

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

TANK WASTE COMMITTEE

January 9, 2003

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, and Committee Business 1
Scope of the Accelerated Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of
Single-Shell Tanks Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) 1
EIS Scoping – Developing Advice 5
Vit or 2028? 5
Supplemental Technologies 6
Committee Business 10
Handouts 11
Attendees 11

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, Introductions, and Committee Business

Tank Waste Committee Chair Doug Huston welcomed attendees and gave an overview of the agenda. Meeting summaries since February have not been finalized; members were asked to review previous summaries so they can be finalized.

Scope of the Accelerated Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of Single-Shell Tanks Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Mary Burandt, Department of Energy - Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), spoke to the committee about the Accelerated Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of Single-Shell Tanks Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). An independent National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) contractor, SAIC, has been hired to write the EIS, which is a federal responsibility. CH2M Hill Hanford Group (CHG) is responsible for preparing the data packages that will then be turned over to SAIC.

The Notice of Intent (NOI) announcing the EIS was published January 8, 2003 in the Federal Register. Since sharing a draft of the NOI with the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) in December, the NOI was redrafted. A paragraph was added to explain how this EIS differs from previous ones. The section on transuranic (TRU) waste issues was clarified. Now there is a 60-day public comment period and the dates for the public meetings were moved to February per the Board's advice.

Alternative 2 in the EIS represents an attempt to treat all the waste by 2028 with only vitrification. DOE-ORP received a lot of comments on Alternative 5, which lays out all the

Performance Incentives (PIs) and more closely represents current acceleration plans. The alternative looks at whether acceleration is risk reduction.

Moses Jarayssi, CHG, commented on the progress on the eight data packages. The initial pre-drafts are complete and are being reviewed internally. SAIC is holding coordinating meetings.

Mary said that the supplement to the TWRS EIS looking at immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW) is being combined with the Hanford Solid Waste EIS (HSW-EIS) and will not be part of this EIS..

Committee Discussion

- Ken Bracken questioned how SAIC was chosen. Mary said DOE-ORP selected from the six contractors available on DOE's nationwide NEPA contract.
- Pam Brown was concerned that this EIS is being written to support contract changes that have already happened. She asked how the preferred alternative will be selected or if the decision has already been made. Mary said the PIs certainly drove the need for the EIS, but decisions on closure cannot take place until the NEPA analysis is done. There is no preferred alternative yet, but Alternative 5 recognizes that the PIs are on the table. This allows the decision makers to understand the impacts.
- Pam asked who makes the ultimate decision about the preferred alternative. Mary explained that the decision will be made through the Record of Decision (ROD) process, with interaction between DOE-ORP and DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ). Pam recalled that when the decision on the 1997 Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) EIS went to DOE-HQ, it became a black box.
- What is the difference between Alternatives 4 and 5 with regard to extensive retrieval? Mary said Alternative 4 assumes double retrieval deployment to get to 0.1% (retrieve once, then again). In Alternative 5, sluicing is involved and it is assumed that retrieval leakage is worst.
- Is the EIS looking to a common end state (with the exception of the No Action alternative)? Yes, except for the No Action and the TWRS-modified Action alternatives. For analysis in the EIS, the end state assumed is 100 years of institutional control.
- How long is the EIS analyzing for? Mary said DOE-ORP has not gotten to that level of detail in scoping – so it is a good scoping question to ask.

Mary, as requested, distributed a rough draft of the primer created to help educate the public on basic tank issues. She asked for committee feedback on the primer.

Regulator Perspectives

Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), offered comments on the EIS scoping. A ROD is needed by April of 2004. DOE-ORP has invited Ecology to be a cooperating agency on the EIS, so Ecology is preparing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Ecology is not convinced that April 2004 is a doable date and hopes to have influence on the quality of the document.

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, added that timeline is an issue, as is the fact that Ecology wants the alternatives and sub-alternatives to clearly define real choices that a decision-maker would make.

The EIS should examine whether alternative technologies are acceptable for treating some portion of the waste.

