UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING AND HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY OCTOBER 7, 2010

+ + + + +

The Board met in the Three Rivers Convention Center, 7016 W. Grandridge Boulevard, Kennewick, Washington, Peter S. Winokur, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

PETER S. WINOKUR, Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Vice Chair JOSEPH F. BADER, Board Member

TIMOTHY DWYER, Technical Director

LARRY W. BROWN, Board Member JOHN E. MANSFIELD, Board Member STAFF PRESENT: RICHARD AZZARO, General Counsel

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: GREG ASHLEY, BNI DAVID BROCKMAN, DOE-ORP DONNA BUSCHE, URS STACY CHARBONEAU, DOE-ORP

> DAVID DICKEY, Consultant DALE KNUTSON, DOE-ORP

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: (Cont'd)

DAVID S. KOSSON, CRESP

LONI M. PEURRUNG, PNNL

FRANK RUSSO, BNI

PAUL RUTLAND, WRPS

LEO SAIN, URS

INES TRIAY, DOE-EM

```
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
```

```
Chairman Winokur and Board Members
Department of Energy
1. Pretreatment Facility Safety
Safety-related systems, structures and
  components
Design Complexity
2. Pretreatment Facility Operation
Public Statements
```

		Page	4
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S	10.90	-
2	(5:00 p.m.)		
3	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: My name is		
4	Peter Winokur. I am Chairman of the Defense		
5	Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and I will		
6	preside over this public meeting and hearing.		
7	At this time, I would like to		
8	introduce my colleagues on the Safety Board.		
9	To my immediate left is Vice Chair Jessie		
10	Roberson, and to her left is Mr. Larry Brown.		
11	On my right is Dr. John Mansfield. On his		
12	right is Mr. Joseph Bader. We five constitute		
13	the Board.		
14	The Board's General Counsel,		
15	Richard Azzaro, is seated to my far left. The		
16	Board's Technical Director, Timothy Dwyer, is		
17	seated to my far right. Several members of		
18	our staff closely involved with oversight at		
19	the Department of Energy's Defense Nuclear		
20	Facilities at Hanford are also present.		
21	Today's meeting and hearing was		
22	first publicly noticed in the Federal Register		

1	on July 26, 2010, and renoticed for a change
2	of location on September 15, 2010. It is
3	being held open to the public in accordance
4	with the provisions of the Government in the
5	Sunshine Act.
6	The hearing is being broadcast
7	over internet via video streaming. The link
8	can be found on the Board's website. A video
9	recording of the hearing will be made
10	available on the Board's website as soon as
11	possible after the hearing is concluded, and
12	will remain available for at least 60 days.
13	A verbatim written transcript,
14	together with associated documents, will be
15	available for viewing and copying in the
16	Board's public reading room on the 7th floor
17	of the Board's headquarters in Washington,
18	D.C.
19	In accordance with the Board's
20	practice, and as stated in the Federal
21	Register notice, we will welcome comments from
22	interested members of the public at the

conclusion of testimony for each of the three
 sessions comprising this public meeting and
 hearing.

4 A list of those speakers who have 5 contacted the Board is posted at the entrance 6 to this auditorium. We have listed the people 7 in the order in which they have contacted us 8 or, if possible, when they wish to speak. Ι 9 will call the speakers in this order and ask that speakers state their name and title at 10 11 the beginning of their presentation.

12 There is also a table at the 13 entrance to the room with a sign-up sheet for 14 members of the public who wish to make a 15 presentation but did not have an opportunity 16 to sign up previous to this time. They will 17 follow those who have already registered with 18 us in the order in which they have signed up. 19 In order to give everyone wishing 20 to speak an equal opportunity, we ask 21 presenters to limit their original statements 22 to five minutes. The chair will then give

consideration to additional comments should 1 2 time permit. Presentations should be limited to comments, technical information, or data 3 4 concerning the subjects of this meeting and 5 hearing. The Board members may question 6 anyone making presentations to the extent 7 deemed appropriate. 8 The record of this proceeding will

9 remain open until November 7, 2010. This
10 Board reserves its right to further schedule
11 and regulate the course of this hearing, to
12 recess, reconvene, postpone, or adjourn this
13 meeting and hearing, and to otherwise exercise
14 its authority under the Atomic Energy Act of
15 1954, as amended.

Let me now proceed to explain the Board's statutory authority in inquiring into the matters that are the subject of this public meeting and hearing. The Board's enabling statute, now in effect for more than 20 years, is found in the Atomic Energy Act beginning in Section 2286 of Title 42.

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## Page 7

1	One section of this defines the
2	Board's role in the review of facility design
3	and construction, and I quote, "The Board
4	shall review the design of a new Department of
5	Energy Defense Nuclear Facility before
6	construction of such facility begins, and
7	shall recommend to the Secretary, within a
8	reasonable time, such modifications of the
9	design as the Board considers necessary to
10	ensure adequate protection of public health
11	and safety.
12	"During the construction of any
13	such facility, the Board shall periodically
14	review and monitor the construction and shall
15	submit to the Secretary, within a reasonable
16	time, such recommendations relating to the
17	construction of that facility as the Board
18	considers necessary to ensure adequate
19	protection of public health and safety.
20	"An action of the Board, or a
21	failure to act under this paragraph, may not
22	delay or prevent the Secretary of Energy from

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 8

1	carrying out the construction of such a
2	facility."
3	The hearing begun this morning
4	forms a part of the Board's continuing effort
5	to fulfill this statutory charge with respect
6	to the waste treatment and immobilization
7	plant also known as the waste treatment plan.
8	The record of the hearing, both
9	oral and written, will be used by the Board to
10	formulate recommendations to the Secretary of
11	Energy for this critical project. These
12	recommendations may take the form of a formal
13	recommendation to the Secretary or may be
14	transmitted to the Department through letters
15	or informal exchanges between technical
16	counterparts.
17	The Board's oversight
18	responsibilities continue through completion
19	of construction, testing, operation, and
20	eventual decommissioning of these facilities.
21	The Board's statutory charter is,
22	like that given to other agencies operating

F	- 1	$\sim$
Page	- I	()
I U G C	_	0

under the Atomic Energy Act, the protection of
 public health and safety, including safety of
 the workers.

In the case of the waste treatment 4 5 plant, however, this statutory charge is made 6 more complex because proper construction and 7 operation of the plant is critical to 8 resolving the underlying health and safety 9 problem, namely the large volume of toxic and radioactive waste now stored in underground 10 tanks at Hanford. 11

12 Many of these tanks are already 60, 70 years old and would be almost 100 years 13 14 old by the end of the projected treatment Consequently, it is not enough in 15 mission. this case for the Board to focus solely on 16 whether the construction of the waste 17 treatment plant will not suffer accidents 18 19 harmful to workers and the public. It must 20 operate safely and effectively for many 21 decades to remediate the safety hazard 22 represented by the tank waste.

		Page 11
1	The Board has, therefore, inquired	
2	into many issues that involve a mixture of	
3	accident risk and successful and efficient	
4	long-term operations. At this time, I would	
5	like to provide some additional background on	
6	the history of the project.	
7	The Hanford high level waste tanks	
8	began receiving waste in the 1940s. As the	
9	initial single-shell tanks were being	
10	constructed, they were designed for about a	
11	20-year life.	
12	Over the seven decades of	
13	operation of the tank farms, poor chemical	
14	configuration control of the waste has created	
15	a much more challenging problem for	
16	understanding the chemistry and properties of	
17	the waste, as well as getting them mobilized,	
18	than exists at other sites such as the	
19	Savannah River Site and the Idaho Cleanup	
20	Project.	
21	Characterization of this waste	
22	remains problematic. The first time that a	

		Page
1	single-shell tank was suspected of leaking was	
2	in the mid-1950s. Many single-shell tanks	
3	have been proven leakers since then. The	
4	leakage exacerbates the need to get this waste	
5	out of the tanks and into stable forms	
6	suitable for eventual disposal.	
7	The Department of Energy's	
8	solution to removing and stabilizing the waste	
9	to reduce the current and future threats to	
10	health and safety is the waste treatment	
11	plant. The waste treatment plant was	
12	initiated in the mid-1990s. This is the	
13	first-of-a-kind project. The Board's formal	
14	oversight of the project began in earnest	
15	after a privatization effort was abandoned in	
16	2002.	
17	The Board has been advising the	
18	Department about our concerns related to	
19	design basis safety requirements and their	
20	potential impact on operational safety	
21	throughout the life of the project.	
22	Since initiating the project, the	

Department has pursued internal and external 1 2 reviews of the project, obtaining advice from experts in academia, the chemical and process 3 industries, and its national laboratories, to 4 5 help inform the design, safe operation, and 6 performance of the plant over its projected 7 40-year operational life. 8 It is important to note that the 9 Department undertook a significant redesign effort starting in 2009, even though the 10 11 design of the plant was more than 70 percent 12 complete. The redesign of the plant is now over 80 percent complete, and construction of 13 14 its treatment facility is more than 30 percent 15 complete.

16 Recently, the Department indicated 17 to the Board that it is transitioning the 18 waste treatment plant project from a design 19 and construction project to one of 20 construction and commissioning. The 21 Department has referred to this transition as 22 pivoting.

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

Page 13

		Page	14
1	As such, the Department is		
2	planning to wrap up its design actions by		
3	establishing the final design criteria for the		
4	plant's structures, systems, and components.		
5	The pivot is intended to provide a defined		
6	path forward, to finish the design of the		
7	systems and components that have not been		
8	finalized, and to resolve any outstanding		
9	technical issues.		
10	The Board is deeply concerned that		
11	the plant may be commissioned before several		
12	key technical issues are fully resolved. Once		
13	operational and exposed to radioactive waste,		
14	options for design changes and blackened hot		
15	cells will be extremely limited, costly, and		
16	expose workers to hazardous situations. To		
17	the maximum extent possible, solutions must be		
18	accommodated before commissioning. A learn-		
19	as-we-go philosophy does not seem prudent for		
20	this facility.		
21	Given that the project is now		
22	pivoting, wrapping up design and focusing on		

		Рa
1	commissioning, it is a crucial time to have	
2	DOE [Department of Energy] explain where they	
3	are, where they are going, what remains to be	
4	done, and in what timeframe. Also implicit in	
5	the Board's statutory mandate is keeping the	
б	public appropriately informed of issues	
7	affecting public health and safety. Those are	
8	the goals of these proceedings.	
9	The proceedings began last month	
10	when DOE provided over 200 pages of written	
11	answers to the Board's questions. These	
12	questions and answers are available on the	
13	Board's website and will become a part of the	
14	record of these proceedings. I want to take	
15	a moment to thank the Department for its	
16	timely response to these questions.	
17	We began this morning to explore	
18	some of these answers to gain a more complete	
19	understanding. However, because of the large	
20	volume of information that must be discussed,	
21	a lack of further inquiry in this hearing, or	
22	in the near future, should not necessarily be	

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## Page 15

		Page
1	viewed as satisfaction on the part of the	
2	Board with either a previous written or verbal	
3	answer.	
4	The Board noted in its transmittal	
5	of questions to DOE in August 2010 that these	
6	questions should be viewed as a starting point	
7	for the discussions that will occur during	
8	this public meeting and hearing.	
9	There are several areas of the	
10	waste treatment plant design in which the	
11	Board has concerns with the safety and	
12	ultimate operation for the decades the plant	
13	must operate. These areas include: the	
14	ability of the plant to adequately mix the	
15	waste after they are transferred from the tank	
16	farms into the plant; the hydrogen control	
17	strategy for dealing with a hydrogen gas that	
18	is inevitably generated by the high level	
19	waste; the implementation of safety controls	
20	necessary to implement the hydrogen control	
21	strategy; and the likelihood that limitations	
22	on the plant's operating envelope resulting	

		Page	17
1	from the performance of the plant's mixing		
2	systems will result in more demands on the		
3	tank farms to deliver waste that meets		
4	restrictive waste acceptance criteria or the		
5	need to provide alternative processing		
6	capability.		
7	The second session of the Board's		
8	hearing, this evening's session, will		
9	concentrate on potential concerns with the		
10	pretreatment facility. These concerns are,		
11	first, the changes that Bechtel National		
12	Incorporated has made to the safety and design		
13	bases of the pretreatment facility in		
14	conjunction with a reduction in the material		
15	at risk; second, the effect of DOE's drive to		
16	reduce the complexity of the pretreatment		
17	facility design; and, third, the safety		
18	strategy for the design of piping and vessels		
19	to confine radioactive waste that is to		
20	say, the primary confinement design.		
21	As in this morning's session, we		
22	are trying to understand the ability of the		

		Page	18
1	plant to safely, effectively, and efficiently		
2	process waste delivered from the tank farms,		
3	so that it can vitrified for eventual		
4	disposal. We have requested that DOE and		
5	Bechtel National Incorporated participate in		
б	this evening's panel discussion.		
7	That concludes my opening remarks.		
8	I will now ask my fellow Board members if they		
9	have opening remarks before we begin the		
10	testimony.		
11	Hearing no such request, I want to		
12	invite Mr. David Brockman, Manager of DOE's		
13	Office of River Protection, to provide some		
14	introductory remarks.		
15	MR. BROCKMAN: Thank you, Mr.		
16	Chairman, Board Members. I welcome the		
17	opportunity to introduce myself to the Board		
18	as a recent appointee to this position and		
19	provide introductory remarks on the subject of		
20	pretreatment facility safety.		
21	I have asked my predecessor in		
22	this position, Shirley Olinger, to join me.		

Γ

		Page	19
1	As the Office of River Protection		
2	Manager, I have the delegated authority for		
3	the waste treatment plant safety basis, a		
4	responsibility that is independent of the		
5	waste treatment plant federal project		
6	director.		
7	This statement conveys my		
8	perspective on the evolving pretreatment		
9	safety basis, the chosen control strategy, and		
10	the view ahead as we plan for transitioning to		
11	commissioning and operations.		
12	The waste treatment plant		
13	pretreatment facility is a design-build		
14	project with approximately 80 percent design,		
15	approximately 80 percent complete, and		
16	construction approximately 50 percent		
17	complete.		
18	The approved safety basis is a		
19	preliminary documented safety analysis being		
20	modified for an addendum that addresses		
21	reduction in material at risk, or MAR		
22	[Material at Risk], and new criteria for		

		Page	20
1	hydrogen and piping in auxiliary vessels known		
2	as HPAV [Hydrogen and Piping in Ancillary		
3	Vessels].		
4	In an effort to improve the safety		
5	and operation of the pretreatment facility, a		
б	number of design changes have been		
7	implemented. These includes changes to select		
8	vessel mixing designs and changes to controls		
9	for hydrogen and piping. These changes		
10	represent approximately eight percent of the		
11	facility design.		
12	The reduction in MAR aligns a		
13	waste treatment plant pretreatment safety		
14	basis with the existing approved safety basis		
15	for tank farm operations, the source of the		
16	waste treatment plant waste. The reduction		
17	from prior supertank MAR is consistent with		
18	the expected progression of waste treatment		
19	plant design as uncertainties are reduced.		
20	Further, a committed specific		
21	administrative control in the tank farms will		
22	ensure the feed to the waste treatment plant		

		Page
1	is within the assumed waste envelope.	
2	Likewise, the changes to HPAV criteria also	
3	reflect reduced uncertainty based on an	
4	experimental evidence collected by the	
5	project's investigation of piping response to	
б	a range of possible hydrogen combustion	
7	events.	
8	I view these changes to be	
9	consistent with a normal design progression.	
10	Early project conservatisms are expected to be	
11	refined over time as the design evolves and as	
12	studies and analysis are completed to reduce	
13	the uncertainties.	
14	Conversely, in some instances	
15	completed studies or analysis identify the	
16	need to increase design margin, such as vessel	
17	enhancements, to resolve mixing issues.	
18	Important safety functions such as	
19	facility confinement and confinement	
20	ventilation approach were addressed early in	
21	the design process, and these strategies have	
22	not been affected by the recent changes in the	

		Page	22
1	waste treatment plant facilities.		
2	The project safety analysis		
3	analysis apply control selection and		
4	functional classification criteria for the WTP		
5	[Waste Treatment Plant] safety-related		
б	structures, systems, and components, that		
7	comply with a set of nuclear safety		
8	requirements, provide the framework for the		
9	Department of Energy and its contractors to		
10	design nuclear facilities.		
11	Over the past year, numerous		
12	changes and analysis assumptions have been		
13	adopted in response to comments made by the		
14	project's independent experts and the Defense		
15	Nuclear Facilities Safety Board staff.		
16	Examples of issues that are being addressed		
17	with analysis changes or uncertainty		
18	evaluations include entrainment coefficient,		
19	deposition velocity, and spray leak		
20	phenomenology.		
21	Pretreatment facility the		
22	pretreatment facility is on the critical path		

Page 23 for completing construction of the waste 1 2 treatment plant and plays an essential role in 3 assuring accomplishment of the waste treatment 4 plant mission. Both the MAR change and new 5 HPAV design approach will yield a superior 6 design for the waste treatment plant, which 7 complies with DOE's safety policy. 8 Both DOE and Bechtel National have 9 high confidence that the project is procuring/instructing safety-related systems, 10 11 structures, and components to the appropriate requirements and standards and ensuring that 12 the final documented safety analysis will 13 14 support startup and operation of the waste 15 treatment plant facilities as necessary for efficient achievement of the critical waste 16 stabilization mission. 17 I would now like to turn the floor 18 over to Shirley. 19 20 Good evening, MS. OLINGER: 21 Chairman Winokur, other Board members, Board 22 staff, and members of the public. I, too,

		Page	24
1	welcome an opportunity to address the Board		
2	and provide introductory remarks as the prior		
3	Office of River Protection manager on the		
4	subject of the pretreatment facility safety.		
5	My remarks provide a perspective		
6	as both the owner and the nuclear safety		
7	regulator for the Office of River Protection		
8	with respect to the evolving safety control		
9	strategy for the pretreatment facility during		
10	the 2009 to 2010 time period.		
11	Bechtel National Incorporated, the		
12	contracted design authority for the waste		
13	treatment plant, developed key changes		
14	affecting the safety bases that were approved		
15	by the Office of River Protection. They		
16	reflect an expected evolution with iteration		
17	between the design and safety analysis		
18	processes to ensure reliable fulfillment of		
19	the facility's mission.		
20	I believe the changes will yield a		
21	superior design and improve the overall safety		
22	of the pretreatment facility and comply with		

		Page	25
1	DOE's safety policies. In late 2008, I		
2	requested a summary of the design changes that		
3	had been developed to implement conservative		
4	design criteria established in April 2006 to		
5	address hydrogen and piping in ancillary		
6	vessels, HPAV, principally involving the		
7	addition of active preventative safety		
8	controls.		
9	That effort identified a		
10	significant number of HPAV safety controls in		
11	the pretreatment facility with the majority		
12	being active controls, such as fresh or vent		
13	systems, pump timers, and over 70 percent of		
14	them functionally classified as safety class,		
15	the highest safety classification.		
16	I judge the resulting design		
17	approach to be inconsistent with the general		
18	principle that the design should be kept		
19	simple from an operational perspective to the		
20	extent practical.		
21	I understood that these HPAV		
22	controls, and the many safety class controls,		

Γ

		Page	26
1	were being driven by conservative design		
2	criteria set in prior years to address		
3	uncertainty in the hazard characteristics of		
4	the waste to be processed in the facility,		
5	including both the waste hazard		
б	characteristics referred to as the material at		
7	risk, or MAR, and the generation of		
8	combustible hydrogen in the pretreatment		
9	facility waste piping systems.		
10	These conservative requirements		
11	drove an evolving design of increasing		
12	complexity. For example, high point vents on		
13	piping systems involve waste and gas		
14	interfaces that would be difficult to maintain		
15	during operations. And many hazardous waste		
16	components needed to be installed in protected		
17	bulges in the corridors outside the hot cell		
18	walls due to overcrowding in the hot cells.		
19	Black cells contain only passive		
20	components, which will not be accessed once		
21	the facility goes operational, while the hot		
22	cells contain the active components, which		

1	will be accessed for maintenance via remote
2	handling equipment. The bulges are designed
3	to ensure worker protection, but they entail
4	increased risk of inadvertent worker exposures
5	to hazardous chemical vapors and radiological
6	hazards than if they had been included in the
7	hot cell area as originally intended.
8	I request a comparison with the
9	most comparable facilities in the EM
10	[Environmental Management] complex, the
11	defense waste processing facility, and the
12	salt waste processing facility at Savannah
13	River, that has double the curie content of
14	Hanford's tank waste, and found that while
15	hazards were generally comparable, neither
16	facility required a similar large number of
17	active preventative systems for combustible
18	gas and piping, or more than a few safety
19	class systems.
20	I recognize, however, that changes
21	at this stage of the project must be taken
22	with due diligence. Therefore, working with

Page 28 Bechtel National, we convened expert teams to 1 2 review the waste treatment plant material at 3 risk, the HPAV design approach, and the operational implications of such a large 4 5 number of controls. 6 The teams were chartered to assess 7 whether changes were warranted and whether 8 practical alternatives were available. The 9 teams recommended changes in the design specification for the MAR to align with the 10 11 waste treatment plant design requirements with 12 the 2003 tank farms' documented safety bases assumptions that relied on characterization 13 14 data from actual tank waste at the tank farms. The teams also recommended an 15 16 alternate strategy for dealing with hydrogen 17 that is generated when radioactive waste is present in the pretreatment facility piping 18 19 This recommendation drew upon the systems. 20 results of the project's analysis and testing 21 program from the 2006 to the 2009 time period. 22 After reviewing the team

		Page	29
1	recommendations, the Office of River		
2	Protection, working with BNI [Bechtel National		
3	Incorporated], required them to prepare the		
4	technical submittals and the safety bases		
5	change package to implement these		
б	recommendations, simplifying the design where		
7	justified, while ensuring a facility that		
8	meets DOE's safety requirements.		
9	Following presentation of		
10	initially proposed changes to the Defense		
11	Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in the summer		
12	of 2009, the project incorporated their		
13	feedback, and Bechtel National submitted the		
14	change package to the Office of River		
15	Protection late in 2009.		
16	I approved the change in MAR and		
17	functional classification of structures,		
18	systems, and components on November 2, 2009,		
19	and the change in HPAV design criteria on		
20	February 15, 2010. Both bases of approval		
21	approvals are documented in corresponding		
22	safety evaluation reports.		

		Page
1	The approved criteria address	
2	Bechtel National's plan to use quantitative	
3	risk analysis to identify route-specific	
4	loading conditions from potential hydrogen	
5	events for design. The QRA [Quantitative Risk	
6	Analysis], quantitative risk analysis, was	
7	approved as a design tool, recognizing that	
8	the existing safety analysis assumed various	
9	piping boundary failures could occur as a	
10	result of hydrogen combustion and selected	
11	appropriate mitigative controls, namely the C5	
12	boundary and filtered ventilation systems.	
13	The acceptability of the QRA as	
14	part of the methodology for compliance with 10	
15	CFR 830 [Code of Federal Regulations] is	
16	expected to be confirmed. In an effort to	
17	resolve technical issues expressed by the	
18	Board, comprehensive, independent expert-based	
19	review of the safety design strategy for	
20	control of hydrogen pipes was commissioned.	
21	This led to the formation of the HPAV	
22	independent review team.	

Page 31 The HPAV independent review team 1 2 endorsed the plan's design approach, subject to resolution of their findings. 3 Bechtel 4 National has prepared a closure plan, and the 5 Department of Energy waste treatment plant has 6 approved this plan. 7 Once the findings are addressed, 8 the HPAV independent review team concludes 9 that the net result of this approach to design will be a low probability of pipe failure if 10 hydrogen explosions occur. One additional 11 12 conclusion of the HPAV independent review team experts was that the austenitic stainless 13 14 steel used in the waste treatment plant piping 15 systems would not fragment explosively, even if loaded to failure. 16 17 Bechtel National experts confirmed 18 this conclusion for both piping and in-line 19 components fabricated from austenitic 20 stainless steel and the Office of River 21 Protection directed that such fragmentation 22 should no longer be assumed to be credible.

Page 32 This change simplifies some 1 2 designs permitting the shortening of long dead legs in the ultrafiltration loop, for example, 3 4 and thereby reducing the potential for 5 significant combustible gas accumulation. 6 Bechtel National is now resolving 7 the HPAV independent review team findings and 8 finalizing the tools to implement the new HPAV 9 strategy. Only after those tools are applied will we know the extent to which the piping 10 design can be simplified, although preliminary 11 12 results lead Bechtel National to conclude that 13 many pipe routes will be shown to meet the new 14 criteria. Once the design is complete, the 15 16 project will focus on ensuring safe and 17 reliable facility operation with a resulting 18 mix of active and passive HPAV controls. 19 My bases for approval is that both 20 the MAR change and the new HPAV design 21 approach will yield a superior design and 22 improve the overall safety of the pretreatment

		Page	33
1	facility that complies with DOE's safety		
2	policy. Together they ensure the operational		
3	reliability necessary for efficient		
4	achievement of the critical waste		
5	stabilization mission of the facility.		
б	Thank you very much for your time.		
7	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Thank you, Mr.		
8	Brockman and Ms. Olinger, for those comments.		
9	The session will continue with		
10	testimony offered by members of the Board		
11	staff. I ask each member who offers testimony		
12	to begin by stating his name and position for		
13	the record.		
14	MR. KASDORF: Good evening, Mr.		
15	Chairman, members of the Board. My name is		
16	Roy Kasdorf. With me is Mr. Steven Stokes,		
17	the staff lead for WTP. I am the lead for the		
18	Board's nuclear facilities design and		
19	infrastructure group. I am responsible for		
20	ensuring that staff reviews of the design and		
21	construction of the waste treatment plant, and		
22	the immobilization plant, are completely		

Page 34 consistent with the Board's mission. 1 2 In this evening's meeting, the 3 Board is considering safety-related aspects of 4 the pretreatment facilities design and 5 operation. The staff will discuss the DOE's 6 changes with the assumed material -- assumed 7 radioactive material at risk and the resulting 8 changes in the design and safety basis for the 9 WTP. As I indicated in this morning's 10 11 meeting, for the past eight years the Board 12 staff has been reviewing the WTP pretreatment 13 facility design and safety basis development. 14 The staff recognizes that the operation of the WTP is vital to the remediation of the Hanford 15 16 site. 17 The WTP is the primary means for 18 reducing the risk resulting from storage of 19 high level radioactive waste in the Hanford 20 waste tanks. As such, the Board staff 21 recognizes that the WTP must operate 22 efficiently and safely over the entire

		Page
1	duration of its multi-decade mission.	
2	The staff's concerns fundamentally	
3	relate to safety issues, but many of the	
4	safety issues would result in significant	
5	operational problems, such as the buildup of	
6	material and vessels plugging/bursting the	
7	pipes.	
8	There are several unique	
9	challenges in the WTP design and construction	
10	which complicate DOE's design effort and	
11	underlie the staff's safety concerns. First,	
12	the WTP is a one-of-a-kind facility. The	
13	design of this facility is complicated, and	
14	DOE and its contractors have chosen to use	
15	several unproven technologies. For example,	
16	pulse jet mixers are unproven in their ability	
17	to mix the types and variety of wastes that	
18	will be processed in WTP.	
19	Second, the chemistry in Hanford's	
20	high level waste is extremely complicated and	
21	variable. The hazards in treatment and	
22	processing of the waste are different from	

		Page	36
1	those encountered in storing the waste in the		
2	tank farms, and will remain challenging over		
3	the life of the WTP operation.		
4	For example, the WTP wastes are		
5	heated to near boiling to aid in leaching		
6	aluminum, and solids are concentrated to the		
7	maximum extent possible to optimize loading of		
8	the high level waste class logs.		
9	Third, characterization of the		
10	Hanford's waste tanks tank waste is		
11	difficult and expensive and time-consuming.		
12	The range and distribution of particle size,		
13	density of the high level waste solids are		
14	uncertain, particularly with regard to		
15	plutonium solids. The lack of adequate		
16	characterization of plutonium solids has		
17	complicated the development of WTP's		
18	criticality controls.		
19	These challenges lead to increased		
20	uncertainty risk in the design. DOE routinely		
21	accepts and manages risk during design and		
22	construction, but in this case they have		
1 accepted risks that will not be resolved until 2 after WTP has been constructed and is being 3 operated. For example, waste will not be 4 retrieved and prequalified by the tank farm's 5 operating contractor until six months before 6 the waste batch is due to be shipped to the 7 waste treatment plant.

