

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

TANK WASTE COMMITTEE / BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE MEETING

June 22, 2006

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Waste Treatment Plant.....	1
EAC Report.....	7
Committee Discussion on WTP.....	9
Committee Business.....	13
Action Items / Commitments	13
Handouts	13
Attendees.....	13

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

Rick Jansons, Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made.

Waste Treatment Plant

Bill Linzau and Bob Quirk, Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB), discussed DNFSB’s April 6, 2006 House testimony on Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) issues. He apologized for not being able to attend the previous committee meeting in May. Bill described DNFSB’s mission and responsibilities. DNFSB currently operates with 10 site representatives and a \$22 million annual budget. Bill outlined the timeline of correspondence between DNFSB and the Department of Energy (DOE) regarding the WTP. DNFSB first became aware of seismic issues at the WTP in 2001. In July 2002, DNFSB sent a letter to DOE describing their concerns about seismic issues. DNFSB continued to express its concerns in December 2002, January 2003, and July 2004, advising DOE to include a large enough margin of safety to accommodate seismic issues. In March 2005, DOE identified an increase in ground motion and developed a revised design and construction plan. Bill said DNFSB’s testimony also included other concerns, such as hydrogen mitigation, the operation of pulse jet mixers, and the decision not to use fire resistant coatings on structural steel.

DNFSB believes DOE’s updated plan provides a reasonable margin of safety and use of appropriate conservatism in ongoing design and construction at the WTP. DNFSB

believes issues can be resolved in a timely manner, and do not preclude moving forward with design and construction. DNFSB believes DOE has provided an appropriate path forward for all issues except hydrogen mitigation, pulse jet mixer design, and the decision not to use fire resistant coatings on structural steel. DNFSB recommends DOE continue to use peer review reports for issues that arise.

Regulator Perspectives

- Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said there is a large overlap between what DNFSB and Ecology look at regarding the WTP. She said Ecology is also concerned about hydrogen generation in the tanks and pipes in the tank farms, tank and pulse jet mixer erosion, and control systems. Since DNFSB and Ecology have different expertise, they are able to learn from each other. She said 2018 is an unacceptable WTP start-up date for Ecology. The WTP needs to be built according to Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones and be a safe and adequate facility. There must also be a balance of risks with seismic concerns and waste sitting in the tanks.

Committee Discussion

- *Does DNFSB's review consider information as far back as the Tank Waste Remediation System Privatization (TWRS-P) document?* Dirk Dunning said there are problems relating California seismic standards to conditions at Hanford. BNFL Inc. (BNFL) said a study of seismic issues at Hanford, would likely require meeting higher standards for the WTP. He said this problem has been known since 1995. Bill said he is unfamiliar with review work done prior to joining the Board.
- *Why has DNFSB taken over review of the WTP for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)?* Bill said he is unsure why DNFSB took over for NRC. He indicated DNFSB was directed to take over when the contract became private. Suzanne said when privatization ended, having NRC review the WTP was not viable.
- *Does it make sense to follow Congressional guidance to move review of the WTP back to NRC?* Bill said those decisions are made at a higher level; however, he noted a decision is still undetermined.
- *Does DOE appear to be following DNFSB guidance?* Bill said a DNFSB letter states that DOE's current criteria are good for evaluating the WTP design.
- *Is DNFSB looking at any other areas at Hanford?* Bill said DNFSB is also continuing to review the design bases and model revisions at the High Level Waste (HLW) facility and hydrogen generation issues. He indicated DOE is approaching some resolution on these issues, which DNFSB will review once they are complete. Future DNFSB evaluations will start looking at WTP control systems. There are several components and systems requiring automated controls, which DNFSB has a lot of time to consider given the schedule delay.
- Considering a potential restart of the Energy Northwest plants, Ken Gasper said a review of the control systems determined that they were antiquated. *Is this something*

that will be looked at in regard to the WTP delay? Bob said control systems have evolved and are now mostly digital systems. Current nuclear power plant control systems are state of the art, and technologically advanced equipment is being used for safety systems and plant operation systems.

