FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
TANK WASTE COMMITTEE
January 18, 2017
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

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, Tank Waste Committee (TWC) chair, welcomed committee members and introductions were made. Committee members approved the November 2016 TWC meeting summary.

AY-102 Retrieval Progress

Agency Presentation

Reggie Eakins, U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), provided TWC members with an update on the retrieval progress of Tank AY-102. AY-102 was declared a leaking double-shelled tank (DST) in 2012. Waste retrieval began in March 2016 and must be completed by March 4, 2017, per the settlement agreement with the State of Washington. 26,000 gallons of waste remain in AY-102.

Key points from Reggie's presentation[1] include:

- The first phase of retrieval (March-April 2016) removed 95% of waste using sluicers. The ability to retrieve additional waste became less efficient as the overall amount of waste was reduced over time.
- DOE-ORP opted to change technologies and use extended reach sluicers, which require high pressure water to break down the slurry mix. Waste retrieval resumed on December 13, 2016 to retrieve the remaining 41,000 gallons of sludge in the tank.
    - DOE-ORP created a mockup facility of the AY-102 tank prior to phase two of retrieval to simulate the tank's dimensions and the internal air lift circulators. Workers trained for several months before operating the extended reach sluicers.
- Seven pits were upgraded with new equipment in 2016, including three pumps, two sluicers, and 2000 feet of hose-in-hose transfer line.
- Waste filled the annulus space in AY-102 in April 2016, during sluicing operations. A pump was installed to return the liquid waste to the primary tank. The annulus was recently pumped on December 19, 2016, lowering the amount of waste to 6 inches.
- Crews have worked a total of twenty-four months in the field and two months of retrieval operations, totaling more than 500,000 hours of work in the last three years. There have been five first aid cases during that period.
- DOE-ORP is on track to meet the settlement agreement deadline. A video inspection of the leak site(s) will be conducted after waste retrieval is achieved, and take six to nine months to complete.

Attachment 1: AY-102 Retrieval Update (DOE-ORP, 1/18/17)

- It will take three to five months to evaluate whether additional retrieval is feasible in the primary tank and/or the annulus.

Agency Perspective

Jim Alzheimer, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said he was encouraged by the progress DOE-ORP has made on AY-102 waste retrieval. He noted that workers used lessons learned from waste retrieval of the C Tank Farm and that waste has been easier to retrieve from AY-102 than the C Farm Tanks. This is encouraging because AY-102 is similar to the tanks at the AX Farm, which is the next tank farm to undergo retrieval. Some concerns that remain include poor weather and released tank vapors, which have caused several workers to become ill.

Committee Questions and Responses[2]

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Has DOE-ORP gained any further insights into the nature of the leak, it's size, or location?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP observed that if the area near the B-Pit is sprayed, a leak is detected in the annulus. Leaks into the annulus can be avoided if the high-pressure water is not sprayed in certain areas.*

Q. What is the elevation of the B-Pit compared to the bottom of AY-102?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The B-Pit is a few feet below grade. AY-102 is 30 feet below grade.*

Q. Can sluicers reach the annulus?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] No, the sluicers do not have the capability to reach the annulus.*

Q. At what depth can the annulus pump remove liquid?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The pump can remove all but 3 inches of liquid in the annulus. Below 3 inches of waste and the instrument will not function properly in the annulus.*

Q. Have technical staff and/or subject matter experts explored the potential that chelates from the cesium extraction process and solvents from the strontium extraction process played a significant role in the failure of AY-102?

> *R. [DOE-ORP?] After retrieval is complete, we will investigate the tank and the annulus. We are attempting to discover what caused the leak and the location of the leak. We will begin the process to make those kinds of determinations soon.*

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Q. When should this question be revisited?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP can revisit the question later this year, as they move into phase three. There is a post-inspection that will take six to nine months to complete after March.

Q. Does DOE-ORP have a plan to completely retrieve waste in the annulus to close AY-102? Will AY-102 be reused?

R. [DOE-ORP] Retrieval needs to be completed first and then the tank will be under investigation to evaluate whether it will be closed or reused.

Q. How much does phase one of this project cost? Is there a significant impact to the budget with the weather delays that occurred this winter?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP will follow up with the latest cost information for AY-102 retrieval. It is estimated to be over $40 million.

