



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
TANK WASTE COMMITTEE**

*August 8, 2018
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Opening.....	2
Review of Proposed Draft Double-Shell Tank Advice.....	2
John Price Challenge.....	3
Review of Fiscal Year 2019 Proposed TWC Work Plan Items	5
Review of Proposed Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C Advice.....	5
Open Forum	6
Attendees	7

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

Opening

Bob Suyama, Benton County and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair, welcomed committee members and introductions were made. The June 2018 meeting minutes were approved by consensus. Bob also provided an overview of the agenda.

Announcements

James Lynch, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of River Protection (ORP) and Designated Deputy Federal Officer (DDFO) informed members of a Pre-Solicitation special community day for the 222-S Laboratory Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) on Tuesday, August 21, 2018. James noted that the special community day will consist of a tour, followed by a presentation on the 222-S Laboratory DRFP, and end with one-on-one sessions with an opportunity to ask questions. James stated that members can refer to the solicitation website for more information on the 222-S Laboratory DRFP at https://www.emcbc.doe.gov/SEB/222S_Lab/.

Doug Greenwell with Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) provided a brief update on AY-102 recovery project. Doug stated that the retrieval of AY-102 tank was completed in 2017. An inspection of the AY-102 found numerous leak sites, with a report issued in late 2017. A decision was made based on the report in consultation with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) to close the tank. WRPS has been working the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agencies to determine a path forward for closing for the tank. Most of the activity with the tank is focused on the lay-up of the tank to ensure no intrusion of liquids. There is a pit on top of tank that has transfer lines. These transfer line will be addressed in early 2019. In August 2018 there will be a rinse and caustic addition to the inside of the tank. The rinse portion is a typical process for the singe-shell tanks (SST). The rinse mobilizes the radionuclides in the tank. There is about 30,000 to 50,000 gallons of water in tank. Based on advice from Integrity Expert Panel, caustic will be added to the tank to help prevent corrosion. An exhauster will be used to dry out the primary tank. The Annulus will dry out on its own in a couple of years.

Review of Proposed Draft Double-Shell Tank Advice

Bob Suyama introduced the draft Double-Shell Tank (DST) proposed advice. Bob noted that the Issue Manager Team (Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, and Jeff Burright) worked several hours on the phone through Issue Manager calls and via email. He encouraged the TWC members to ready through the advice thoroughly to ensure all information is relevant and factual.

Bob opened the discussion for members to provide general thoughts and feedback regarding the draft advice. Upon minor grammatical edits and verbiage changes, the Issue Manager Team will request approval via email from the TWC committee to move the draft advice forward to the September Board meeting.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: "I suggest we add a sentence or advice bullet point regarding the addition of waste to DSTs. DOE needs to stop adding waste that does not need to go there. DOE mentioned adding condensates to the DSTs which increased the potential for corrosion."

Q (Ecology): “Does this advice allude to the request for the next System Plan to have specific DST failure scenarios? If so, what will those be?”

Q: “What is a specific enough scenario?”

R (Ecology): “The Hanford Advisory Board has requested more input on the System Plan and the scenarios in the System Plan. Is this advice going to request specific scenarios that we should consider? If so, then what will those scenarios be? At this point, there is not enough information for me to take back and consider for any future System Plans.”

Q: “Is Ecology looking for a piece of advice specifically addressed System Plan scenarios?”

R (Ecology): “I mentioned this because members have suggested different kinds of scenarios in meetings such as this TWC meeting.”

C: “That is a good point. I think that the System Plan can address scenarios for multiple DST failures or periodic DST failures.”

R (Ecology): “I would defer that to ORP because I don’t know that I can see that as part of the System Plan. I can see that as an extension of something different. In the context of the System Plan, you may want to consider including a DST failure scenario. Please keep in mind that we will start preparing System Plan 9.”

C: “As I listen to this conversation evolve, I am in favor of a separate analysis of the System Plan. You have to be very specific in the System Plan for the modeling of the scenario. I don’t think we will be able to come with a failure scenario that I am comfortable with putting in the System Plan.”

R (Ecology): “I would agree with you that the System Plan is highly constraining because what the System Plan is designed to do. You are suggesting an overarching view of the kinds of things that may occur with DST and what the Agencies may have to consider.”