- *Has the DNFSB considered a phased start-up for the WTP?* Bob said a phased start-up received a high-level evaluation, and will be considered in more detail. Bill added that DNFSB will have several staff here to review the WTP start-up. Rick said the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) and committee have discussed advice recommending DOE start one system before another at the WTP. Bob said the DNFSB has not weighed in on that issue, since formal advice has not been proposed.
- *Has the simulator facility been used in training?* Bill said DNFSB has not begun its review of the simulator facility. DNFSB has been working hard to keep up with the changing WTP design. Bob said DNFSB will review the simulator facility as part of its review of the facility's operational readiness.
- *Has DNFSB taken a position on the design-build approach for the WTP?* Bill said DNFSB does not have an official position on the design-build approach for the WTP, but has always advocated using an adequate margin of safety.
- *Has DNFSB evaluated the erosion problems with the black cells?* Bill said DNFSB has looked at the erosion of the black cells. DNFSB agrees with Bechtel National Inc.'s (BNI) proposal to test and monitor this erosion. DNFSB is not currently evaluating the black cells.
- *Does DNFSB apply the same requirements it used in its seismic analysis of the WTP to its evaluation of the tank farms and the additional piping and equipment involved in those areas?* Bill said the tank farms just updated the seismic criteria and standards using the same character and estimates as the WTP.
- *Does DNFSB evaluate the WTP in the 80th percentile and the tank farms in the 50th percentile?* Bill said the WTP is using the 84th percentile, and the tank farms use existing standards.
- *Since Hanford has the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) facility and an operating nuclear plant (Energy Northwest's Columbia Generating Station), why is a different seismic standard used for the WTP?* Bill said DOE is following appropriate seismic standards for the WTP facility and using appropriate methods to evaluate risk. A lot of work has been done to evaluate the seismic risk at Hanford. Because the WTP is a new facility, DOE is following the latest seismicity standards for the area and region. Sandra Lilligren said there has been a lot of new seismic information that has been developed than what was used in LIGO and Columbia.
- *Is DNFSB concerned Energy Northwest's Columbia Generating Plant was not built to these higher seismic standards?* Bill said that is outside DNFSB's purview. Dirk Dunning added that lower risk facilities do not have to be built using the highest seismic standards.
- Gary Peterson said Congressman Norm Dicks has stated that it does not make sense to leave waste material in the tanks. *Why is the same seismic criteria and standard*

not used for both the WTP and the tank farm facilities? Suzanne said waste in the tanks is an issue, but there is a need to balance future seismic risks and risks associated with waste remaining in the tanks. Regardless of when the WTP comes online, the tanks will be beyond their life, which is why Ecology wants to have the WTP operating as soon as possible.

- Dirk noted that one of the largest seismic risks is the Cascadia subduction zone, which is due for a seismic event sometime in the next 50 to 250 years. He said this is a very sizable risk in 2050. Suzanne said the tanks are going to experience the same amount of vibration as the WTP during a seismic event. Dirk said it is important to keep in mind that the inability to respond following a major seismic event could require the WTP to operate on its own for a significant length of time.
- *How does DNFSB feel about the potential change to its review responsibilities for DOE activities?* Bill said DNFSB will continue to do the same work it has always done to uphold safety standards across the DOE complex.
- Since the WTP completion and start-up date continues to be delayed, Dick Smith commented that the prudent thing might be to build new tanks. He acknowledged the cost is not trivial, but compared to the cost of recovering leaked waste it would be trivial.
- *Does DNFSB plan to conduct a full review of the WTP estimate at completion (EAC) to determine whether the claim that all its concerns are being addressed?* Bill said DNFSB will stay familiar with the WTP EAC, but will only review it for technical nuclear safety aspects, not for hours or quality issues. Gerry commented that this means if the current EAC becomes the new baseline, it will not be reviewed by DNFSB to determine whether it is adequate. Gerry passed out information on DOE's disclosure of guidance to the contractor for procuring the WTP EAC, engineering hours for WTP completion including meeting DNFSB safety requirements, and DOE's review of the EAC and how to improve it.
- *What is the level of DNFSB review of the Tank Integrity Report?* Bill said DNFSB would review aspects of the report of concern to them, such as seismic calculations and corrosion chemistry, but not the complete report. DNFSB does not have a formal plan to review the report.

Rick reviewed the committee's discussion on the WTP from the May committee meeting. He emphasized the committee's need to focus on policies and recommendations for WTP completion, which is the Board's primary goal for the year.