Q. Is there room in another DST to receive waste if another tank was identified as leaking?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP has learned many lessons from AY-102 retrieval. It is a possibility that another tank may present challenges they have not yet seen or expected.

Q. How much waste will be left in the tank after retrieval is 'complete'? Will there be a reason to worry about leaking waste in the future or will the supernate be removed and the material left will be hardpacked?

R. [DOE-ORP] Next steps will be determined during phase three. DOE-ORP anticipates leaving AY-102 in a stable condition.

Q. Would a third retrieval technology be implemented before March 4, 2017?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP has an agreement with Ecology to complete waste retrieval using the current technology. Phase three will begin after March 4, 2017.

R. [Ecology] AY-102 retrieval has slightly different than goals than single shell tanks (SST) waste retrieval. The purpose of retrieving waste from AY-102 is to evaluate if it can be repaired. There is not a lot of waste left in AY-102.

C. I would like to see the criteria used in evaluating if AY-102 will be repaired or closed. Will there be a need to use another tank to send the waste to? Let's not use damaged equipment and run the risk of setting others up with a failing tank.

R. [DOE-ORP] It is unlikely that AY-102 will be repaired. Phase three calls for required evaluation of the possibility for reuse. If AY-102 was reused, it would have to meet compliance standards under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Liability Act (CERCLA) and Independent Qualified Registered Professional Engineer (IQRP) assessment. Part of the investigation will tell us if there is a similar problem in other tanks or if AY-102 is unique.

C. Please use as much transparency as possible during the decision-making process to help the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) understand the logic behind the decisions made and the agreed upon path forward.

The TWC committee thanked Reggie, Sebastien, and Jim for the update on the AY-102 waste retrieval process. The Committee suggested that the topic be presented at the March Board meeting or as an evening topic that follows the March Board meeting. The project addresses public concern about tank waste and conveys information with a variety of visuals. DOE-ORP will determine if the topic will be timely for presentation during or after the March Board meeting. Bob Suyama will present the idea during the Executive Issues Committee call. The TWC requested that DOE-ORP share an update on AY-102's waste retrieval process and next steps at the April TWC meeting.

Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment

The Waste Management Area (WMA) C Performance Assessment (PA) is a tool used by decision makers that provides a basis for understanding how conceptual and numerical models are put together. The PA is comprised of three complementary parts, related to the different regulatory requirements, including:

- Radiological PA of residual waste sites to address DOE Order 435.1
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) closure analysis of residual wastes
- Assessment of past leaks to address CERCLA requirements

Agency Presentation

Chris Kemp, DOE-ORP, provided TWC members with an update on the WMA C PA. Key points from his presentation[3] include:

- DOE-ORP held eleven workshops with stakeholders and agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Ecology, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and Tribal nations to begin developing the PA.

Attachment 3: Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment Overview (DOE-ORP, 1/18/17)

- The PA is comprised of four elements which are separated into two distinct categories:
    - Landfill closure of tanks and ancillary equipment residual impacts:
        1. DOE Order 435.1 PA
        2. RCRA Closure Analysis
    - RCRA corrective action of soil contamination (RFI/CMS):
        3. Baseline risk assessment
        4. Analysis of past leaks
- The PA identified that the concept of landfill closure of the tanks meets performance objectives under DOE Order 435.1 and regulatory standards under RCRA.
- Groundwater has been impacted from technetium-99 from previous releases. Analysis shows that concentration levels of technetium-99 are at or near their peak and are expected to decline over the next few decades. After that time, groundwater concentrations will be below drinking water standards for all contaminants of potential concern.
- Tetchnecium-99 is twenty times above drinking water standards in groundwater below WMA C. Significant impacts to groundwater at this site will remain in the future.
- Groundwater flowed in a southeast direction beneath WMA C prior to World War II. 450 billion gallons of liquids were released into the soil, altering the groundwater to flow in an opposite direction during Hanford operations. Groundwater flow has returned to pre-WWII conditions based on recent analyses.
- DOE-ORP is internally reviewing the PA and the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR), which is a decision that states that residuals remaining after sluicing can be reclassified as low-level waste. The PA and WIR will be reviewed by DOE Headquarters and DOE General Counsel, who will then submit the documents to the NRC for review.
- The NRC is required to hold a public hearing and a 90-day comment period on the PA. DOE-ORP estimates that the NRC will receive the PA and WIR in April 2017.
- While the NRC holds a public comment opportunity, DOE-ORP will begin to incorporate comments received from Ecology, the NRC, and the public. The PA will become final after all comments are incorporated.
- The PA will go through a second review process and a RCRA permit, along with a RCRA facility investigation and corrective measures study, followed by an opportunity to receive public comments.