C: “As soon as you start speaking of scenarios, I start thinking of the System Plan.”

C (Ecology): “As a follow up to a request for information on what tanks will do for the Tank Side Cesium Removal project. There will be four tanks total. BP-107 will be the qualification and feed tank. BP-106 will pre-treatment feed and transfer tank, AP-108 will be the vent and drain tank, and AP-102 will be for Effluent Manager Facility (EMF) returns as a contingency, if needed.”

Q: “Has any impact on characterization been evaluated as part of moving waste in these tanks?”

R (Ecology): “Sampling and characterization is considered to occur in more than one place, but I don’t know the specifics.”

Next Steps: The Issue Manager Team will incorporate recommended changes provided by the committee. Once the changes have been incorporated and approved by the Issue Manager Team, the Facilitation Team will send the draft advice to the TWC committee for approval to move forward to the September Board meeting.

John Price Challenge

Bob Suyama introduced the topic of the “John Price” challenge. Bob noted that John Price, Ecology challenged the HAB to provide the TPA agencies with a preferred scenario based on the System Plan 8.

Jeff Burrig provided background of where the “John Price” challenge started. He stated that the Board passed Advice #295¹ at the March Board meeting, which advised the TPA Agencies on the System Plan 8 and the development process of the System Plan. During the March Board meeting, John Price challenged the Board to provide their preferred scenario based on the System Plan 8. The Issue Manager Team worked several hours on developing a response to John Price at the June Board meeting. John Price informed members that the response from the Board would be timely to submit at the September Board meeting in order to influence the TPA Agencies on the preferred scenarios for the next System Plan.

Jeff encouraged members to read through the “John Price” challenge document and provide general comments. Bob opened the discussion for members to provide their thoughts and suggestions regarding how the Board should respond to John Price’s challenge. Bob stated that the Issue Manager Team is leaning towards a letter response to John Price and a roundtable discussion at the September Board meeting.

Bob provided a sounding board question for “John Price” challenge discussion at the September Board meeting.

- “What kind of assumption or criteria would you like to see in the next system plan?”

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: “One thing we should suggest is that they change the name from System Plan. It is not a System Plan, but more of a set of alternatives.”

Q: “What is your vision for how this should be brought forward to the TPA Agencies?”

R: “The last conversation we had about this was the idea of a sounding board.”

C: “Each of these points has a greater to less of a degree assumption behind it. Are you really looking to craft a certain scenario or are you wanting to suggest a list of assumptions to create scenarios? Whatever scenario you come up with, we have to take that scenario and put it through the modeling process. In the price challenge, do you want it to affect the whole scheme? What is it that you want us to consider as far as assumptions?”

C: “John Price expressed that he would like to see a sounding board at the September Board meeting as a response to the challenge. The public input form Board is the major part of this challenge.”

C (ORP): “I really like the document that you put together. I like how it lays out assumptions that align with the Board’s values. I see the assumptions that are listed that show what we should be considering for the System Plan. I think you should use this format for addressing the future System Plans.”

C (Ecology): “Assumptions can be modeled. If we are going to model an assumption, keep in mind that there will be other assumptions in the model could affect or not affect the expected outcome. So, I offer that you suggest an assumption to be modeled, but I would hold an opinion on what the outcome might be because if it’s different than what you expect then we have modeled it appropriately.”

C: “Based on this conversation, I am assuming that we are going to be offering new scenarios for the new System Plan, not the previous System Plan.”

¹[Tank Waste System Planning & Milestone Negotiations](#)

C (Ecology): “Well you are offering criteria for potential scenarios for System Plan 9”

C: “Looking at System Plan 8 is scenario one because that is the baseline, so you already have the baseline scenario for future System Plans, which is your fundamental plan going forward. I presume this baseline will be similar to the next baseline in the next System Plan.”

Review of Fiscal Year 2019 Proposed TWC Work Plan Items

Bob Suyama introduced the proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 TWC Work Plan for members to review and were given an opportunity provide input and/or suggest additional items that the TWC committee should focus on for FY2019.