- *Why did the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) not attend the committee's meeting?* Rick said they were invited, but are an independent agency. He noted that their testimony on the WTP was e-mailed to the committee for review.
- Paige Knight expressed concern about how WTP decisions are being framed. She believes the Board and decision-makers are being given a false choice between the WTP start-up and the need to build new double-shell tanks (DSTs).
- Al Boldt said that DOE seems to have all its eggs in one basket with the WTP project the tank waste completion program. He emphasized the need for an alternate plan. He believes bulk vitrification will be ultimately unsuccessful, so given a 2019 start-up

date, DOE needs to evaluate whether to build an additional low activity waste (LAW) plant or another set of DSTs. Suzanne said Ecology's alternate plan is a second LAW plant with melters. She said the TPA agencies are currently determining whether bulk vitrification can cover the waste treatment needs if a second LAW plant is not built. She believes this determination is separate from the potential need to build additional DSTs.

- Rob Davis commented that part of the issue is the lack of cost associated with letting tanks leak, since there is no penalty for leaving a leaking tank in place. Al and Dirk disagreed, saying that actual leaks have costs, but in terms of planning and accounting, no costs are associated with leaking tanks. Dirk indicated a need to evaluate all long-term impacts at the same time. For instance, if damages occur there are huge long-term costs associated with returning the water and soil underneath the site to natural conditions.
- Pam Larsen commented that one of the premises in dealing with tank capacity is the need for space to pump waste from one DST to another. She suggested that even if there is a leak in the first layer of a DST, the second layer provides some robustness. She said it might be best to pump waste from the single shell tanks (SSTs) to the DSTs. Melinda Brown, Ecology, said the law requires DOE maintain capacity in the largest tank, to provide space to pump waste out of a leaking tank to a point below the leak. Suzanne added that State regulations require emptying and decommissioning tanks as soon as possible. Pam suggested the law might need to be changed due to a lack of tank space. Suzanne said DOE is delaying retrieval of SSTs until about 2014, but DOE has space available to retrieve SSTs, so they should speed up the schedule to empty SSTs. However, Suzanne also acknowledged the need to move forward with tank waste removal. She said other ideas include retrofitting grout vaults to make them compliant with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), but serve as emergency space; however, this might be more expensive than building new DSTs.
- Dirk said the big issue in terms of reserve space is that liquid waste is more prone to release than solid waste. Therefore, liquid waste should be retrieved as soon as possible.
- *If \$850 million per year for the WTP is feasible, then why does DOE not consider funding a second LAW plant?* Gerry Pollet said the LAW plant is designed and is only a few years from being completed. He believes the Board can advise DOE to fund building new DSTs. He suggested the Board consider advice requesting baseline alternatives be examined (e.g. building a second LAW facility or new DSTs). Suzanne said Ecology has requested an explanation of the basis for the original \$690 million for WTP, which it has not received.
- *What would new DSTs cost?* Suzanne said she has heard it would take seven to eight years to get new DSTs funded and designed (for a four-pack). She said a second LAW plant would take six years to actually build, based on a replicate WTP melter system. Cost would be roughly \$1 to \$2 billion based on the current cost for the LAW plant.