- Leon Swenson asked about the implications of not meeting the 2004 date. Suzanne said it impacts tank closures and the permit. Until Ecology has coverage under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the NEPA, it cannot issue the permit. Ecology would also be unable to issue a permit for any supplemental treatments found to be viable until the SEPA analysis is complete. Jeff added that delays in completing the EIS translate to delays in permitting and thus, delays in tank closure. That process is public, so there will be ample time for input.
- Ken Bracken asked for clarification on what it means for Ecology to be a cooperating agency. Ecology was involved in pre-scoping; Ecology input is reflected in documents (not 100% but a good deal). Ecology will continually check if the EIS meets SEPA needs. Another looming decision is treating waste with something other than vitrification. Ecology wants other technologies to have been used on other tank waste, wants the final state to be comparable to glass, and wants to see environmental and financial analyses. Supplemental technologies should be considered, but the implications of those should be clearly laid out in an EIS.
- Ken expressed interest in a matrix showing the tradeoffs of treatment to closure. As a cooperating agency, he felt Ecology must be transparent in how it reaches its decisions. Suzanne said Ecology is keeping a running issue list and documenting the resolution of those issues. Ideally, the draft EIS will begin with a forward describing the major issues and how they were resolved. Mary added that DOE-ORP has an internal resolution process.
- Pam said the City of Richland recently did an extensive, validated socioeconomic analysis on building the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and would happily share those results.
- Wade Riggsbee asked whether participating as a cooperating agency put Ecology in a situation with a potential for conflicts of interest. Suzanne Dahl said Ecology's Attorney General did not see a legal issue with cooperating. Ecology is required to have SEPA analyses in place prior to issuing permits. If an EIS for NEPA exists, SEPA uses that.
- Leon Swenson noted that some alternatives in the EIS have closure options and some do not. How did DOE-ORP decide to have one EIS cover both? Mary said that it is difficult to separate the connection. With the added potential for treatment technologies alternative to vitrification, the parameters change.
- Ken Bracken asked why the No Action alternative in this EIS could not be done by just updating the TWRS EIS. Mary said DOE-ORP discussed this point with DOE-HQ and resolved that if this were the first EIS, the No Action alternative would be to walk away. However, since the TWRS EIS is in place, the actual No Action possibility was already deemed not valid because not to do anything would violate the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). In this EIS the "No Action" alternative actually means "No new action." DOE-ORP has set this No Action alternative as the TWRS EIS, which does not supercede the old EIS until the new ROD is made. The ultimate RODs must reflect data in both EISes.

More Committee Discussion

- Pointing out that the new EIS will supercede the old EIS, Pam Brown expressed nervousness about losing the requirement that waste must be treated in a way that is protective of human health and environment.