8 Some of this risk and uncertainty 9 was previously accounted for by the DOE's use 10 of the supertank model to specify the bounding 11 waste for the basis of WTP's design. But the 12 supertank design approach has been abandoned 13 in favor of the reduced MAR strategy.

14 A consequence of abandoning the 15 supertank design approach is that DOE will be 16 required to accept more risk due to 17 uncertainty related to the characterization of 18 tank waste, which increases the potential that 19 WTP may not be able to accept all tank waste. 20 DOE elected to begin building the 21 WTP facilities ahead of completing the final 22 design. This design approach places

additional burden on both the contractor and 1 2 DOE and exacerbates problems regarding 3 management of project risk given uncertain and 4 incomplete design information. 5 Although DOE and BNI have 6 developed processes to minimize the impacts 7 from building the WTP ahead of the design 8 completion, design and safety-related issues 9 continue to impact the project's costs and This fact places further pressure 10 schedule. on DOE and BNI as they move forward -- move 11 the design and construction forward and accept 12 13 risks that are normally resolved prior to 14 beginning construction. 15 In late 2008, DOE was becoming 16 concerned that the plant was going to be too 17 complex to operate safely. At that time, the 18 design of the pretreatment facility was more 19 than two-thirds complete and construction was 20 about one-forth complete. 21 In February 2009, DOE informed the 22 Board that they had concluded that the WTP

1	accident analysis and resulting complexity and
2	safety-related systems were severely impacting
3	the potential operability of WTP.
4	The staff has attempted to
5	understand the basis for DOE's statements
6	regarding design complexity but has been
7	unable to substantiate DOE's position. The
8	staff does not believe complexity issues will
9	become clearer until the project develops
10	operating procedures and technical safety
11	requirements to support its safety basis. At
12	this time, the project has not developed these
13	documents.
14	In response to Board questions in
15	preparation for this meeting, DOE stated that
16	they did not make a formal determination that
17	the plant would be too complex to operate.
18	However, many of the discussions with DOE
19	surrounding the revised hydrogen control
20	safety strategy suggests that operational
21	complexity was and remains a concern for the
22	project.

		Page
1	DOE initiated an effort to resolve	
2	concerns with complexity of the plant. DOE	
3	believed that they could reduce the assumed	
4	MAR and could eliminate unnecessary	
5	conservatism in the design by reanalyzing the	
6	hazards and reducing unmitigated consequences.	
7	They tasked BNI to eliminate	
8	unnecessary conservatism by reevaluating	
9	selected assumptions and methods used in the	
10	accident analysis for seismic and hydrogen	
11	explosion events for WTP.	
12	Based on the reduction in the	
13	assumed MAR, and the perceived need to reduce	
14	complexity, DOE suggested that all safety	
15	class controls could be removed from the	
16	design. In February 2009, the DOE informed	
17	the Board that a review of the MAR would focus	
18	on removing unnecessary conservatism and that	
19	a revised safety analysis would provide a	
20	fresh look at the accident scenarios, the	
21	accident analysis, and the safety-related	
22	engineered controls.	

Page 41 The staff was not concerned with 1 2 removing conservatism in the MAR assumptions. However, the staff did raise a concern that 3 4 this could potentially put more requirements 5 on the tank farm contractor who would now have 6 to ensure that the waste being received to the 7 -- delivered to the WTP did not exceed the new 8 MAR limits, a tighter waste acceptance 9 criteria. In May 2009, BNI revised the 10 severity level calculation -- this is BNI's 11 12 term for an unmitigated accident analysis --13 for the pretreatment facility. The staff 14 noted that the unmitigated consequences to the public had decreased well beyond what could be 15 16 accounted for by a reduction in the MAR. The staff found that BNI had not 17 18 only changed the MAR but had made other 19 changes to the accident analysis. The Board 20 communicated its concern to DOE and Congress 21 in the Board's December 2009 quarterly report 22 to Congress stating, "While the Board does not

		Ρa
1	question reducing the MAR, the Board's review	
2	found that the contractor made other non-MAR-	
3	related changes to the severity level	
4	calculations that may have inappropriately	
5	reduced the calculated consequences of	
б	accidents."	
7	Since that time, the Board staff	
8	and DOE have resolved most of the concerns	
9	identified in May 2009. As a result, DOE has	
10	decided not to reclassify several safety class	
11	systems. DOE realized that they must remain	
12	safety class.	
13	Key safety class controls that	
14	remain are the active confinement ventilation	
15	system for the facility and the ventilation	
16	systems for the process vessels.	
17	However, several concerns remain	
18	unresolved the values selected for	
19	deposition velocity, which is a parameter used	
20	to estimate how much radioactive material	
21	reaches the public following an accidental	
22	release of material, the calculational	

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

# Page 42

1	methodology used in determining consequences
2	from spray leak consequences from piping
3	system spray leaks, the safety design strategy
4	for the pretreatment facility primary
5	confinement, and the design requirements for
6	mitigation of hydrogen controls in the piping
7	systems.
8	The Board informed DOE that the
9	value of deposition velocity established in
10	DOE guidance is not reasonably conservative
11	for the Hanford site and the WTP waste. The
12	result this results in underpredicting the
13	unmitigated doses to the public by about a
14	factor of four.
15	DOE briefed the Board last month,
16	indicating they now agree that the specified
17	deposition velocity of one centimeter per
18	second used by WTP is not technically correct.
19	However, DOE asserts that there is sufficient
20	conservatism in other aspects of the analysis
21	to offset this lack of conservatism.
22	The staff does not understand the

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

# Page 43

		Page	44
1	technical basis for this assertion and		
2	continues to believe that the project should		
3	use a reasonably conservative value, between		
4	0.1 centimeter per second and 0.3 centimeters		
5	per second, for deposition velocity.		
6	After reviewing WTP's severity		
7	revised severity level calculations, the Board		
8	staff raised concerns regarding the		
9	calculation methods used to determine the		
10	unmitigated dose consequences due to spray		
11	leaks for the WTP process piping.		
12	Subsequently, DOE's experts		
13	acknowledged that DOE's guidelines governing		
14	spray leak analysis may not be conservative		
15	when applied to WTP. As a result, BNI		
16	developed a WTP-specific method for the		
17	analysis of spray leaks.		
18	Depending on the input parameters		
19	selected, BNI calculated unmitigated dose		
20	consequences to the public ranged from a few		
21	millirem to 80 rem, well above the WTP		
22	evaluation guideline of five rem used for		

		Page	45
1	defining the need for safety class controls.		
2	BNI concluded that the unmitigated		
3	dose to the public would be would be		
4	expected to be much less than one rem for		
5	spray leaks in the WTP based on what BNI		
6	believes are reasonable input parameters into		
7	their equations.		
8	BNI has also concluded that		
9	uncertainties exist in their method		
10	selected methodology, which could easily cause		
11	the predicted consequences to the public to		
12	approach the five rem WTP evaluation		
13	guideline. However, BNI's analysis did not		
14	consider the lower value of deposition		
15	velocity that the Board believes is justified		
16	for use at WTP.		
17	Ultimately, the public doses to		
18	the public the potential doses to the		
19	public could rise to be above the five rem WTP		
20	threshold, which would require safety class		
21	controls for protection of the public. DOE		
22	has selected safety class confinement		

		Page	46
1	ventilation system and facility structure as		_ •
2	the primary means of protecting the public		
3	from the release of radioactive materials from		
4	process piping and in-line components.		
5	When compared to an approach that		
б	credits the integrity of the piping and the		
7	in-line components, DOE's approach would allow		
8	a less robust design for the piping and in-		
9	line components.		
10	The Board staff evaluated the		
11	impact of DOE's approach on piping and in-line		
12	components in both the black cells and the hot		
13	cell. In the black cells, the piping and		
14	vessels are all welded construction and are		
15	required to meet the more rigorous seismic		
16	design criteria. In effect, the black cell		
17	design requirements are equivalent to a safety		
18	class design.		
19	However, the Board staff believes		
20	that the WTP's design for hot cell piping is		
21	less robust. Further, we do not believe the		
22	design is consistent with DOE's policy on		

		Pa
1	defense in depth identified in DOE's standard	
2	for documented safety analysis, which states	
3	in part, "For high hazards operations, there	
4	are typically multiple layers of defense in	
5	depth. The inner layer of defense in depth	
6	relies upon a high level of design quality, so	
7	that important systems, structures, and	
8	components will perform their required	
9	functions with high reliability and high	
10	tolerance against degradation."	
11	We interpret this to mean that the	
12	primary boundary the piping system	
13	should be designed to a high level of design	
14	quality consistent with the safety	
15	classification. This is also consistent with	
16	DOE's Order 420.1, Facility Safety, and its	
17	guides, which specify that the usual safety	
18	function of process equipment is to provide	
19	primary confinement and prevent or mitigate	
20	radioactive material releases, and further	
21	specifies that priority be given to	
22	establishing safety controls closest to the	

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

# Page 47

Page 48 hazard. 1 2 DOE is conceptually relying on a single barrier -- the building and its 3 4 ventilation system -- to mitigate the 5 consequences from a spray leak. Further, DOE 6 has not considered the hazards to the worker 7 having to clean up and decontaminate the 8 facility following a significant leak. 9 Typically for new facilities 10 releases are prevented by designing the 11 vessels and piping systems to withstand potential accidents. However, the proposed --12 13 the approach proposed by BNI and DOE would 14 limit the potential release by isolating the 15 potentially breached piping system from the vessels following an accident. 16 17 While this design approach can be 18 acceptable, the staff believes it is inferior 19 to designing the piping system to withstand 20 possible accidents. 21 DOE's hydrogen controls are 22 intended to prevent an explosion in process

		Ρa
1	vessels by retaining safety class process	
2	ventilation systems. The process piping and	
3	in-line components, DOE's design criteria, now	
4	specify that hydrogen explosions can be	
5	contained by the process piping or prevented,	
6	but would allow in-line components, which are	
7	part of the primary boundary, to leak.	
8	The Board staff believes that DOE	
9	should classify the safety function performed	
10	by the primary piping system boundary based on	
11	potential consequences from a release of	
12	material to the public or the co-located	
13	worker. As I indicated earlier, the Board	
14	staff believes that the design requirements	
15	specified for black cell vessels and piping	
16	system are adequate.	
17	However, in the hot cell piping	
18	system, the design requirements are less	
19	robust. They allow permanent deformation of	
20	a pipe due to an explosion, allow some	
21	leakage, and rely upon leak detection to	
22	minimize the consequences of potential	

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

# Page 49

Page 50 failures of piping and components. 1 2 At this time, the staff has not 3 been provided any demonstration or analysis 4 that proves that leaks can be detected 5 adequately to allow timely mitigation actions, 6 particularly for leaks involving thick, non-7 Newtonian waste. As such, the staff is not able to determine the leak detection 8 9 capabilities will work and a suitable evaluation of BNI's proposal cannot be 10 11 completed. 12 Now I would like to briefly 13 discuss the incorporation of safety controls 14 into the preliminary documented safety analysis, the PDSA [Preliminary Documented 15 16 Safety Analysis]. BNI has yet to determine if 17 the recent changes resulting from the 18 preliminary -- from the pretreatment safety 19 control strategy can be effectively 20 implemented into the PDSA in the form of 21 technical safety requirements. 22 This concern is particularly

		Page	51
1	applicable to the revised hydrogen design		
2	safety control strategy. The hydrogen		
3	accident scenarios and associated safety		
4	controls will be discussed in depth in		
5	tomorrow morning's meeting and hearing.		
6	At issue in today's session is how		
7	safety controls can be implemented into the		
8	PDSA. DOE and BNI have chosen to use a		
9	quantitative risk analysis, a QRA, as both a		
10	design and a safety evaluation tool for piping		
11	systems subject to hydrogen accidents. The		
12	use of the QRA for this purpose is		
13	unprecedented in DOE.		
14	DOE and BNI have to date invested		
15	very little effort in ensuring that the		
16	hydrogen control design strategy can be		
17	successfully implemented into the WTP safety		
18	analysis. The Board staff believes that since		
19	the use of QRA for the design of piping		
20	systems is new to DOE, great care must be		
21	taken in its development to ensure that the		
22	resulting PDSA meets DOE requirements.		

This demands that the safety-1 2 related controls related to the use of QRAs be 3 developed as soon as possible. This will 4 ensure that the requirements for formulation 5 of technical safety requirements can be 6 implemented. 7 There are also other issues that 8 impact the development of the pretreatment 9 facility safety basis. Even though the pretreatment facility design is about 80 10 percent complete, DOE has not established the 11 12 final flow sheet or completed the comprehensive hazards analysis. Both of these 13 14 should have been completed much earlier in the 15 design process, particularly considering the 16 design-build nature of the WTP project. BNI and DOE must establish the 17 18 pretreatment facility flow sheet, complete the 19 comprehensive hazards analysis, and 20 demonstrate that the proposed safety 21 strategies can be successfully implemented 22 into the PDSA or risk late changes in the

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## Page 52

Page 53 pretreatment facility design that will unduly 1 2 delay the project. 3 That concludes my prepared 4 comments, and we will try to answer any 5 questions the Board may have. 6 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Do the Board 7 members have any questions? 8 (No response.) 9 If not, I now invite the panel of witnesses from the Department of Energy and 10 11 its contractor organizations to take their 12 These witnesses are -- Dr. Ines Triay seats. 13 is the Assistant Secretary for Energy for 14 Environmental Management, Mr. David Brockman is the Manager of DOE's Office of River 15 16 Protection, Mr. Dale Knutson is the Federal 17 Project Director for the Waste Treatment 18 Plant, Mr. Frank Russo is the Bechtel Project 19 Director for the Waste Treatment Plant, Mr. 20 Greg Ashley is the Bechtel Engineering 21 Director for the Waste Treatment Plant, Mr. 22 Leo Sain is the URS Executive Vice President

		Page	54
1	for Performance Assurance and Operations, and		
2	Ms. Donna Busche is the URS Nuclear Safety		
3	Manager for the Waste Treatment Plant.		
4	Does any member of the panel wish		
5	to submit written testimony? We have a lot of		
6	material to cover this at this hearing.		
7	The Board has chosen these panelists carefully		
8	and requests that panelists alone answer		
9	questions that are directed to them to the		
10	best of their ability.		
11	If a panelist would like to take a		
12	question for the record, their answer to that		
13	question will be entered into the record of		
14	this hearing at a later time.		
15	Thank you for being here this		
16	evening. And with that, we will begin the		
17	panel session with a question from Ms.		
18	Roberson.		
19	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Good		
20	evening. I would like to start out can you		
21	hear me now?		
22	Good evening. I'd like to start		

		Page
1	out with a question to Ms. Busche. Ms.	
2	Busche, is the preliminary documented safety	
3	analysis and addendums, and the safety	
4	requirements document and the design,	
5	consistently reflecting the same safety	
б	strategy right now?	
7	MS. BUSCHE: The current PDSA and	
8	the design are consistent. The PDSA addendum,	
9	which has not been completely approved we	
10	had some conditions of approval that were	
11	finalizing just some actions. So the design	
12	has not been modified to reflect any changes	
13	in the PDSA addendum, which I think was the	
14	heart of the MAR and the HPAV lead-in by Mr.	
15	Kasdorf.	
16	So it is consistent with the	
17	current approved DOE PDSA and safety	
18	requirements document. But the safety	
19	requirements document did modify some hydrogen	
20	and pipe criteria. That has not gone forward	
21	yet.	
22	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay.	

Page 56 MS. BUSCHE: From a design 1 2 perspective, is my understanding. 3 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: But your 4 organization reviews all of these changes for 5 impact on safety before they are approved or 6 submitted to DOE, is that right? Any change 7 that might affect safety, does your 8 organization review those and analyze the 9 impact? 10 MS. BUSCHE: My organization does 11 review engineering design changes, yes, ma'am. 12 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. Okay. 13 In the context of those changes, I guess I 14 really need to ask you, from a safety 15 perspective or an ability to produce a safety 16 basis for this facility, are there any 17 specific areas of focus or concern from you as 18 the project continues on? 19 MS. BUSCHE: In the pretreatment 20 facility, we have several known technical 21 issues that have been identified through one 22 or more of our various processes.

		Page	57
1	Recently, as we have done just a		
2	routine update to our baseline and some		
3	refined planning, we have identified key		
4	issues like resolution now and implementation		
5	of mixing. Because we have just now completed		
6	M3 [Major Issue 3], that has not been carried		
7	forward into the PDSA addendum, PDSA or design		
8	yet, resolution of HPAV, and some other minor		
9	ones, but it's a pretty substantial effort to		
10	resolve those technical issues.		
11	And some of the planning that my		
12	organization has worked with engineering and		
13	we have put in the hours that we need to		
14	systematically evaluate from an integrated		
15	perspective any of those final design changes		
16	starting with what's the hazards analysis that		
17	would feed and integrate in with that with		
18	the next iteration based on how we resolve		
19	those issues.		
20	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: So other		
21	than mixing and HPAV, are there any others?		
22	MS. BUSCHE: We have other		

		Page	58
1	technical issues that didn't rise to that		
2	level, but we know we have to resolve. For		
3	example, C5-V, as identified earlier, is a		
4	safety class structure, system, and component.		
5	Okay?		
6	Given the resolution of comments		
7	from the spray leak methodology, we now have		
8	known performance issues based on the		
9	methodology that we have chosen. So we have		
10	identified the technical issue of areas where		
11	we may need to go out and get additional		
12	information to help us demonstrate when we		
13	write Chapter 4 of the final DSA [Documented		
14	Safety Analysis] that that confinement		
15	ventilation system will perform its intended		
16	safety function and how it will do so.		
17	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Are there		
18	any others?		
19	MS. BUSCHE: I think there has		
20	been enough discussion on the project on the		
21	overall confinement strategy. We have		
22	clearly, we have what is documented in the		

		Page	59
1	PDSA and the PDSA addendum, but I think spray		
2	leaks has brought in, due to the results of		
3	that methodology, some questions on the		
4	overall safety design strategy for both the		
5	aerosolized portion of that and the liquid		
6	portion of that.		
7	I wouldn't elevate those to the		
8	same level. I think that would be handled		
9	very typically through a normal iteration on		
10	any design-build project.		
11	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Why is it		
12	appropriate to be completing the comprehensive		
13	risk analysis, hazards analysis, at this		
14	point? What is driving that?		
15	MS. BUSCHE: I don't want to		
16	suppose. We have what we call an integrated		
17	safety management process where engineering		
18	and nuclear safety review the hazards analysis		
19	at a certain point in the design. Pretreat is		
20	a very complicated facility, and we have seen		
21	several examples, and they range in degrees		
22	of, you know, I think either complexity or		

Page 60 safety significance. 1 2 But when we looked at the 3 collective set of that, I think my 4 organization took pause and worked with engineering and says, "You know, we may have 5 6 individual answers. We myopically analyze 7 this engineering design and this engineering 8 design. But we have some discomfort or 9 uncomfortableness with the ability to have integrated that across to be able to establish 10 11 a final control strategy -- and this is my terminology -- "that was licensable and 12 commissionable." 13 14 So we need to have consistency in 15 how we analyze hazards and how we structure 16 that hierarchy and layers of defense in depth, as Mr. Kasdorf has identified. 17 18 So a systematic evaluation of 19 hazards is -- it's on the project. We are 20 actually planning it, and we are going to be 21 -- we have started initiating some of the 22 preliminary work we need to do to actually

		Page	61
1	conduct those hazards analysis.		
2	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Mr.		
3	Brockman, you are the safety basis authority		
4	for WTP and for the tank farms, right?		
5	Correct?		
6	MR. BROCKMAN: I am.		
7	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. In		
8	the SER [Safety Evaluation Report] that ORP		
9	[Office of River Protection] approved, and its		
10	owners' perspective attached to it, you		
11	describe the basis for the reduction in		
12	conservatism and why it was warranted. And		
13	you and Ms. Olinger really just went back		
14	through that in your statement.		
15	I guess what I'd ask you to do is		
16	to categorize what those changes not I		
17	understand bulges, and I mean bulges are		
18	designed from a safety perspective, but the		
19	drivers for that. Is that question clear?		
20	One was simplicity; I got that.		
21	MR. BROCKMAN: Yes.		
22	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Another was		

		Page	62
1	for facility reliability. Is that correct?		
2	I think that's what		
3	MR. BROCKMAN: That's		
4	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: what you		
5	guys said. Another was to reduce potential		
6	worker safety risk, right? Is that correct?		
7	MR. BROCKMAN: Correct.		
8	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Was there		
9	another that I missed?		
10	MR. BROCKMAN: I didn't make those		
11	decisions. But to me, just simply learning		
12	more about the effects of hydrating and when		
13	there is a deflagration or detonation or in		
14	between, it just seems prudent to make sure		
15	that that's well understood. And I think that		
16	the testing that has been done has really		
17	enhanced our understanding of that, and has		
18	allowed us to lead to changes that accomplish		
19	some of those things that you just discussed.		
20	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. So I		
21	think we are going to through the course of		
22	this hearing we will probably deep dive into		

		Page	63
1	a lot of those elements that you guys cited in		
2	your opening statement.		
3	But what I'd like to do is elevate		
4	a little bit and try to make sure we		
5	understand the managerial decisionmaking		
6	process. Okay. And I'm going to ask you		
7	you're the safety basis expert here I'm		
8	going to ask you to help me through this.		
9	When constructing your safety		
10	basis, what are you trying to protect, okay,		
11	generally?		
12	MS. BUSCHE: Generally, in		
13	constructing a safety analysis for any nuclear		
14	facility, the intent is to look at the breadth		
15	and depth of potential upset accidents and		
16	operational events, establish a hierarchy of		
17	controls and nuclear safety control strategy		
18	that can be implemented in a set of technical		
19	safety requirements and implemented in the		
20	field for limiting conditions for normal		
21	operations.		
22	So you analyze all of the various		

		Page
1	machinations of what could go wrong, and then	
2	you set controls at a much lower level so that	
3	it really never happens. That's my	
4	vernacular.	
5	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: So, but you	
6	establish some margin and correct me if I'm	
7	wrong you have you establish for	
8	instance, we have spent a lot of time talking	
9	about design parameters today. You establish	
10	your design at some level above what has been	
11	evaluated as failure modes	
12	MS. BUSCHE: Correct.	
13	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: based on	
14	material or components, right?	
15	MS. BUSCHE: Correct.	
16	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: And then, at	
17	that design level, you integrate and evaluate	
18	the protection you need and you establish a	
19	safety basis for operating. Is that correct?	
20	MS. BUSCHE: Correct.	
21	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. And	
22	so the question I have, when you remove	

Page 65 conservatism out of the design, naturally you 1 2 remove conservatism out of your --3 MS. BUSCHE: Correct. 4 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: -- operating 5 envelope, is that correct? 6 MS. BUSCHE: Correct. 7 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. Is it 8 -- let me ask this. I think I've already made 9 this point. So the key parameters of your 10 safety basis will be designed to protect that specific operation. 11 12 MS. BUSCHE: Correct. 13 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. So, 14 Mr. Brockman, generally speaking, you apply 15 the same thought process in approving the 16 safety basis for the tank farm and for the 17 WTP, right? Because DOE safety requirements, 18 you have used the same --19 MR. BROCKMAN: I would. 20 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: You would. 21 MR. BROCKMAN: I have not applied 22 it. I would.

		Page	66
1	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Right. So		
2	let me just and the WTP is being built to		
3	remedy a hazard that now exists in the tank		
4	farm, right?		
5	MR. BROCKMAN: That's correct.		
6	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Is that		
7	right? That's the purpose of this		
8	MR. BROCKMAN: That's correct.		
9	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: So, Mr. Sain		
10			
11	MR. SAIN: Yes, ma'am.		
12	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: I'm going		
13	to say something, and I'm going to ask you		
14	I don't know how to ask it in a question, and		
15	it's not intended to be provocative. But I		
16	would describe the tank farm as operationally		
17	fragile. Is that an unreasonable		
18	characterization?		
19	MR. SAIN: I don't think so.		
20	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Tell me why.		
21	MR. SAIN: Well, it's, you know,		
22	very old. It has been around a long time. We		

Г

Page 67 know we have had tanks that have leaked. 1 2 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: So you have 3 agreed with the assertion. 4 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Everything 5 you said. 6 MR. SAIN: Well, I'm not sure what 7 the assertion is. 8 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. 9 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: That the tank 10 farm is fragile, the operation. Was that 11 correct, Ms. Roberson? 12 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: That's 13 correct, yes. 14 MR. SAIN: Well, I'm agreeing that 15 it's a hazard, a high hazard. And we're 16 dealing with, you know, tanks, as I said, that 17 have been around a long time. And the real 18 goal is to go treat that waste on the tanks. 19 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Absolutely. 20 Absolutely. 21 Well, let me say I characterize a 22 tank farm as historically fragile, and I don't

		Page	68
1	mean five years ago or last year, I mean this		
2	week. I mean, your team is surprised by what		
3	they find, and it found the evaporating within		
4	the last two weeks.		
5	You are going through an		
б	improvement plan for conduct of ops, and I		
7	have to say at least the four contractors		
8	before you have gone through the same cycle.		
9	It has a history of operational fragility.		
10	The key to my question, my concern		
11	here, is more or less whose job is it, and		
12	what consideration was given? Because it		
13	appears to me when you remove conservatism		
14	from this brand-new facility that you are		
15	designing, and increase the worker		
16	transactions in this 70-year old facility that		
17	is clearly fragile that's why we want to		
18	get stuff out who where does the		
19	decisionmaking occur to balance the		
20	consequences of those decisions? That's my		
21	question.		
22	MR. BROCKMAN: I will attempt to		

		Page	69
1	give you my response to that, or I will give		
2	you my response to that. That occurs in my		
3	office, and in the new federal project		
4	director's office now we have the integration		
5	person. We are looking to that person.		
6	But this mission that the Office		
7	of River Protection is on is to treat that		
8	waste, is a whole mission. It is a system in		
9	itself, and it isn't just tanks and it isn't		
10	just waste treatment plant. And it may		
11	include some additional facilities or systems		
12	that have to be built to accomplish our		
13	mission.		
14	And we, my office, as well as the		
15	waste treatment WTP project manager, have to		
16	do what you just described. We have to		
17	balance, because our goal is to treat that		
18	waste and to optimize the life cycle cost and		
19	schedule to treat that waste, doing it safely.		
20	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: And I		
21	understand that is the goal. I guess what I'm		
22	asking is it isn't transparent that that		

		Page	70
1	occurred, and that's really my question.		
2	Clearly, increased transactions in the tank		
3	farm increase the potential for worker risk in		
4	the tank farms.		
5	What consideration was given to		
6	balance the decrease in worker risk in WTP to		
7	that in a tank farm? And why was one		
8	considered more valuable or meaningful than		
9	the other?		
10	MR. BROCKMAN: Well, I believe		
11	that our tank farm operations can be done		
12	safely. And if we need to do additional		
13	operations, or additional facilities need to		
14	built and operated, that we they won't be		
15	operated at an unacceptable level of risk.		
16	There is an improvement program		
17	going on in the tank farms. The		
18	infrastructure is old, but we are spending		
19	money to improve that with just exactly that		
20	concept in mind, that the operations over		
21	there have to be done safely. We don't have		
22	room that they be done less safe than the		

Page 71

waste treatment plant operations. 1 2 MR. KNUTSON: There has also been 3 an important part of this conversation that 4 needs to be very clear for the record, and 5 that is that there is not an inherent 6 transition of risk to the tank farm simply 7 because the natural design progression and 8 evolution on the waste treatment plant has 9 reduced conservatism in the control selection 10 strategy or conservatism of specific elements 11 of a design. That risk is not inherently translated directly over onto the tank farms. 12 13 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: I don't see 14 how you could say that if you read the 15 responses to the questions. 16 MR. KNUTSON: Well, I don't know 17 from the perspective that you are bringing 18 what part of the questions you are mixing to 19 come to the conclusion. I don't intend to 20 challenge that, but just for the record the 21 idea that because an inherent iterative 22 process of design reduces conservatism in a

		Page	72
1	design element and WTP does not inherently		
2	translate to an increased risk statement for		
3	the operation of the tank farms.		
4	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Well, what		
5			
6	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Can I		
7	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Yes.		
8	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: and you can		
9	go? I think what we heard this morning is,		
10	you know, the WAC [Waste Acceptance Criteria]		
11	in the is going to be more restrictive now,		
12	obviously, with the reduction in MAR. And we		
13	discussed a large range of tank farm		
14	operations that can be potentially extremely		
15	challenging, controlling particle size		
16	rheology, additional blending, things of that		
17	nature.		
18	You don't believe that translates		
19	into increased risk for the tank farms, which,		
20	as we said, was some of the tanks are 60,		
21	70 years old. Transfers aren't particularly		
22	easy in the tank farms. There is the		
		Page	
----	--	------	
1	possibility for clogging, problematic events,		
2	but you don't see any relation between those		
3	two?		
4	MR. KNUTSON: I can tell you that		
5	we discussed the idea that that is all managed		
6	through an ICD-19 [Interface Control Document		
7	19], and we have accepted no changes to ICD-19		
8	that would result in something that the tank		
9	farms, as characterized, has an inherent		
10	increase in their risk or their operational		
11	risk posture.		
12	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: So nothing		
13	resulted and I'll turn it back to Ms.		
14	Roberson in additional transfers needed to		
15	be made, operations that are more complex, and		
16	stressful operations that aren't fully defined		
17	right now that you may have to perform, none		
18	of that is represented as a risk?		
19	MR. KNUTSON: I guess I don't		
20	understand the premise of your statement. But		
21	the issue is: does ICD-19 control those		
22	physical parameters and the waste feed		

Г

		Pag
1	characteristics that must be met between the	
2	tank farms and WTP? And the answer is yes.	
3	Have we modified those in a way	
4	that the tank farm operating contractor and my	
5	counterpart in tank farms have raised concerns	
б	with or have identified as substantially or	
7	significantly different than their current	
8	understanding? The answer is no.	
9	DR. TRIAY: If I may, since the	
10	everything that happens in the authorization	
11	basis phase, the Office of River Protection	
12	receives oversight from the Environmental	
13	Management Headquarters Office, I would like	
14	to make two comments.	
15	First, to ensure that we move to	
16	accurately reflect reality in a better	
17	estimate of the material at risk, I don't	
18	believe is correctly described as a reduction	
19	in conservatism. Conservatism is the	
20	selection about a number of supportable	
21	assumptions, not purposely selecting a known	
22	invalid assumption parameter.	