- *What is the base annual funding for the most work that could be done on the WTP in a given year?* John Eschenberg, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) said a consistent funding level of \$800 to \$850 million in fiscal years 2008 (FY08), 2009 (FY09), and 2010 (FY10) would be adequate to complete the WTP. \$800 million is a funding level that can be spent wisely and safely in FY08 through FY10. He emphasized that tradesmen need to be trained to work efficiently and effectively at the WTP, since the standards are much stricter at the WTP than elsewhere. DOE-ORP is taking a year of lag time to conduct adequate training.
- *Assuming the WTP EAC is correct, how can adequate funding for the WTP be assured in FY08 given a year of lag?* John said the trade off is a year of decoupling will be reduced, so it becomes more challenging to have one year of advance design ahead of construction. However, it does provide more time to incorporate revised seismic criteria into the WTP design.
- *If DOE-ORP spent \$850 million in FY08 through FY10, and continued funding in FY11, would a second LAW facility come online?* John said that seems feasible if a second LAW plant is selected as the preferred option over supplemental treatment.
- *What is the cost of the LAW facility?* John said the current LAW plant costs \$2 billion, which is up from the original estimate of \$500 million.
- Gary said the Board needs to consider the political ramifications of the WTP. One of the most significant difficulties with the plant is uncertain and inconsistent Congressional funding. He indicated the current project timeline from 2006 to 2020, is potentially three presidents, at least five energy secretaries, and multiple changes in Congress. The Board needs to recognize the difficulty of providing necessary funding within the project timeframe. In addition to the political changes, Dirk noted that the costs and difficulties associated with technological advancements will also need to be considered
- *How do the Board, DOE, contractors, and regulators get support from the public and society to prompt a consistent funding commitment from Congress?* Norma Jean Germond said the need to consider long-term issues, such as funding, underlines the importance of the Board and the public interest groups to ensure the public stays concerned about Hanford issues. She said it is very important for DOE to recognize the need for public involvement in the cleanup process. Suzanne agreed that the length of Hanford cleanup is a big issue. Given the cleanup cost, Hanford becomes larger than a just a Northwest issue. Support from other states and the broader society is crucial.
- Gerry believes the public hears the message about the need to build the WTP, but the underlying need to empty the tanks is not well recognized. If the baseline changes and the tanks are not emptied all the way, then everything changes, including the WTP. He emphasized making emptying the tanks a priority.
- Rob said it comes down to immediate costs. If the cost of doing nothing is ever less than the cost of doing something, nothing will be done. If the Board does not have a clear position on what to do with the tanks, then the cost of doing nothing is not

defined. People in the Northwest care about doing the right thing, but the rest of the nation is looking at cost. He supports developing a cost for building new tanks.

- *How is DOE addressing the main issues identified in the current EAC?* John said DOE plans to address the issues identified in the report, and he could provide the committee with an update in a few months.
- *Will DOE-ORP release the blacked out, redacted pages from the December 2005 EAC?* John said the pages were redacted because they protect proprietary information. Gerry said the Board cannot judge the viability of the current EAC if it cannot review elements, such as the number of engineering hours, in the original EAC. John said DOE is estimating 15 million engineering hours to complete the WTP. About three million engineering hours are remaining. The entire job will take an estimated 55 million hours. The hours are broken down by activity. He noted that there is a process for the Board to request information from the EAC, which should give the total engineering hours and costs. He said DOE-ORP is committed to providing information to the Board as soon as it is available. Gerry pointed out that the redacted information is not limited to engineering hours. He said the contractor guidance was also deleted, which is essential for the Board to understand. He said the Board cannot have confidence in the current EAC and give advice without seeing the ACOE recommendations and what was wrong with original the EAC. John said he understands Gerry's concerns. Redacted information included two elements: 1) Proprietary business information, and 2) ACOE's perspective on buyer versus seller issues (to protect the contractor and government's business interests).
- *How many of the EAC's roughly 25,000 pages of detailed information were deleted?* Gerry said that for the purposes of appeal, the redacted pages are described as amounting to "hundreds."
- Dick said DOE or the contractor needs to perform analysis of the alternatives and costs associated with them to determine if they make sense. *How long would a systems analysis take to perform?* Dick said a systems analysis could take a few months or up to a year, depending on the level of detail.
- *What is the difference between the expert panel review and a systems analysis?* Dick said the expert panel review was only charged with determining whether the WTP facility will work. Rick said one concern about conducting an engineering estimate is that it will not account for costs and political uncertainty. John said an evaluation of all the alternatives has not been done since the Tank Waste Remediation System Environmental Impact Statement (TWERS EIS). Dick said the systems analysis should be done at a high enough level so as not to get into the details of the alternatives. Suzanne agreed a systems analysis would need to remain at a high level. Gerry reminded the committee that the Board has recommended DOE-ORP conduct that type of analysis.

EAC Report

John Eschenberg, DOE-ORP, provided an update on the WTP EAC. He detailed the highest level schedule, indicating that completion of hot commissioning is planned for February 2019. This amounts to an eight year and one month slip from the original baseline. He noted that the estimate includes 17 months of schedule contingency. The general sequence of WTP facility construction is unchanged; first the pre-treatment facility, then the LAW plant, and finally the HLW facility.