- Ken asked what is assumed as the final low-activity waste (LAW) product with regard to Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) wastes of Class A, B, and C. He was informed that it would be Class C or better, but Mary noted that the question addressed disposal, which will not be addressed in the NOI or in the scooping period. Issues of classes of waste will be addressed in the data packages.
- Tom Stoops asked how Ecology will define what closure is during this process. Suzanne said Ecology is in the process of working through draft closure plans for the Single Shell Tanks (SST). Decisions for actual closure are made in those closure plans, not the EIS (which should look to the closure plans). Ecology is doing closure plans at the same time the EIS is being developed. Mary said the EIS will look at clean closure, landfill closure and associated issues. The details of how that decision is translated into a tank a farm and a waste management unit takes place within the RCRA closure process. Decisions on closure of specific units will be made within closure plans. Suzanne agreed but said this EIS will hopefully talk about closure as a set of alternatives, including what assumptions are made. Moses Jarassyi added that closure of tanks has to adhere to or do better than the ROD.
- Jeff Lyon said the EIS provides a bound, but RCRA closure plans have another set of guidelines. Suzanne said supplemental treatments would have to equal the performance of glass, which means better than Class C.
- Harold Heacock emphasized the need for this EIS to have credibility. DOE-ORP is going down a current path with the PIs for contractors. He cautioned Ecology to make sure it is doing an objective job and maintaining independence.
- Wade Riggsbee asked how it is possible to consider all the waste as HLW until a relevant court case in Idaho is settled. The NOI went through the Department of Justice and NEPA allows the analysis of alternatives that are not legal but might be probable or deemed reasonable. The catch is that the decision-maker cannot pick an illegal alternative. So regardless of how the court case works out, DOE-ORP is required to analyze the addition of TRU or LLW in the EIS because it is practical.
- Mary said DOE-RL and DOE-ORP have not yet sorted out all the details regarding waste inventory and interaction between the this EIS and the HSW-EIS. Moving the LAW to the HSW-EIS does not mean that inventory is lost; it still must be captured in the Tank EIS. At some point the tank waste disposal decision will have to link back up to the HSW-EIS.
- Does this EIS cover a change in disposal location? Yes.
- Pam asked about Bechtel's consideration of not separating technetium from waste constituents, which changes potential impacts to the environment. Mary said the EIS considers that possibility. The data packages will make certain assumptions about where constituents go.
- Wade Riggsbee questioned the lack of performance assessments addressing ILAW disposal. The EIS should look at cumulative effects. Mary said the first place to see that level of detail would be in the draft data packages, which include waste form performance and disposal location.
- Tom Stoops asked for clarification on the ILAW in the supplemental TWRS EIS. Mary said that what was to be the supplement to the TWRS EIS focused on the ILAW portion of the vitrified waste. That was to address the change in the waste form to monolith, incorporate a new disposal location, and address the issue of long-term storage now being disposal. The waste form was vitrified glass.

- Suzanne reiterated the need for the EIS to include clearly defined, real alternatives, not just bounding alternatives, because it needs to help decision-makers. Supplemental non-WTP waste treatment should have a sub-label for the various type of final product, not be labeled with the regulatory nomenclature. She suggested listing the actual technologies (bulk vitrification, steam reforming, grout, etc.).

EIS Scoping – Developing Advice

Al Boldt provided a policy level summary of a technical analysis he had written for the committee regarding this EIS. NEPA says to look at all potentially viable alternatives. Closure is being driven by DOE-HQ. Al thinks the EIS scope is not broad enough and has other deficiencies. In most cases it seeks to use supplemental technology until a decision has been made. The closure aspect is extremely limited. He did not see a difference between 0.01 or 0.1% of the waste, since both just involve taking out the bulk of the waste and putting a cap over the tanks. Hazardous waste usually requires removal of a tank – like at gas stations. It is not a good option, but the analysis must be done to convince the public of that.

Overall, the EIS does not appear to look at all reasonable alternatives. There are other treatment options (such as different melters, steam reformers, etc) and other closure options (e.g., clean closure). Mary Burandt said Alternative 4 is clean closure, since the post-retrieval remediation attempts to remove 99.9% of waste. She said the differences between landfill closure and clean closure are still issues to be addressed. The tanks would be left in the ground in Alternative 4. Al emphasized that the EIS must include the tank removal option so the public can review it.

Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, suggested the advice about the EIS scoping be very specific. The committee decided it would like to hear what assumptions/parameters will be made in the EIS analysis, see the final data packages, and also hear back from DOE-ORP after the scoping comments have been collected. The committee is particularly interested in tracking the point when the analysis moves from bounding to decision-making. Ken also suggested collecting input from other Board committees.

The committee brainstormed a list of scoping issues and Leon grouped the comments into three categories: items currently missing from the proposed EIS scope, items requiring further information/definitions, and items of broader context (how does this EIS fit with others, fit with decision processes, etc). Al Boldt, Leon Swenson, Ken Bracken and Doug Huston will draft the advice. Harold will solicit input from the Budgets and Contracts Committee and Pam may need to do the same thing for the River and Plateau Committee. The goal is to present advice to the Board in February. Everyone was reminded that the Board will produce a piece of consensus advice, but individuals are still encouraged to comment during the scoping period. Mary Burandt offered to return to the committee in March to give an update on comments received on scoping for the EIS.