Page 75 The supertank, by definition, by 1 2 its definition, does not exist as a waste 3 stream at the tank farm. Regardless of the 4 age of the tanks, regardless of any 5 operational fragility of the tank farm, the 6 supertank is not a waste stream in the tank 7 farm. So I believe that moving into 8 expressing reality in the material at risk, 9 while still being very conservative, does not reduce the margin of safety or move risk from 10 the waste stream in plant to the tank farm. 11 12 The key, in my opinion -- and that is why in my role of oversight of the Office 13 14 of River Protection I was supportive of the decisions made by the office of River 15 16 Protection manager -- is that a complex 17 design, relying on over a thousand active 18 controls, would have higher likelihood to have an event, like hydrogen deflagration or a 19 20 detonation that active controls were trying to 21 prevent, in one case were due to worker 22 errors, and the QRA is certainly showing this.

		Page	76
1	So I truly have to say that I		
2	don't believe that the Department of Energy is		
3	moving risk from the waste treatment plant		
4	into the tank farm. Instead, I do believe		
5	that the Department of Energy is going to		
6	implement a superior design in the waste		
7	treatment plant with higher operational		
8	reliability than the current parameters		
9	utilized for the material at risk.		
10	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: So let me		
11	say to all of you, I am not challenging your		
12	intent. But when you look at added process		
13	requirements in the tank farm, you are clearly		
14	adding additional operator action in the tank		
15	farm. You are trying to remove it from WTP.		
16	So my question isn't challenging		
17	your intent. It is, was that consideration		
18	given, and where was it given? That's really		
19	what I'm asking.		
20	DR. TRIAY: I'm sure that you were		
21	not challenging our intent. My point is that		
22	it is not a matter of intent. It is a matter		

		Ρ
1	or reality. The supertank concept is not a	
2	waste stream in the tank farm. You are not	
3	adding any risk by selecting a material at	
4	risk that is defensible, that is conservative.	
5	That in no way adds any kind of risk to the	
6	tank farm.	
7	If you are referring to the fact	
8	that we need to blend or mix waste in the tank	
9	farm, we have to do that regardless of whether	
10	or not we have stayed with the super tank	
11	concept or not. So I don't see where we are	
12	adding risk to the tank farms.	
13	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: So the one	
14	thing we understand from the last section	
15	session is that ICD-19 is I guess classified	
16	as a living document now, but is changing. So	
17	there are additional requirements being added.	
18	Is that not correct? I thought that's what I	
19	understood from the last session.	
20	MR. ASHLEY: Ms. Roberson, if I	
21	could respond to that, there are not	
22	additional requirements being added to ICD-19.	

Page 77

		Page	78
1	One of the requirements has is being		
2	modified, and that is the weight percent		
3	solids that is received in the HLWP [High-		
4	Level Waste Plant] receipt vessel. That		
5	change in requirement, though, was made in		
6	concert with the tank farm, number one, to		
7	ensure that we were not adding undue burden		
8	and changing their risk profile, substantially		
9	changing their feed delivery plant. That is		
10	a change in the ICD, but it is a requirement		
11	that was previously a weight percent		
12	requirement, going from 16 weight percent to		
13	10 weight percent.		
14	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. Mr.		
15	Sain, did you want to respond?		
16	MR. SAIN: Please. When I agreed		
17	with you about fragile, I was talking about,		
18	you know, the single-shell tanks. Upgrades		
19	are being made in the tank farm		
20	infrastructure, and to me when you have a		
21	supertank concept that was, in my view,		
22	grossly overconservative, and you bring it		

I

		Page 79	9
1	down to reasonably conservative, that is not		
2	reducing or adding risk. And, in my view, at		
3	the tank farm it is not driving the tank farm		
4	to higher risk at all.		
5	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Well, your		
6	DSA was the same. You didn't		
7	MR. SAIN: Sure.		
8	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: have a		
9	supertank. I mean, it didn't change anything		
10	in the tank.		
11	MR. SAIN: All we've done is		
12	reduce the MAR to the point to balance the		
13	tank farm. So I am confused as to how that		
14	drives a tank farm into having to do more.		
15	See, one thing I hear is that,		
16	"Well, you guys now are going to have to go do		
17	a lot more characterization." Well, remember,		
18	I have lived in a tank farm, and you don't		
19	move waste anywhere unless you know what is in		
20	it. So characterizing waste, knowing what you		
21	are going to transfer, we are going to have to		
22	do even if we had stayed with the super tank		

Page 80 1 concept. 2 And, I mean, that's just a fact of life. 3 That's going to be a requirement. You're not going to be able to transfer high 4 5 level waste somewhere and not know the 6 constituents of what you've got in it. 7 I fully VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: 8 understand that. 9 MR. SAIN: Right. So --10 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: I actually 11 have a little process knowledge on this one, 12 too. 13 MR. SAIN: I know you do. 14 (Laughter.) 15 To say that it's going to impose a lot more work characterization effort on the 16 part of the tank farm, I just can't buy that. 17 18 DR. TRIAY: And we are relying, 19 Ms. Roberson, on your historical knowledge to 20 tell you that there are no added process 21 requirements on the tank farm as a result of 22 the MAR difference.

Page 81

1	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. So
2	let me tell you, one of the things that is
3	driving it one of them is the reality of
4	the operation of the tank farm that raises
5	that concern for me.
6	The other is in the response to
7	questions. I can't remember how many times
8	the response we got was, "If but, then this
9	will be a restriction on waste acceptance
10	criteria in the tank farm." So I will come
11	back to those. I want to give the floor over
12	to somebody else, but I'm probably not done
13	with this one yet.
14	DR. TRIAY: Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Did you have a
16	comment you wanted to make?
17	MR. KNUTSON: I just wanted to
18	close on that last point. I think it is
19	really important that we keep in mind that
20	this morning's discussion also identified that
21	we are talking about a very small number of
22	the overall batches that would result in some

		Page	82
1	modification of the waste acceptance criteria.		
2	And we did talk about that this morning		
3	extensively.		
4	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Thank you. One		
5	of the things I wanted to get clear about,		
6	because I heard it in your opening statement,		
7	Mr. Brockman and Ms. Olinger, as a result		
8	and nobody is arguing about the reduction in		
9	MAR is that what this led to was a superior		
10	design.		
11	And I guess I'd ask you, Ms.		
12	Busche, from a safety perspective, looking at		
13	where we have come with the revised hydrogen		
14	strategy and your need to defend it, is it		
15	obvious to you that this is a superior design		
16	in safety space?		
17	MS. BUSCHE: What I can say is the		
18	control strategy has fundamentally really not		
19	changed. What has changed, based on MAR and		
20	the revised HPAV criteria, which will include		
21	fragmentation, is reduction in the functional		
22	classification of certain SSCs, structures,		

Page 83 1 systems, and components. 2 So it may have eliminated 3 redundancy, but I will still -- when the final 4 DSA, when we write that for operations, the 5 control will still be there. The question 6 will be how to write that control for 7 implementation. It will still be there. 8 Going from safety class to safety significant, 9 the control is still there. 10 So is it a superior design? The only answer I can offer is I don't know, 11 12 because we haven't implemented the QRA. So I 13 haven't had the opportunity to evaluate any 14 potential design changes. We're not done yet. 15 We haven't completed that activity. 16 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: So it's very 17 hard to make that judgment, because you don't 18 know what you need to defend the QRA at this point, correct, in safety space? 19 20 MS. BUSCHE: That is correct. 21 What we do know in running some of the test 22 cases and examples, the QRA has afforded us an

		Page
1	opportunity to identify areas where our design	
2	was probably not the smartest way to do that,	
3	because it created a dead leg and it created	
4	a hazard.	
5	So the tool will be used to	
6	eliminate many of those hazards now that we	
7	have once it is released to refine that	
8	process. So there are some good elements to	
9	the QRA. It is the integration with nuclear	
10	safety, right, that I will still need to come	
11	to terms with and figure out how to integrate	
12	in that to the final DSA, and then for the	
13	life of the project.	
14	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Are you	
15	confident that you can support the QRA in a	
16	safety basis, that you will be able to	
17	identify the TSRs [Technical Safety	
18	Requirements] and other kinds of controls you	
19	need to implement that strategy? Are you	
20	can you definitively say that?	
21	MS. BUSCHE: I am the QRA is	
22	primarily a design tool, so I would look at	

		Page	85
1	the QRA just like I would any other		
2	engineering calculation. Consistent with		
3	3009, Appendix A, I would look at all inputs		
4	and assumptions and determine what must be		
5	protected by a technical safety requirement.		
6	Okay?		
7	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Do you think		
8	it's more complex than what the hydrogen		
9	control strategy was before the revision took		
10	place?		
11	MS. BUSCHE: I absolutely have no		
12	feel for that, because the tool is not done.		
13	I have seen previous versions. So there are		
14	things that are a change to the current PDSA.		
15	If I'm because I've written several DSAs		
16	and TSRs, so I can kind of look ahead, that		
17	aren't required today in the control strategy		
18	that may very well be required in the future.		
19	Whether it's more complex or less complex, I		
20	can't answer that question.		
21	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Well, that is		
22	kind of where I wanted to have an		

Page 86 understanding, because when we started this 1 2 discussion -- and I guess I will turn to you, 3 Mr. Brockman, and I think -- why did the 4 Department, at the end of 2008/2009, why was 5 it convinced that the design was too complex to operate reliably? 6 7 I mean, what was -- I mean, I'm 8 hearing that we're not sure that we can --9 that the safety basis is extremely difficult, or may be extremely difficult to implement as 10 a result of some of these design changes. 11 So how did you make that decision? 12 MR. BROCKMAN: I did not make that 13 14 decision. I wasn't there at the time. 15 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Well --16 MR. BROCKMAN: I would like --17 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: I'm sorry. MR. BROCKMAN: 18 -- Ines --19 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: The Department 20 -- it wasn't you, you're right. So the 21 Department, yes. 22 MR. BROCKMAN: And I'm not

Page 87 familiar. I'm going to ask Ines if she would 1 2 address that --3 DR. TRIAY: Okay. MR. BROCKMAN: -- if it's all 4 5 right with you. 6 DR. TRIAY: Sure. I'm happy to --7 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Absolutely. 8 Absolutely. DR. TRIAY: -- happy to address 9 10 the question. The Department, and in particular the previous Office of River 11 12 Protection manager, with EM Headquarters as 13 the oversight of the Office of River 14 Protection, made a decision not that it was 15 impossible to operate the waste treatment plant as -- in the -- within the current 16 17 design. What we said, and what I believe 18 19 Ms. Olinger has testified to, is that we 20 believed that we could get to a superior 21 design because we could remove dead legs, 22 remove bulges with active components outside

		Page	88
1	the hot cell, remove several high point vents,		
2	remove human error that was very likely given		
3	the very large amount of controls in the		
4	facility.		
5	I would like to make absolutely		
6	certain that we separate the discussion that		
7	we have had into several parts. The new		
8	material at risk bounds the tank farm		
9	contents. The change in the material at risk		
10	has not driven new actions in the tank farm.		
11	We have not been driven to any new		
12	requirements, transfers, or anything that		
13	hadn't already been planned.		
14	Many of the responses I believe		
15	address the possibility of the waste		
16	acceptance criteria not being met. And then,		
17	we said that this could be fixed by either		
18	waste treatment plant actions or the blending		
19	and dilution in the tank farms. This is not		
20	saying in any way that the tank farm must		
21	assume a large burden.		
22	I would like to really ask my		

		Page	89
1	colleague, Mr. Leo Sain, because I believe		
2	that he led a team at the request of the		
3	Office of River Protection manager, Ms.		
4	Olinger, to look at specifically this issue of		
5	operability of the waste treatment plant and		
б	the issue of the material at risk as well as		
7	some of these overly conservative parameters		
8	that were used in the design.		
9	And it the bottom line is that		
10	when you ask, why was the Department convinced		
11	that these changes would lead to more reliable		
12	operation and more effective operation, and		
13	even a safer operation, we relied on expert		
14	judgment by individuals like Mr. Sain.		
15	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: That is		
16	actually not I appreciate that very much.		
17	It's not what I asked. I asked if the		
18	Department was convinced at the end of 2008		
19	that this design was too complex to operate		
20	reliably, the design you had for the facility.		
21	DR. TRIAY: I believe that my		
22	answer was that the Department was not		

convinced that it could not operate. 1 The 2 Department was convinced that it could improve 3 the design and, therefore, have a more 4 reliable operation. 5 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Okay. And I 6 This is what it says in the appreciate that. 7 owners' perspective on changes in the design 8 basis of the waste treatment and immobilization plant pretreatment facility. 9 And I just quote this, "These conservative 10 11 design requirements for MAR and hydrogen drove an evolving design of unforeseen complexity 12 that led both BNI and ORP to raise concerns 13 14 for the reliability and the safety of future WTP operations." 15 16 And I'm not trying to criticize 17 you for reaching this conclusion. I am just trying to get you to agree that you did reach 18 19 that conclusion or -- because it seems to me 20 it wasn't a matter of improving things. You 21 were fairly well convinced at the end of 2008 22 that the plant was too complex to operate

reliably. 1 2 DR. TRIAY: My point being that what the Department did do was ask individuals 3 with experience, individuals that had decades 4 5 of experience in operating nuclear facilities, 6 and those individuals, those independent 7 experts that the Department engaged, they said 8 that the operation of the facility could be 9 greatly simplified. And, indeed, in the expert opinion of many of them, they said that 10 it was too complex. 11 12 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: And who were 13 these experts? Do we have --14 DR. TRIAY: As I just said, I --15 that's why we wanted --MR. SAIN: Let me jump in here. 16 17 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: And now we're 18 over to you, Mr. Sain. 19 MR. SAIN: I'm glad to be here. 20 (Laughter.) 21 Let me just say that I think it 22 was November '08 I had gotten a call to come

		Page 9
1	out and do a review of the technical issues.	
2	MAR was not on the list of what we were to	
3	review.	
4	I came, had as I remember	
5	this is all on the record, so I'm going from	
6	total memory about five or six experts with	
7	me that I handpicked. We came out and started	
8	reviewing the technical issues at the time, M3	
9	being one of them.	
10	In the very beginning of the	
11	review, we kept a number of individuals on the	
12	team tripping over MAR, the supertank concept.	
13	And we concluded, after two days of being at	
14	the project, that we were going to add MAR to	
15	the list and do a look at it.	
16	And our conclusion was is that the	
17	supertank concept was totally unachieveable	
18	and was grossly over-conservative, especially	
19	for a plant that in our opinion was at the	
20	stage that WTP was, you know, significant	
21	design and construction completion.	
22	And so our recommendation in that	

		F
1	report was that, you know, DOE and the	
2	contractor should go look at the MAR and see	
3	if there were not a more reasonable value of	
4	MAR that would really help the project,	
5	because having been a person that not only has	
6	been in Operations, I, you know, actually	
7	managed safety bases for a number of years,	
8	and I knew that a MAR of that value was	
9	driving controls that, in comparison to a	
10	reasonably conservative value, you would not	
11	have.	
12	And when you look at the sheer	
13	size of WTP, someone like me that has this	
14	operational background knew right away	
15	instinctively that this has got to be fairly	
16	complex, and so in our report we said that one	
17	of the main benefits of going and rebooting at	
18	this MAR, and getting back to a reasonably	
19	conservative value, that the safety bases	
20	community across the country would agree was	
21	reasonably conservative, would reduce the	
22	operational complexity.	

Page 94 Now, I will tell you that what I 1 2 have heard all along is, you know, reduce operational complexity. I personally -- I 3 think this is the first time that I am hearing 4 5 "too complex to operate." I don't know where 6 that came from. 7 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: It came from --8 MR. SATN: T think --9 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: It came from 10 the Department of Energy. 11 MR. SAIN: You know, I am a person 12 that had the challenge of starting up and running FB line, and I am convinced that after 13 14 doing that you can operate anything if you've 15 got the right leadership and the right 16 programs. So I don't think it's about "too 17 18 complex to operate," but I think it's about 19 being reasonable and trying to come up with a 20 very large plant with multiple facilities that 21 is going to ease the burden on the operators 22 so that they can focus on the important things

Page 95 and operate the plant. 1 2 So it was intuitive, and we said 3 it in the report, and I think it took off 4 after people started reading our report as 5 something very intuitive to individuals that 6 have been around operating facilities. 7 Well, I think CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: 8 you might have the sequencing wrong there. 9 But nobody disagrees with the fact that if there are fewer controls in a plant it can be 10 more reliable. That is really not the issue 11 12 I am trying to get it. MR. SAIN: Well, more reliable and 13 14 easier for operators to operate. I will take you back to TMI, which I was in Commercial 15 16 when that happened. And one of the big things that came out of TMI was all of the alarms the 17 18 operators had to contend with. 19 You know, the Safety Board, I 20 remember DWPF. One of the comments that the 21 Safety Board made, which was a good one, was 22 you guys needs to go reconfigure your alarms

		Dago	96
1	on DWPF, because you've got hundreds of alarms	rage	50
2	going off simultaneously. It is confusing.		
3	It is going to confuse the		
4	operator in a casualty, and so the whole		
5	concept of trying to keep large facilities,		
6	you know, within the required nuclear safety		
7	envelope and reasonably conservative, but		
8	beyond that think about, you know, simplistic		
9	operations, as simple they can be. That's		
10	important.		
11	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Ms. Roberson?		
12	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: One more		
13	question. I'm going to try this one more		
14	time, and I'm actually going to ask you to		
15	just think about what I'm saying and maybe		
16	respond for the record. I've certainly		
17	listened to what you have say.		
18	What I want to say is this is what		
19	we know. We don't have an operating envelope		
20	for WTP yet, which means we can't have our		
21	operating envelope for tank farms yet, because		
22	they connect. They will become one process at		

some point. 1 2 I understand from this morning the 3 project -- tank farms -- has employed PNNL [Pacific Northwest National Lab] - I don't 4 5 know who else -- to help develop a model for 6 creating the recipe that will meet the MAR. 7 Is that correct, Mr. Sain? Right? 8 MR. SAIN: Yes. 9 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. What I'm saying is -- what I'm looking for is the 10 11 evidence that the approach you just described 12 -- simpler/safer -- is being applied to the 13 totality of the process. And also what I'm 14 saying is the Board will be looking for that 15 evidence, because by the time -- let me 16 finish, please -- the waste enters WTP it will 17 be very sweet. The hard work is in the tank farm, so --18 19 MR. SAIN: But the hard work, as 20 far as transfers, is there before this. 21 That's the point I was trying to make earlier. 22 First and foremost, you are going to do sludge

Page 98

batches here, and always were going to do
sludge batches, just like we do at Savannah
River today.

4 If you're going to do sludge 5 batches, you've got to absolutely know the characterization of the waste you're dealing 6 7 with, what you're going to add. If it's 8 supernate, if it's recycled water, you know, 9 in some cases we add recycled water at Savannah River coming back from DWPF. 10 You're going to have to know what the characteristics 11 12 of all that stuff is, and it's the expert engineers that, you know, put that formula 13 14 together and come up with that sludge batch. 15 We were going to have do that, 16 even if we had stayed with the super tank 17 concept. We were going to have to know what 18 we were transferring before we send it 19 anywhere. That is a hard requirement in this 20 business today, and you're not going to escape 21 that. 22 So if we would have stayed with

		Page 99
1	the supertank concept, we couldn't have taken	
2	waste out of the tank farm and just sent it to	
3	WTP. We would have had to have characterized	
4	it, would have known what it was, and we would	
5	have had to have validated that it wasn't	
6	going to exceed any of the limits to send it	
7	to, you know, WTP.	
8	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. Well	
9		
10	MR. SAIN: I assume WTP will have	
11	an organic limit, just like DWPF does, as an	
12	example.	
13	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Let me wrap	
14	up by saying the Board hasn't been advocating	
15	the supertank strategy. What I'm saying to	
16	you is, as you make changes in the WTP, we	
17	will be looking at how they affect the tank	
18	farm. I advise you to look at it the same	
19	way.	
20	MR. SAIN: Okay.	
21	VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay?	
22	MR. KNUTSON: I just want to make	

		Page	100
1	sure that the position that we discussed this		
2	morning of the tank farm WTP integration role		
3	I think I'm finally understanding the		
4	position of the line of questioning.		
5	But one of the primary functions		
6	of that role is to understand the balance		
7	between, is it okay in tank farm space as well		
8	as WTP space, for the criteria that meets		
9	expected conditions? And those expected		
10	conditions have to change from the opening day		
11	of operations, the opening day of		
12	commissioning, through the multiple batches		
13	that have to be processed over the life cycle		
14	of the operating plant.		
15	So that mechanism, that new senior		
16	executive service position, is a role that is		
17	actually focused on exactly the question		
18	you're asking. And as Ms. Busche identified,		
19	the evolution of the controls has to be able		
20	to has to be taken into the context of both		
21	the WTP operations and tank operations, and		
22	that role is designed to be able to do exactly		

1 that. 2 MR. DWYER: Mr. Chairman, if I 3 could just -- just to put this in a concrete 4 example, again that we talked about this 5 morning, we briefly discussed a change to the 6 balance of design that you subsequently told 7 us was not going to occur. 8 We talked about a requirement that 9 you could not send plutonium particles greater than 10 microns from tank farms to the waste 10 11 treatment plant. And when we asked this 12 morning, "Won't that restrict and place a greater burden on tank farms?" I believe Mr. 13 14 Rutland informed us, "No, that was just in the draft document. It has since been removed." 15 16 But that is the type of thing that 17 if you put something like that into your 18 restrictions that puts a burden on tank farm, would you agree? If you tell them, "You can't 19 20 send me any plutonium particles greater than 21 10 microns"? 22 The hypothetical of MR. KNUTSON:

		Page
1	"if" such a thing should exist	
2	MR. DWYER: No. I'm agreeing	
3	MR. KNUTSON: then perhaps	
4	there would be a response.	
5	MR. DWYER: Yes.	
6	MR. KNUTSON: It needs to be	
7	balanced by the idea that with the role that	
8	is being envisioned the conversations and the	
9	dialogue and the formalization of expected	
10	condition definition takes place in a far more	
11	integrated fashion than it has to date. And	
12	that was done explicitly.	
13	MR. DWYER: And, in fact, you	
14	you informed us this morning that on further	
15	inspection, "Gee, we can't do that," and you	
16	pulled it out of the draft document. So	
17	MR. ASHLEY: No. Mr. Dwyer, I	
18	would like to clarify what Mr. Rutland said	
19	this morning is the purpose of the basis of	
20	the design is to ensure that we have a	
21	documented basis for the design of the	
22	facility.	

Page 103 And as we went through the M3 1 2 program, we were updating the BOD, the basis 3 of design document, and we had a draft, and we were clearly updating that for what we had 4 5 tested and what we had verified that the 6 vessels would mix, okay, would meet the mixing 7 requirements. 8 What Mr. Rutland said is we have 9 worked with him, we have clarified, that is not -- that is our basis of design. What Mr. 10 Rutland clarified is how they will ensure they 11 12 meet that. Okay? And as he said, the way 13 that is going to be met is by control of the 14 critical velocity. The control of the critical 15 16 velocity will ensure that they meet the 17 limits, okay, our basis of design for transfer 18 of --19 MR. DWYER: I --20 MR. ASHLEY: So we didn't remove 21 -- when you see the final BOD, we did not 22 remove those parameters. They are there in

Page 104 the basis of design when it is finally 1 2 approved. 3 MR. DWYER: Right. You chose to 4 approach it a different way. 5 MR. ASHLEY: It -- the control, in other words --6 7 MR. DWYER: Yes. 8 MR. ASHLEY: -- the specific control, but we didn't -- I wanted to clarify, 9 10 we did not remove those specific parameters 11 from that -- from what will ultimately be the 12 approved basis of design. 13 MR. SAIN: And I think the good 14 news with that was someone asked this morning, 15 "What formal document, Mr. Rutland, did you 16 get?" Well, he didn't get one. The reason is 17 the integration. Paul talked to WTP, because we are integrating, and they resolved this 18 19 issue. 20 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Okay. I --21 Mr. Chairman? MR. BROCKMAN: 22 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Yes, I'll let

Page 105 -- after you Dr. Mansfield will have some 1 2 questions. Go ahead, please. 3 MR. BROCKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can 4 assure you that in my turnover -- and that is 5 the best knowledge I have of my turnover --6 the statement that the plant was too complex 7 to operate was not used for the rationale 8 behind these reviews of stuff. That was not 9 used. And I'm interested in, for my information, where that statement is that --10 11 where we said that. I would like to know --12 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: We're going to 13 put the document, the owners -- we're going to 14 put it on the record, and it is the owners' 15 perspective on changes in the design basis of 16 the waste treatment and immobilization plant 17 pretreatment facility. And it is a part of the PDSA addendum. Is that accurate, or --18 19 MR. STOKES: It's a part of the 20 safety evaluation report. 21 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Safety 22 evaluation report. And the timeframe for that

		Page	106
1	was?		
2	MR. STOKES: I believe that was		
3	signed in November of 2009.		
4	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: November 2009.		
5	Okay. We'll get that for you.		
6	Dr. Mansfield?		
7	MEMBER MANSFIELD: I'm going to		
8	ask a series of four or five questions. There		
9	must be a simple answer to this. I could		
10	either ask you, Mr. Sain, but I'm going to ask		
11	Mr. Ashley. In the pretreatment facility,		
12	there are, by the count that I was given, 336		
13	possible transfer routes from tank to tank,		
14	and 65 of them need routine flushing for HPAV		
15	under ordinary conditions.		
16	And after several days of		
17	transfer, now what happens? You've shut the		
18	pump off, and then what do you do?		
19	MR. ASHLEY: I'm not following the		
20	question.		
21	MEMBER MANSFIELD: There's		
22	you've got a suction dead leg full of waste.		