John described the cost differences between the original December 2005 EAC and the current May 2006 EAC. The total completion cost changed from \$10.537 billion to \$11.553 billion. The expert team evaluating the cost and schedule components of the EAC recommended the project assign \$1 billion for “unknown unknowns.” John said the forecast at completion (FAC) is \$10.437 billion with \$1.651 billion of contingency for engineering, design, and construction changes, which is three times the contingency in the March 2003 EAC. He said the technical and programmatic risk assessment (TPRA) is worth \$1.16 billion, which covers the risk that BNI has little control over. This amounts to approximately \$2.8 billion worth of contingency, which is 4.5 times the contingency in the March 2003 EAC. He said DOE was to receive \$620 million for the WTP, but funding was reduced to \$525 million. BNI ended up with \$490 million for “bricks and mortar” costs, which drives the FAC figures.

Regulator Perspective:

- Suzanne said Ecology received several updates on the May 2006 EAC, and is in the process of going through the materials and information. Ecology believes the original estimated annual project cost of \$690 million is inadequate. Ecology’s high level concerns include the need to establish consistent funding and the need to determine what amount is appropriate to be spent safely and effectively, keeping in mind worker safety and best design of the plant.

Committee Discussion:

- *What does the 80% confidence factor refer to?* John said there are two 80% levels to consider:
 - 1) Between DOE and Bechtel to complete scope of Bechtel’s work, and,
 - 2) External influences that BNI has little control over (TPRA \$1.16 billion provides an 80% confidence level).Bechtel’s contract FAC is an 80% confidence level that they can complete the work based on the estimated project cost.
- *What is the reliability estimate for Bechtel’s portion of the hard cost before contingency?* John said the EAC shows (page 19) the confidence curves. He noted that the project has a 20% confidence level without contingency. The total cost of the WTP project represents an 80% confidence level overall.

John described the spending rate curve figures in the EAC. He outlined how new scope, escalation, funding cuts, and management costs, which extend the project’s completion schedule, get covered under constant annual appropriation funding. The

project contract is a cost plus contract, which allows DOE to assume risk, since no contractor would accept a fixed price contract for a project like the WTP.

- *Did DOE include contract motivations for contractor meeting or exceeding cost and schedule estimates in the contract?* John said contract motivations were included in the contract, and DOE has requested BNI return the incentive money they already received. DOE does not believe BNI can meet the project scope based on current funds.
- *Have funding cuts been figured into the total project cost in the May 2006 EAC?* John said they have not. Rob commented that, on average, every \$22 million of funding lost results in a year delay.
- Gerry said the Government Accountability Office (GAO) said DOE could not spend the current year's funding. John said DOE will spend \$590 million, which leaves roughly \$150 to \$170 million in reserve. DOE has to keep about \$150 million in reserve in the event the project has to be closed down.
- Melinda said it is somewhat speculative to discuss the budget since the Senate has not received it yet. In the omnibus spending bill, the \$600 million may not be the final figure, so it should not be considered a fixed number.
- *What is assumed annual escalation in the EAC?* John said nominally about 3% escalation is assumed. John said the Office of Management and Budgets (OMB) provides escalation guidance. In addition, a cost and schedule expert panel determined the OMB escalation guidance number was higher than the number recommended by the expert panel.
- *What are the new regulations in the current EAC?* John said he was not sure, but for safety and health requirements federal regulation 10 CFR 851 codifies the intent of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) provisions.
- *How is percentage design measured?* John said percentage design is measured in hours complete.
- *What is the estimate of escalating costs for the WTP resulting from NRC becoming involved?* John said he is unsure what costs NRC's involvement will add.
- Norma Jean said the Board is concerned about the lack of NRC's ability to regulate DOE. *How does DOE feel about the NRC?* John said the NRC would only regulate the Pre-treatment facility and the LAW facility; however, it is unclear what NRC's role is. Rob commented that the cost of NRC's involvement would come out of the WTP project budget.