Vit or 2028?

The committee began the discussion of values important to the Board with respect to vitrifying all the tank waste and/or completing waste treatment by 2028.

Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP, has been discussing this issue at the Congressional level as well as at public meetings. He reiterated that the current path is vitrification.

The two categories of TRU waste, contact-handled (CH TRU) and remote-handled (RH TRU) will be consolidated to free up space. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is in the process of submitting a license for accepting RH TRU. In the tanks, 75% of the waste is LAW. In the 100% vitrification approach, that would all be vitrified in the LAW melter. However, as shown in the 2+2 Supplemental Treatment approach, DOE-ORP believes that 1/3 of LAW could be vitrified in the WTP and the other 2/3 could be treated by supplemental technologies. The grout option being considered now is different than the unsuccessful grout analyzed a few years ago. The HLW in sludges will still be made into glass, but other technologies may be more appropriate for LAW.

Roy said there are several limitations to vitrifying 100% of the waste. Managing all the waste as HLW was the conservative approach. DOE-ORP is trying to match treatment to waste and disposal options. Grout, steam reforming and bulk vitrification are under consideration. DOE-ORP will need supplemental technology running by 2010, so it must decide what to use by 2005.

20% of the LAW will require thermal treatment. The capacity of the two LAW melter is enough to handle 36% of the LAW. DOE-ORP will keep the third melter cell available and look at the supplemental technologies, so the option remains to install the third LAW melter or take advantage of advances in melter technology.

By finishing in 2028, 1-2 million Curies will remain as residues. The process includes retrieving the waste, analyzing it, stabilizing materials, then considering backfilling the tanks to ensure structural integrity, and, finally, walking away.

Using 1HLW + 3 LAW then going to 2 + 6 means the project would finish in 2046. Using 2 HLW + 3 LAW without supplemental treatment means finishing in 2056. Under the 2+2 plus supplemental approach, all treatment could be completed by 2028. Work on the WTP is fully funded at \$690 million; DOE-ORP is not jeopardizing the WTP. Supplemental technology funding comes from the CHG budget. DOE-ORP feels this is the best path for success and the best expenditure of tax dollars. Roy promised DOE-ORP will be open and honest about its plans.

Committee Discussion

- WIPP is expected to have the permit to handle RH TRU by 2006.
- Leon observed that DOE-ORP appeared to be betting a lot on supplemental technologies. Roy said DOE-ORP is using a disciplined approach, will make informed decisions, and is just taking advantage of the time before 2005. They are building a bigger, more capable plant.
- Bob Parks asked what the time frame would be for finishing if 2+2+ supplemental did not work. DOE-ORP will decide on the approach by 2005 and always has the option to consider other courses of action.

Supplemental Technologies

Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, introduced Rick Raymond and Dale Allen from CHG to give the committee an update on the status of supplemental technologies. CHG has awarded contracts for tests of steam reforming (with a company called Thor) and bulk vitrification (with a company called AMEC). Bids are due on a contract to test containerized grout (due to the current sensitive period of awarding the contract, they could not comment as freely on this). Rick and Dale

described the technologies under consideration and discussed TRU and LAW disposition. They emphasized that the key is completing waste treatment by 2028.

Bulk vitrification

Bulk vitrification produces aluminosilicate glass in a disposable container. It is similar to in-situ vitrification, so control of some of the variables is possible. Very little equipment is reused in bulk vitrification, as virtually everything becomes part of the melt and disposal system. An advantage of bulk vitrification is that it's a one-time melter that does not lead to any worries that the melter won't work again. Melters in the WTP have to last as long as possible and thus require a tighter operating envelope. Tank waste will first be tested at the liter scale. .