		Page	107
1	If you've got a low point in the discharge		
2	line, you've got that full of waste. What		
3	comes next?		
4	MR. ASHLEY: Okay. Routinely in		
5	the operation of the facility, after transfers		
6	they will be followed by a flush.		
7	MEMBER MANSFIELD: A flush.		
8	MR. ASHLEY: Okay?		
9	MEMBER MANSFIELD: How long do you		
10	have to do that?		
11	MR. ASHLEY: Okay. One of the		
12	things that we are evaluating, and one of the		
13	advantages of using the quantitative risk		
14	assessment that we will be using and we		
15	will talk about that I'm sure we'll have		
16	questions		
17	MEMBER MANSFIELD: Tomorrow.		
18	MR. ASHLEY: on that in		
19	tomorrow's session		
20	MEMBER MANSFIELD: Yes.		
21	MR. ASHLEY: is that it avails		
22	us the opportunity to look in more detail at		

	Page	108	
our operation to determine what risks that			
operation presents, what hazards that			
operation might present.			
MEMBER MANSFIELD: You mean how			
long you can leave the path unflushed.			
MR. ASHLEY: Correct. Correct.			
MEMBER MANSFIELD: Do you take			
gelling and precipitation into account when			
you do that?			
MR. ASHLEY: We take basically			
and I think we will probably get into some of			
the more of those discussions tomorrow, but			
we do look at the rheology of -			
MEMBER MANSFIELD: This doesn't			
have to do with HPAV, so much as it does			
MR. ASHLEY: From a the waste			
transfer perspective and a flush perspective,			
we do absolutely take into consideration the			
rheology of the materials.			
MEMBER MANSFIELD: Okay. Now, in			
the we also guys figured out that in the			
24 hours you've got about in a day			
	our operation to determine what risks that operation presents, what hazards that operation might present. MEMBER MANSFIELD: You mean how long you can leave the path unflushed. MR. ASHLEY: Correct. Correct. MEMBER MANSFIELD: Do you take gelling and precipitation into account when you do that? MR. ASHLEY: We take basically and I think we will probably get into some of the more of those discussions tomorrow, but we do look at the rheology of - MEMBER MANSFIELD: This doesn't have to do with HPAV, so much as it does MR. ASHLEY: From a the waste transfer perspective and a flush perspective, we do absolutely take into consideration the rheology of the materials. MEMBER MANSFIELD: Okay. Now, in the we also guys figured out that in the 24 hours you've got about in a day	Page our operation to determine what risks that operation presents, what hazards that operation might present. MEMBER MANSFIELD: You mean how long you can leave the path unflushed. MR. ASHLEY: Correct. Correct. MEMBER MANSFIELD: Do you take gelling and precipitation into account when you do that? MR. ASHLEY: We take basically and I think we will probably get into some of the more of those discussions tomorrow, but we do look at the rheology of - MEMBER MANSFIELD: This doesn't have to do with HPAV, so much as it does MR. ASHLEY: From a the waste transfer perspective and a flush perspective, we do absolutely take into consideration the rheology of the materials. MEMBER MANSFIELD: Okay. Now, in the we also guys figured out that in the 24 hours you've got about in a day	
		Page	109
----	--	------	-----
1	(Whereupon, the audio system cut		
2	off briefly.)		
3	MEMBER MANSFIELD: So you've got		
4	the jumper has a provision for flushing.		
5	It's got valves, it's got it's got some		
6	sort of flush liquid provision to the jumper		
7	to get		
8	MR. ASHLEY: Yes.		
9	MEMBER MANSFIELD: to execute		
10	those flushes. Okay. Now let's look at the		
11	total loss of offsite power during a transfer.		
12	The jumper is still there. You have reserved		
13	power to complete that transfer?		
14	MR. ASHLEY: Many of the transfers		
15	are not ITS, okay, which that is a specific		
16	event that is evaluated, what the effect of		
17	that event is. For example, once again you		
18	get into, you know, what is what is one of		
19	the hazards of stagnant waste in our piping?		
20	MEMBER MANSFIELD: No, I'm just		
21	saying, do you have power to complete the		
22	transfer, or do you have to leave it		

Page 110 MR. ASHLEY: We may not have power 1 2 to complete the transfer. 3 MEMBER MANSFIELD: May not. Under 4 what conditions might you? 5 MR. ASHLEY: In loss of offsite 6 power, if the specific -- if that specific 7 function is not a safety function, then that 8 pump, to complete that transfer, would not be available and the waste would become --9 MEMBER MANSFIELD: So there is no 10 11 power --12 MR. ASHLEY: -- would become 13 stagnant. 14 MEMBER MANSFIELD: -- loss of 15 offsite power, there is no power to those 16 pumps? 17 MR. ASHLEY: That's correct. 18 MEMBER MANSFIELD: Or valves. 19 MR. ASHLEY: Specific pumps, the 20 specific pumps. 21 MEMBER MANSFIELD: Well, I mean, 22 all of the hot cells -- all of the hot cell

		Page	111
1	pumps?		
2	MR. ASHLEY: You know, actually,		
3	we I never say "all." When I talk about		
4	the pretreat facility, the pretreat facility		
5	is a very complex facility, but many of the		
6	pumps are not ITS. And so there would not be		
7	emergency power to those specific to many		
8	of the specific pumps.		
9	MEMBER MANSFIELD: How long if		
10	and you will know how long that it will		
11	take for that waste to gel up and make and		
12	become perhaps next to impossible to pump?		
13	MR. ASHLEY: We basically, pipe		
14	plugging and, actually, that was one of the		
15	FRT issues was the potential for pipe		
16	plugging. That is one of the issues that was		
17	studied.		
18	Also, associated with that, and we		
19	did make design changes associated with		
20	resolution of that FRT issue to ensure that we		
21	could flush lines, that we could clear		
22	plugging, we have the ability to do chemical		

Page 112 flushes, we have the duty to --1 2 MEMBER MANSFIELD: With no offsite 3 power. 4 MR. ASHLEY: We have the ability 5 -- when restored, we have the ability --6 MEMBER MANSFIELD: No, I'm talking 7 about a day or multi-day -- waste in many 8 cases begins to gel in a day. 9 MR. ASHLEY: That's correct. 10 MEMBER MANSFIELD: And in a week it's immovable. 11 12 MR. ASHLEY: It's not immovable. 13 MEMBER MANSFIELD: Well, it 14 will --MR. ASHLEY: It's not immovable. 15 16 MEMBER MANSFIELD: But it --17 MR. ASHLEY: It's not immovable. 18 MEMBER MANSFIELD: -- enough it's 19 immovable. 20 MR. ASHLEY: It is not immovable, 21 and chemical cleaning for these wastes is very 22 effective. We use a sodium hydroxide and use

Page 113 of dilute nitric acid, which we have that 1 2 ability in our systems. 3 MEMBER MANSFIELD: So you have --4 but you have a jumper there with a flush line, 5 and now you have to remove that flush line 6 with your flush liquid and hook up something 7 to acids or other chemical things, and that is 8 not more complicated than flushing -- than providing emergency power so that you could 9 flush every line? 10 11 MR. ASHLEY: We have -- the 12 flexibility in these systems is -- we have substantial flexibility in these systems, and 13 14 most of these connections are jumpered. The 15 emergency power -- the emergency power is 16 supplied to all of those systems that are 17 required to have emergency power for safety 18 reasons. 19 MEMBER MANSFIELD: That is just a 20 C5 ventilation system. 21 MR. ASHLEY: Not just C5, the 22 mixing systems --

		Page	114
1	MEMBER MANSFIELD: Okay.		
2	MR. ASHLEY: We need to continue		
3	to mix the waste in		
4	MEMBER MANSFIELD: But not		
5	MR. ASHLEY: our vessels.		
6	MEMBER MANSFIELD: not the		
7	valves and pumps in the hot cell.		
8	MR. ASHLEY: For hot cell, we do		
9	not have power to the pumps in the hot cell.		
10	MEMBER MANSFIELD: Right. So it		
11	is less complicated for you to wait until this		
12	thing sets up, and wait until power comes on,		
13	and rig a chemical flush or something like		
14	that, than it is to just turn on the water to		
15	the existing pump flush system by providing		
16	emergency power to the hot cell? I mean, that		
17	just doesn't sound right. This may not be		
18	important to safety, but it is certainly		
19	important to your night's sleep.		
20	MR. ASHLEY: Actually, all of		
21	these situations, we have a detailed OR model.		
22	We looked at the availability of this		

	Page 115
1	facility. We looked at the impact that these
2	events have on the facility. We have our
3	flush tanks, so that we can provide
4	pressurized flushes.
5	Right now, the design is it is
6	a design to assure that operations is not
7	interrupted, we do not have substantial
8	interruptions by line plugging. Line
9	plugging
10	MEMBER MANSFIELD: Not when
11	there's external power.
12	MR. ASHLEY: Line plugging is a
13	fact of this facility. These are slurry
14	systems. Lines will plug. It is an important
15	design feature to be able to clear the lines.
16	MEMBER MANSFIELD: But I so far
17	you haven't convinced me at all that you have
18	saved any complexity by having to live out a
19	long, perhaps day long or longer, loss of
20	offsite power and rig up a chemical flushing
21	system when all you needed to have was an
22	emergency power supply to the pumps and valves

Page 116 in the hot cells. 1 2 MR. ASHLEY: And I want to --3 I'm not saying MEMBER MANSFIELD: 4 safety class. I'm just saying don't wreck the 5 plant. 6 MR. ASHLEY: Right. But I want to 7 clarify that there are some flushes which are 8 ITS flushes, and that's why I wanted to make 9 sure I don't say "all," because in this 10 facility it is a complex facility. 11 MEMBER MANSFIELD: And I won't say "immovable." 12 MR. ASHLEY: We do have some of 13 14 the flushes which are ITS flushes for our high 15 solid systems. 16 MEMBER MANSFIELD: And it seems to 17 me an added benefit to -- following my line of 18 questioning is if you did this, you wouldn't 19 have an HPAV problem at all. 20 MR. ASHLEY: Flushes don't resolve 21 entirely accumulation of hydrogen. Flushes 22 and purges are not the only solution. Venting

		Page	117
1	is required for elimination of pockets of		
2	hydrogen as well. So flushes are not the only		
3	solution.		
4	MEMBER MANSFIELD: So you have		
5	provided vents?		
6	MR. ASHLEY: We do currently		
7	and the design currently has high point vents,		
8	a number of high point vents, as part of the		
9	hydrogen control.		
10	MEMBER MANSFIELD: I thought those		
11	were some of the dead legs that were being		
12	removed for complexity purposes.		
13	MR. ASHLEY: And the high point		
14	vents, you know, just getting back to to		
15	what were the complex aspects of the design,		
16	high point vents that run out of the hot cell		
17	into bulges where the controls are actually in		
18	the bulges. As you can imagine, the height of		
19	the hot cell, those are very long legs that		
20	have to run up to the corridor outside of the		
21	cell.		
22	That is part of the design		

		Page	118
1	complexity that the previous control strategy		
2	with the active controls that we are		
3	currently looking at.		
4	MEMBER MANSFIELD: So far you have		
5	explained something that it includes more		
6	design complexity, the necessity to rig up a		
7	chemical flush after several days of offsite		
8	power.		
9	I'm not getting anywhere with		
10	this, Mr. Chairman. But you can see what I'm		
11	trying to say.		
12	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: I think you can		
13	see that we really are trying to probe the		
14	complexity issue and understand whether I		
15	mean, nobody is debating the supertank concept		
16	and the MAR reduction. That's you know,		
17	that's understandable and you definitely want		
18	to do that.		
19	But there are a lot of aspects of		
20	the safety basis in some of these strategies		
21	that just aren't clear right now that we		
22	really have had a reduction in complexity in		

	Page
1	the plant. But I will go to Mr. Bader now for
2	some questions.
3	MEMBER BADER: Well, the first
4	thing I'd like to say is the reason we are
5	focusing on this complexity issue is for
6	nearly two years it was the driver behind a
7	lot of the discussions we had that affected
8	safety and operation. And now when we get the
9	answers to the questions there is a nice
10	statement in several places in the answer.
11	It's that too complex to operate was never
12	determined. So it's there's a certain
13	degree of "wow, gee whiz" to this.
14	Let me go to the question of what
15	we discussed this morning in terms of the
16	large scale testing. My memory of the
17	discussion, Ms. Busche, was that there are a
18	number of important clarifications that will
19	come out of that testing that will allow you
20	to do a number of things including work on the
21	safety basis, the criticality safety
22	evaluation report, is that correct?

119

		Page	120
1	MS. BUSCHE: Correct.		
2	MEMBER BADER: We also discussed		
3	the number of a number of tests that should		
4	be done in that large scale testing, Mr.		
5	Knutson, and I think by my count what was		
6	enumerated and you can break this up		
7	different ways was eight major segments of		
8	testing.		
9	MR. KNUTSON: There were many. I		
10	don't know what the number was.		
11	MEMBER BADER: My concern with all		
12	of this is that at least some of those are		
13	likely to result in surprises in new wishes		
14	being developed. And at that point, I believe		
15	you said you are three years away from hot		
16	functional testing. Is that correct?		
17	MR. KNUTSON: Correct.		
18	MEMBER BADER: To me the		
19	likelihood that something will go wrong that		
20	results in a function being transferred to the		
21	from the waste treatment plant to the tank		
22	farms is pretty high. And that to me is why		

	Page
1	we needed to have things that are important to
2	safety, important to efficiency, decided as
3	soon as possible.
4	Now, let me ask, this new SER
5	or, I'm sorry, SES [Senior Executive Service]
б	is this going to be his is he going to
7	be heavily involved in this testing program
8	from that perspective, looking at the balance
9	between decisions that have to be made?
10	MR. KNUTSON: There are elements
11	of commissioning training, operator
12	qualification. There are elements of
13	simulation. There are elements of controls
14	evaluation that are all within the scope of
15	this new individual's responsibilities.
16	In addition to that, there are
17	specific elements of design and safety that we
18	have talked about that need to be resolved.
19	It will be a concerted effort from Bechtel
20	design individuals, the URS safety
21	individuals, and this integration role, all
22	working together to ensure that the necessary

121

	Pa	ge
1	elements of the testing program are addressed.	
2	MEMBER BADER: Mr. Russo?	
3	MR. RUSSO: Yes, sir.	
4	MEMBER BADER: Would you like to	
5	comment on that aspect of the decisionmaking	
6	process?	
7	MR. RUSSO: Yes, if I may. And	
8	I'm going to go a little bit backwards to come	
9	forward if you don't mind. Many years ago I	
10	built a facility in Canada that was very	
11	different but in some ways very similar to	
12	this one. It was a \$6 billion pitching and	
13	processing facility for Shell up at Fort	
14	Saskatchewan. The feed came from Fort	
15	McMurray through a 500-mile pipeline. It was	
16	a very thick slurry, very caustic. Of course,	
17	it had no radiological characteristics	
18	whatsoever.	
19	And in the early stages of that	
20	project, because the ownership of the project,	
21	unlike this, was you had a mining company	
22	owning the mining part of the job and Shell	

122

	Page 123
1	owning the actual processing part of the job,
2	was there was a great deal of debate about
3	where something should happen.
4	And there was a similar debate to
5	what you were talking about, Ms. Roberson, in
6	terms of, well, the risk of mining versus the
7	risk of refining have to be somehow
8	adjudicated and bounded. And initially there
9	wasn't a method to really modify that, to
10	control those decisions, and everyone was
11	making them predicated pretty much on their
12	self-interest as opposed to the interest of
13	the holistic project.
14	Shell Solutions out of The Hague
15	came in, worked with the project team on both
16	sides, and we made the determination that what
17	you really needed was, in essence, what Dale
18	has introduced in terms of the integrated flow
19	sheet with someone who owns the middle box.
20	So feed comes over. It doesn't
21	meet the WAC; that goes back on that side.
22	And the adjudication takes place in that

	Page	124
middle box. Feed comes over, I can't process		
it properly, I don't send it back to the tank		
farm. I have to physically deal with it.		
But, again, the middle box is		
there to provide the oversight and the		
governance of determinations as to what is the		
best outcome, both in the physical design as		
you're designing the plant and as you get into		
operation.		
So when you look at the question		
you asked, where will most of that effort come		
from, it has got to be in that middle box, and		
I'm pretty certain that's where Dale has		
determined to put it, meaning when we are		
looking at the integrated testing or anything		
that talks to the integrated flow sheet, Dale		
will obviously have a major say from the point		
of view when I say "Dale," I mean Mr.		
Knutson for the record in terms of the		
implications on the capital project.		
Stacy Charboneau will have a great		
input in terms of the implications on the tank		
	<pre>middle box. Feed comes over, I can't process it properly, I don't send it back to the tank farm. I have to physically deal with it. But, again, the middle box is there to provide the oversight and the governance of determinations as to what is the best outcome, both in the physical design as you're designing the plant and as you get into operation. So when you look at the question you asked, where will most of that effort come from, it has got to be in that middle box, and I'm pretty certain that's where Dale has determined to put it, meaning when we are looking at the integrated testing or anything that talks to the integrated flow sheet, Dale will obviously have a major say from the point of view when I say "Dale," I mean Mr. Knutson for the record in terms of the implications on the capital project. Stacy Charboneau will have a great input in terms of the implications on the tank</pre>	Page middle box. Feed comes over, I can't process it properly, I don't send it back to the tank farm. I have to physically deal with it. But, again, the middle box is there to provide the oversight and the governance of determinations as to what is the best outcome, both in the physical design as you're designing the plant and as you get into operation. So when you look at the question you asked, where will most of that effort come from, it has got to be in that middle box, and I'm pretty certain that's where Dale has determined to put it, meaning when we are looking at the integrated flow sheet, Dale will obviously have a major say from the point of view when I say "Dale," I mean Mr. Knutson for the record in terms of the implications on the capital project.

		Page	125
1	farm. But that SES position will be the one		
2	that basically provides both sides a balanced		
3	determination as to what is best for the		
4	integrated flow sheet.		
5	And I believe that to be the model		
6	that is being adopted, and, you know, Dale		
7	could Mr. Knutson can expand on that. But		
8	that is, I believe, critical when you are		
9	dealing with a feed and a facility to process		
10	that feed.		
11	MEMBER BADER: Is it fair to say		
12	I'll wait until you read that.		
13	MR. RUSSO: Let me see what		
14	okay. Go ahead. I'm ready.		
15	MEMBER BADER: If all goes		
16	reasonably well, all this testing will be		
17	finished in three years prior to hot		
18	functional testing.		
19	MR. RUSSO: Yes. All the testing		
20	that affects what I need to do to		
21	MEMBER BADER: If it goes		
22	reasonably well.		

Page 126 MR. RUSSO: -- to build a plant, 1 2 right. 3 Are you able to MEMBER BADER: 4 develop your control system completely until 5 that is finished? 6 MR. RUSSO: You can develop the 7 control system. But as I think was originally 8 expressed -- and I'll let Greg, you know, 9 embellish on this -- the design is an 10 iterative process. And to the point earlier in terms of at 80 percent do you want it to be 11 12 iterating as much as it is right now? 13 Obviously, the answer to that is no. But 14 that's a fact of life. It is. It comes from 15 the learnings of many years in terms of what 16 you call a one-of-a-kind facility, which is 17 correct. 18 We can get a control system logic 19 and a control system design established, and 20 then the question becomes, what modifications 21 in the final iterations you would have to do? 22 If I may, I would like Greg to add to that.

Page 127 MEMBER BADER: Well, let me --1 2 before you do that --MR. RUSSO: 3 Yes, sir. 4 MEMBER BADER: -- let me go -- and 5 by the way, I'd go back and say my memory was 6 the first time we met you made a comment to me 7 that you had never before worked on a project 8 at this stage of design and construction that 9 still didn't have a firm process flow sheet. Is that correct? 10 11 MR. RUSSO: Yes, in the -- that is 12 a correct statement. In the process industry 13 that I came from -- and, again, it's a totally 14 -- not totally unfair, but it's an unfair 15 comparison because it is reality -- those oil 16 companies particularly, because product to 17 market, price of that product per unit, was so 18 important that they would invest a 19 considerable amount of effort, not a lot of 20 time by the way, but a considerable amount of 21 effort, to get their feed defined to the level 22 that they felt comfortable to go out and make

		Page	128
1	the capital investment, because understanding		
2	the feed had a great implication on how you		
3	line up the equipment, your heat balances,		
4	etcetera, material and heat balances.		
5	So you typically would see process		
б	definition fully complete before you get into		
7	design. Now you know, final design. Now,		
8	as a reality of this job, as the EFRT came up		
9	and new questions were asked that were		
10	legitimate, reasonable questions, given that		
11	our feed stock isn't chemical but it is		
12	radiological, it really took the entire normal		
13	sequence and put it into a different		
14	parameter. We just have to deal with that.		
15	We understand it.		
16	MEMBER BADER: So, but if I		
17	understand what you're telling me, you really		
18	can't determine the complexity of operation,		
19	the complexity of control on this plant until		
20	you get to that point. Is that correct?		
21	MR. RUSSO: When you have your		
22	engineered features finally defined, obviously		

Page 129 it then allows Donna Busche to go out and 1 2 determine what controls need to be applied around both the engineered and the 3 4 administrative controls to ensure you are 5 staying within the safety envelope. 6 That said, you could look at some 7 of the design that was in the original HPAV, 8 and I can compare it to when we first met way 9 before that at AMWTP. But we took over that 10 facility, I think as you know, Ms. Roberson, and there was a lot of design features in 11 there that on paper looked extremely reliable 12 and extremely good for the co-located worker. 13 14 But in reality, in application, we ended up in some cases, with the Board's 15 approval in all cases, eliminating some of 16 17 those controls, because when you got into 18 operation they were actually creating 19 opportunities for me to have to send workers 20 in in suits to clean up contamination from the 21 transuranic waste. So until -- and I think this is 22

		Page	130
1	the "not putting it off" comment, until you		
2	really get to a point where and cold		
3	commissioning, by the way, which is before hot		
4	commissioning, should give us some experience		
5	in this area. Until you get into a point when		
6	you actually understand how the facility		
7	interacts with itself, you will always be		
8	questioning that.		
9	And I think Donna Busche told me		
10	before a couple of days ago that it will be		
11	two or three years into the actual operation		
12	before you finally finalize what those TSRs		
13	really need to be. They will start out		
14	overtly conservative, and then as time and		
15	operating experience comes into play, there		
16	will be, you know, an endeavor to look at		
17	those and reduce them.		
18	MEMBER BADER: Greg, do you want		
19	to		
20	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Mr. Ashley?		
21	MR. ASHLEY: I think, Mr. Bader,		
22	in reference to some of Frank's comments, you		

		Page
1	know, certainly the large scale integrated	
2	test from a control system completion is very	
3	important for us. And I think we you know,	
4	we identified that as part of our strategy.	
5	You know, we have our basic design	
6	logics and concepts in terms of how we will	
7	control PJMs [Pulse Jet Mixer]. It is really	
8	important that we run those at full scale	
9	prototypically, so that we can finalize the	
10	control system strategy for the PJMs.	
11	The one thing I did want to Dr.	
12	Mansfield, I do need to clarify some of the	
13	in response to your comments, our UFP filter	
14	loop does contain a pressurized flush system,	
15	which is ITS. As you know, our UFP filter	
16	loop is a critical process loop. It is a	
17	large loop where we where we, you know,	
18	post leach and concentrate solids. So this is	
19	an area where we are protecting that with an	
20	ITS power flush to ensure that we do not have	
21	line plugging.	
22	I also misspoke. Our flushes,	

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## Page 131

		_	1.0.0
1	which are below the hydrostatic level, can	Page	132
2	create dead legs. Our vents can't create dead		
3	legs, so our flushes that are below the		
4	hydrostatic level can create dead legs.		
5	Another element in terms of		
6	plugging, particularly avoiding chemical		
7	plugging, as we talked about one of the		
8	issues, the FRT issues, and one was the		
9	potential for line plugging, something that we		
10	had to ensure that we were addressing		
11	properly.		
12	One of those was to avoid		
13	potential for chemical line plugging. We do		
14	have a report, which I will make sure that the		
15	staff does get, which address how we address		
16	off-normal conditions and the potential for		
17	chemical line plugging. That was all done as		
18	part of the line plugging studies.		
19	So this is an area that we have		
20	looked at extensively. We did have PNL do		
21	testing for us relative to critical velocities		
22	to ensure that we don't have plugging, as well		

Page 133 as determine what flush velocities were 1 2 required to assure that we could remove plugs from the lines. So I'll make sure that the 3 4 staff, if they don't already have this 5 documentation, that it is available to them. 6 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Thank you. Ι 7 would like to move to Mr. Brown at this time. 8 MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. 9 Chairman. I guess I'm the wrap-up man again. As I listened to the whole conversation that 10 11 has gone on about complexity, I thought back 12 to the question I asked Mr. Sain earlier this morning, what -- from a tank farm point of 13 view, what would be the ideal WAC? And your 14 15 answer was --16 (Laughter.) MR. SAIN: Well, I won't go there 17 18 again. 19 (Laughter.) 20 Well, why not? MEMBER BROWN: Ι 21 mean, your answer was, whatever you can --22 what you can send to the waste treatment

		Page	134
1	plant.		
2	MR. SAIN: No. I said what I		
3	said was my ideal WAC would be a WAC we can		
4	meet.		
5	MEMBER BROWN: Okay.		
6	MR. SAIN: And that's what the WAC		
7	is all about is you've got to meet the waste		
8	or the you know, acceptance criteria		
9	before you transfer waste. So anyway		
10	MEMBER BROWN: And it seems to me		
11	that if if you had didn't have to do any		
12	blending, if you could send it directly from		
13	the tanks to the waste treatment plant, that		
14	would be an ideal WAC. There would be or		
15	maybe an ideal WAC. I mean, there would be		
16	almost there would be no requirements for		
17	processing or blending or, etcetera, for you		
18			
19	MR. SAIN: But		
20	MEMBER BROWN: if you could.		
21	That would be the simplest.		
22	MR. SAIN: But let me take a		

	Page 135
1	little bit different approach. You want to
2	use blending to your advantage. It's
3	advantageous to you.
4	MEMBER BROWN: Sure.
5	MR. SAIN: You've got tanks at
6	both sites that have real problems in the
7	tanks with what is in there, and other tanks
8	that, you know, it's not such a problem. And
9	so by blending you can mix a blend that
10	eliminates a lot of problems for yourself. So
11	blending, in my mind, is a very positive
12	thing. And we have learned that from years of
13	experience.
14	I think the other thing is that
15	when you look at stuff like condition of the
16	sump tanks, and the fact that, you know, most
17	of the liquid has been taken out of the tanks,
18	you're going to have to blend. I mean,
19	regardless of, you know, this issue that we
20	have all been focused on, blending is going to
21	be required.
22	And I say, do what we've done in

the past, use that to your advantage, and it 1 2 will really help you be able to process all of 3 the waste. 4 MEMBER BROWN: And I'm not an 5 advocate for supertank or any other particular 6 solution. What I'm an advocate for is the one 7 that works best. And -- but it seems to me, 8 it's not intuitive to me, that doing more 9 blending or whatever in the tank farms is 10 going to -- won't increase the chances for a 11 safety problem. Any time you do more things 12 and you have more people, more pumps, more 13 pipes, more valves, it seems to me that you 14 are more likely to have a problem, 15 intuitively. 16 And I'm not a particular advocate 17 for probability PRA [Probabilistic Risk Analysis] or QRA, but as you -- as you analyze 18 19 these various options, it seems to me you need 20 some sort of metric where you can compare 21 And right now it is basically expert them. 22 elicitation, "Well, I think blending will be

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## Page 136

		Page	137
1	better here or there," and it seems to me like		
2	there might be some valve in having some		
3	quantification of what these hazards are as		
4	you try and compare, as Ms. Roberson has said,		
5	the totality of the problem, who is going to		
6	get more risk as you get it move it from		
7	here to there.		
8	Just some thoughts.		
9	MEMBER BROWN: Well, do you -		
10	DR. TRIAY: If I may for a moment,		
11	I would like to say that there is no question		
12	that the Department of Energy is also looking		
13	at the risk holistically. And we completely		
14	agree with Ms. Roberson and with you, Mr.		
15	Brown.		
16	Let me just be completely clear.		
17	The new material at risk does not require for		
18	us to blend the waste. There is no waste		
19	stream that has the concentrations in the		
20	supertank which is a concept involving taking		
21	the highest concentration of every constituent		
22	from the entire tank farm and creating a tank		

Page 138 -- a waste stream that does not exist on 1 2 paper. 3 So I just want to make absolutely 4 certain that everybody understands, in order 5 to meet the new MAR, our current recipes for 6 tank farm delivery do meet the new material at 7 risk, and there are no blending requirements 8 or any new requirements that we have imposed 9 in the tank farm as a result of the revised MAR. 10 11 MR. SAIN: And I want to add one 12 I said it was intuitive, and I'm a thing. little bit more thorough than that. And so I 13 14 will add to this whole thing about MAR and the 15 super tank concept that I went and did a comparison of WTP to DWPF. 16 17 And, you know, one of the things 18 that I learned from you guys and ladies was, 19 you know, we ought to take advantage of what 20 is out there to learn lessons and compare and 21 all that kind of stuff. So it's interesting 22 when you go compare DWPF and what it has as

	Page 139
1	far as controls to the existing WTP today. It
2	is startling, in my mind.
3	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. I'd
4	like to turn attention a little to back to
5	the PDSA, the PDSA addendum, the DSA, the
6	TSRs, that whole process. Maybe ask, Ms.
7	Busche, if you could tell me where we are in
8	that whole train of events. I mean, we have
9	a PDSA that's approved, we've got an addendum
10	that is awaiting approval. That is going to
11	lead to the DSA. Can you explain that whole
12	timeline and where we are at in it?
13	MS. BUSCHE: Sure. Before I did
14	that, I was listening to that last exchange,
15	and I wanted to offer just a couple, because
16	I I think it sometimes we are not we
17	are not communicating on our side. And so
18	what I'd like to offer is it is clearly an
19	iterative process, and you hear people say
20	that. Okay?
21	But when you are resolving
22	technical issues, sometimes that is easier

	Page .
said than done, and it is going to play into	
your question, Mr. Brown, as we get into, how	
do we move forward? So in just simple terms,	
if you reduce the MAR, you could potentially	
reduce the functional classification, which	
could reduce the number of safety systems.	
That does not mean that it	
eliminates the layers of defense in depth. It	
doesn't mean controls go away. Okay? The	
onus is still on us in the final documented	
safety analysis to eloquently describe in	
Chapter 3 those layers of defense in depth.	
So I am comfortable that we are	
not removing controls that we don't need at	
this point in time. As we move forward, okay,	
and I think I hinted at some technical	

and I think challenges, what we have to do is now iterate -- come up with realistic accident analysis where we are with the PDSA addendum is in unmitigated consequences. They are postulated, okay?

