

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
TANK WASTE COMMITTEE**

*January 9, 2013  
Richland, WA*

<b>Topics in this Meeting Summary</b>	
Opening.....	1
Update on Double-Shell Tank AY-102 (joint with PIC) .....	1
Issue Manager Framing: Radiation Damage to Concrete at the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) .....	4
Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM EIS) (joint with PIC).....	6
Committee Business.....	8
Attachments .....	9
Attendees .....	9

*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.*

**Opening**<sup>1</sup>

Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Vice Chair Vince Panesko welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee approved the November meeting summary.

Vince announced the EIC meeting will be held Wednesday January 9, 2013 from 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. at the Red Lion Richland Hanford House, McNary Room.

**Update on Double-Shell Tank AY-102** (joint with PIC)

Vince Panesko provided an introduction on Double-Shell Tank AY-102. A January 8, 2013 article published in the *The Tri-City Herald*, “No leak found in Hanford’s 2<sup>nd</sup> oldest radioactive waste tank,” featured an update on AY-101, Hanford Site’s second-oldest Double-Shell Tank (DST). Vince cited the article and noted that construction workers first had difficulty constructing the bases of the inner and outer shells. Bulges in the base established need for insulating material to be put beneath the base to hold the steel bottom in place. Vince noted that 36% of the welds were rejected on AY-102 after inspection. The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) issued advice in November 2012 to build additional DST storage. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is currently conducting studies to explore other options for handling the waste in light of the slow, on-going leak in tank AY-102, the site’s oldest DST.

The purpose of today’s topic is to hear an update about activities regarding AY-102 (e.g. monitoring, video inspections).

---

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

### *Agency Presentation*

Jeremy Johnson, Tank Integrity Programs Manager with the U.S. Department of Energy Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), provided a presentation on AY-102 monitoring. Jeremy noted that monitoring has increased since the leak was discovered. The monitoring camera was moved to Riser 83 where the material appeared newer. Jeremy noted that liquid level monitors in the annulus do not indicate that there is liquid filling up in the annulus. DOE will continue to monitor the waste in the tank. If there is a leak anywhere in the tank base, it would drain through the leak detection pit, which is monitored.

Jeremy noted that DOE-ORP is currently evaluating three of six DSTs. AY-101 monitoring was completed, and no anomalies were found that would indicate a leak. DOE is currently reviewing construction documentation, which consists of boxes of construction records obtained from the archives. Jeremy noted that the leak found in AY-102 occurred in the ventilation area in the annulus. DOE is in the process of fabricating jumpers (piping and valves) to put into the primary pit to allow simultaneous pumping out of the primary and pumping out of AY-101 if necessary. Jeremy noted that an integrated project team (IPT) has met to evaluate AY-102 and has developed recommendations to present to the steering committee. DOE has not yet evaluated whether or not building new DSTs is necessary; this is a next step for the agency.

### *Regulator Perspective*

Jeff Lyon, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), noted that IPT meets regularly on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. At the end of January, Washington River Protection Solutions LLC (WRPS) will put together a team to determine how to pump the sludge that has leaked into the annulus around the tank. Jeff noted that a next step for IPT is to determine the best way to close the tank if necessary. Closing and removing waste from a DST has not previously been done. Jeff noted that he expected pumping to remove the waste from the tank to begin between 2015 and 2016. Ecology has not yet considered options other than pumping the waste out of the tank. Jeff noted that this is not something on which Ecology will exercise discretionary authority. Ecology is working to determine a reasonable amount of time for waste removal from the tank.

### *Committee Questions and Response*

*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 a leak spot originally at Riser 90?

*R: [DOE] Yes, originally a leak was discovered in Riser 90. Jeremy noted that when the leak stopped changing, the camera was moved to Riser 83. The extent of the material has not changed since monitoring began. There are very minor changes occurring, and it is not clear whether those changes are due to continual leakage or if the material is rearranging itself so the moister areas are redistributed.*

Q: What is the temperature at Riser 83?