Agency Perspective

Jim Alzheimer, Ecology, stated that Ecology staff have finished their review of the WMA C PA and are assembling their comments to send to DOE-ORP. He said that Ecology learned from the C Tank Farm retrieval and the revision of the PA will reflect the lessons learned. The review process is one of the larger review processes that Ecology has been involved in. Jim stated that both Ecology and DOE-ORP are seeking to complete the review process in a timely manner.

Committee Questions and Responses[2]

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Was there an event that caused the change in groundwater flow to change direction?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] Groundwater levels will elevate significantly if vegetation is cleared from the land, coupled with a large amount of water dispersed to the land. The groundwater had to find a different flow route. This scenario is also common on irrigated lands.*

Q. Do agencies provide perspective on the reclassification of high-level waste to low-level waste?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The State does not regulate radionuclides. The WIR is for radionuclides only.*

Q. What is the NRC's timeline to complete the review of the PA and WIR?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The NRC said they think they can complete the PA on time, in the April timeframe of this year. They commended Hanford on doing the best job at outlining the working sessions leading up to the PA.*

Q. Can a more specific timeline be shared as to when Ecology will send their comments on the PA to DOE-ORP?

> *R. [Ecology] Comments on DOE Order 435.1 PA will be shared within a few days. Ecology plans to operate on a bi-monthly schedule to share their comments with DOE-ORP as the PA continues to be developed.*

Q. Does DOE-ORP have a plan to share a current draft of DOE Order 435.1?

> *R. [DOE-ORP] The draft may be released as a federal register notice. DOE-ORP will find out and report back to TWC.*

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

C. The Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) found a report on lateral transport in areas north of the C Tank Farm and shared the information with regulatory agencies. ODOE has been unsuccessful in physically meeting with DOE-ORP and addressing the identified issues and concerns.

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE was supposed to meet with ODOE last week, but the meeting was cancelled due to poor weather.

C. Perhaps we can set up a meeting to occur in conjunction with the TWC meeting in February.

R. [DOE-ORP] Yes, we will coordinate and try to set that meeting up.

Q. Technetium-99 is going to exceed drinking water levels for several decades and then decrease. Does that lead to a change in the PA's conceptual model for how DOE will contain radionuclides in drinking water in the future? The PA for C Farm states that DOE does not have to return and change models beyond what was already planned, like leaving contamination in the soil and causing it to leak into groundwater.

R. [DOE-ORP] Uranium sequestration has been occurring in the 200-East Area using a pump-and-treat method. The decision makers need to look closely to determine if the WMA C needs to have pump-and-treat operations and to decide how one would remove, treat, and dispose unplanned releases, such as 82 and 86. The PA is a tool for the agencies to decide if it makes sense to dig up unplanned releases. There is not an assumption in the PA that DOE will remove those areas.

Q. How does DOE-ORP assess future drinking water contamination of technetium-99 at C Tank Farm? How is C Tank Farm positioned in comparison to the observations of technetium-99 contamination near the B-Complex Area?

R. [DOE-ORP] There is potential that the model will be inaccurate; the model is an educated assumption of groundwater actions. DOE is actively considering vadose zone technologies. There may be methodology or tools that are available in the future.

R. [Ecology] Ecology will evaluate the status of drinking water standards and the updated model once landfill closure is achieved. The agencies must agree on the acceptable risk of contamination in the future. Ecology will require response plans to be in place if contamination exceeds drinking water standards. Monitoring efforts will be ongoing. The agencies are attempting to be conservative in their estimates.

Q. Does DOE Order 435.1 require a composite PA for each site? If so, how will this impact Hanford?

R. [DOE-ORP] The composite PA is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). Mike Kline is the director and the draft is expected to be released in 2019. PA's are living documents that are continually reviewed.