So if you look in safety analysis

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## 

Page 141

space, we have not updated Chapter 3 to reflect the next level of transition into the accidents which lead into the technical safety requirements, which will give us a feel for controls.

6 Now, I answer on the conservative 7 side of "I don't know," because I haven't done 8 that work. That doesn't mean that as we have 9 done our lower level working process of those 10 integrated safety management system that there are lots of discussions on high point vent. 11 12 Those are not articulated yet in the next 13 iteration of where we are going to go in the 14 license or the safety basis document. Okay? 15 So where are we? So that -- I 16 just -- I was listening to that, and I think 17 everybody was correct, but it really wasn't I 18 think getting into some of the questions that 19 Ms. Roberson started with. 20 So where are we? We have a PDSA 21 that is currently approved, reflects that 22 supertank MAR. Okay?

Page 142

	E E
1	We have made no changes to the
2	design yet that reflect the updated MAR, and
3	I and I am comforted to hear that that's a
4	good thing, because from an overall future
5	operations from and I'll call it hazard,
6	crave, or grave it is good if those source
7	terms line up from the generating facility to
8	the processing facility. So writing that
9	final DSA, that makes it easy, and so that was
10	refreshing for me to hear.
11	The PDSA addendum did make changes
12	to the material at risk. I think Mr. Kasdorf
13	identified there were other changes made to
14	the analysis methodology. That document was
15	approved by the Department. We had conditions
16	of approval, and it is a minor point in my
17	world, but maintaining configuration
18	management of the license is paramount. So
19	until we do every element of correspondence
20	that has gone back and forth, we will not
21	transition to that PDSA addendum.
22	So we are and I don't want to

		Page
1	turn around, but we are clearly we have had	
2	all of our discussions with the Office of	
3	River Protection. We have resolved their	
4	comments. What we are waiting is final	
5	verification that we have closed their	
6	comments per our agreed-to disposition.	
7	So I would suspect I think in here	
8	we said by the end of September. So, but we	
9	are very close to as soon as we send it over	
10	there, then the Department would update their	
11	safety evaluation report and say that the	
12	matter is closed, and then we will begin the	
13	next phase of the next iteration.	
14	We need to implement that PDSA	
15	addendum into the PDSA, which will necessitate	
16	changes to Chapter 3 and give us a better	
17	understanding of where the next vision of the	
18	technical safety requirements are going to be.	
19	Okay?	
20	So the challenge that we have now	
21	is as we go through those technical issues,	
22	there is going to be a lot of changes	

143

		Page	144
1	throughout the full scope of the 17 chapters.		
2	All right? So we are we have not finalized		
3	our plan I think internally.		
4	What I am very strongly committed		
5	to now is we need to have an integrated		
6	iteration. It will do me no good, it will do		
7	the project no good, if I answer the mixing		
8	question, but I don't understand the mixing		
9	question with respect to potential HPAV		
10	issues, because they are not unrelated.		
11	So that integrated we call it a		
12	plan for a plan is being kicked off with		
13	preliminary planning sessions, and it will be		
14	approximately 10 months to 12 months to		
15	complete that systematic evaluation of hazards		
16	that integrates it.		
17	We've got the pieces and parts.		
18	We need to integrate it, because we are		
19	nearing the end of design, and we need to		
20	understand, are there any new nuclear safety		
21	functional requirements that need to be		
22	addressed?		
Page 145 I don't know if that answered your 1 2 question, but --MEMBER BROWN: Yes, I think so. 3 Mr. Brockman? 4 5 MR. RUSSO: May I just add one 6 clarification, please? 7 MEMBER BROWN: Sure. 8 MR. RUSSO: Thank you. In 9 recognizing what Ms. Busche said, when we look at the changes in pretreat, and what we have 10 to do to keep them under configuration control 11 12 and aligned with the PDSA, we took the approach that we wanted to not touch the P&ID 13 14 [Piping and Instrumentation Diagram] more than one time. We don't want to touch all the 15 16 follow-on documentation more than one time. 17 So we went out and redlined 18 everything and put a complete matrix together 19 of all of the affected documents, all of the 20 affected drawings, and then put together a 21 work unit, so that we can work these all off So we can look at the iterations 22 at one time.

		Page 1	146
1	of M3, HPAV, and the other minor changes that		
2	Ms. Busche spoke about, which will facilitate		
3	our environmental and nuclear safety folks to		
4	do that integrated look at it from a PDSA		
5	point of view.		
б	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. Mr.		
7	Brockman, you are the approval authority for		
8	completion of these PDSA addendum issues, is		
9	that correct?		
10	MR. BROCKMAN: That's correct.		
11	MEMBER BROWN: And do you have		
12	anything you wanted to add to Ms. Busche's		
13	statement?		
14	MR. BROCKMAN: Her statement was		
15	accurate. Was are awaiting I believe we		
16	are expecting very soon the final		
17	documentation to close the last condition of		
18	approval.		
19	MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.		
20	MR. BROCKMAN: And I wanted to		
21	add, if I may, one more thing now or later.		
22	I do have that document in front of me, and		

	Page 147
1	I'd like to read the statement. It says, "The
2	conservative design requirements for MAR and
3	hydrogen drove an evolving design of
4	unforeseen complexity that led both BNI and
5	ORP to raise concerns for the reliability and
6	the safety of future WTP operations."
7	To me, that says we had concerns,
8	we raised a question. I don't read in there
9	at all that we made a declaration it was too
10	complex to operate.
11	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Let me tell you
12	for the record, as a Board member, and having
13	come out to Hanford many times in the last few
14	years and been briefed, that that is my
15	understanding of what the Department conveyed
16	to the Board very clearly. And I will just
17	leave it at that.
18	Thank you.
19	MEMBER BROWN: One of the
20	statements Mr. Kasdorf made in his opening
21	statement I wondered if somebody could clarify
22	for me. And the question is: is the current

Page 148 process ventilation system design undersized 1 2 as compared to the current design criteria? 3 Anybody comment on that? 4 MR. KNUTSON: Greg actually should 5 probably address that. 6 MR. ASHLEY: I didn't recall that 7 the comment was that it is undersized. The 8 process ventilation vessel vent system -- as 9 part of this process, we had -- it had previously been classified -- did not have an 10 active safety function, that vessel vent 11 12 system. The system was a passive vessel purge 13 system. 14 The vent system contains a number 15 of pieces of equipment, such as a scrubber, 16 which does not have currently -- or previously 17 did not have an active safety function. As we 18 talked about potential reclassification of 19 that vessel vent system, we then had to look 20 at the ability of the design to meet what was 21 then going to be the functional 22 classification.

		Page	149
1	It has caused us to go back and		
2	talk to the supplier. Basically, in a post-		
3	DBE [Design Basis Event], the sprays in that		
4	that scrubber would not be operable. And		
5	so we had to look at, what is the		
6	effectiveness, then, in terms of the removal		
7	of aerosols and aerosols, then, that would end		
8	up on the vessel vent HEPA filters.		
9	So when Mr. Kasdorf referred to		
10	that, it is that change in classification that		
11	has caused us to relook at the design to say,		
12	in that upgraded functional requirement,		
13	safety requirement for that system, could the		
14	design comply with that? That's just it's		
15	an issue that we are currently looking at.		
16	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. There		
17	has been some talk about the sprays and leaks		
18	question in the hot cells. Can you tell me		
19	what the functional classification of the		
20	piping in the hot cells is today?		
21	MS. BUSCHE: By the current PDSA		
22	addendum, because I think we are very close to		

		Page
1	that, it ranges from safety excuse me, no	
2	higher than safety significant, but we reduced	
3	no pipe that wasn't already commercial grade	
4	to commercial grade.	
5	So in the revision of our	
6	unmitigated analysis, we actually have said it	
7	wouldn't go any lower than safety significant,	
8	and we have a note in the actual license that	
9	we would if we choose or need to find a	
10	solid technical basis, you know, to go to that	
11	next level, we could go back to the Department	
12	and request that.	
13	So, and it it is really hard to	
14	do generalities when you are talking as much	
15	piping as we have. But I think it is a fair	
16	general and I will probably get a note if	
17	I'm wrong no lower than safety significant.	
18	MEMBER BROWN: Is that the same	
19	classification of the pumps and the valves and	
20	other equipment in the hot cells, that it	
21	would be safety significant, no higher than	
22	safety significant?	

		Page	151
1	MS. BUSCHE: That I am		
2	uncomfortable answering without looking at the		
3	actual document itself, because it is a pretty		
4	complicated Table 5 in the addendum, so		
5	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Dr. Mansfield		
6	has a clarifying question.		
7	MEMBER BROWN: Yes, sir.		
8	MEMBER MANSFIELD: On the issue of		
9	valves, the one the HPAV-related experiment		
10	we have had a valve failure that would have		
11	sprayed had a considerable spray of waste		
12	in the hot cell.		
13	MS. BUSCHE: Right.		
14	MEMBER MANSFIELD: So I'm going to		
15	reinforce that question. Should the for		
16	instance, the valving in the hot cells for		
17	transfer paths be qualified in some way, so		
18	that the possibilities of leaking past gaskets		
19	during shocks of HPAV detonations can be		
20	mitigated? Is that would that be it		
21	seems to me that would be as much a part of		
22	the safety qualification as making sure that		

		Page	TOZ
1	you are using safety significant piping.		
2	MS. BUSCHE: I think you're		
3	referring to I think some of Roy's opening		
4	statements with your followup. I		
5	MEMBER MANSFIELD: It is not so		
6	much the piping in the hot cells that I am		
7	worried about for my question. It is the in-		
8	line components in the hot cells that have		
9	more leak paths than the piping has.		
10	MS. BUSCHE: I don't know if I		
11	understand that.		
12	MR. ASHLEY: Dr. Mansfield, I can		
13	answer that. In terms of in-line components,		
14	when we talk about specific events, in-line		
15	components are qualified. They are safety		
16	requirements. If the requirement is		
17	maintenance of the pressure boundary, the in-		
18	line components will be qualified for		
19	maintenance of the pressure boundary, if it's		
20	HPAV affected.		
21	We have not completed and I		
22	believe we have discussed this previously with		

		Page	153
1	staff we have not completed our test		
2	acceptance criteria, our test planning, but		
3	our intent and our requirement, as stated in		
4	our basis of design, is these in-line		
5	components will be component tested, just like		
6	we do seismic qualification, just like we do		
7	environmental qualification. They would be		
8	qualified for the HPAV event. They would be		
9	specific measurable test acceptance criteria		
10	associated with the qualification of those		
11	components.		
12	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: All right. Mr.		
13	Brown? Sorry.		
14	MEMBER BROWN: Yes. So in the hot		
15	cells, are we talking when we are talking		
16	about defense in depth, are we relying on the		
17	primary waste boundary, which would be the		
18	pipes, in-line components, or are we relying		
19	upon the building and the ventilation system		
20	as the confinement boundary?		
21	MS. BUSCHE: If you hang on		
22	just a second. If you look at the suite of		

		Page	154
1	accidents, okay, we there is a lot of		
2	discussion, so when I say "loss of confinement		
3	events," okay, the credited control in the		
4	accident analysis is a confinement boundary,		
5	C5-V, to mitigate the release.		
6	The basis for the selection of the		
7	confinement ventilation is our experience		
8	is pipes leak, jumpers will leak. Okay?		
9	Especially in hot cells. And I believe it is		
10	a fundamental tenet of the when you pick a		
11	credited control, you have to demonstrate it		
12	provides its credited safety function. Okay?		
13	So now that doesn't mean we are		
14	done. The next layer of defense in depth that		
15	we will articulate is actually, what is the		
16	quality and the pedigree of the pipes and		
17	I'm sure that will go to the in-line		
18	components as well as we design that to		
19	protect that transient? There will be several		
20	for loss of confinement.		
21	You will get some that are more on		
22	the operator. How do you hook up jumpers so		

Γ

		Pag
1	you minimize the potential for misalignment?	
2	All the way to you have an HPAV event, and do	
3	you need to provide another control to protect	
4	that boundary?	
5	So the QRA will help us with the	
6	HPAV, and I think we will probably deep dive	
7	on that tomorrow morning. But there is much	
8	piping that is safety significant. It is just	
9	not the credited control, because in all cases	
10	we can't demonstrate that it will prevent the	
11	leak.	
12	So when I am talking loss of	
13	confinement, I need to pick a control that is	
14	going to either prevent or mitigate it, and we	
15	saw no way, without pipe in pipe, you know	
16	I mean, you get into some scenarios, if you	
17	want to prevent the leak, we did not feel we	
18	could do that in all cases given the design	
19	with the jumper configuration.	
20	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. Now, we	
21	have talked a bit about the flow sheet in the	
22	pretreatment plant, that it's not final. What	

## Page 155

		Page	156
1	safety basis decisions remain unanswered		
2	because the flow sheet isn't final?		
3	MS. BUSCHE: It's a little hard to		
4	speculate. As part of our going-forward plan		
5	that I shared just a moment ago, we are		
6	actually part of that integrated hazards		
7	analysis, the process flow diagrams will be		
8	updated based on the results of mixing. What		
9	are our capabilities? That will then flow		
10	into an update of our data sheets or our		
11	project models and an update to the P&IDs.		
12	Those will work in concert, then,		
13	to systematically evaluate the hazards to		
14	answer that question. I don't expect a lot		
15	I don't see any showstoppers, but that is		
16	based on my experience in looking at what I		
17	know. But I can't preclude that there will		
18	not be a new control until we follow our		
19	process.		
20	So at this point, because we are		
21	nearing the end of the design, we need to pick		
22	a control that can provide the credited safety		

		Page	157
1	function, and that pick a control that		
2	provides a credited safety function, and I		
3	think I will just leave it at that.		
4	Predicting what I don't know, I don't know.		
5	MEMBER BROWN: So who can say when		
6	we expect to finish the flow sheet, complete		
7	it?		
8	MR. ASHLEY: Mr. Brown, you know,		
9	when you refer to the flow sheet not final,		
10	the flow sheet will undergo revision, because		
11	we are doing some design improvements to the		
12	facility. Particularly, we are doing system		
13	modifications to preclude precipitation of		
14	solids after our ultrafiltration wash and		
15	solids concentration. Particularly, what we		
16	want to do is prevent solids that could plug		
17	our ion exchange column.		
18	However, the flow sheet today is a		
19	final flow sheet. It will undergo those		
20	revisions associated with those system		
21	modifications that though we won't talk		
22	specifically about what we call the CNP/CXP		

	Page	15
[Cesium Nitric Acid Recovery Process/Cesium		
Ion Exchange Process] modification, but that		
is part of the suite of modifications that we		
will make to the pretreat facility that Donna		
has talked about that will then undergo or go		
through the hazards analysis, the ISM process.		
That is a very important		
modification. It allows sodium reduction. It		
will allow a reduction in the life cycle of		
WTP, and actually will preclude upset events		
where we would plug ion exchange, have to stop		
the process, have to flush or remove an ion		
exchange column and replace it.		
So there will be some changes, but		

13 exchange column 14 So I don't -- I don't really know where the 15 premise that the flow sheet isn't final has 16 17 come from. It will undergo changes over the 18 next year as we implement some beneficial 19 changes to the facility systems. 20 MR. RUSSO: That CNP/CXP 21 modification we are talking about is an 22 example of the Department making a capital

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

## 58

	P
1	investment in the pretreat facility to save
2	operating expense over the life cycle of the
3	project. So there were two options. One had
4	a very minor capital implication but had a
5	life cycle implication. The one that was
6	selected had a higher capital implication to
7	save life cycle costs.
8	MEMBER BROWN: It sounds to me
9	like ARPMCU. I mean, you are in a constant
10	those kinds of issues you are going to be
11	addressing maybe over the life of this plant.
12	But the basic flow sheet, you are telling me,
13	is is final. Is that
14	MR. ASHLEY: Yes. Yes. But as we
15	as we do system changes, beneficial
16	changes, or identify that we will receive a
17	lower weight percent solids, those do have
18	effect, the flow sheet will have to be
19	updated. But the flow sheet and the mass
20	balance has from the flow sheet has been
21	completed.
22	MEMBER BROWN: I mean, as I think

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433 Page 159

		Page	160
1	we talked about this morning with Mr. Rutland,		
2	there may be hundreds of flow sheets that you		
3	have to develop for the different wastes that		
4	you treat. So, but the basic flow sheet for		
5	the pretreatment facility is final.		
6	MR. ASHLEY: Yes. When we talk		
7	about the batches, and how the individual		
8	batches are characterized in the		
9	prequalification, that doesn't change the WTP		
10	flow sheet. That changes how we operate the		
11	process. For example, how long do we have to		
12	leach?		
13	Depending upon the specific feed,		
14	how will we concentrate that feed? How many		
15	times will we wash that feed as we recirculate		
16	it in the UFP loop?		
17	So that isn't a fundamental flow		
18	sheet change. That is how we're going to		
19	operate and how we're going to process that		
20	specific feed.		
21	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. So the		
22	flow sheet issue, Ms. Busche, isn't really		

		-	1 6 1
1	slowing you up on safety basis documentation,	Page	TOT
2	or is it?		
3	MS. BUSCHE: My job is to verify.		
4	So when we do an update to the hazards		
5	analysis, even if there are minor changes,		
6	design improvements, okay I don't disagree		
7	at all with what Mr. Ashley has said we are		
8	still obligated to make sure that there is no		
9	impact. So we have configuration management		
10	of the hazards we have analyzed, the controls		
11	we have selected, and a clear path to		
12	transition.		
13	So it is is it holding me up?		
14	No. But we are in the process of, for		
15	example, mixing. We are evaluating those		
16	vessel assessment summary reports to		
17	understand what those impacts are. Some may		
18	change the process flow diagram. Some may		
19	not.		
20	So we are focused more on the		
21	outcome I mean, the inputs and assumptions,		
22	and then the output, so that we can update our		

	Pa
1	hazards analysis. But they have to be
2	consistent before we release it, so
3	MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.
4	In talking about the safety-related aspects of
5	hydrogen in the pipes design, is the current
6	WTP design capable of meeting DOE's safety
7	requirements in 10 CFR 830 and 3009?
8	MS. BUSCHE: Could you be more
9	specific on what safety requirements? Does
10	the design currently meet the hazards analysis
11	methodology of Subpart B? I think that for a
12	PDSA the answer to that is yes. Does it meet
13	it for a DSA? The answer to that is no. I've
14	got lots of work to do as we now finalize the
15	QRA and mature that into the hazards analysis,
16	lots of work to do.
17	So at a PDSA stage, we have
18	information that is supporting design. But I
19	think a lot of the dialogue in this particular
20	session is as part of a natural iteration we
21	have found out new information on hydrogen and
22	pipes in ancillary vessels and how to

Page 162

		Page	163
1	integrate that in. It is changing I will call		
2	it the hazards analysis of record, and some of		
3	the design basis of record is changing, right?		
4	So it is a natural evolution, but		
5	it is a it is a complex facility to try to		
6	explain that. So I believe we are compliant		
7	for a PDSA, but not for a DSA, nor am I		
8	required to be for a DSA at this time.		
9	MEMBER BROWN: Is it your		
10	understanding that the hydrogen and pipe		
11	design issues, the QRA will be used as a		
12	safety-related tool or not?		
13	MS. BUSCHE: I believe it's a		
14	design tool. But from a compliance to 3009,		
15	Appendix 3009, Appendix A, I believe we are		
16	obligated to evaluate the inputs and		
17	assumptions just like any other design calc.		
18	You determine what is an initial condition and		
19	what is an assumption requiring to be		
20	protected by a TSR?		
21	So there are some things, when we		
22	go the QRA has been through a state of		

Γ

	Page 164
1	change. There are some things in the QRA that
2	are obvious. There are some flushes that are
3	already required that the QRA is going to lead
4	me to say, "Yep, that's a key thing in the
5	calculation, so I will continue to protect
6	that with a TSR."
7	There is others that are from a
8	normal hazards analysis process would be a
9	safety management program. And we will figure
10	out how to work that into defense in depth.
11	Okay?
12	But then, there is others that I
13	don't know today. Until the QRA is finalized,
14	and they finish their distribution curves and
15	they finish that out, we can't complete that
16	process. I believe we can comply with both
17	the rule and the safe harbor methodology, but
18	obligated to evaluate that document just like
19	any other engineering calc.
20	MEMBER BROWN: Okay. In my simple
21	mind
22	MS. BUSCHE: Okay.

		Page	165
1	MEMBER BROWN: okay, we have		
2	kind of a bright line before QRA was		
3	brought into this process and after QRA was		
4	brought into this process. Do you think that		
5	the use of QRA is going to simplify or		
6	complicate meeting DOE requirements, safety		
7	requirements, 3009, 830?		
8	MS. BUSCHE: I think the level of		
9	detail needed for the DSA is approximately the		
10	same. Ultimately, we had to have a design		
11	basis for pipes. Period. That work is going		
12	to be the same no matter what tool they would		
13	have picked. It's just the route to get		
14	there.		
15	Where it may be more complicated		
16	and to be candid, I haven't thought through		
17	it yet is if we adopt this tool, what would		
18	it mean for the future operations of the		
19	facility with respect to the unreviewed safety		
20	question process? Because it is embedding		
21	infrequencies, which is not necessarily I		
22	haven't figured out how to use the		

Page 166 requirements of the rule, risk bending, for 1 2 example. I haven't -- I really haven't thought through it. 3 4 We have been more focused on how 5 are we going to do the first scrub of the QRA to identify how to develop the DSA and the 6 7 controls. But, clearly, that is on my list of 8 things that has to be resolved as we move forward to operate the plant. You have to 9 10 know how you are going to maintain that 11 license through routine changes, test, and 12 experiment. 13 One of my problems, MEMBER BROWN: 14 a Larry problem, is how to deal with PRA and 15 QRA when DOE presents a solution to a problem 16 based on that analysis, because I don't have 17 a DOE policy upon which to base my judgment. 18 And so I have to make it up, and I'm not very 19 good at that. So --20 DR. TRIAY: If I may, Mr. Brown, 21 the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Safety and 22 Operations Oversight, Steve Krohn, is the

	I	Page	167
1	Chairman of our Technical Authority Board.		
2	This is a concept that the environmental		
3	management office adopted several years back,		
4	because we wanted to use concepts that were		
5	best industry practices like the QRA approach.		
6	And in the Technical Authority		
7	Board, from the environmental management		
8	program perspective, it is going to be looking		
9	at the QRA, ensuring compliance with all of		
10	the DOE polices and procedures in a very		
11	formal, rigorous, and disciplined manner.		
12	That evaluation is ongoing. And the Chief of		
13	Nuclear Safety, who reports to the		
14	Undersecretary of Energy, is a part of that		
15	process.		
16	So the Department of Energy and		
17	the environmental management program will have		
18	a formal evaluation of how the QRA meets all		
19	of the Department of Energy's policies and		
20	standards.		
21	MR. DEWEY: Mr. Brown, Mr. Bader		
22	wants just a very quick followup on that.		

Page 168 1 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. 2 MEMBER BADER: Actually, two. We 3 have been pushing 2009-1 as the recommendation 4 for a DOE policy on risk. Ms. Busche, do you 5 believe you need that policy to be out and agreed -- and approved by the Secretary before 6 7 you can complete your QRA analysis? 8 MS. BUSCHE: I would agree that we 9 need it out before we implement the QRA. Ι believe it is an effective tool. It is just, 10 11 if you -- when you read 3009, it is not clear 12 how to use it. 13 MEMBER BADER: At all. 14 MS. BUSCHE: So I believe before 15 we implement it, yes. Or this determination 16 that Dr. Triay --That is correct. 17 DR. TRIAY: 18 MS. BUSCHE: I mean, it's one or 19 the other. It has got to happen, so --20 DR. TRIAY: That is exactly right, 21 and that is exactly why I brought up this 22 comment is because we, in the environmental

		Page	169
1	management program, believe that this		
2	particular QRA application is extremely		
3	beneficial to our nuclear operations.		
4	And we intend to use the Technical		
5	Authority Board that has a level of oversight,		
6	all the way to the Chief of Nuclear Safety, in		
7	the Office of the Undersecretary, to do the		
8	formal evaluation with all rigor and		
9	discipline. And that is what Ms. Busche is		
10	going to utilize.		
11	So I believe that that will		
12	satisfy the Board's questions with respect to		
13	the Department of Energy's position on the QRA		
14	process.		
15	MEMBER BADER: Ms. Busche, one		
16	further question along those lines. Once you		
17	are done in terms of the you get approval		
18	and you can implement, do you see the QRA		
19	having to be maintained online during		
20	operation?		
21	MS. BUSCHE: Yes. And that goes		
22	back to my USQ. If it is a basis for making		

		Page 1
1	some of those design decisions, one of the	
2	fundamental tenets we will have to ask is,	
3	does this change the frequency, as described	
4	in the DSA?	
5	So even though it's not used as a	
б	safety control selection tool, it is clearly	
7	part of the design basis for selected design	
8	features, like the primary boundary and the	
9	pipe. So, yes, I do believe so.	
10	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Mr. Brown?	
11	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. That	
12	takes one question off my list here. Thank	
13	you, Mr. Bader.	
14	(Laughter.)	
15	I am glad to see that Mr. Krohn,	
16	the Chief of EM Safety, and the Chief of	
17	Nuclear Safety, Mr. Lagdon, are both here,	
18	because I think it is important as they	
19	grapple with this subject to understand how	
20	this may be a design tool, but it bleeds over	
21	into safety space. And they need to	
22	understand that and consider that as they	

Page 171 grapple with this problem. 1 2 As I think back to the conference which EM and the Office of HSS [Health, 3 4 Safety, and Security] and DOE recently 5 sponsored through CRESP on uncertainty, I 6 recall -- and Mr. Sain mentioned it earlier --7 Three Mile Island and how the WASH-1400 8 report, Rasmussen report, whatever name you 9 want to attach to it, was very controversial at the time. 10 11 It predicted things that nobody 12 liked, and then Three Mile Island validated them, which was the loss of flow accident. 13 14 And that was found through a QRA or PRA 15 analysis but was not found through the 16 traditional deterministic analysis. So I guess my question with that 17 18 lead-in, Ms. Busche, is, do you think the use 19 of QRA will make WTP safer? 20 MS. BUSCHE: I believe it will 21 provide a technical basis for understanding 22 where hydrogen in pipes needs to be protected.

		Page	172
1	So by that, I actually look forward to being		
2	able to write that up in the bases of the TSR,		
3	because it will do that for us.		
4	Will it make it safer for us? I		
5	am looking at the whole suite of controls that		
6	we have to have for the pretreatment facility,		
7	and this is just one of the design inputs that		
8	we have. We've got many, many, many.		
9	So I really don't have a feel and		
10	haven't really thought about it from that		
11	perspective. I don't think it will make us		
12	more unsafe or safer. I just haven't thought		
13	about it.		
14	MEMBER BROWN: Well, as I think		
15	about it, the if it eliminates some dead		
16	legs		
17	MS. BUSCHE: Oh, yes.		
18	MEMBER BROWN: that hydrogen		
19	could have accumulated in, and could have		
20	created a problem, then that's a good thing.		
21	Now		
22	MS. BUSCHE: Correct.		