Committee Discussion on WTP

Rick reviewed the committee's previous discussion of WTP issues, including:

- Concerns about tank retrieval and options for additional tank capacity
- Cost and desire for a second LAW facility
- Building additional DSTs

- High-level systems integration review
- He emphasized that the goal for the committee is to develop policy advice principles.
- Dirk commented that over the last five years there was a plan to build two vitrification plants. Currently, there are plans for constructing only one vitrification plant. He believes DOE needs to recognize the WTP scope is changing and initiate an integrated systems review. *Considering the potential for cost and schedule changes, is there an alternate plan?* Al noted that the Board has already issued advice recommending a systems approach.
- *Given the cost and schedule delays, what happens to the other DOE projects that are dependent on the initial WTP schedule? Is there enough processing capacity for maintaining the space to accommodate waste another 15 years?* Jerry Peltier said these types of questions are starting to surface and the answers are not clear. Rick said public discussion of the ripple effects of the WTP delays has occurred. Given the delays it is inevitable that waste will stay in the tanks longer. Gerry said these questions underline the need for a systems analysis approach that considers the impacts on the overall cleanup schedule.
- Dirk expressed concern that DOE and the public have lost sight of the overarching goal to remove, treat, and dispose tank waste.
- Paige wondered what advice the Board could provide that would motivate DOE to listen to the Board.
- Jeff Luke said the dilemma is building new DSTs might impact the momentum and urgency needed to build the WTP. Jerry added that the Board must be careful not to give DOE a way out on WTP issues by advising building new DSTs. Dirk said such advice must be couched within the Board's values.
- Jerri Main commented that the politics and need to convince the nation of the importance of Hanford cleanup is most important. She supports developing a systematic picture of the components related to the alternatives.
- Al said part of a systems study should involve emphasizing making glass to demonstrate progress. He believes DOE has underestimated the staying power of public support for the project, and the project may die in Congress because the schedule has extended out beyond 2019. However, if DOE can make glass in 2012, the public and Congress might continue to support the project. Public confidence would be increased with an early start. Jeff said issuing Board advice to make glass by 2012 would accelerate the project by 20 months and require \$800 million in FY08, and \$850 million in FY09 and FY10. Dirk said such advice would echo work done 20 years ago, when the public told DOE to start the project and show progress. Rob said 20 months acceleration is worth about \$1 billion in savings. Gerry said the decision to delay the project a year does not just increase cost and close the gap between construction and design, but is also a tradeoff that will challenge confidence in the project.

- Todd Martin explained that the goal of the Board’s advice is to encourage DOE to develop a regional consensus behind a plan to reach the goal of retrieving, treating, and disposing of tank waste.
- Pam commented that adequate funding for tank farm operations is an important priority. As the Board considers advice on the WTP, Pam said tank farm operations need to be taken into account. She said the advice framework Todd provided is very constructive.
- Al said the design of the LAW plant is 87.7% complete and the design of the analytical lab is 66% complete. DOE should go ahead and complete these facilities early. Several committee members agreed this makes sense.
- Gerry expressed concern about the Board issuing another piece of advice that recommends DOE do another systems analysis. He said DOE needs to develop a “get well” plan that has public confidence, and a systems analysis is part of a “get well” plan. DOE needs to develop criteria for an analysis, to ensure transparency and treat tank waste in accordance with the TPA. The current EAC does not address this issue.
- Jeff commented that if the Board advises DOE to perform an analysis that has to pay attention to public input, the analysis would not necessarily provide an appropriate approach to WTP facility construction. Instead, the Board should emphasize getting DOE’s systems analysis, and then engage in public discourse. He said he has heard that if the LAW facility is completed first, it will sit unused because the pre-treatment facility is not complete. For this reason, he said he cannot support any advice requesting an analysis that requires public input on the analysis process.
- Rick questioned the value of an analysis, since analyses can be developed to support anything. He suggested Board advice outline a comprehensive understanding of the current conditions, recognizing the 12 years of WTP delays and the resulting problem of increased hazards, such as failing tank farms. Given these conditions, the advice should then list specific recommendations the Board unanimously agrees on. He said the advice would go to the Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) and will also show Congressional staffers there is regional support for the WTP project.
- Al said the advice should be prefaced with the idea that DOE has lost Congressional support for the WTP. DOE is in a reaction mode, rather than actively pursuing a program to get the project back on track. Rick said he believes the local DOE offices want the project to succeed.
- Rob wondered about the timing of Board advice, since DOE will issue a report on the possibility of an early LAW facility start in the near future. He hopes the committee will have a chance to review the report at a meeting in August, prior to the Board meeting.
- Gerry said Board advice should say analysis is not enough, and that other topics of public interest need to be addressed. An analysis of whether the LAW plant can be accelerated should be independently reviewed, or someone other than DOE should conduct the analysis.