*R: [DOE] There is no temperature reading directly at that location. There is a reading at the refractory material below. Jeremy noted that he did not have the number offhand.*

Q: If you have enough liquid so that levels cover the ventilation space, you are no longer able to draw air beneath the tank. How much liquid would it take in the annulus to compromise the air cooling system, and would that be a serious problem in terms of being able to maintain temperature control?

*R: [DOE] With modifications to the pump, DOE is able to maintain the level of liquid in the annulus. There is currently no pretreatment of the air coming into the annulus. One thing under consideration was filtering the air in the annulus to help dry it out.*

Q: What is Ecology's stance on adding water to the tank to cool it?

*R: [Ecology] Safety is most important. The position Ecology has expressed in IPT meetings is that the leak is an urgent matter. Ecology wants the waste to be pumped out of the tank. Ecology would not stop DOE from doing something that would prevent a serious accident.*

C: There are systems of checking the annulus and monitoring leaks. It is surprising how difficult it is to look at the annuli. That some of the risers need excavation and that we are struggling through a system for looking at the annuli and monitoring the DSTs could be something that could lead to advice.

C: It seems as though the configuration response to this issue has not been well thought-out. Waste cannot be pumped out of the annulus and out of the tank simultaneously with one pump.

*R: [Ecology] An Emergency Pumping Guide discusses each of the DSTs and the different contents therein. The Emergency Pumping Guide notes that the annulus should be kept as free of liquid as possible. The leak that has been discovered has been detected before the leaked material touched the leak detector. HAB advice should please consider that plans are changing because AY-102 is leaking.*

Q: When will the integrity of the tanks be evaluated, and is there a sense of urgency to pump the waste out of AY-102?

*R: [Ecology] The IPT is planning to evaluate the integrity of the tanks in February and March 2013.*

Q: DOE is pumping and cleaning out single-shell tanks (SSTs). Is there enough space in the tanks to receive waste from AY-102 if it is found that another DST is starting to leak or has a problem?

*R: [DOE] There are roughly 3.5 million gallons available throughout all of the tanks that could be used to transfer waste. This estimate takes into consideration that some waste is not compatible with other waste. DOE maintains at least enough space to pump an entire DST.*

C: HAB Advice #263 proposed building additional tanks. The committee is waiting on a response to this advice.

Q: What kind of contingency plan is in place if the cooling system goes down while the tank is being pumped, and does the current contingency plan involve adding water?

*R: [DOE] There is currently no backup system, but DOE has a good understanding of how long the system could be down before it would heat up enough to become problematic. It is not likely that adding water to the tank would cool the contents.*

*R: [Ecology] There are a couple of months before the heat increases to a point at which it becomes problematic.*

*R: [Department of Health (DOH)] DOH regulates and licenses the admission units on the Hanford Site. DOH is working with DOE and WRPS to determine the effects of waste in the annulus and how that affects the exhauster. The cooling mechanism uses a high efficiency particle absorber (HEPA) filter system and has the same controls as the primary exhauster. DOE is conducting isotopic analysis on the filters and monitoring that process weekly to ensure the system is adequate. All air flowing through the annulus is going through the monitored HEPA filters.*

C: DOE should consider turning the ventilation system under the tank into a liquid system.

C: I am concerned that because there must be at least six inches of liquid in the annulus in order to pump, it will be too late to find an alternate system.

*R: [DOE] The pump system that would go into the annulus consists of two separate types of pumps: electrically-driven, and air-driven. Electrically-driven pumps have a higher capacity than air-driven pumps. With either system, there will be some small amount of waste left at the bottom of the annulus.*

Q: This situation represents a unique opportunity to inform the public while DOE is asking questions and discovering new information from the IPT. Is there a plan to provide an update on the listserv with progress for how DOE is dealing with the leak and DOE's approach to the tank farms as more information is discovered?

*R: [DOE] DOE will continue to be as transparent as possible.*

*R: [Ecology] Ecology has been issuing public field reports that include IPT progress updates. The last report was issued December 5, 2013. Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, will check with Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, to send the document to TWC.*

C: There are many people in the public who do not receive the listserv messages and who do not attend HAB meetings, but who only see newspapers articles written about the cleanup. Would it be possible to put out a program of planned releases to the public in the newspaper? I would like to see more information disseminated to the public in a programmed, planned way.