- Harold asked about problems the vendor has had with fires. Rick and Dale assured him that the proposal required the contractor to include lessons learned. One reason bulk vitrification is being considered is because of the controls possible and the fact that it is a confined system.
- Jeff Luke asked whether the simulation would try to recreate the full spectrum of constituents in tank waste. There will be a targeted set of tests for each tank using characterization data from each tank of interest. Eventually this will lead to a range of tests.
- Leon asked about permitting for offgas issues. Suzanne Dahl answered that under RCRA there would be a risk assessment and trial burns, so permitting would be similar to what is being done for the WTP. She emphasized that it would have to take place before the technology come on line.

Containerized Grout

As a non-thermal treatment, containerized grout is not appropriate for waste that needs thermal treatment. It is the most commonly used LAW disposal method. Salt waste is immobilized in a grout within a container that would then be disposed. It could be deployed on waste coming from either the pre-treatment plant or from tank retrieval. Grout processing would be near the tank farms. This technology is being considered for certain waste streams and will be tested in a side-by-side comparison.

Steam Reforming

Steam reforming involves immobilizing salt waste streams into an aluminosilicate waste form in a fluidized bed. It destroys nitrates and could be deployed on waste coming from either the pre-treatment plant or from tank retrieval. All tests so far indicate it would be good to apply to high sulfate waste. The waste form performance requires additional evaluation.

Schedule for Testing, Deployment and Startup

Testing of the three technologies is to take place between now and August 2003, which is not enough time to conduct all the 90-day tests, so there will have to be an interim comparison of the results. Hot lab testing using actual tank waste will occur in late FY03, and by FY05 a decision will be made on what technology to use, followed by procurement, construction, and safety analysis.

Decisions will be based on worker and public safety, environmental protection performance comparable to vitrification, schedule acceleration, cost-effectiveness, operability, and system interface impacts.

- Al Boldt asked about phosphate glass, which Roy Schepens had mentioned. John Swailes, DOE-ORP, said iron phosphate is being treated as a candidate; DOE is evaluating it internally. The rationale for considering iron phosphate is that since all melters are designed to be replaced every 5 years through the plant life, DOE is looking for a better replacement melter. DOE is looking at what it would take to extend the existing technology. Greg Jones emphasized that if these technologies fail, adding the other melters to the WTP would be the solution.
- Pam asked if a cold crucible melter was being considered. Yes, but not as a separate enhanced technology because a different plant package would have to be used to support it. It is not being pursued at the local DOE level.
- Regarding the decision point on containerized grout by Aug 2003, Ken Bracken asked if there was an equivalent assessment being done on waste form by that time. Rick Raymond said that since there is not time by August to do a full performance assessment, they would do a contaminant release to the undisturbed soil as a way to compare. This is necessary at that stage to downselect for further investment. Suzanne Dahl said that Ecology would ask if the waste form performs similar to glass, which could be expressed as an order of magnitude.
- Leon asked if the intention is to downselect to only one supplemental technology. CHG is competing the technologies against each other, but any number of them may be chosen.

Supplemental Waste Treatment and Disposal of TRU in the Tanks

In the interest of saving money and meeting the 2028 TPA milestone for completion of tank waste treatment, DOE-ORP is considering retrieval, treatment, and disposal of TRU from the tanks without using the WTP. This strategy would be protective of human health and the environment and the waste would be disposed of at WIPP.

Due to the variety of reactor technologies that were used at Hanford and the many different facilities that sent waste to the tank farms, the waste is highly varied. CHG is studying the process history and characterization data to understand which types of waste is in which tanks.

This process is on an accelerated schedule. A design and construction contract should be in place by July 2003, permitting in place by May 2004 with construction/startup in October 2004.