Page 173

1	MEMBER BROWN: Now, that's just
2	one piece of it. Maybe by eliminating that
3	dead leg you lose some other safety function.
4	So it has to be looked at in the whole
5	context, but it seems to me and I hope that
6	it helps the safety problem, safety not
7	problem, but the safety question at the waste
8	treatment plant.
9	Do you have any other concerns
10	with the use of QRA as related to WTP? And,
11	if you do, do you have any plans for how you
12	are going to address them? Anything we
13	haven't talked about?
14	MS. BUSCHE: No. At this time, I
15	am just waiting for to see the resolution
16	of the HPAV independent review team comments,
17	how they get incorporated into the tool, and
18	then I could probably more appropriately
19	answer that. Right now it is I need to see
20	the final product.
21	MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. If I
22	could ask Dr. Triay a question about this EM

		Page	174
1	Technical Authority Board. Will they be		
2	developing standards and requirements for		
3	implementation of QRA at WTP? Or is this		
4	going to be a recommendation that you that		
5	they make to HSS, and then it gets involved in		
6	the whole DOE bureaucracy? How is that how		
7	is that decision going to be made, so that it		
8	can be implemented or not?		
9	DR. TRIAY: I would like to see		
10	whether I can either answer the question		
11	myself or if you will allow Dr. Krohn to join		
12	us, would that be		
13	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: No, I think it		
14	would be best if you answer the question. And		
15	if you're not able to do so, please just state		
16	it for the record.		
17	DR. TRIAY: Well, what we intend		
18	to do is make sure that in this particular		
19	tool the QRA is compliant with 10 CFR 830.		
20	As you saw in the or you heard		
21	Ms. Olinger in her words, you know, to the		
22	Board, whether the QRA is viewed as a design		

		Page	175
1	tool or as an element of the safety analysis,		
2	its acceptability as part of the methodology		
3	for compliance with 10 CFR 830 is expected to		
4	be confirmed. It is that confirmation that		
5	will be performed by the Technical Authority		
6	Board.		
7	Actually, the waste treatment		
8	plant has been asked to evaluate the		
9	calculations that the QRA supports, determine		
10	3009 requirements and guidance for those		
11	calculations, determine if there are any		
12	inconsistencies, and evaluate the impacts of		
13	any such inconsistencies.		
14	The Technical Authority Board will		
15	then review the results of that evaluation.		
16	And with respect to the process, the		
17	environmental management program instituted		
18	the Technical Authority Board so that we could		
19	deal with best nuclear industry practices in		
20	without necessarily having to go through		
21	the consensus-building within the entire		
22	Department of Energy in order to press forward		

		Page
1	with a very good practice such as the	
2	utilization of QRA.	
3	We do have the oversight from the	
4	departmental perspective, by having our Chief	
5	of Nuclear Safety formally participate in the	
6	Technical Authority Board process.	
7	So between the environmental	
8	management, Technical Authority Board's work,	
9	that is a very disciplined process, and the	
10	oversight from the Chief of Nuclear Safety	
11	we believe that that will be sufficient for us	
12	to press forward with the QRA approach.	
13	I just would like to conclude by	
14	saying that in my opinion the QRA will risk-	
15	inform the design of the waste treatment	
16	plant, and that the HPAV independent review	
17	team has stated that it will make design a lot	
18	better versus a deterministic approach.	
19	MEMBER BROWN: So if I understand	
20	it correctly, the EM Technical Review Board	
21	will see where the QRA is consistent. And if	
22	it's not in those areas or situations where	

## Page 176

		Page	177
1	it's not consistent with DOE existing orders		
2	and standards, it won't be used.		
3	DR. TRIAY: As I was saying		
4	before, we expect the QRA to be compliant with		
5	10 CFR 830. But from the perspective of the		
6	final authority of the Technical Authority		
7	Board, yes, their decision will drive what is		
8	it that is going to be done in the waste		
9	treatment plant.		
10	As you know, the pilot		
11	applications of this type of what we consider		
12	a very beneficial best practice of the nuclear		
13	industry are needed to develop new standards,		
14	and this QRA will serve as an important pilot		
15	for perhaps the Department then to develop new		
16	standards.		
17	So we think that the work of the		
18	Technical Authority Board will be the final		
19	authority as to what we will do in the waste		
20	treatment plant. And, in addition, this		
21	particular pilot will serve to for the		
22	Department to interchange the promulgation of		

Page 178

1 new standards.

2	MEMBER BROWN: I just have one
3	more question, Mr. Chairman. Going since
4	we're on controversial issues, let me go back
5	to one other one. How is the question of
6	deposition velocity going how is that
7	decision making process going, and how will
8	that be resolved, or when will it be resolved?
9	DR. TRIAY: Again, the Chief of
10	Nuclear Safety is here, and he is available to
11	come before you. But if you want me to speak
12	for him, I will do my best. As we have noted
13	in our response, for deposition velocity our
14	Chief of Nuclear Safety is the ultimate
15	authority as to what kind of parameter we are
16	going to use in the waste treatment plant.
17	And we have noted, however, that
18	for the waste treatment plant the safety
19	classification does not change if we were to
20	use a value of .1 or 1. I believe those
21	sensitivity analyses have been performed, and
22	in the waste treatment plant it doesn't make

1			
		Page	179
1	any difference for the classification of the		
2	safety systems.		
3	But with respect to who is the		
4	authority, it would be the Chief of Nuclear		
5	Safety making that determination on behalf of		
6	the Department.		
7	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: But, Madam		
8	Secretary, the Chief of Nuclear Safety has		
9	agreed with the Board's position that the		
10	correct value of deposition velocity is in the		
11	range of 0.1 to 0.3. So what is the rationale		
12	of the Department for not putting a correct		
13	value into the code?		
14	DR. TRIAY: As I was stating, for		
15	the waste treatment plant our uncertainty		
16	analysis indicates that there is no different		
17	result whether we use .1 or whether we use 1.		
18	So our Chief of Nuclear Safety will direct the		
19	waste treatment plant to utilize the value		
20	that he believes prudent for the waste		
21	treatment plant, that we will do it.		
22	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: So we're in a		

Page 180 situation right now where the incorrect value 1 2 is the prudent value to use? I believe that I have 3 DR. TRIAY: 4 made clear that for the waste treatment plant 5 it makes no difference, and that we will take 6 direction in the waste treatment plant from 7 the Chief of Nuclear Safety. So when he 8 finishes his work, and I believe that he has 9 an upcoming review of a paper delineating the values that he wants us to use for the waste 10 11 treatment plant that is going to be peer reviewed, we will take direction from him. 12 13 CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Very 14 respectfully, I am very surprised that the 15 Department of Energy would take that approach. 16 But you have expressed your opinion and your 17 views. Thank you. 18 Ms. Roberson? 19 VICE CHAIR ROBERSON: Okay. Ι 20 want to do one followup on what Mr. Brown was 21 just asking, and maybe this has changed. My 22 understanding was the Office of Primary
		Page	181
1	Interest, for whether it's 3009 or 830, is		
2	HSS. Are they a part of the effort to look at		
3	the tool and ensure it is aligned?		
4	DR. TRIAY: Yes. Dr. Krohn has		
5	worked closely with our office of HSS. The		
6	point that I was making was that the QRA pilot		
7	will actually serve the Department well in		
8	terms of understanding how a tool of that		
9	nature could actually be utilized Department-		
10	wide.		
11	So I think that the Department is		
12	looking at this particular application of the		
13	QRA as a good pilot, and Dr. Krohn, as the		
14	head of the Technical Authority Board and Mr.		
15	Chip Lagdon, as the Chief of Nuclear Safety,		
16	work very closely with HSS.		
17	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Okay. Mr.		
18	Dwyer, I think you had a question?		
19	MR. DWYER: Yes, if I could just		
20	followup with something Ms. Busche was saying.		
21	I believe you indicated when we were talking		
22	about the piping and the hot cell that it		

	Page 182
1	wasn't possible to demonstrate that you could
2	maintain confinement with the piping. Is that
3	
4	MS. BUSCHE: Not in all cases
5	where there is jumpers concerned.
6	MR. DWYER: And why is that?
7	MS. BUSCHE: From an accident
8	analysis perspective, around the complex it
9	piping systems leak, specifically at
10	connections. So we couldn't say we could
11	prevent all leaks, so we chose an alternative
12	control I mean, a mitigative control
13	strategy. That has been the project's control
14	strategy for leaks and loss of confinement
15	events from pipes since the beginning PDSA.
16	MR. DWYER: So is this a specific
17	I guess a specific characteristic of the
18	jumper connections?
19	MS. BUSCHE: No. When you
20	postulate failure, the places that you are
21	most likely going to get a loss of confinement
22	event due to the primary boundary is typically

		Page	183
1	going to be a jumper connection. You still		
2	have erosion/corrosion. You have all other		
3	potential initiators.		
4	The most credible one is jumper		
5	connections. My experience in working,		
б	unfortunately, in tank farms in years past is		
7	they do leak. I have seen spray leaks, okay?		
8	They do leak.		
9	So it is something that we		
10	postulate that it fails, not that it is not		
11	important, not that we're going to design it		
12	with pedigree, but we are postulating in the		
13	accident world that it will fail. And we are		
14	specifically crediting a mitigative strategy		
15	versus a preventive strategy.		
16	I understand the rules of how you		
17	should select controls, but I don't believe we		
18	can prevent leaks unless we did pipe in pipe.		
19	I mean, there's multiple ways you could have		
20	done that, but		
21	MR. DWYER: Okay. So I let me		
22	try again.		

Page 184 1 MS. BUSCHE: Okay. 2 MR. DWYER: So I thought what you 3 said is -- I'm sorry. I thought what you said 4 was that this is not just a characteristic of 5 there is a jumper in the line, but then you 6 argued that it is a characteristic that there 7 is a jumper in the line. Help me out here. 8 MS. BUSCHE: Well, it's -- again, 9 at an unmitigated accident analysis, where we 10 are in the severity level assessments, we are not refined. We don't have the details of the 11 accident analysis updated yet that looks at 12 the full suite of different configurations. 13 14 In the unmitigated -- I call them 15 scoping calques - you just assume the worst 16 You figure out what is going to fail, one. 17 and we just assumed it was going to fail. We 18 didn't -- it wasn't a real complicated 19 analysis. We just assumed it failed. 20 MR. DWYER: Okay. And you 21 couldn't design a system that wouldn't fail? 22 MS. BUSCHE: Oh, it would lead you

Page 185 towards a pipe in pipe type configuration. 1 2 I'm sure you could, right? But it's -- it 3 wasn't --I'm just curious from 4 MR. DWYER: 5 the standpoint of we discussed that the piping 6 is safety significant, but we never discussed 7 the seismic characterization. Does that have 8 anything to do with it? 9 MS. BUSCHE: Seismic is an initiator for loss of confinement events from 10 11 the primary boundary, yes, it is. 12 MR. DWYER: Okay. So there is 13 actually two different categorizations or 14 classifications of safety significant piping 15 in the complex that we are talking about 16 there? 17 MS. BUSCHE: No. 18 There's not? Are --MR. DWYER: 19 I guess I don't MS. BUSCHE: 20 understand the question, Mr. Dwyer. 21 MR. DWYER: Okay. One of the 22 issues that we had was -- let me phrase it a

	Page 186
1	different way. What performance category are
2	you going to meet with your safety significant
3	piping?
4	MS. BUSCHE: I can answer that. I
5	think the most qualified with respect to the
6	application of the design criteria as
7	connected to the functional classification is
8	probably Mr. Ashley. It is functionally
9	classified as safety significant in most cases
10	in the hot cell, okay? Most cases. And that
11	is typically your high activity process lines.
12	So it's a general statement.
13	From that, the projects design
14	criteria and, Greg, please jump in is if
15	it's safety significant in our world it is
16	seismic Category 3. It is not the terminology
17	that you would use, say, from 1189.
18	MR. ASHLEY: That's correct, Mr.
19	Dwyer. The design criteria has been the
20	design criteria of the WTP from the beginning,
21	is safety significant, is seismic Cat 3. Now,
22	it is a unique categorization relative to the

		Pag
1	WTP.	
2	We do have conditions where we	
3	have designed the piping, even though it is	
4	safety significant, to seismic Cat 1, which is	
5	the highest seismic category for the WTP where	
6	SS, safety significant, is seismic Cat 1.	
7	We qualify it to seismic Cat 1 for	
8	all the hot cell piping, the hot or not hot	
9	cell, the black cell piping the black cell	
10	vessels, and we qualify all the way out to the	
11	isolation valves in the hot cell, and those	
12	isolation valves are on jumpers. So all of	
13	that out to that isolation valve is qualified	
14	to seismic Cat 1.	
15	I believe, as Mr. Kasdorf talked	
16	about in his testimony, those isolation valves	
17	there are on a post-DBE or post-seismic event.	
18	Their function is to be able to isolate.	
19	Obviously, our inventory, we don't have	
20	significant inventory in the hot cell. Our	
21	inventory is in our vessels. Our vessels are	
22	in our black cells.	

Page 188 So the function of those isolation 1 2 valves is post-DBE through a switch. The operator has the ability to close those 3 isolation valves. The switch also terminates 4 5 power to non-safety pumps, i.e. we stop 6 pumping. We'll stop pumping and we'll isolate 7 the inventory in the black cells. 8 MR. DEWEY: Okay. And so up to 9 the isolation valve it's seismic Category 1. MR. ASHLEY: Cat -- seismic Cat 1. 10 MR. DEWEY: And on the other side 11 12 it's seismic Category 3. 13 MR. ASHLEY: Seismic Cat 3. 14 Is that part of the MR. DEWEY: 15 reason why you can't demonstrate containment? 16 MS. BUSCHE: No. 17 MR. DEWEY: Okay. It's not. From a 18 MS. BUSCHE: 19 functional classification standpoint, we 20 wouldn't care what the initiator was. We 21 would functionally classify it based on the 22 bounding unmitigated consequence. It's not

Page 189 rocket science. 1 2 So we are primarily at this stage 3 looking at what are the range of transients 4 that could create a potential loss of 5 confinement. The easiest one that drives it is a jumper misalignment. So at the 6 7 unmitigated stage it wasn't --8 MR. DEWEY: Okay. 9 MS. BUSCHE: -- just picked the 10 worst one. 11 MR. ASHLEY: Just to add on to that, similar to commercial nuclear 12 13 facilities, leaks of that type, spray leaks, 14 are treated as non-mechanistic. We use 15 consensus codes and standards for design of 16 piping and vessels. Regardless of the codes 17 and standards you use, you still assume nonmechanistic breaks. 18 19 And I believe what Ms. Busche is 20 talking about is, regardless of what we had 21 done in design, nuclear safety would still 22 assume that we have vessel leaks, that we have

Page 190 That is just part of spray leaks in piping. 1 2 the safety control strategy that is required. 3 MR. DEWEY: So if you go to the 4 description that you were just giving of a 5 reactor, are you saying then that they don't 6 consider the piping the primary boundary? 7 MR. ASHLEY: Absolutely. We 8 consider the piping the primary boundary as 9 well. 10 MR. DEWEY: No, we were just 11 discussing that the structure in the C5-V is 12 the primary containment. 13 MR. ASHLEY: We design the piping 14 to the consensus codes and standards to 15 maintain that confinement boundary. 16 MR. DEWEY: But you don't credit it. 17 18 MS. BUSCHE: Correct. From an 19 accident analysis, it is a mitigative 20 strategy. That is irrespective of how you 21 protect the hazard closest to the source. We 22 chose not to pick the primary boundary to

		Page
1	credit it in the accident analysis. We chose	
2	a mitigative strategy to credit the C5-V.	
3	MR. DEWEY: Thanks.	
4	MS. BUSCHE: Is still the the	
5	pipe is still the primary boundary. That has	
6	not changed.	
7	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Dr. Mansfield?	
8	MEMBER MANSFIELD: From everything	
9	that has been said about the future waste	
10	acceptance criteria, it almost certainly is	
11	going to require blending for especially	
12	for the sludge batches. And that is going to	
13	require more sampling, it's going to require	
14	lab work. Somebody even mentioned it might	
15	require grinding of large particles. And it	
16	is certainly going to involve, therefore,	
17	additional risks.	
18	And will it involve increasing the	
19	number of batches? Right now you've got	
20	planned a fixed number of batches, 300 and	
21	something I think, wasn't it? What's going to	
22	happen if you need is all of this blending	

191

		Page	192
1	going to require blending by the way, to		
2	achieve radiological properties that are going		
3	to be required to satisfy the HPAV conditions,		
4	for instance are you clear what I mean?		
5	If you can't achieve proper shear		
6	strength, for instance, and it's going to		
7	require in the sludge waste, and it's going		
8	to require blending to do that, is that going		
9	to require more batches to be dispatched to		
10	the WTP? Or are you going to be able to use		
11	supernate from		
12	MR. ASHLEY: I believe that		
13	currently and as Dr. Triay spoke the		
14	current system plan already requires blending.		
15	There will be blending to mobilize the		
16	sludges. Those requirements, in terms of, you		
17	know, the rheology of those batches, are		
18	already in the ICD.		
19	MR. SAIN: That's correct.		
20	MR. ASHLEY: So		
21	MEMBER MANSFIELD: So no		
22	conceivable treatment requirement is going to		

Page 193 require more batches. You're not going to 1 2 have to add any volume to the waste stream? 3 MR. ASHLEY: We are in constant discussion with the tank farm, as we talked 4 5 about in terms of how we control the solids 6 concentration in HLP-22 [High-level Waste Lag 7 Storage and Feed Blending Process System], has 8 a very small effect on the number of batches. 9 However, that is -- as I said, that is being communicated and worked with the tank farm. 10 You know, some of the decisions that 11 12 are made, they are integrated decisions in 13 terms of our -- the WTP requirements and will 14 that have an effect on the mission, on the mission life, increasing number of batches. 15 So all of those are considerations as we 16 17 discuss what -- you know, the specific 18 requirements for the WTP. 19 MEMBER MANSFIELD: I don't have any 20 questions. 21 Mr. Bader? CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: 22 Ms. Busche, I'd like MEMBER BADER:

	Page 194
1	to go back to the deposition velocity. Do you
2	feel comfortable incorporating in your safety
3	documents a value that is agreed to be wrong?
4	MS. BUSCHE: Short answer, no.
5	MEMBER BADER: I don't either.
6	Would you like to set the precedent for being
7	the first in the DOE complex to do that?
8	MS. BUSCHE: No.
9	MEMBER BADER: I wouldn't either.
10	End of questions. I can't believe this. I'm
11	done.
12	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Any others?
13	(No response.)
14	Thank you, Mr. Bader.
15	This concludes testimony from our
16	staff and that of the Department and its
17	contractors. Thank you very much. We
18	appreciate it. We know that you are here late
19	at night with us, and it has been a very good
20	exchange. We appreciate that.
21	I will now call on members of the
22	public who have signed up to speak. As I

	Page 195
1	indicated earlier, I'd ask that each speaker
2	limit remarks to about five minutes. If time
3	permits, I will extend time for additional
4	comments.
5	And we do have one speaker with us
6	tonight, Mr. Patrick Pinto.
7	MR. PINTO: My name is Patrick
8	Pinto, and I am a chemical engineer. I have
9	worked in this DOE nuclear fuels reprocessing
10	and waste management business for over 35
11	years.
12	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Sir? We're
13	having a problem with that mic feed.
14	(Whereupon, adjustments were made to
15	the microphone system.)
16	Mr. Pinto, we'd like you to
17	please start at the beginning, sir.
18	MR. PINTO: Okay. My name is
19	Patrick Pinto. I am a chemical engineer, and
20	I have worked in the nuclear in the DOE
21	nuclear fuels reprocessing and waste
22	management business for the last over 35

		Page	196
1	years. In fact, I started my working career		
2	here at Hanford in 1973 in the tank farms as		
3	a process engineer working on the sludge		
4	sluicing program, where the sludge was being		
5	sluiced out of the tanks. So I am very		
б	familiar with the nature of these solids.		
7	In 1980, I moved to work in the oil		
8	business, because I was tired of the DOE		
9	nuclear fuels work. And the oil business went		
10	caput in 1985 with the oil price falling so		
11	drastically, so I had to seek refuge back in		
12	the nuclear fuels business, and I went to work		
13	at the Idaho National Lab, and I worked there		
14	as a project manager, as a conceptual design		
15	engineer, and as a safety analyst.		
16	So, and since 2001, I have been		
17	working on the waste treatment plant design		
18	for Bechtel. I obviously do not speak for		
19	Bechtel, because I am speaking as a private		
20	citizen.		
21	Now, we are all concerned about the		
22	two big hazards we have which are the HPAV		

issue, hydrogen explosion in pipes, and the 1 2 plutonium criticality issue. And I would 3 suggest that keeping the waste constantly 4 suspended is a very extremely conservative and 5 costly process to mitigate these hazards. 6 I would rather propose that we let 7 the solids settle and ventilate the tank 8 space. To keep the solids constantly 9 suspended takes a lot of energy, and we have to use all of these PJMs, and these PJMs are 10 very compressive air intensive. And if one 11 12 were to calculate just the cost of the amount 13 of compressed air used it is a huge amount, 14 and you are talking about a large continuing 15 operating cost for the plant. 16 Now, you can take just a small 17 fraction of that area you are using to keep 18 these solids suspended and ventilate the vapor 19 space of the tank and cause a virtual tornado 20 So you have really gotten rid of in the tank. 21 the HPAV issue just by the dilution effect. 22 Now, the other safety concerns I

> Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

### Page 197

		Page	198
1	have are with CCN [Correspondence Control		
2	Number] ion exchange and the ultrafiltration		
3	process itself. The CCN ion exchange process		
4	uses CCN ion exchange columns with valve		
5	manifolds. And the valves can leak, and you		
6	have all of these transfers, numerous and		
7	advertent transfers, and the project has		
8	written reports saying all of these leaks		
9	would be in a safe direction, so we don't have		
10	to worry about them.		
11	But I don't think that statement		
12	really would hold true, if someone were to		
13	you know, but there is it's not really a		
14	safety issue so much. You know, providing		
15	valves and jumpers is a huge cost. And then,		
16	when the valves leak because the design		
17	that is used here is the same design that was		
18	used at West Valley. And, you know, there		
19	were valve leakage problems at West Valley.		
20	So I in response to these		
21	concerns on valve leakage, I did submit		
22	defensive professional opinion reports where		

	Page 199
1	I came up with a very simple system to get rid
2	of the valves and do a valveless transfer
3	between columns. And, in fact, the cost
4	savings were so high that you could totally
5	I was planning to use a cartridge system for
6	the ion exchange, and it would totally get rid
7	of the present disposal system and the resin
8	addition system.
9	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Mr. Pinto, could
10	you begin to summarize your comments, and we
11	will accept what you would like to submit for
12	the record.
13	MR. PINTO: Okay. Well, I haven't
14	gotten into the ultrafiltration system yet.
15	If we accept the premise that we could let the
16	solids settle see, that is the only reason
17	for using an ultrafiltration system, that we
18	cannot let the solids settle. We could go
19	with a gravity clarifier and get much higher
20	concentration solids than the ultrafiltration
21	system would yield for you.
22	In fact, the ultrafiltration system

		Page	200
1	ultrafiltration is a very inappropriate		
2	technology to use, because it is mainly used		
3	for polishing waste streams with very small		
4	solids content. You cannot use		
5	ultrafiltration to concentrate solids, because		
6	you run into an enthalpy problem. You've got		
7	this tank from where you're pumping the liquid		
8	around, and you're concentrating trying to		
9	concentrate the solids in this tank.		
10	And as you remove the permeate, the		
11	level in the tank falls, and you've got to		
12	make up the liquid by adding very diluted		
13	solids. So you've got you are constantly		
14	adding four percent solids to a 10, 11, 15		
15	percent stream. So you've got a big enthalpy		
16	increase problem.		
17	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Mr. Pinto, could		
18	you		
19	MR. PINTO: Yes?		
20	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: could you		
21	finish up your remarks in about a minute,		
22	please?		