C: There is opportunity for advocacy for a solution if the public is informed. I hope this is instructive information rather than inflammatory information. Inflammatory information damages the budget.

C: During negotiations to include the DSTs in the TPA, negotiators asked for ideas. Regulators, please consider what you want to hear from the Board and committees. There needs to be the interjection of public policy.

The committee agreed March would be a good time to hear an update from on the IPT. EnviroIssues will get the field reports from Ecology and distribute them to TWC members.

**Issue Manager Framing: Radiation Damage to Concrete at the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF)**

Vince Panesko, introduced the framing topic and noted that it will also be a joint framing topic with the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection committee (HSEP) at the HSEP meeting on Thursday January 10, 2013, and encouraged committee members to attend. Vince noted that the purpose of this discussion is to frame the questions to be posed at the February TWC or HSEP meeting with regard to high radiation at the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) and radiation damage to concrete.

Dale Engstrom provided additional background information on the topic. Dale noted that Dirk Dunning, issue manager and TWC Chair, has researched cleanup at Savannah River Site and Oak Ridge National Laboratory and found that concrete deterioration has occurred at these sites with radiation exposure. Over time, tensile strength decreases by up to 70%. The radiation dose over time for WESF is higher than radiation exposure at Savannah River Site and Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Dale noted that WESF capsules are situated six feet from the wall and eight feet from the floor. In addition, the concrete at WESF is dry, which makes it more susceptible to deterioration. There is concern for what would happen during seismic activity. The committee has been under the impression that concrete captures radiation and acts as a protective layer. It also deteriorates with exposure to radiation.

Vanessa Turner, DOE, noted that DOE released a September 2012 report, Documented Structural Evaluation of WESF Concrete Degradation Due to Radiation (CHPRC – 10858). The study takes a conservative approach and finds that the cells will last ten more years before deteriorating. Vanessa noted that the contractors finished re-racking the capsules, and the heat load of the capsules is now redistributed. If the water drains from the capsules, there may be months or even years before deterioration occurs.

C: [Ecology] Ginger Wireman, Ecology, noted that DOE tested the concrete core sampled from the dome of C-107 in 2012 and found no sign of degradation.

C: Radiation damage in tanks at Oak Ridge National Laboratory was found to be minimal.

The committee agreed on the following framing/issue manager questions:

- Describe the different types of concrete and its uses.
- What are the results of the evaluation of concrete strength at WESF?
- Have you used commercial nuclear power plant experience?
- Are there seismic concerns?
- What are the implications of what has been learned at WESF for other uses of concrete on site?
- What is NRC's position on this?
- What is the mechanism that causes degradation (e.g. water breaking it down)?
- What part of the concrete is being damaged?
- What is the condition of the cesium and strontium capsules?
- Has the depth of the degradation of the concrete compromised the imbeds?
- What does interim storage of the waste capsules mean?
- How long is interim?
- What is permanent disposition of the capsules?
- What is the plan and schedule for dry storage?
- What is the risk?
- Are there any other sites with similar situations, or are there relevant past studies from Hanford Site?
- What does the TPA say about WESF?

Hillary Johnson noted this topic is joint between TWC, HSEP and the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) and is currently planned for HSEP's agenda. Issue managers Mike, Dirk, and Dale will provide DOE with a list of questions to be answered in a presentation with time for discussion following.

**Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM EIS)**  
(joint with PIC)

Liz Mattson, issue manager, introduced the topic. Liz noted that the final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM EIS) was released in December 2012. DOE hosted a webinar in December 2012 to introduce the document. An issue manager team of RAP, TWC, and Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) members assembled to review the final EIS. Through email and phone conversations, issue managers compiled a list of framing questions to frame the topic for a briefing during a Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting. The purpose of the COTW meeting would be two-fold; 1) to receive a briefing with answers to the framing questions during the educational component for the first half of the meeting and 2) to develop advice on how the final EIS will be used to make cleanup decisions. The COTW is currently scheduled for January 23.

