these tanks should be identified.

C. The Board has requested more information about the transuranic (TRU) waste issue, but has not received that information yet.

R. Hillary captured this request as a follow up item for committee work planning. This had previously been a topic for August before the committee decided that system planning was the priority for this meeting. DOE is prepared to provide an update on TRU waste.

C. TWC could request a presentation on the tank space management plan and margins for safety from DOE. The Board can then determine if that plan appears to be adequate or if the Board would like to draft specific advice on building additional storage capacity.

The committee agreed to the advice points as revised and confirmed that Dirk Dunning and Shelley Cimon will update the background section with a broader focus to reflect the revised advice points. Steve Hudson will review the draft advice for grammar and punctuation. The draft will then be sent to the committee for final consensus, with the goal of bringing it before the Board in September.

Committee Business*

The committee reviewed and updated the 3-Month Work Plan (Attachment 4). In the interest of reviewing and reaching agreement on the draft advice points (see discussion above), the committee chose to table the development of the September Potential Meeting Topics Table until the August 13 committee call. DOE is coordinating a tour for TWC members the morning of Wednesday, September 11. This means the September 11 TWC meeting will likely be a half-day meeting in the afternoon. This will be confirmed on the August 13 committee call. September meeting topics will likely include discussions of System Plan assumptions and models. If possible, the committee would like to hear an update on the status of leaking tanks and will likely request such an update at most meetings.

TWC would like to continue the discussion and potential advice development for System Plan 7 in October. October meeting topics will be dependent on what transpires during the September meeting.

TWC will have a committee call on August 13 at 3:00 pm to further refine the 3-Month Work Plan and to develop the September Potential Meeting Topics Table.

There were two topics proposed for committee work in the future and binned for consideration: Harold Heacock proposed an Ecology review of regulatory framework, particularly at the 100 Area versus the 200 Area, and Jeff Luke proposed a topic and potential advice development regarding high manager turnover at the TPA agencies and contractors and the impact of this on cleanup.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Attachment 2: 241-AY-102 Pumping Plan

Attachment 3: Draft Advice re: Double-Shell Tank AY-102 and Leaking Single-Shell Tanks

Attachment 4: TWC Three Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

David Bernhard	Rebecca Holland	Jerry Peltier
Richard Bloom	John Howieson	Gerry Pollet
Al Boldt	Steve Hudson	Mecal Samkow (phone)
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Dave Rowland (phone)

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Dirk Dunning	Jeff Luke	Dick Smith
Barbara Harper (phone)	Liz Mattson	Bob Suyama
Harold Heacock	Ken Niles	Jean Vanni

Others

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Jim Alzheimer, Ecology	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology (phone)	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Jeremy Johnson, DOE-ORP	Ed Fredenburg, Ecology (phone)	Sharon Braswell, MSA
James Lynch, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Reid Peterson, PNNL
Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
Adam Russell, DOE-ORP	John Price, Ecology	John Britton, WRPS
Michelle Searls, DOE-ORP	Nancy Uziemblo, Ecology	Regina Lundgren, Public (phone)
DaBrisha Smith, DOE-ORP		
Isabelle Wheeler, DOE-ORP		