- Pam noted that the River and Plateau Committee heard a presentation on this issue at its meeting the day before; it will be included on the agenda for discussion at the February Board meeting.
- Suzanne Dahl commented that since the TRU facility's design is not complicated, the permitting should not be complicated either.
- Ken asked whether the mixed TRU waste would need to meet different WIPP waste acceptance criteria. Rick and Dale explained that the waste would be CH TRU. WIPP accepts some RCRA waste and DOE-ORP is coordinating with them.
- Pam expressed support for the possibility that the TRU would leave Hanford. Ken Bracken agreed, but pointed out that there would be many drums (tens of thousands) that would be in competition with TRU from other activities and locations around the DOE complex.

Regulator Perspectives

Suzanne Dahl commented that there are some good things associated with the investigation of supplemental technologies, such as getting the second HLW melter, maximizing the WTP and getting the TRU out of some of the tanks. It would be great to get more of the TRU out of the tanks and get it off the site.

Ecology is supportive of DOE investigating other technologies on a smaller portion of the waste. Ecology wants demonstrations and waste performance treatability studies, since the TPA says all the waste must be vitrified. Ecology expects a full analysis of the costs/benefits and actions in an EIS format. In the meantime, Ecology expects the WTP to stay on track. Ecology is fully supportive of a second HLW melter coming in as soon as possible, but does not understand why DOE is pulling out the third LAW melter. Even if there are supplemental technologies in 2005, considering the cost of building the WTP and how much waste must be treated, Ecology still thinks the WTP should be constructed at the highest capacity possible. Ecology is working with CHG and DOE on the supplemental technologies to develop streamlined and expedited permitting methods for whatever facilities meet muster.

- Leon asked what assurances DOE-ORP has from WIPP that it could handle the large number of containers of TRU in the desired time frame. Rick Raymond said WIPP has enough tunnel space, but not enough packaging and shipping capacity at this time. DOE-ORP, DOE-RL, DOE-HQ and Carlsbad will need to resolve these issues. CHG has been doing all the coordinating, with WIPP, other sites, etc. Ken Bracken noted that increased TRU storage might be needed at Hanford to meet the shipping schedule.
- Bob Parks asked if the EIS has to be completed before retrieval. Suzanne Dahl said the current EIS gives coverage only for retrieval, not for the activity of repackaging TRU in a facility. It is a SEPA issue.
- Ken referred to Roy Schepens' presentation that two LAW melters can handle 36% of the volume. Does that increased capacity impact Ecology's desire for a third melter? Suzanne said Ecology's interest is to maximize WTP capacity.
- The committee asked about sulfate removal. Rick Raymond said it's a pretreatment and doesn't go along with the three technologies. Suzanne said sulfate removal would help throughput in the WTP. John Swailes pointed out that it is about as expensive to build a sulfate remover as another melter. The issue is keeping sulfate away from the WTP.

Committee Discussion: Vit or 2028

The committee discussed whether it is more important to insist upon all the tank waste being treated by vitrification or insist that DOE complete tank waste treatment by 2028. Doug noted that this is only the beginning of this discussion; more input will be necessary to answer this question.

- Leon commented that there is an implied assumption that something else won't be as effective as vitrification. Doug didn't think that assumption was implied; just that it looks like not all vitrification can be done by 2028. With vitrification, at least there is some confidence that it will work. The regulators want DOE-ORP to compare all supplemental technologies using vitrification as the standard.
- Committee members discussed why this question is being asked: given DOE-ORP activities, does the Board want to re-consider its current stance on vitrification? The TPA says vitrification should be complete by 2028. Some members felt the question arose because

DOE feels vitrification and 2028 is not possible, so investigating supplemental technologies and changing the melter configuration is DOE's solution to meeting 2028. In other words, some Board members feel DOE has already made the choice that 2028 is more important.