Liz noted that one outcome of the framing questions would be a presentation containing framing question answers that would serve as a public information tool to post on the website. Liz noted that advice is the Board's best tool to influence how DOE writes the Record of Decision (ROD). The committee needs to understand the final EIS in order to provide input and structure advice and recommendations.

*Committee Questions and Response*

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

C: Given the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, there is a one-month period during which people can file litigation on the final EIS. RAP was advised that DOE would not be willing to release any information that was not scripted and already found in the document in order to avoid a lawsuit.

*R: [DOE] Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, noted that she disagreed with the statement that DOE would not be willing to release any information that was not already found in the document in order to avoid a lawsuit, and she did not know how RAP received that misinformation. Anyone has up to six years to file a lawsuit against the final EIS. The 30 days is noted by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) so that agencies do not issue a final EIS and issue a ROD immediately after. The 30-day waiting period does not influence whether or not DOE can respond to committee questions. After the EIS is finished and the ROD is issued, DOE will submit permit packages to Ecology, which will go through the public comment process. This process is outlined in Ecology's foreword to the final EIS. RODs themselves do not go out for public comment. There is opportunity for public comment during the permit process.*

Q: What kind of input do the agencies want from the HAB on EIS decisions in the future, and will the agencies approach the HAB to receive input on specific projects?

*R: [Ecology] If and when a permit application goes through to close the tank farms, there will be a comment period on the permit process. HAB input on that will be appreciated.*

C: I am not sure a COTW is necessary. Advice could be that the Board get involved early in the process, as early knowledge and advancement in the process of development of the ROD is most helpful. A COTW meeting may not be the best use of HAB resources. There is no reason why the HAB needs to produce advice before the 30-day limit is up.

Q: If a COTW is not the best way to disseminate the answers to the framing questions and collect the information in the form of a presentation for the public, then what is the best way to distribute the information?

*R: [DOE] First the committee needs to prioritize topics of interest in order to frame the issues in a forward-looking way. DOE's decision not to choose a preferred alternative for Supplemental Treatment has generated much attention from Ecology and the Board. Each entity submitted letters to DOE regarding the decision. Mary Beth suggested that the Board focus on topics or items that could be impacted instead of on things that are not likely to change from this point forward.*

*DOE requests that people read the final EIS summary and Ecology's foreword. Key findings are located in the summary, and it will provide more detailed information for how DOE chose preferred alternatives. In addition, there is a reader's guide that can help readers locate specific topics of interest. Chapter 2 provides more narrative than the summary. Chapters 4 and 5 will provide more detail. If individuals have particular technical questions, the appendices are the best places to look for technical information.*

C: DOE's response to HAB advice about the draft EIS was very appreciated. Technical issue managers should review the response to advice and gauge what other questions the issue managers have regarding the response to advice.

C: It could be beneficial to produce advice if the HAB wants the opportunity to have dialogue with the agencies while the ROD is being developed.

Hillary Johnson noted that procedurally the Board typically does not use advice to gain commitment regarding dialogue from the agencies.

Q: The Board would be interested in seeing a schedule of proposed RODs to be issued so the Board has an idea of what to focus on. The ROD schedule could inform the HAB's actions. How soon will DOE issue a ROD, and will there be more than one ROD? If it is not happening yet, will you inform the Board of when DOE plans to release RODs?

*R: It is unknown at this point when a ROD will be released. As of Monday, January 14, 2013 there will be a new supervisor at ORP. The department has not yet had a chance to brief the supervisor on the EIS and its current status. In the same system as the final EIS, the ROD will need to be signed off on at Headquarters. Working with Headquarters is a slow process.*

Q: Where is a ROD required?

*R: [DOE] A ROD is required before the project begins the CD-2 phase, preliminary design. It is during the CD-2 stage that the project starts to spend money.*

C: It might be helpful for Mary Beth to provide the committee with a briefing in April on how the Board and committees could incorporate advice.

C: It would be helpful for issue managers to develop a process diagram to identify where public involvement and public comments fit into the process.

C: For most documents, there is some effort to walk the public through the document and through the respective planning process. There is no public process for the final EIS.