		Page	201
1	MR. PINTO: Well, the basic comment		
2	I have is that we are wasting a lot of the		
3	public's money on these on using the wrong		
4	technology to do the separation of the solids		
5	from the liquids. If you use gravity		
6	settling, you could separate you know, the		
7	batch of ultrafilters, solids, that you are		
8	going to process could be done in one-tenth		
9	the time.		
10	So if on the basis of that, the		
11	whole pretreatment facility would have to run		
12	10 times longer. And look at all of the		
13	operating costs you are incurring in that		
14	respect.		
15	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Thank you.		
16	MR. PINTO: Well, since you are		
17	hurrying me up, I will end my speech and wish		
18	the project the best of luck.		
19	CHAIRMAN WINOKUR: Thank you.		
20	Please submit whatever you would like for the		
21	record. We are happy to accept it.		
22	Are there any other members of the		

		Page	202
1	public who wish to speak at this time?		
2	(No response.)		
3	That concludes the public comment		
4	portion of this session, and I will,		
5	therefore, close this session. Anyone who		
6	wishes to submit written testimony should do		
7	so at this time by giving a copy to the		
8	Board's General Counsel, Richard Azzaro.		
9	Thank you all for coming. We are		
10	recessing the hearing, and we will reconvene		
11	tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m.		
12	(Whereupon, at 8:25 p.m., the above-		
13	entitled matter went off the record.)		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			

٦

	14.18	140.19 142.11 21	advantages 107.13	amount 88.3
<u>A</u>	accomplish 62.18	143.15 146.8	advertent 198.7	127.19 20 197.12
abandoned 12:15	69.12	149.22 151.4	advice 13.2	197.13
37:12	accomplishment	addendums 55.3	advice 13.2 advise 99.18	<b>AMWTP</b> 129.9
<b>abandoning</b> 37:14	23.3	adding 76.14 77.3	advising 12.17	analyses 178.21
<b>ability</b> 16:14 17:22	account $108.8$	77.12 78.7 79.2	advocate 136.5 6	analysis 19.19
35:10 54:10 50:15	accounted 37.9	200.12 14	136.16	21.12 15 22.2 3
60:9 111:22 112:4	41·16	addition $25.7$	advocating 99.14	21.12,13 22.2,3
112:5 115:2	accumulated	121.16 177.20	aerosolized 59.5	22.12,17 25.15
148:20 188:3	172.19	199.8	aerosols 149.7 7	30.66839.1
able 57:19 50:8	accumulation 32.5	additional 7.1 11.5	affect 56.7 99.17	40.10 19 21 41.12
60:10 80:4 84:16	116·21	31.11 38.1 58.11	afforded 83.22	41.19 43.20 44.14
100:19,22 115:15	accurate 105.18	69.11 70.12 13	age 75.4	44.17 45.13 47.2
120:5 150:2 172:2	146.15	72:16 73:14 76:14	agencies $9.22$	50.3 15 16 51.9
1/4:15 18/:18	accurately 74.16	77.17 22 191.17	ago 68.1 122.9	51.18 52.13 19
192:10 abaalutalu 67:10 20	achieve $192.2.5$	195.3	130.10 156.5	55.3 57.16 58.14
absolutely 07:19,20	achievement 23.16	address 24.1 25.5	agree 43.16 90.18	59.13 13 18 61.1
85:11 87:7,8 88:5	33.4	26.2 30.1 87.2 9	93·20 101·19	63.13,136.18
98:5 108:18 158:5	acid 113.1 158.1	88.15 132.15 15	137.14 168.8	140.11 18 22
190:7	acids 113.7	148.5 173.12	agreed 67.3 78.16	142.14 150.6
academia $15.5$	acknowledged	addressed 21.20	168.6 179.9 194.3	154.4 156.7 158.6
28.12 100.11 15	44·13	22.16 31.7 122.1	agreed-to 143.6	161.5 162.1 10.15
38:12 199:11,15	act 5.5 7.14 21 8.21	144.22	agreeing 67.14	163.2 164.8
201:21	10:1	addresses 19:20	102:2	166:16 168:7
175.2	action 8:20 76:14	addressing 132:10	ahead 19:10 37:21	171:15.16 175:1
1/J.2	actions 14:2 50:5	159:11	38:7 85:16 105:2	179:16 182:8
acceptable 40.10	55:11 88:10.18	adds 77:5	125:14	184:9.12.19
<i>ALLS 72.10 91.0</i>	active 25:7.12	adequate 8:10.18	aid 36:5	190:19 191:1
41.0 /2.10 01.9	26:22 27:17 32:18	36:15 49:16	air 197:11.13	analyst 196:15
02.1 00.10 134.0	42:14 75:17.20	adequately 16:14	alarms 95:17.22	analyze 56:8 60:6
135.2,9 191.10	87:22 118:2	50:5	96:1	60:15 63:22
accepted 57:175:7	148:11.17	adiourn 7:12	align 28:10	136:18
accepts 30:21	activity 83:15	Adjournment 3:22	aligned 145:12	<b>analyzed</b> 161:10
27.1	186:11	adjudicated 123:8	181:3	ancillary 20:2 25:5
27.1 accident 11.2 20.1	actual 28:14 123:1	adjudication	aligns 20:12	162:22
A0.10 20 21 41.12	130:11 150:8	123:22	<b>allow</b> 46:7 49:6.19	answer 16:3 53:4
40.10,20,21 41.12	151:3	adjustments	49:20 50:5 119:19	54:8.12 74:2.8
41.19 40.10 31.3	add 92:14 98:7.9	195:14	158:9 174:11	83:11 85:20 89:22
140.10 134.4	126:22 138:11.14	administrative	<b>allowed</b> 62:18	106:9 119:10
1/1.13 102.7	145:5 146:12.21	20:21 129:4	allows 129:1 158:8	126:13 133:15.21
105.15 104.9,12	189:11 193:2	adopt 165:17	alternate 28:16	141:6 144:7
170.17 171.1 accidental 17.71	added 76:12 77:17	adopted 22:13	alternative 17:5	152:13 156:14
accidents $10.19$	77:22 80:20	125:6 167:3	182:11	162:12.13 173:19
A2.6 18.12 20	116:17	advantage 135:2	alternatives 28:8	174:10.14 186:4
42.0 40.12,20 51.11 62.15 1/1.2	addendum 19:20	136:1 138:19	aluminum 36:6	194:4
15/1	55:8,13 57:7 59:1	advantageous	amended 7:15	answered 145:1
1.74.1 accommodated	105:18 139:5.9	135:3	AMERICA 1:1	answering 151:2
accommonateu	· - ,-			0

Г

	I	I	I	I
answers 15:11,12	19:14,15,16 20:10	asserts 43:19	74:10	<b>balances</b> 128:3,4
15:18 60:6 119:9	144:14 165:9	assess 28:6	auxiliary 20:1	barrier 48:3
Anybody 148:3	April 25:4	assessment 107:14	availability 114:22	<b>base</b> 166:17
<b>anyway</b> 134:9	area 27:7 130:5	161:16	available 5:10,12	<b>based</b> 21:3 40:12
appears 68:13	131:19 132:19	assessments 184:10	5:15 15:12 28:8	45:5 49:10 57:18
Appendix 85:3	197:17	Assistant 53:13	110:9 133:5	58:8 64:13 82:19
163:15,15	areas 16:9,13 56:17	166:21	178:10	156:8,16 166:16
applicable 51:1	58:10 84:1 176:22	associated 5:14	avails 107:21	188:21
application 129:14	argued 184:6	51:3 111:18,19	avoid 132:12	baseline 57:2
169:2 181:12	arguing 82:8	153:10 157:20	avoiding 132:6	<b>bases</b> 17:13 24:14
186:6	ARPMCU 159:9	<b>assume</b> 88:21	awaiting 139:10	28:12 29:4,20
applications	articulate 154:15	99:10 184:15	146:15	32:19 93:7,19
177:11	articulated 141:12	189:17,22	Azzaro 1:19 4:15	172:2
applied 32:9 44:15	Ashley 1:22 53:20	assumed 21:1 30:8	202:8	<b>basic</b> 131:5 159:12
65:21 97:12 129:2	77:20 102:17	31:22 34:6,6 40:3	<b>a.m</b> 202:11	160:4 201:1
<b>apply</b> 22:3 65:14	103:20 104:5,8	40:13 184:17,19		basically 108:10
appointee 18:18	106:11,19 107:4,8	assumption 74:22	<u> </u>	111:13 125:2
appreciate 89:16	107:11,18,21	163:19	<b>B</b> 162:11	136:21 149:2
90:6 194:18,20	108:6,10,16 109:8	assumptions 22:12	<b>back</b> 61:13 73:13	<b>basis</b> 12:19 19:3,9
approach 21:20	109:14 110:1,5,12	28:13 40:9 41:2	81:11 93:18 95:15	19:18 20:14,14
23:5 25:17 28:3	110:17,19 111:2	74:21 85:4 161:21	98:10 117:14	34:8,13 37:11
31:2,9 32:21	111:13 112:4,9,12	163:17	123:21 124:2	39:5,11 44:1 52:9
37:12,15,22 45:12	112:15,17,20	Assurance 54:1	127:5 133:11	56:16 61:3,11
46:5,7,11 48:13	113:11,21 114:2,5	<b>assure</b> 105:4 115:6	139:4 142:20	63:7,10 64:19
48:17 97:11 104:4	114:8,20 115:12	133:2	149:1 150:11	65:10,16 74:11
135:1 145:13	116:2,6,13,20	assuring 23:3	167:3 169:22	84:16 86:9 90:8
167:5 176:12,18	117:6,13 130:20	<b>as-we-go</b> 14:19	171:2 178:4 194:1	102:19,21 103:2
180:15	130:21 148:6	<b>Atomic</b> 7:14,21	196:11	103:10,17 104:1
appropriate 7:7	152:12 157:8	10:1	background 11:5	104:12 105:15
23:11 30:11 59:12	159:14 160:6	attach 171:9	93:14	118:20 119:21
appropriately 15:6	161:7 186:8,18	attached 61:10	backwards 122:8	141:14 149:3
173:18	188:10,13 189:11	attempt 68:22	Bader 1:15 4:12	150:10 153:4
approval 29:20	190:7,13 192:12	attempted 39:4	119:1,3 120:2,11	154:6 156:1 161:1
32:19 55:10	192:20 193:3	attention 139:4	120:18 122:2,4	163:3 165:11
129:16 139:10	asked 18:21 89:17	<b>audio</b> 109:1	125:11,15,21	169:22 170:7
142:16 146:7,18	89:17 101:11	auditorium 6:6	126:3 127:1,4	171:21 201:10
169:17	104:14 124:11	August 16:5	128:16 130:18,21	<b>batch</b> 37:6 98:14
approvals 29:21	128:9 133:12	austenitic 31:13,19	16/:21 168:2,13	201:7
approved 19:18	175:8	<b>authority</b> 7:14,17	169:15 170:13	<b>batches</b> 81:22 98:1
20:14 24:14 29:16	asking 69:22 76:19	19:2 24:12 61:3	193:21,22 194:5,9	98:2,5 100:12
30:1,7 31:6 55:9	100:18 180:21	146:7 167:1,6	194:14	160:7,8 191:12,19
55:17 56:5 61:9	aspect 122:5	169:5 174:1 175:5	<b>Dalance</b> 68:19	191:20 192:9,17
104:2,12 139:9	<b>aspects</b> 34:3 43:20	175:14,18 176:6,8	69:17 70:6 79:12	193:1,8,15
141:21 142:15	117:15 118:19	177:6,6,18,19	100:6 101:6 121:8	Bechtel 17:11 18:5
168:6	162:4	178:15 179:4	139:20 holonord 102 7	23:8 24:11 28:1
approving 65:15	assertion 44:1 67:3	181:14	Dalanced 102:7	29:2,13 30:2 31:3
approximately	67:7	authorization	125:2	31:17 32:6,12

٦

52 10 20 121 10		174 1 00 175 6 14	65 10 21 66 5 8	100 1 100 1 100 0
53:18,20 121:19	<b>beyond</b> 41:15 96:8	1/4:1,22 1/5:6,14	65:19,21 66:5,8	120:1 129:1 130:9
196:18,19	big 95:16 196:22	1/5:18 1/6:6,20	68:22 /0:10 82:7	139:7,13 145:9
becoming 38:15	200:15	177:7,18 181:14	86:3,13,16,18,22	146:2 149:21
<b>began</b> 11:8 12:14	<b>billion</b> 122:12	<b>Board's</b> 4:14,16 5:8	87:4 104:21 105:3	151:1,13 152:2,10
15:9,17	<b>bit</b> 63:4 122:8	5:10,16,17,19	145:4 146:7,10,14	153:21 156:3
beginning 6:11	135:1 138:13	7:17,19 8:2 9:4,17	146:20	160:22 161:3
7:22 38:14 92:10	155:21	9:21 12:13 15:5	brought 59:2 165:3	162:8 163:13
182:15 186:20	<b>black</b> 26:19 46:12	15:11,13 17:7	165:4 168:21	164:22 165:8
195:17	46:13,16 49:15	33:18 34:1 41:21	Brown 1:16 4:10	168:4,8,14,18
begins 8:6 112:8	187:9,9,22 188:7	42:1 129:15	133:7,8,20 134:5	169:9,15,21
<b>begun</b> 9:3	blackened 14:14	169:12 176:8	134:10,20 135:4	171:18,20 172:17
behalf 179:5	<b>bleeds</b> 170:20	179:9 202:8	136:4 137:9,15	172:22 173:14
believe 24:20 39:8	<b>blend</b> 77:8 135:9	<b>BOD</b> 103:2,21	139:3 140:2 145:3	181:20 182:4,7,19
44:2 46:21 70:10	135:18 137:18	boiling 36:5	145:7 146:6,11,19	184:1,8,22 185:9
72:18 74:18 75:7	blending 72:16	<b>bottom</b> 89:9	147:19 149:16	185:17,19 186:4
76:2,4 87:18	88:18 134:12,17	Boulevard 1:12	150:18 151:7	188:16,18 189:9
88:14 89:1,21	135:2,9,11,20	boundary 30:9,12	153:13,14 155:20	189:19 190:18
101:13 106:2	136:9,22 138:7	47:12 49:7,10	157:5,8 159:8,22	191:4 193:22
120:14 125:5,8	191:11,22 192:1,8	152:17.19 153:17	160:21 162:3	194:4,8
146:15 152:22	192:14.15 193:7	153:20 154:4	163:9 164:20	Busche's 146:12
154:9 163:6.13.15	<b>BNI</b> 1:22 2:14 29:2	155:4 170:8	165:1 166:13.20	business 98:20
164:16 168:5.10	38:5.11 40:7	182:22 185:11	167:21 168:1	195:10.22 196:8.9
168:14 169:1.11	41:10.17 44:15.19	190:6.8.15.22	170:10.11 172:14	196:12
170:9 171:20	45:2.5.8 48:13	191:5	172:18 173:1.21	<b>buy</b> 80:17
176.11 179.20	50.16 51.9 14		172.10 175.1,21	buy 00.17
	1 10 11 8 14	bounded 123.8	176.19 178.2	
1/0:11 1/8:20	52.17 90.13 147.4	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10	176:19 178:2 180:20	С
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15	52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>RNI's</b> 41:11 45:13	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10	176:19 178:2 180:20 huild 126:1	C calc 163:17 164:19
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3 10 15 16	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:14	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 bolioved 40:3 87:20	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 BNI's 41:11 45:13 50:10 Board 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5 8 13	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildun</b> 35:5	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44·19
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6 15	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 BNI's 41:11 45:13 50:10 Board 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5 10 8:3 9	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brond now 68:14	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:10 48:18 40:8	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13 17 20 9:0	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 brand-new 68:14	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 40:14 51:18	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breached 48:15	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 170:20	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 12:17 14:10 16:2	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 breachet 120:6	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17 17 87:22	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breache 180:18	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9 11
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 22:21	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 42:15	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 29:1 79:7	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 150:15 160:2	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 89:21 04:21	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5
170:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177.12	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 20:10 22:10 15	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101 12 18	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 24 2 11 20 29 22	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14
176:11 178:20   180:3,8 181:21   183:17 187:15   189:19 192:12   194:10   believed 40:3 87:20   believed 40:3 87:20   believed 40:3 87:20   believes 45:6,15   46:19 48:18 49:8   49:14 51:18   179:20   bending 166:1   beneficial 158:18   159:15 169:3   177:12   benefit 116:17	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 20 14 40 17 41 10	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 93:17 benefits 93:17	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calculations 184:15
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 116:17 benefits 93:17 best 54:10 105:5	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 40:15 415 45 45	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 116:17 benefits 93:17 best 54:10 105:5 124:7 125:3 136:7	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 43:15 44:7 45:15	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22 bring 71:17	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10 56:19 57:22 58:19	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10 candid 165:16
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 93:17 best 54:10 105:5 124:7 125:3 136:7 167:5 174:14	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 43:15 44:7 45:15 46:10,19 49:8,13 51:0,12 40:17 41:19	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22 bringing 71:17 broadcast 5:6	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10 56:19 57:22 58:19 59:15 63:12 64:12 64:12	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10 candid 165:16 canabilitica 50:0
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 116:17 benefits 93:17 best 54:10 105:5 124:7 125:3 136:7 167:5 174:14 175:19 177:12	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 43:15 44:7 45:15 46:10,19 49:8,13 51:18 53:5,6 54:7	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22 bringing 71:17 broadcast 5:6 Brockman 1:22	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10 56:19 57:22 58:19 59:15 63:12 64:12 64:15,20 65:3,6	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10 candid 165:16 capabilities 50:9
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 116:17 benefits 93:17 best 54:10 105:5 124:7 125:3 136:7 167:5 174:14 175:19 177:12 178:12 201:18	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 43:15 44:7 45:15 46:10,19 49:8,13 51:18 53:5,6 54:7 95:19,21 97:14	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22 bring 78:22 bringing 71:17 broadcast 5:6 Brockman 1:22 18:12,15 33:8	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10 56:19 57:22 58:19 59:15 63:12 64:12 64:15,20 65:3,6 65:12 82:12,17 20 20 21 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10 candid 165:16 capabilities 50:9 156:9 canabilities 17:6
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 93:17 best 54:10 105:5 124:7 125:3 136:7 167:5 174:14 175:19 177:12 178:12 201:18 better 74:16 137:1	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 43:15 44:7 45:15 46:10,19 49:8,13 51:18 53:5,6 54:7 95:19,21 97:14 99:14 147:12,16	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22 bring 78:22 bring 71:17 broadcast 5:6 Brockman 1:22 18:12,15 33:8 53:14 61:3,6,21	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10 56:19 57:22 58:19 59:15 63:12 64:12 64:15,20 65:3,6 65:12 82:12,17 83:20 84:21 85:11	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10 candid 165:16 capabilities 50:9 156:9 capability 17:6
176:11 178:20 180:3,8 181:21 183:17 187:15 189:19 192:12 194:10 believed 40:3 87:20 believes 45:6,15 46:19 48:18 49:8 49:14 51:18 179:20 bending 166:1 beneficial 158:18 159:15 169:3 177:12 benefit 93:17 best 54:10 105:5 124:7 125:3 136:7 167:5 174:14 175:19 177:12 178:12 201:18 better 74:16 137:1 143:16 176:18	50:10 51:8,14 52:17 90:13 147:4 <b>BNI's</b> 41:11 45:13 50:10 <b>Board</b> 1:3,10,15,16 1:17 3:3 4:5,8,13 6:5 7:5,10 8:3,9 8:13,17,20 9:9 10:16 11:1 12:17 13:17 14:10 16:2 16:4,11 18:8,16 18:17 22:15 23:21 23:21 24:1 29:11 30:18 33:10,15 34:3,11,20 38:22 39:14 40:17 41:19 41:22 42:7 43:8 43:15 44:7 45:15 46:10,19 49:8,13 51:18 53:5,6 54:7 95:19,21 97:14 99:14 147:12,16 167:1,7 169:5	bounded 123:8 bounding 37:10 188:22 bounds 88:8 box 123:19 124:1,4 124:12 brand-new 68:14 breached 48:15 breadth 63:14 break 120:6 breaks 189:18 briefed 43:15 147:14 briefly 50:12 101:5 109:2 bright 165:2 bring 78:22 bringing 71:17 broadcast 5:6 Brockman 1:22 18:12,15 33:8 53:14 61:3,6,21 62:3,7,10 65:14	176:19 178:2 180:20 <b>build</b> 126:1 <b>building</b> 37:20 38:7 48:3 153:19 <b>buildup</b> 35:5 <b>built</b> 66:2 69:12 70:14 122:10 <b>bulges</b> 26:17 27:2 61:17,17 87:22 117:17,18 <b>burden</b> 38:1 78:7 88:21 94:21 101:13,18 <b>bureaucracy</b> 174:6 <b>Busche</b> 1:23 54:2 55:1,2,7 56:1,10 56:19 57:22 58:19 59:15 63:12 64:12 64:15,20 65:3,6 65:12 82:12,17 83:20 84:21 85:11 100:18 119:17	C calc 163:17 164:19 calculate 197:12 calculated 42:5 44:19 calculation 41:11 44:9 85:2 164:5 calculational 42:22 calculations 42:4 44:7 175:9,11 call 6:9 59:16 91:22 126:16 142:5 144:11 157:22 163:1 184:14 194:21 calques 184:15 Canada 122:10 candid 165:16 capabilities 50:9 156:9 capability 17:6 capable 162:6

<b>capital</b> 124:20	centimeter 43:17	195:12 199:9	182:17 184:4,6	104:9 116:7
128:1 158:22	44:4	200:17,20 201:15	characteristics	131:12 147:21
159:4,6	centimeters 44:4	201:19	26:3,6 74:1 98:11	clarifying 151:6
caput 196:10	certain 59:19 82:22	challenge 71:20	122:17	class 25:14,22
care 51:20 188:20	88:6 119:12	94:12 143:20	characterization	27:19 36:8 40:15
career 196:1	124:13 138:4	challenges 35:9	11:21 28:13 36:9	42:10,12,13 45:1
carefully 54:7	certainly 75:22	36:19 140:17	36:16 37:17 66:18	45:20,22 46:18
carried 57:6	96:16 114:18	challenging 11:15	79:17 80:16 98:6	49:1 58:4 83:8
carrying 9:1	131:1 191:10,16	36:2 72:15 76:11	185:7	116:4
cartridge 199:5	Cesium 158:1	76:16,21	characterize 67:21	classification 22:4
<b>case</b> 10:4,16 36:22	CFR 30:15 162:7	chances 136:10	characterized 73:9	25:15 29:17 47:15
75:21	174:19 175:3	change 5:1 23:4	99:3 160:8	82:22 140:5
cases 83:22 98:9	177:5	29:5,14,16,19	characterizing	148:22 149:10,19
112:8 129:15,16	<b>chair</b> 1:15 4:9 6:22	32:1,20 56:6 78:5	79:20	150:19 178:19
155:9,18 182:4	54:19 55:22 56:3	78:10 79:9 85:14	Charboneau 1:23	179:1 186:7
186:9,10	56:12 57:20 58:17	88:9 100:10 101:5	124:21	188:19
casualty 96:4	59:11 61:2,7,22	149:10 160:9,18	charge 9:5 10:5	classifications
Cat 186:21 187:4,6	62:4,8,20 64:5,13	161:18 164:1	charter 9:21	185:14
187:7,14 188:10	64:16,21 65:4,7	170:3 178:19	chartered 28:6	classified 25:14
188:10,13	65:13,20 66:1,6,9	changed 41:18	chemical 11:13	77:15 148:10
categorization	66:12,20 67:4,8	82:19,19 180:21	13:3 27:5 111:22	186:9
186:22	67:12,19 69:20	191:6	112:21 113:7	classify 49:9
categorizations	71:13 72:4,7	changes 14:14	114:13 115:20	188:21
185:13	76:10 77:13 78:14	17:11 20:6,7,8,9	118:7 128:11	<b>clean</b> 48:7 129:20
categorize 61:16	79:5,8 80:7,10	21:2,8,22 22:12	132:6,13,17 195:8	cleaning 112:21
category 186:1,16	81:1 96:12 97:9	22:17 24:13,20	195:19	<b>Cleanup</b> 11:19
187:5 188:9,12	99:8,13,21 180:19	25:2 27:20 28:7,9	chemistry 11:16	<b>clear</b> 61:19 71:4
cause 45:10 197:19	<b>Chairman</b> 1:12,14	29:10 34:6,8	35:19	82:5 111:21
caused 149:1,11	3:3 4:3,4 18:16	41:19 42:3 50:17	Chief 167:12 169:6	115:15 118:21
caustic 122:16	23:21 33:7,15	52:22 55:12 56:4	170:16,16 176:4	137:16 161:11
CCN 198:1,3,4	53:6 67:2,9 72:6,8	56:11,13 57:15	176:10 178:9,14	168:11 180:4
cell 26:17 27:7	73:12 81:15 82:4	61:16 62:18 73:7	179:4,8,18 180:7	192:4
46:13,16,20 49:15	83:16 84:14 85:7	83:14 86:11 89:11	181:15	clearer 39:9
49:17 88:1 110:22	85:21 86:15,17,19	90:7 99:16 105:15	Chip 181:15	clearly 58:22 68:17
114:7,8,9,16	87:7 89:15 90:5	111:19 142:1,11	<b>choose</b> 150:9	70:2 76:13 103:4
117:16,19,21	91:12,17 94:7,9	142:13 143:16,22	<b>chose</b> 104:3 182:11	139:18 143:1
151:12 181:22	95:7 96:11 101:2	145:10 146:1	190:22 191:1	147:16 166:7
186:10 187:8,9,9	104:20,21,22	158:14,17,19	<b>chosen</b> 19:9 35:14	170:6
187:9,11,20	105:3,12,21 106:4	159:15,16 160:10	51:8 54:7 58:9	clogging 73:1
cells 14:15 26:18,19	118:10,12 130:20	161:5 166:11	<b>cited</b> 63:1	<b>close</b> 81:18 143:9
26:22 46:12,13	133:6,9 147:11	changing 77:16	citizen 196:20	146:17 149:22
110:22 116:1	151:5 153:12	78:8,9 163:1,3	clarification 145:6	188:3 202:5
149:18,20 150:20	167:1 170:10	<b>Chapter 58:13</b>	clarifications	closed 143:5,12
151:16 152:6,8	174:13 178:3	140:12 141:1	119:18	closely 4:18 181:5
153:15 154:9	179:7,22 180:13	143:16	clarified 103:9,11	181:16
187:22 188:7	181:17 191:7	chapters 144:1	clarifier 199:19	<b>closest</b> 47:22
Center 1:11	193:21 194:12	characteristic	clarify 102:18	190:21

			l	l
closure 31:4	199:10	37:21 59:12	153:5,11,18	concerted 121:19
<b>CNP/CXP</b> 157:22	commercial 95:15	completion 9:18	154:18	conclude 32:12
158:20	150:3,4 189:12	38:8 92:21 131:2	comprehensive	176:13
<b>code</b> 30:15 179:13	commissionable	146:8	30:18 52:13,19	concluded 5:11
codes 189:15,16	60:13	<b>complex</b> 10:6 27:10	59:12	38:22 45:2,8
190:14	commissioned	38:17 39:17 73:15	compressed 197:13	92:13
coefficient 22:18	14:11 30:20	75:16 85:8,19,19	compressive	concludes 18:7
cold 130:2	commissioning	86:5 89:19 90:22	197:11	31:8 53:3 194:15
colleague 89:1	13:20 14:18 15:1	91:11 93:16 94:5	comprising 6:2	202:3
colleagues 4:8	19:11 100:12	94:18 105:6 111:5	conceivable 192:22	conclusion 6:1
collected 21:4	121:11 130:3,4	116:10 117:15	concentrate 17:9	31:12,18 71:19
collective 60:3	committed 20:20	119:11 147:10	131:18 160:14	90:17,19 92:16
<b>column</b> 157:17	144:4	163:5 182:8	200:5.9	concrete 101:3
158:13	communicated	185:15 194:7	concentrated 36:6	<b>condition</b> 102:10
columns 198:4	41:20 193:10	complexity 3:14	concentrating	135:15 146:17
199:3	communicating	17:16 26:12 39:1	200:8	163:18
combustible 26.8	139·17	39.6 8 21 40.2 14	concentration	conditions 30.4
27.17 32.5	community 93.20	59.22 90.12 93.22	137.21 157.15	55.10 63.20 100.9
combustion 21.6	companies 127.16	94.3 115.18	193.6 199.20	100.10 106.15
30.10	company 122.10	117.12 118.1 6 14	concentrations	110.10 100.15
$come 71.10 \ 81.10$	company 122.21	118.72 110.1,0,14	137.10	1/2.15 187.2
82.13 84.10 01.22	27.15	128.18 10 133.11	concent 70.20 77.1	102.3
02.13 04.10 91.22	27.13 compare 120.8	120.10,19 155.11	77.11 78.21 80.1	172.5 conduct 61:1 68:6
94.19 90.14 110.10 1 <b>22</b> .9	126.20 127.4	147.4	02.12 17 06.5	conference 171.2
119.19 122.0	130.20 137.4	162.14 167.0	92.12,17 90.3	confidence 22.0
124:11 140:18	158:20,22	105:14 107:9	90:17 99:1 110:15	confidence 25.9
14/:15 158:17	<b>compared</b> 40:5	1/5:5	157:20 158:15	
1/8:11	148:2	<b>compliant</b> 163:6	10/:2	
<b>comes</b> 107:3	comparison 27:8	1/4:19 1/7:4	concepts 131:6	11:14 142:17
114:12 123:20	93:9127:15	complicate 35:10	16/:4	145:11 155:19
124:1 126:14	138:16	165:6	conceptual 196:14	161:9 185:1
130:15	<b>complete</b> 13:12,13	complicated 35:13	conceptually 48:2	configurations
comfortable	13:15 15:18 19:15	35:20 36:17 59:20	<b>concern</b> 39:21 41:3	184:13
127:22 140:13	19:17 32:15 38:19	113:8 114:11	41:20 50:22 56:17	confine 17:19
194:2	38:20 52:11,18	151:4 165:15	68:10 81:5 120:11	confinement 17:20
comforted 142:3	109:13,21 110:2,8	184:18	concerned 14:10	21:19,19 42:14
coming 98:10	128:6 144:15	complies 23:7 33:1	38:16 41:1 182:5	43:5 45:22 47:19
202:9	145:18 157:6	comply 22:7 24:22	196:21	58:14,21 153:20
comment 81:16	164:15 168:7	149:14 164:16	concerning 7:4	154:2,4,7,20
122:5 127:6 130:1	completed 21:12	component 58:4	concerns 12:18	155:13 182:2,14
148:3,7 168:22	21:15 50:11 52:12	153:5	16:11 17:9,10	182:21 185:10
201:1 202:3	52:14 57:5 83:15	components 3:13	35:2,11 40:2 42:8	189:5 190:15
comments 5:21 7:1	152:21 153:1	14:4,7 22:6 23:11	42:17 44:8 74:5	confirmation 175:4
7:3 22:13 33:8	159:21	26:16,20,22 29:18	90:13 147:5,7	confirmed 30:16
53:4 58:6 74:14	completely 33:22	31:19 46:4,7,9,12	173:9 197:22	31:17 175:4
95:20 130:22	55:9 126:4 137:13	47:8 49:3,6 50:1	198:21	confuse 96:3
131:13 143:4,6	137:16	64:14 83:1 87:22	concert 78:6	confused 79:13
173:16 195:4	completing 23:1	152:8,13.15.18	156:12	confusing 96:2
		, , - , -		6