- Greg Jones commented that DOE-ORP is looking for technology that could be better than vitrification; some of the waste may be better served. DOE-ORP is seeking to match the characteristics of the technology with proper waste treatment and disposal. He said the exploration of supplemental technologies is not purely a schedule driven issue at this point.
- Noting that the Board wants all the waste treated and disposed of, Harold pointed out that two pieces of information are missing: 1) measurements of the effectiveness of the supplemental technologies, and 2) risk evaluation. He urged holding discussions once the comparative risks are known. The waste product's risk to the public and the environment should be equivalent to glass. He suggested the committee tell the Board that DOE-ORP is looking at alternate technologies, since the current plant (even with three melters) will not vitrify the waste by 2028, but at this point there is not enough information to make a recommendation about those technologies.
- Al expressed support for the principle that any non-vitrification technology must produce waste with the performance of glass.
- Jeff Luke suggested telling the Board that the committee is looking at the subject of alternative technologies and that there is a possibility that supplemental technology will perform acceptably. Nobody knows enough today about the supplemental technologies to answer the question "Vit or 2028."
- Leon commented that the criterion may not be "as good as glass" but rather "good enough to provide an acceptable level of risk."
- Pam urged for tank waste treatment in as timely a manner possible that is protective of the environment for the long term, since she suspects the vitrified logs will stay at Hanford rather than be shipped to Yucca Mountain. Since this EIS opens up what was done before, and the preferred alternative will be chosen by DOE-HQ, the emphasis should be on ensuring that the analysis is rigorous enough. For the future of this region the EIS should define the best path forward and compel DOE to make that choice.
- Regarding supplemental technologies, Al voiced a concern about having up to four processing facilities generating four waste forms. That approach could lead to a dilution of the available manpower resources, which could lead to trouble on a fixed annual budget.
- Ken thought the question "vit or 2028" is oversimplified. 2028 is an artificial date that was agreed upon long ago; waste performance should have higher weight than schedule. The Board will need to think about the limited resources and the degree of compromise to reach cleanup by 2028. Ken said the Board does not need to make any changes in stance or advice until DOE can prove an alternate waste form that is equal to vitrification.
- Leon framed the question in parameters of risk assessment vs. budgetary practicalities.
- Many committee members were concerned about the practical consideration that treatment extending much further than 2028 won't be funded.

The committee reiterated that the Board wants to be informed of the decision-making process and involved instead of second-guessing decisions later. Greg Jones emphasized that DOE-ORP has committed to doing that and will continue to engage the Board on this issue.

Committee Business

The monthly committee call was canceled, but there will be a call to discuss the advice if necessary.

Leon, Doug, Harold will be on the Executive Issues Management call.

Handouts

- Rightsizing Hanford’s Tank waste Treatment Solutions, Roy Schepens, January 9, 2003
- Alternative Component Matrix, January 9, 2003
- Tank Waste Disposal and Closure Environmental Impact Statement Scope, Allyn Boldt, January 7, 2002
- Tank Waste Committee Meeting Agenda, January 9, 2003
- Notice of Intent, Department of Energy, January 8, 2003
- Supplemental Technologies Under Active Evaluation, CH2MHILL, January 9, 2003
- Press Release: Contractor Selection, CH2MHILL, January 9, 2003
- River Protection Project Mission Update, Office of River Protection, CH2MHILL, Bechtel National, Inc., January 9, 2003
- Retrieval, Treatment and Disposal of Tank Waste & Closure of SSTs (EIS), HAB Tank Waste Subcommittee, Mary Beth Burandt, January 9, 2003
- Hanford Progress, U.S. Department of Energy, December 16, 2003
- Overview of packages, January 9, 2003

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Allyn Boldt	Doug Huston	Maynard Plahuta
Bob Parks	George Jansen, Jr.	Wayne Riggsbee
Pam Brown	Jeffrey Luke	Tom Stoops
Harold Heacock	Bob Parks	Leon Swenson

Others

Mary Burandt, DOE-ORP	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
Gregory Jones, DOE-ORP	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Dee Willis, CEES
Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Dale Allen, CHG
Jim Rasmussen, DOE-ORP		Moses Jarayssi, CHG
Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP		Bryan Kidder, CHG
John Swailes, DOE-ORP		Tony Knepp, CHG
		Deb Wilcox, CHG
		Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
		Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
		Barbara Wise, FH
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec
		John Stang, Tri City Herald