*R: [DOE] There is no public hearing like there was for the draft EIS. There was a webinar to introduce the document and DOE has provided pre-briefings when requested.*

Q: What happens when DOE chooses a preferred alternative for Supplemental Treatment?

*R: [DOE] DOE will issue a Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register 30 days before DOE can issue a ROD on supplemental treatment. If we choose a preferred alternative that has already been analyzed, DOE does not need to re-analyze the alternative in order to make a decision.*

Committee members generally agreed that the framing questions produced were excellent questions but expressed mixed views on whether or not to hold the COTW meeting. Discussion in favor of holding the COTW meeting included 1) it is important to disseminate summary-type information to the public and hear DOE responses to questions in order to educate the entire Board about the final EIS and how it will be used to make decisions, 2) advice should be issued during the 30-day waiting period between final EIS release and issuance of ROD cautioning about specific decisions that may be made based on the final EIS. Discussion against holding a COTW included 1) questioning the need for advice within the 30-day window, 2) the idea that the committees could work on specific framing questions, 3) the idea that advice could be issued in a more project-specific way, and 4) the cost of holding a COTW.

The issue managers were thanked for their work in developing the framing questions. These framing questions will help the Board move forward for understanding.

Hillary noted that since the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) already confirmed the COTW for January 23, the EIC will review the discussions and recommendations from both RAP and TWC and make a decision to keep or cancel the COTW.

The committee generally agreed that advice is not needed for February and instead proposed an issue manager presentation on DOE's response to previous TC & WM EIS advice. Issue managers include: Liz, Dale, Dirk, Vince, David, Dick, Jean, and Al. The committee decided to have an issue manager call to decide what to do next in planning issue manager presentations.

## **Committee Business**

### *Review Follow-Up Items*

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE, noted that the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Proposed Rule 435.1 may be out for public comment at the end of February. Tiffany will follow up on this. If it is, the committee agreed March would be timely for this topic.

Hillary Johnson reviewed the follow-up items, which included distributing field reports from Ecology to TWC (Michelle), sending out the September 2012 Documented Structural Evaluation of WESF Concrete Degradation Due to Radiation (CHPRC – 10858), and providing the link to the SST Integrity Program.

The EIC will discuss and make a decision with the agencies regarding the TC & WM FEIS path forward, including issue manager presentations and a tutorial from ORP regarding the final EIS resources at the February board meeting.

*Update the 3-Month Work Plan*

The committee discussed the 3-month work plan. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, proposed that because HSEP has planned three joint topics with TWC, if the Performance Assessment (PA) Integration, Waste Management Area C and Single Shell Tank Integrity Milestones are not a high priority for February, TWC might consider having a joint meeting with HSEP in February in lieu of separate TWC and HSEP meetings. The committee thought that made sense and agreed that a status update on the PA Integration, Waste Management Area C could be timely for March. It will be joint topic with RAP because of the issues with groundwater beneath the tank. February will be timely for this issue. The committee agreed that the SST Integrity topic could be held in March as well.

The committee thought that the following joint topics with HSEP would be timely for February: WTP preliminary documented safety analysis, DST Build up flammable (also joint with PIC), Radiation Damage to Concrete at WESF (also joint with RAP), and site wide waste transfer systems.

The committee agreed that there is not enough time to prepare for the TC & WM FEIS topic in addition to preparing for the Board meeting in February, and that this topic would be timely for March. The committee agreed that the following topics would be timely for March: WIR proposed rule 435.1, PA Integration of Waste Management Area C status update (joint with RAP), IPT update on AY-102, SST Integrity Milestones, and TC & WM FEIS/RODs.

The committee agreed that the following topics would be timely for April: System Plan 7, follow up to tank sampling/mixing, and supplemental pretreatment WTP.

*Complete the February Potential Meeting Topics Table*

Because the committee agreed on a joint meeting with HSEP for February, the February Potential Meeting Topics Table will be populated during the HSEP meeting the following day. The joint topics table will be distributed to TWC following the HSEP meeting.