Q. I have been working on comments to submit to DOE related to the C-101 release, which appears to be a release of technetium-99 that caused groundwater contamination. There is an inability to explain cyanide contamination in groundwater. There may have been a pipeline leak that released thousands of gallons of cyanide, nitrates, and other chemicals. DOE-ORP should address the cyanide release in the groundwater.

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP and the Nez Pearce Tribe are supposed to meet soon to compare inventory of contaminants in groundwater.

C. Cyanide may have originated from the experimental facility, Semiworks. The activities that took place there were not well-documented or did not happen according to procedure. It is important for DOE-ORP to keep that in mind.

R. [DOE-ORP] Cyanide is an issue with processing SSTs. Thank you for the information.

Q. There is no documentation on the cyanide stream?

R. [DOE-ORP] There is quite a bit of documentation on the ferrocyanide, which is discussed in the PA. I am not sure about the cyanide stream documentation.

Q. Would DOE-ORP be open to studying cesium-137 under Tank C-105 once the tank's hardware is removed?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP would be interested in studying that. Please submit that comment during the public comment period on the PA.

C. The involvement the TWC has had in the PA process over the last few years is appreciated. Thank you.

C. Ecology has brought a positive and constructive approach to working with DOE-ORP on the WMA C PA. The TWC has been instrumental in providing background information and technical expertise to its members.

Q. Is there a well-designed cap for the C Farm that accounts for lateral transport?

R. [DOE-ORP] The cap is in conceptual design. DOE-ORP has not looked at lateral modeling. The agency needs to have the model designers meet to have further discussions about the cap design.

Q. What is the driver for removing uranium from the soil and groundwater at WMA C?

R. [DOE-ORP] Uranium may be inadvertent to an intruding chemical. The agency needs to look at a well drilled under DOE Order 435.1, but that can pose a risk to workers because they must work closely to the tanks. Uranium will continue to impact groundwater in the 200-East Area. Drinking water standards for uranium are not exceeded under the DOE Order 435.1 performance objectives. The regulatory agencies need to comment if they believe that uranium will exceed drinking water standards in the 200-East Area.

C. There are public release dates on the four chapters of the PA, which are on the Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) website.

> *R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP can distribute those documents to the HAB, if they are approved for release.*

Chris Kemp encouraged Board members to participate in the public comment periods. The chapter on radionuclides, DOE Order 435.1, is expected to be available for public comment in April 2017. All four chapters of the PA will be available for public comment in the 2018-2019 timeframe, during the permit modification process. Chris noted that DOE will have an updated timeline to share once the PA and WIR are sent to DOE Headquarters and the General Counsel for review. The TWC will anticipate a status update in April 2017 from DOE-ORP.

TWC members thanked Chris and Jim for their presentation and perspectives on the WMA C performance assessment. TWC members were pleased to hear that DOE-ORP and Ecology are working closely on the PA. TWC members will strategize on how to best review the four chapters of the PA and submit their comments.

TPA M-045 Series Change Package

M-045 milestones are schedules to complete the closure of all Single Shell Tank (SST) Farms. A closure plan is a document that details how dangerous or mixed radioactive waste will be treated, stored, or disposed of. Each SST requires a unique closure plan based on the properties of the tank. Ecology will incorporate the closure plan into a Resource Conversation Recovery Act (RCRA) permit and DOE-ORP is required to perform the closure under the approved plan.

Agency Presentation

John Price, Ecology, provided a status update on the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) M-045 Series Change Package for WMA-C. He said that public involvement has been a challenge on the change package because it is a legal agreement. However, Ecology is required to hold public comment periods. John advised the HAB to focus on the work embedded in the milestone versus commenting on the milestone itself. He said that the M-045 Series Change Package is a good preview for items the Board may want to give advice on in the future. Key points from John's presentation[4] include:

- There are sixteen tanks in the C Tank Farm. The WMA C contains contaminated soil and equipment.
- A closure plan involves the investigation of soil contamination, tank waste retrieval, incorporated public comments, and the closure of the tank once the plan is approved.
- There are two types of closures: a clean closure and a landfill closure.