Items added:

- Tank Closure
- Glass formation
- Milestone M-91
- Offsite Disposal of Waste
- Test Bed Initiative
- Composite Analysis
- Overarching question: What is the risk?
- Pensions & Debt in holding bin (needs more clarification)

Items deleted:

- Budget impacts for WTP (combined with the Budgets & Contracts Committee)

Review of Proposed Draft Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C Advice

Bob Suyama introduced the topic of the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C (WMA C) draft advice.

Bob stated that the TWC Committee received a presentation at the June 19, 2018 meeting on the WIR following a public meeting on June 18, 2018. He noted that the Issue Manager Team prepared a draft piece of advice. Bob stated that the purpose of the discussion is to review the initial draft, but not wordsmith the draft advice. Bob asked the TWC members to read through the draft advice and provide input and suggestion on the draft advice. Bob noted that the draft advice will be reviewed by the Issue Manager Team for additional input and revisions prior to the September Board meeting.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “What is the NRC reviewing?”

R: “The three criteria listed in the draft advice and how well DOE met the three criteria.”

C: “I think it would be in the best interest to get our comments in now to ensure the NRC has had adequate to review them. DOE mention that they plan to make a decision in 2019, so would indicate that the NRC review will be complete by then.”

C: “I really appreciate what the committee has done on this document.”

C: “I appreciate all the work the committee has done. I think as we go through this advice, we should keep track of the questions we have.”

Q: “Has anyone gone through the Tank Waste EIS to ensure everything is clear? For example, the regulatory background.”

R: “So the Tank Waste EIS is to satisfy the composite analysis. The EIS listed alternative five as retrieval at 99.9%. The EIS was supposed to show the big picture but the composite analysis did not have that information.”

Q (Ecology): “What is the expectation of this advice? Which of the bullet points in this draft advice s your primary and which is your secondary?”

C: “Let’s start with the big picture of the advice. Don’t leave waste is bottom of tanks. It is highly inappropriate to proceed with WIR at this time.”

Q: “How is the decision made on what we are recommending? Who makes this decision?”

Q: “Can you comment or not on whether this WIR process follow DOE policies in terms on constructing this process?”

R (ORP): “I believe so. We have a couple of full day meetings on this. I believe it was created in accordance with DOE policies and processes.”

Next Steps: The Issue Manager Team will schedule a conference call to address additional recommendations for the draft WIR advice.

Open Forum

Bob Suyama introduced the topic of open forum. He explained to TWC members that the open forum provides an opportunity for members to discuss topics that may not be on the agenda. Bob noted that he invited Duane Schmoker, Project Manager for APT (Aerotek and Perma-Fix joint venture) to provide an overview of the Hanford Test Bed Initiative. The Hanford Test Bed Initiative is regarding the 2,000 gallon of low activity waste that derives from tank and treated then stabilized.

Jim Lynch noted that Duane Schmoker does not represent any of the TPA Agencies, as he is giving a contractor perspective on the Hanford Test Bed Initiative. Jim noted that ORP is currently reviewing the project and process, including the document in order to determine the next steps.

Agency Perspective

Dan McDonald, Ecology provided his perspective on the Test Bed Initiative presentation. Dan noted that Ecology has not received an official or formal proposal received regarding this project. He stated that there have been no technical discussions regarding this project. Dan said that he is aware of a letter from Ecology to DOE expressing concerns regarding the Test Bed Initiative.

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Bob Suyama	Steve Wiegman	Gerry Pollet
Gene Van Liew	Tom Carpenter (Phone)	Alex Klemetieve
Tony Umek	Helen Wheatley	Vince Panesko (Phone)
Pam Larsen	Marlene George	Ken Niles (Phone)
Paige Knight	Emmett Moore	Richard Bloom
Pam Larsen	Liz Mattson (Phone)	Jeff Burrigh

Others:

Jim Lynch, ORP	Dana Gribble, MSA	Kaylyn Burnett, ORP
Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC
John Price, Ecology	Julie Atwood, Yakama Nation	Duane Schmoker
John Britton, WRPS	Echo Dahl, Northwind supporting ORP	Tom Rogers, WA DOH
Dieter Bohrmann, Northwind supporting ORP	Kelsey Shank, the EDGE	Darin Shank, SE&C
Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Melissa Amaro, ProSidian	