**Attachments**

- Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes
- Attachment 2: Tank Waste Committee 3 Month Work Plan
- Attachment 3: Double-Shell Tank AY-102 Update Presentation
- Attachment 4: Preliminary framing questions for the TPA agencies regarding information the HAB would like presented at the proposed January COTW

**Attendees**

Board Members and Alternates

David Bernhard	John Howieson	Vince Panesko
Richard Bloom	Steve Hudson	Jerry Peltier

Al Boldt	Pam Larsen	Dave Rowland
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Mecal Samkow
Sam Dechter	Liz Mattson	Dick Smith
Dale Engstrom	Maynard Plahuta	Bob Suyama
Rebecca Holland	Melanie Myers	Jean Vanni

Others

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Dieter Borhmann, Ecology	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Lori Huffman, DOE-ORP	Michelle Hendrickson, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, MSA
Jeremy Johnson, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Barbara Wise, MSA
J. D. Dowell, DOE-RL	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	John Britton, WRPS
Al Farabee, DOE-RL	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Felix Miera, WRPS
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL		Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues
John Martell, WDOH		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Tom Rogers, WDOH		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues

AY-102 Follow Up

- Integrated Project Team (IPT) recommendations?
  - Update to TWC from IPT in March
- Response to advice # 263
- Field reports from Ecology (Michelle)
  - Send to TWC members (EnviroIssues)
- Public involvement distribution of regular recent updates is important (e.g. public listserv)
- Joint with PIC
- IMs – Dirk, Vince, Liz

Page 1

---

WESF FRAMING

- Describe the different types of concrete & its uses on site.
- What are the results of the evaluation of concrete strength at WESF?
  - September 2012 Documented Structural Evaluation of WESF Concrete Degradation Due to Radiation
    - CHPRC – 10858
- Have you used commercial nuclear power plant experience?
  - C-107 dome info from Ginger (concrete core)
- Are there seismic concerns?
- What are the implications of what has been learned at WESF for other uses of concrete on site? (e.g. design of high level waste vault)
- What is NRC’s position on this?
- What is the mechanism that causes degradation? (e.g. water breaking it down?)
- What part of the concrete is being damaged?
- What is the condition of the cesium and strontium capsules?
- Has the depth of the degradation in the concrete compromised the imbeds?
- What does interim storage of the waste capsules mean? How long is interim?
- What will be the permanent disposition of the capsules?
- What is the plan and schedule for dry storage?
- What is the risk?
- Are there any other sites with similar situations or relevant past studies from Hanford Site?
- What does the TPA say about WESF?
  - SST Integrity Program online

Page 2

---

TC & WM FEIS Resources

- Reader’s Guide
- Summary
- Ecology’s Foreword
- Chapter 2
- Chapters 4 & 5
- Appendices
- Comment Response

- Look at the TPA to see what decisions are coming up

Page 3

---

#### TC & WM FEIS Proposals to Consider

- Use framing questions as topics for future committee meetings
  - IMs report on what changed and consequences
  - Need greater level of understanding of topics
- Tutorial at (April) Board meeting regarding specific questions/topics
- TWC/PIC does not see need for advice in February
- Focus on “This is what you said in the EIS & now this decision is happening & here is what we think”
- Can committee see a schedule of RODs?
- IM presentation on response to TC & WM EIS advice at the February Board meeting
  - Liz, Dale, Dirk, Al, David, Dick, Vince, Jean
  - IM call needed
    - “roadmap” timeline for public involvement, etc.
- Request tutorial from ORP regarding FEIS resources
- EIC to review

Page 4

---

#### February (work planning)

- WTP – Preliminary Documented Safety Analysis (HSEP/TWC)
- DST Build up flammable (HSEP/TWC)
- Radiation Damage to Concrete at WESF? (joint RAP & HSEP)
- Site wide waste transfer systems (joint w/HSEP)

Page 5

---

#### March (work planning)

- WIR proposed rule 435.1 (public comment period?)
- PA Integration Waste Management Area C status update (joint RAP) – IM Vince
- IPT update on AY-102
- SST integrity milestones (videos, concrete update)
- TC & WM FEIS topic? / RODs

Page 6

---

#### April (work planning)

- System Plan 7
- Follow up to tank sampling/mixing
- Supplemental Pre-treatment WTP – IM Al

Page 7

---