Attachment 4: TPA M-045 Series Change Package (Ecology, 1/18/17)

    - A clean closure is permitted so long that a tank and associated pipes and pumps can be removed completely from the ground or cleaned to a protective level.
    - A landfill closure involves rules that apply if the tank, piping, and associated equipment are left in place and will require post-closure care, such as ongoing monitoring, maintenance, or institutional controls.

- Closure plans for the SST system, that is comprised of 149 tanks, is divided into three tiers:
    - Tier 1 Closure Plan
        - Close the SST system of 149 tanks, associated piping and equipment, contaminated soil, and contaminated groundwater
    - Tier 2 Closure Plan
        - Close an individual WMA
    - Tier 3 Closure Plan
        - Close an individual tank, or group of tanks, within a WMA
        - Contaminated soil around the tank, or group of tanks, would have an additional closure plan

- DOE-ORP was required to submit Tier 1, 2, and 3 closure plans for WMA C on September 30, 2015 (M-45-82). DOE-ORP missed their milestone by only submitting the Tier 1 closure plan, requiring a new date for the submittal of Tier 2 and Tier 3 closure plans.

- M-45-83 requires the closure of WMA C by June 30, 2019. The amended Consent Decree Milestone B-1 allows DOE-ORP to complete retrieval of the last C tank by March 31, 2024, which conflicts with the TPA milestone date for closure of WMA C by 2019.

- Milestone dates conflicted with one another once DOE-ORP did not submit the Tier 2 and Tier 3 closure plans. DOE-ORP requested a phased approach in the submittal of the closure plans, which Ecology agreed with. A phased approach allows DOE-ORP to incorporate lessons learned from one tank closure to the next.

- The smaller tanks, C-201 thru C-204, were selected as the first SSTs to be closed. Closing the larger tanks, C-100 series, will be easier once the small tanks are removed.

- Ecology is transitioning to a new approach that adds expectations for schedules to be included in the submitted closure plans.

- DOE-ORP must submit the Tier 2 closure plan and the four Tier 3 closure plans for the smaller C-200 tanks to Ecology by March 31, 2017.

- Ecology will review the Tier 2 and Tier 3 plans. DOE-ORP will revise the plans based on Ecology's comments and hold a public comment period and a public meeting. Ecology will hold

a separate public comment period as the plans are revised, after the DOE-ORP public comment period commences. Ecology will then modify the Hanford permit to incorporate the closure plans as modified.

- The approval of this change package (TPA M-045) will have a 45-day public comment period from January 30 to March 17, 2017. Ecology and DOE-ORP will discuss the changes with Tribal governments as requested.

- The change package may be revised based on public comments or discussions with Tribal governments. A "responsiveness" summary will be published for all comments received. Agencies will sign the change package as revised, following the public comment period.

Agency Perspective

Chris Kemp, DOE-ORP, elaborated on the challenges and learning curves embedded in the closure plans for WMA C. He acknowledged that DOE-ORP did not meet their original TPA milestone date to submit Tier 1, 2, and 3 closure plans. Chris noted that it remains a question if DOE-ORP will include the soil closure plan in the preliminary schedule with the Tier 2 closure plan.

Committee Questions and Responses[2]

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. If the agencies are discussing closure plans, there is an assumption of what 'closure' is. How do the agencies arrive at that definition in the decision-making process?

> *R. [Ecology] DOE-ORP shares their closure plan with Ecology, at which point Ecology can share their comments on whether the plans are complete. The plans are also reviewed by the public and given the opportunity to comment.*
>
> *R. [DOE-ORP] There is not an assumption that DOE-ORP will be digging all of the tanks out of the ground. We are looking at landfill closures, grouting tanks, and building a cap. This model would still support the milestone objectives, the RCRA permit, and not impact drinking water standards. Closure does not always equate to removing the tanks completely.*
>
> > *R. [Ecology] Ecology has not decided to allow landfill closure. A public comment period needs to be held first.*

Q. How are closure plans for tanks and soils tied together to allow continuity of information?

> *R. [Ecology] The Tier 2 closure plan, which is the closure of the entire WMA C, must include an integrated schedule that includes the closure plan of the tanks and soil.*

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Q. Is it a possibility that the closure of soil would be a separate plan?

R. [Ecology] Yes, that is a possibility.

Q. Should the Board consider producing advice that states recommendations to see a simultaneous closure of a unit and a tank?