- The committee generally agreed an analysis needs to be at a higher level than an engineering analysis. Jerry said he is against advising DOE to do any more analytical work.
- Gerry said it is important to bear in mind what the Board can advise Ecology to do as part of the approach to WTP construction (i.e., Ecology should not relax tank decommissioning enforcement). He said everything he hears from Washington, D.C. is that DOE is only asking for money for the project, which adds to the perception of the project as “pork.”
- Jeff said it might be best for advice to ask for DOE’s plan. This would enable the Board to have a better understanding of how DOE perceives its relationships.
- Todd said the critical question for advice is the need to know if the Board is recommending something akin to the original WTP approach. He suggested the Board use its old principle emphasizing the use of existing facilities and technologies as much as possible to retrieve waste, but also continue to study and explore new technologies. He recognized potential concerns that this might eliminate bulk vitrification as a viable technology.
- Al said DOE and BNI indicate the reason they cannot start the LAW plant is because the pre-treatment facility is not complete. He said that excuse gets old. He said DOE and BNI need to be looking at a variety of options and alternatives to demonstrate progress. For example, DOE and BNI could study building a single bulk vitrification facility in the West Area with an early start in 2012 and four new tanks, to demonstrate progress.
- Al said NRC’s involvement in licensing and permitting the HLW plant and pretreatment facility would add another year to the WTP schedule, which is another reason to accelerate the start of the LAW plant ahead of NRC becoming involved. Dick Smith added that the potential cost of long-term unknowns provides incentive to start the LAW plant as soon as possible.
- Considering future facility problems, Ken and Rob expressed concern about the future ability to retrieve waste with available technologies.
- The committee generally agreed on the ultimate goal of advice is to convey the need to focus on retrieving, treating, and disposing of tank waste.

The committee developed an outline of advice principles:

A. Plan A / “Get Well Plan”

- Whole picture overview
- Retrieve all tank waste or as much as technically practicable
- Utilize existing facilities and technologies, but continue studying new technologies
- Look at alternatives
- What does the analysis look like?
- Timeline
- Convey urgency

B. Comprehensive understanding

Committee Business

- Changes to the summary of the joint TWC and Budgets and Contracts Committee meeting in May were incorporated, and the committee approved the summary.
- The committee agreed on the need for an August meeting.
 - August meeting topics include:
 - Two DOE reports
 - Discuss advice
 - DST tank integrity
 - SST corrosion
 - Heart of America Northwest (HOANW) tank leak discrepancies.
 - Things to watch: SST Performance Assessment
- The committee agreed a July conference call is unnecessary.
- Committee members should send committee leadership nominations to Tammie Holm at <tholm@enviroissues.com>. Committee leadership selections will be in September.

Action Items / Commitments

- Next steps for issue managers include:
 - Rob, Ken, Dirk, and Dick will read DOE reports when they become available. They will inform Rick of important issues to be considered in the draft advice. Issue managers will report out to the committee in August.
 - Rick will draft advice based on based on committee discussion and input.
 - Dirk, Jeff, Jerri, and Gerry will assist with drafting advice.
 - Paige will edit advice prior to the committee review.
- John will update the committee on DOE's responses to issues in the EAC report.

Handouts

- WTP Update, John Eschenberg, WTP Project Manager, DOE-ORP, 6/22/2006.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Paige Knight	Jerry Peltier
Rob Davis	Rick Jansons	Gary Peterson
Dirk Dunning	Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet

Ken Gasper	Sandra Lilligren	Dick Smith
Norma Jean Germond	Jerri Main	John Stanfill
Rebecca Holland	Todd Martin	Eugene Van Liew

Others

John Eschenberg, DOE-ORP	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Joe Cruz, BWXT
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Melinda Brown, Ecology	John Britton, BNI
	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Robert Quirk, DNFSB
	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Bill Linzau, DNFSB
		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec/ORP
		Lori Gamache, Nuvotec/ORP
		Annette Cary, TCH
		Gail Laws, WDOH