R. [Ecology] The Board should request that Ecology return to the TWC after March 31, 2017 to give an update on the schedule and target dates for the closure plans.

Q. Do the C-200 tanks have similar issues to the C-100 tanks?

R. [DOE-ORP] The waste inside the C-100 tanks is different than the waste inside the C-200 tanks. There are four C-200 tanks, 53,000 gallons each, that were retrieved between 2005-2007. The C-200 tanks had a central pit, fewer risers, and contained mostly sludge.

Q. Were there inactive, miscellaneous underground storage tanks detected in WMA C?

R. [DOE-ORP] No, not to the Department's knowledge.

Q. Is the remaining waste inside the C-200 tanks dried up?

R. [DOE-ORP] Yes, the remaining waste is dry.

Q. What was the volume of waste in the C-200 tanks?

R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP is not sure of the volume of waste but will find out and report back.

C. There are lessons to be learned in grouting methods. DOE-ORP ought to look at the full video of the tank grouting at Savannah River. The video shows workers pouring grout into the middle of the tank and when it hit the bottom of the tank and mixed with waste, a beehive pattern formed on the tank walls.

R. [DOE-ORP] Grouting tanks is a complicated process.

The TWC thanked John and Chris for their presentation and perspectives. TWC members requested that John return in April or May to share an update on the outcome of the revised Change Package and the subsequent target dates for the Tier 1, 2, an 3 closure plans.

Open Forum

Bob Suyama, TWC chair, explained that open forums provide an opportunity for committee members to bring up topics that have not been discussed or are not included in the work plan.

Committee Questions and Responses[2]

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The chemistry in SSTs and their ability to lose resistance to corrosion is a subject of interest. There have been instances in the past when tanks were not identified as having proper neutralization properties.

> C. Similar to DSTs, the waste is thick and viscous and it is challenging to assess corrosion at the bottom of a tank. People do not know what the chemistry is when steel tanks interact with the waste. My understanding is that DOE-ORP is aware of this issue and addressing it.
>
> C. The TWC ought to share recommendations for this analysis with the agencies. We can pull documentation from previous expert reports.
>
> *R. [DOE-ORP] Can TWC members create a document with a list of questions and items of interest so DOE can brainstorm what a presentation on this subject might include?*

David Bernhard, Vince Panesko, and Bob Suyama will provide suggestions to DOE-ORP of items of interest to include in a future presentation.

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Committee Business

TWC 3-Month Work Plan[25]

The TWC will plan to hold a committee meeting in February 2017 that will tentatively include the following topics:

- WTP technical issues
- Critical infrastructure report
- Tank vapors (Phase II) update
- Tank integrity update

In April 2017, TWC will tentatively meet to discuss updates on AY-102, WMA C Performance Assessment, 242-A Evaporator, cathodic protection at WTP and DFLAW permitting (joint with the Public Involvement Committee).

In May 2017, TWC will tentatively meet to discuss updates on the C Farm Tier 2 and Tier 3 closure plans.

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Attachment 5: TWC 3-Month Work Plan

Attachments

Attachment 1: AY-102 Retrieval Update (DOE-ORP, 1/18/17)

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart Notes

Attachment 3: Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment Overview (DOE-ORP, 1/18/17)

Attachment 4: TPA M-045 Series Change Package (Ecology, 1/18/17)

Attachment 5: TWC 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

David Bernhard (phone)	Pam Larsen	Alex Nazarali
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband (phone)	Phillip Lemley
Dirk Dunning (phone)	Liz Mattson (phone)	Vince Panesko (phone)
Steve Hudson (phone)	Kristen McNall (phone)	Bob Suyama

Others:

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind/DOE-ORP	Jim Alzheimer, Ecology	Samantha Herman, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL (phone)	John Price, Ecology	Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
Carl Hanson, DOE-ORP	Ginger Wireman, Ecology (phone)	Dan Leone, Exchange Monitor (phone)
Reggie Eakins Jr., DOE-ORP		Mark Reese, ODOE (phone)
Yvonne Levardi, DOE-ORP		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald (phone)
Dawn McDonald, DOE-ORP		Sebastien Guillot, WRPS
Chris Kemp, DOE-ORP		Grant McCallum, WRPS
		Mark McKenna, WRPS