<b>Congress</b> 41:20,22 <b>conjunction</b> 17:14 <b>connect</b> 96:22 <b>connected</b> 186:7	52:15 considers 8:9,18 consistency 60:14 consistent 20:17	continuing 9:4 197:14 contracted 24:12 contractor 37:5	Convention 1:11 conversation 71:3 133:10 conversations	<b>counterparts</b> 9:16 <b>country</b> 93:20 <b>couple</b> 130:10 139:15
connection 183:1	21:9 34:1 46:22	38:1 41:5 42:2	102:8	course 7:11 62:21
connections 113:14	47:14,15 55:8,16	53:11 74:4 93:2	Conversely 21:14	122:16
182:10,18 183:5	85:2 162:2 176:21	contractors 22:9	conveyed 147:15	<b>cover</b> 54:6
consensus 189:15	177:1	35:14 68:7 194:17	conveys 19:7	co-located 49:12
190:14	consistently 55:5	control 11:14 16:16	convinced 86:5	129:13
consensus-buildi	constant 159:9	16:20 19:9 20:21	89:10,18 90:1,2	<b>crave</b> 142:6
175:21	193:3	22:3 24:8 30:20	90:21 94:13	<b>create</b> 132:2,2,4
consequence 37:14	constantly 197:3,8	39:19 50:19 51:2	115:17	189:4
188:22	200:13	51:16 60:11 63:17	<b>copy</b> 202:7	created 11:14 84:3
consequences 40:6	constituent 137:21	71:9 73:6,21	copying 5:15	84:3 172:20
41:14 42:5 43:1,2	constituents 80:6	82:18 83:5,6,9	<b>correct</b> 43:18 61:5	creating 97:6
44:10,20 45:11	constitute 4:12	85:9,17 103:13,15	62:1,6,7 64:6,12	129:18 137:22
48:5 49:11.22	constructed 11:10	104:5.9 117:9	64:15.19.20 65:3	credible 31:22
68:20 140:20	37:2	118:1 123:10	65:5.6.12 66:5.8	183:4
Consequently	constructing 63:9	126:4.7.18.19	67:11.13 77:18	<b>credit</b> 190:16 191:1
10:15	63:13	128:19 131:2.7.10	83:19.20 97:7	191:2
conservatism 40:5	construction 8:3.6	145:11 154:3.11	108:6.6 110:17	credited 154:3.11
40:8.18 41:2	8:12.14.17 9:1.19	155:3.9.13 156:18	112:9 119:22	154:12 155:9
43:20.21.61:12	10:6.17 13:13.19	156:22 157:1	120:1.16.17	156:22 157:2
65.1 2 68.13 71.9	13.20 19.16 23.1	170.6 182.12 12	126.17127.1012	crediting 183.14
71.10 22 74.19 19	33.21 35.9 36.22	182:13 190:2	128.20 141.17	credits 46.6
conservatisms	38.12 14 19 46.14	193.5 198.1	146.9 10 168.17	<b>CRESP</b> 2.12 171.5
21.10	92.21 127.8	controlling 72.15	172.22 179.10 12	criteria 14·3 17·4
conservative 25.3	Consultant 1.24	controls 16.19 20.8	186.18 190.18	19.72 21.2 22.4
26.1 10 43.10	contacted 6.5 7	25.8 10 12 22 22	192.19	25.4 26.2 29.19
20.1,10 45.10 AA·3 1A 75·9 77·A	contain 26:19.22	28.5 30.11 32.18	correctly 7/1.18	30.1 32.14 41.9
79.1 89.7 90.10	131·1/	36.18 40.15 22	176.20	A6.16 A9.3 55.20
03.10 10 21 06.7	contained 10.5	12.13 12.6 15.1	correspondence	72.10 81.10 82.1
130.14 141.6	containment	45.21 47.22 48.21	1/2.10 108.1	82.20 88.16 100.8
1/7.7 107.4	188.15 100.12	40.21 47.22 40.21 50.13 51.4 7 52.2	corresponding	134.8 148.2 153.2
147.2 197.4 consider 15:11	contains 1/8.1/	50.15 51. <del>4</del> ,7 52.2	20.21	153.0 186.6 14 10
170.22 177.11	contamination	03.17 04.2 73.10 75.20 87.18 88.2	27.21 corridor 117.20	133.7 100.0,14,19
1/0.22 1/7.11		75.20 04.10 00.5	corridors 26:17	100.20 191.10
170.0,0	127.20 contond 05.10	75.775.10 100.19	corrigons 20.17	22.22 22.14 22.4
127.10 20 151.11	<b>content</b> 95:18	11/:1/ 110:2	<b>COSU</b> 09:18 197:12	22:22 23:10 33:4
12/:19,20 151:11	$\frac{\text{content } 27:15}{200.4}$	121:15 129:2,4,17	197:15 198:15	105:14,15 125:8
consideration /:1	200:4	139:1 140:9,14	199:3	131:10 132:21
68:12 /0:5 /6:1/	contents 88:9	141:5 161:10	<b>costly</b> 14:15 197:5	<b>criticality</b> 36:18
108:18	context 56:13	100:/1/2:5	<b>COSTS</b> 38:9 159:7	119:21 197:2
considerations	100:20 173:5	183:17	201:13	criticize 90:16
193:16	continue 9:18 33:9	controversial 171:9	Counsel 1:19 4:14	crucial 15:1
considered 48:6	38:9 114:2 164:5	178:4	202:8	curie 27:13
70:8	continues 44:2	Cont'd 2:10	<b>count</b> 106:12 120:5	curious 185:4
considering 34:3	56:18	convened 28:1	counterpart 74:5	current 12:9 55:7

Г

55.17 71.7 76.0	dehating 119.15	dogmoog 50,21	described 60.16	149.1 2 20 140.2
<i>33.17 74.7 70.0</i> <i>85.17 87.16 138.5</i>	docados 10.21	dolov 8.22 53.21	74.18 07.11 170.2	140.1,2,20 149.3
03.14 07.10 130.3	11.12 16.12 01.4	delegated 10:2	/4.10 9/.11 1/0.3	149.11,14 133.4
147.22 140.2	<b>December</b> 41:21	delineating 180.0	design 3:14 8:2 4 0	154.10 155.10
149.21 102.3	decided 42:10	dolivor 17:3	12.10 12.5 11 18	150.21 157.11
172.14 ourrontly 117.67	121.2	deliver 17.5	12.19 15.5,11,10	162.18 162.2 11
118.2 1/1.0,7	121.2 decision 86.12 14	dolivory 78.0 128.6	14.2,3,0,14,22	102.10 103.3,11
1/8.16 1/0.15	87.1 <i>A</i> 17 <i>A</i> .7 177.7	domands 17.2 52.1	17.20 10.14 20.6	170.17720
162.10 149.13	07.14 174.7 177.7 178.7	domonstrato 52:20	17.2019.1420.0 20.111021.011	170.1,7,7,20
102.10192.13	1/0.7 docisionmoking	58.12 154.11	20.11,19 21.9,11	172.7 174.22
cut 100.1	63.5 68.10 122.5	155.10 182.1	21.10, 21, 22.10 23.5, 6, 24.12, 17	18/1.21 186.6 13
cvcla 68.8 60.18	decisions 62.11	188.15	25.5,024.12,17 24.21,25.2,4,16	186.10 20 180.15
100.13 158.0	68.20 75.15 121.0	demonstration	24.21 25.2,4,10	180.17,20 107.15
150.2 5 7	123.10 156.1	50.3	23.18 20.1,11	106.1/ 17 108.16
$\mathbf{C}_{0}\mathbf{N}_{1}\mathbf{T}_{1}\mathbf{F}_{1}\mathbf{N}_{1}\mathbf{T}_{1}\mathbf{S}$	125.10 150.1	Jo.J density 36.13	20.5,7,11,27.0,17	108.17
2·1	declaration 1/17.9	Department 3.5	32.11 15 20 21	designed 11.10
<b>C5</b> 30·11 113·20 21	decommissioning	1.10 8.1 0.11	32.11,15,20,21	27.2 17.13 61.18
C5-V 58·3 15/1.5	0.20	12.7 18 13.1 0 16	34.13 35.0 10 13	65.10 100.22
100.11 101.2	deconteminete	12.7,10 13.1,9,10	36.20 21 37.11 12	187.3
1)0.11 1)1.2	18.7	15.15 22.0 31.5	30.20,21 37.11,12	designing /8.10.10
D	40.7 docrosso 70.6	13.13 22.9 31.3 53.10 76.2 5 86.4	37.13,22,22 30.4	68.15 124.8
<b>Dale</b> 1:25 53:16	decreased /1.15	86.10 21 87.10	10.5 16 13.3 5	designs 20.8 32.2
123:17 124:13.16	deemed 7.7	80.10,21 87.10	46.8 16 17 18 20	designs 20.0 52.2
124:18 125:6	deen 62.22 155.6	01.3 7 04.10	46.0,10,17,10,20	52.16 50.10
<b>data</b> 7:3 28:14	deep 02.22 155.0	137.12 1/2.15	40.22 47.0,13	detail 107.22 165.9
156:10	defend 82.14 83.18	143.10 147.15	51.1 10 16 19	detailed 11/1.22
date 51:14 102:11	defense 1.3 1.4 19	150.11 158.22	52.10 15 53.1	details 184.11
<b>David</b> 1:22.24 2:12	8.5 22.14 27.11	167.16 10 160.13	55.4 8 11 56.1 11	detected 50.4
18:12 53:14	20.10 <i>/</i> 7.1 <i>/</i> 5	175.22 177.15 22	57.7 15 50.4 10	detection 10.4
day 100:10.11	2).10 47.1,4,5 60·16 1/0·8 12	170.6 12 180.15	60.7 8 64.9 10 17	50.8
108:22 112:7.8	153.16 154.14	181.7 0 11 10/.16	65.1 71.7 11 22	determination
115:19	164.10	denartmental	72.1 75.17 76.6	30.16 123.16
days 5:12 92:13	defensible 77.4		82.10 15 83.10 14	125.3 168.15
106:16 118:7	defensive 198.22	Depending 1/1.18	84.1 22 86.5 11	179.5
130:10	defined 14.5 73.16	160.13	87.17 21 89.8 19	determinations
<b>DBE</b> 149:3	127.21 128.22	denosition 22.19	89.20 90.3 7 11	124·6
<b>dead</b> 32:2 84:3	defines 8.1	42·19 43·9 17	90.12 92.21 101.6	determine 44.9
87:21 106:22	defining 45.1	44.5 45.14 178.6	102.20 21 103.3	50.8 16 85.4
117:11 132:2.2.4	definitely 118.17	178.13 179.10	102:20,21 103:3	108.1 128.18
172:15 173:3	definition 75.1 2	194.1	104.12 105.15	129.2 133.1
deal 123:2 124:3	102.10 128.6	denth $47.1 5 5 51.4$	111.19 115.5 6 15	163.18 175.9 11
128:14 166:14	definitively 84.20	60:16 63:15 140.8	117:7 15 22 118:6	determined 119.17
175:19	deflagration 62.13	140.12 153.16	121:17.20 124.7	124.14
dealing 16:17	75:19	154:14 164.10	126:9 19 127.8	determining 43.1
28:16 67:16 98:6	deformation 49.19	<b>Deputy</b> 166.21	128.7.7 129.7 11	deterministic
125:9	degradation 47:10	describe 61:11	131:5 142:2	171:16 176:18
<b>debate</b> 123:2,4	<b>degree</b> 119:13	66:16 140:11	144:19 147:2.3	detonation 62:13
	0			

Г

٦

75:20	disagrees 95:9	<b>DOE</b> 15:2,10 16:5	191:7 192:13	early 21:10,20
detonations 151:19	discharge 107:1	18:4 23:8 35:14	draft 101:15	122:19
develop 97:5 126:4	discipline 169:9	36:20 37:15.20	102:16 103:3	earnest 12:14
126:6 160:3 166:6	disciplined 167:11	38:2.5.11.15.21	drastically 196:11	ease 94:21
177:13.15	176:9	39:15.18 40:1.2	drawings 145:20	easier 95:14 139:22
developed 24.13	discomfort 60:8	40:14.16.41:20	drew 28:19	easiest 189:5
25.3 38.6 39.12	discuss 34.5 50.13	42.8 9 11 43.8 10	drive 17:15 177:7	easily $45 \cdot 10$
44.16 52.3 120.14	193.17	43.15 19 45.21	driven 26.1 88.10	easy 72.22 142.9
developing 174.2	discussed 15.20	48.2 5 13 49.8	88.11	effect 7:20 17:15
development 34:13	51.4 62.19 72.13	51.8 13 14 20 22	driver 119.6	46.16 109.16
36·17 51·21 52·8	73.5 100.1 101.5	52.11 17 55.17	drivers 61.19	159.18 193.8 14
develops 39.9	119.15 120.2	56.6 65.17 93.1	drives 79.14 189.5	197.21
<b>DEWEV</b> 167·21	152.22 185.5 6	165.6 166.15 17	driving 59.14 79.3	effective 89.12
188.8 11 14 17	discussing 190.11	167.10 168.4	81·3 93·9	112.22 168.10
189.8 190.3 10 16	discussion 3.7 18.6	171.4 174.6 177.1	drove 26:11 90:11	effectively 10:20
101.3	58.20 81.20 86.2	194.7 195.9 20	147.3	18.1 50.19
diagram 145.14	88.6 119.17 154.2	196.8	DSA 58.13 79.6	effectiveness 149.6
161.18	193·4	DOE's 17.15 18.12	83.4 84.12 139.5	effects 62.12
diagrams 156.7	discussions 16.7	23.7 25.1 29.8	139.11 142.9	efficiency 121.2
dialogue 102.9	39.18 108.12	23.7 23.1 27.0	162.13 163.7 8	efficient 11.3 23.16
162.10	110.7 1/1.11	37.0 30.5 7 11.12	165·9 166·6 170·4	23.3
DICKEV 1.24	1/3.7	<i>AA</i> ·13 <i>A</i> 6·7 11 22	DSAc 85.15	officiently 18.1
difference 80.22	dispatched 102.0	47.13 40.7,11,22 47.1 16 48.21	due 26.18 27.22	3/1.22
179.1 180.5	disposal 12.6 18.4	49.3 53.15 162.6	37.6 16 <i>AA</i> .10	effort 9./ 12.15
different 35.22	199.7	<b>DOF_FM</b> 2.18	49.20 59.2 75.21	13.10 20.4 25.9
74.7 104.4 120.7	disposition 143.6	DOE-DRI 2.10	49.20 <i>39.2</i> 75.21 182.22	30.16 35.10 40.1
120.1	distribution 36.12	1.25	duration 35.1	51.15 57.9 80.16
135.1 160.3	164·14	doing 69.19 94.14	duty $112 \cdot 1$	121.19 124.11
179.16 184.13	dive 62.22 155.6	136.8 157.11 12	<b>DWPF</b> 95.20 96.1	127.19 21 181.2
185.13 186.1	document 55:4 18	<b>Donna</b> $1.2354.2$	98·10 99·11	FFRT 128.8
difficult 26.14	55·19 73·6 77·16	129.1 130.9 158.4	138.16.22	eight 20.10 34.11
36.11 86.9 10	101.15 102.16	dose 44.10 19 45.3	<b>Dwver</b> 1.19 4.16	120.7
diligence 27:22	103.3 104.15	doses 43.13 45.17	$101.2 \ 102.2 \ 5 \ 13$	either 16:2 59:22
dilute 113.1	105.13 141.14	45.18	102.17 102.2,3,15	88.17 106.10
diluted 200.12	142.14 146.22	double 27.13	$102.17 \ 103.19$ $104.3 \ 7 \ 181.18 \ 19$	$155.14\ 174.10$
dilution 88.19	151.3 164.18	<b>Dr</b> 4.11 53.12 74.9	182.6 16 183.21	194.5 9
197.21	documentation	76.20 80.18 81.14	184.2 20 185.4 12	elected 37.20
direct 179.18	133.5 145.16	87.3 6 9 89.21	185.18 20 21	element 72:1 132:5
directed 31.21 54.9	146.17 161.1	91.2 14 105.1	186.19	$142.19\ 175.1$
direction 180.6 12	documented 19.19	106.6 131.11	DC 5.18	elements 63.1
198.9	23.13 28.12 29.21	137.10 151.5	<b>D</b> .C J.10	71.10 84.8 121.10
directly 71.12	47·2 50·14 15	157.10 151.5	E	121.10 04.0 121.10
134·12	55.2 58.13 22	168.16 17 20	<b>E</b> 1:17	121.12,13,17
director 1.19 4.16	102.21 140.10	173.22 174.9 11	earlier 49:13 52:14	elevate 59.7 63.3
19.6 53.17 10 21	documents 5.1/	174.17 177.3	58:3 97:21 126:10	elicitation $136.77$
director's 60·/	39.13 1/15.10	178.9 170.1/	133:12 171:6	eliminate $A0.47$
disagree 161.6	194.3	180.3 181.4 4 13	195:1	84·6
	171.5	100.0 101.7,7,10		01.0

eliminated 83:2	102:20 103:11,16	establishing 14:3	26:11 90:12 147:3	experimental 21:4
eliminates 135:10	111:20 121:22	47:22	exacerbates 12:4	<b>expert</b> 28:1 63:7
140:8 172:15	129:4 131:20	estimate 42:20	38:2	89:13 91:10 98:12
eliminating 129:16	132:10,22 181:3	74:17	exactly 70:19	136:21
173:2	ensuring 23:12	etcetera 128:4	100:17,22 168:20	experts 13:3 22:14
elimination 117:1	29:7 32:16 33:20	134:17	168:21	31:13,17 44:12
eloquently 140:11	51:15 167:9	evaluate 57:14	<b>example</b> 26:12 32:3	91:7,13 92:6
EM 27:9 87:12	entail 27:3	64:17 83:13	35:15 36:4 37:3	expert-based 30:18
170:16 171:3	entered 54:13	156:13 163:16	58:3 99:12 101:4	explain 7:16 15:2
173:22 176:20	enters 97:16	164:18 175:8,12	109:17 158:22	139:11 163:6
embedding 165:20	enthalpy 200:6,15	evaluated 46:10	160:11 161:15	explained 118:5
embellish 126:9	entire 34:22 128:12	64:11 109:16	166:2	explicitly 102:12
emergency 111:7	137:22 175:21	evaluating 107:12	examples 22:16	explore 15:17
113:9.15.15.17	entirely 116:21	161:15	59:21 83:22	explosion 40:11
114:16 115:22	entitled 202:13	evaluation 29:22	exceed 41:7 99:6	48:22 49:20 197:1
employed 97:3	entrainment 22:18	44:22 45:12 50:10	exchange 139:14	explosions 31:11
enabling 7:20	entrance 6:5-13	51:10 60:18 61:8	157:17 158:2.11	49:4
encountered 36.1	enumerated 120:6	105:20.22 119:22	158:13 194:20	explosively 31:15
endeavor 130.16	envelope 16.22	121.14 143.11	198.2.3.4.199.6	expose 14.16
ended 129.15	21.1 65.5 96.7 19	144.15 167.12 18	exchanges 9.15	exposed 14.13
endorsed 31.2	96.21.129.5	169.8 175.15	excuse 150.1	exposures 27.4
energy 3:5 7:14 21	environmental	evaluations 22.18	execute 109.9	expressed 30.17
8.5 22 9.11 10.1	27.10 53.14 74.12	evanorating 68.3	executive 53.22	126.8 180.16
15.2 22.0 31.5	1/6.3 153.7 167.2	evening 23.20	100.16 121.5	evpressing 75.8
53.10 13 76.2 5	140.5 155.7 107.2	33.14 54.16 20 22	100.10 121.5 ovorciso 7:13	expressing 75.0
55.10,1570.2,5 04.10127.12	107.7,17 106.22	55.14 $54.10,20,22$	exercise 7.15	extend 195.5
94.10 137.12 167.14 16 175.22	1/J.1/ 1/0.7	24.2	102.1 120.1	122.20
107.14,10 175.22	envisioneu 102.0	34.2	$102.1\ 130.1$	152.20
180:13 197:9	equal 0:20	<b>event</b> 75:19 109:10	<b>existing</b> 20:14 50:8	extent 7:0 14:17
<b>Energy S</b> 4:19 12:7	equations 45:7	109:17 149:5	114:15 159:1	25:20 52:10 50:7
10/:19 109:15	equipment 27:2	155:8 155:2	1//:1	<b>external</b> 15:1
engaged 91:7	4/:18 128:3	182:22 187:17	<b>exists</b> 11:18 66:3	
engineer 195:8,19	148:15 150:20	events 21:7 30:5	expand 125:7	extremely 14:15
196:3,15	equivalent 46:17	40:11 63:16 73:1	expect 156:14	35:20 72:14 86:9
engineered 40:22	erosion/corrosion	115:2 139:8	157:6177:4	86:10 129:12,13
128:22 129:3	183:2	152:14 154:3	expected 20:18	169:2 197:4
engineering 53:20	error 88:2	158:10 182:15	21:10 24:16 30:16	
56:11 57:12 59:17	errors 75:22	185:10	45:4 100:9,9	$\left \frac{\mathbf{\Gamma}}{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\right  = \frac{\mathbf{\Gamma}}{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$
60:5,7,7 85:2	<b>escape</b> 98:20	<b>eventual</b> 9:20 12:6	102:9 175:3	
164:19	especially 92:18	18:3	expecting 146:16	fabricated 31:19
engineers 98:13	154:9 191:11	everybody 138:4	expense 159:2	facilitate 146:2
enhanced 62:17	<b>essence</b> 123:17	141:17	expensive 36:11	facilities 1:3 4:5,20
enhancements	essential 23:2	evidence 21:4	experience 91:4,5	9:20 22:1,10,15
21:17	establish 52:17	97:11,15	130:4,15 135:13	23:15 27:9 29:11
<b>ensure</b> 8:10,18	60:10 63:16 64:6	evolution 24:16	154:7 156:16	33:18 34:4 37:21
20:22 24:18 27:3	64:7,9,18	71:8 100:19 163:4	183:5	48:9 69:11 70:13
33:2 41:6 51:21	established 25:4	evolves 21:11	experiment 151:9	91:5 94:20 95:6
52:4 74:15 78:7	43:9 52:11 126:19	evolving 19:8 24:8	166:12	96:5 189:13

Г

f	<b>f</b> -U- <b>2</b> 00,11	102.7 105.12	04.4.07.22.110.2	f-11
<b>Fracility</b> $5:9,10\ 8:2,5$	<b>Talls</b> 200:11	195:/ 195:15 f	94:4 97:22 119:3	10110Wing 29:9
8:0,13,179:2	<b>Tamiliar</b> 87:1 196:6	<b>Ieedback</b> 29:13	12/:0 129:8 100:5	42:21 48:8,16
13:14 14:20 17:10	tar 4:15,1797:20	<b>Ieel</b> 85:12 141:4	194:7	106:19 116:17
17:13,17 18:20	102:10 115:16	155:17 172:9	first-of-a-kind	tollowup 152:4
19:13 20:5,11	118:4 139:1	194:2	12:13	167:22 180:20
21:19 22:21,22	<b>farm</b> 20:15 41:5	<b>fellow</b> 18:8	<b>five</b> 4:12 6:22 44:22	181:20
24:4,9,22 25:11	65:16 66:4,16	<b>felt</b> 127:22	45:12,19 68:1	follow-on 145:16
26:4,9,21 27:11	67:10,22 70:3,7	fewer 95:10	92:6 106:8 195:2	foremost 97:22
27:12,16 28:18	70:11 71:6 72:13	<b>field</b> 63:20	<b>fixed</b> 88:17 191:20	form 9:12 50:20
29:7 32:17 33:1,5	74:4 75:3,5,7,11	figure 84:11 164:9	flexibility 113:12	formal 9:12 12:13
34:13 35:12,13	76:4,13,15 77:2,6	184:16	113:13	39:16 104:15
38:18 41:13 42:15	77:9 78:6,19 79:3	figured 108:21	floor 5:16 23:18	167:11,18 169:8
43:4 46:1 47:16	79:3,13,14,18	165:22	81:11	formalization
48:8 52:9,10,18	80:17,21 81:4,10	filter 131:13,15	flow 52:12,18	102:9
53:1 56:16.20	88:8.10.20 97:18	filtered 30:12	123:18 124:16	formally 176:5
59:20 62:1 63:14	99:2.18 100:2.7	filters 149:8	125:4 127:9	formation 30:21
68·14 16 88·4	101.18 124.3	final 14.3 23.13	155.21 156.2 7 9	forms 9.4 12.5
89.20 90.9 91.8	125.1 133.13	37.21 52.12 57.15	157.6 9 10 18 19	formula 98.13
102.22 105.17	127.77 138.6 0	58.13 60.11 83.3	158.16 150.12 18	formulate 0.10
102.22 103.17	102.4 10	20.12 00.11 03.5 84.12 102.21	150.10 159.12,10	formulation 52.4
$100.11 \ 107.3$ $111.4 \ 45 \ 115.1 \ 2$	193.4,10 forma 11.12 16.16	04.12 103.21	159.19,20 100.2,4	$\mathbf{F}_{out} = 122.12.14$
111.4,4,5 115.1,2	17.2 19.2 20.21	120:21 128:7	100:10,17,22	<b>FORU</b> 122:15,14
115:13 116:10,10	1/:3 18:2 20:21	140:10 142:9	101:18 1/1:13	<b>forth</b> 142:20
122:10,13 125:9	28:12,14 36:2	143:4 146:16	<b>flush</b> 10/:6,/	forward 14:6 38:11
126:16 129:10	61:4 /0:4,17	155:22 156:2	108:17 109:6	38:12 55:20 57:7
130:6 142:7,8	71:12 72:3,19,22	157:9,19 158:16	111:21 113:4,5,6	122:9 140:3,15
157:12 158:4,19	73:9 74:2,5 77:12	159:13 160:5	113:10 114:13,15	166:9 172:1
159:1 160:5 163:5	88:19 96:21 97:3	173:20 177:6,18	115:3 118:7	175:22 176:12
165:19 172:6	101:10,13 120:22	<b>finalize</b> 130:12	131:14,20 133:1	<b>found</b> 5:8 7:21
201:11	136:9 183:6 196:2	131:9 162:14	158:12	27:14 41:17 42:2
facility's 24:19	<b>farm's</b> 37:4	finalized 14:8	flushes 109:10	68:3 162:21
fact 38:10 77:7	fashion 102:11	144:2 164:13	112:1 115:4 116:7	171:14,15
80:2 95:9 102:13	favor 37:13	finalizing 32:8	116:8,14,14,20,21	four 43:14 68:7
115:13 126:14	<b>FB</b> 94:13	55:11	117:2 131:22	106:8 200:14
135:16 196:1	feature 115:15	finally 100:3 104:1	132:3 164:2	fraction 197:17
199:3.22	features 128:22	128:22 130:12	flushing 106:14	fragile 66:17 67:10
factor 43.14	129.11 170.8	find 68.3 150.9	109.4 113.8	67·22 68·17 78·17
fail 183.13 184.16	February 29.20	findings 31.3 7	115.20	fragility 68.9 75.5
18/17 21	38.21 A0.16	37.7	focus 10.16 32.16	fragmont 31.15
104.17,21 foiled 194.10	50.21 40.10	52.7 finich 14.6 07.16	10Cus 10.10 52.10 40.17 56.17 04.22	fragmentation
foils 192.10	10.5 20.15 52.16	<b>11111511</b> 14.0 97.10 157.6 164.14 15	40.17 30.17 94.22	21.01.00.01
<b>1811S</b> 185:10	19:5 50:15 55:10	15/:0 104:14,15	<b>10cused</b> 100:17	51:21 82:21
<b>Tallure</b> 8:21 31:10	09:3	200:21	135:20 161:20	<b>Iramework</b> 22:8
31:16 64:11	<b>teed</b> 20:22 57:17	finished 125:17	166:4	Frank 2:14 53:18
151:10 182:20	73:22 78:9 122:14	126:5	tocusing 14:22	Frank's 130:22
<b>failures</b> 30:9 50:1	123:20 124:1	tinishes 180:8	119:5	frequency 170:3
fair 125:11 150:15	125:9,10 127:21	<b>firm</b> 127:9	<b>folks</b> 146:3	<b>fresh</b> 25:12 40:20
fairly 90:21 93:15	128:2,11 160:13	first 4:22 11:22	follow 6:17 156:18	<b>front</b> 146:22
falling 196:10	160:14,15,20	17:11 35:11 74:15	followed 107:6	<b>FRT</b> 111:15,20

Г

100.0			201 5	
132:8	gelling 108:8	79:21,21 80:3,4	201:5	hard 83:17 97:17
fuels 195:9,21	general 1:19 4:14	80:15 83:8 87:1	great 51:20 123:2	97:19 98:19
196:9,12	25:17 150:16	92:5,14 93:17	124:21 128:2	150:13 156:3
fulfill 9:5	186:12 202:8	94:21 96:2,3,13	greater 101:9,13,20	harmful 10:19
fulfillment 24:18	generalities 150:14	96:14 97:22 98:1	greatly 91:9	hazard 10:21 26:3
full 106:22 107:2	generally 27:15	98:4,7,11,15,17	<b>Greg</b> 1:22 53:20	26:5 48:1 66:3
131:8 144:1	63:11,12 65:14	98:20 99:6 101:7	126:8,22 130:18	67:15,15 84:4
184:13	generated 16:18	103:13 105:12,13	148:4 186:14	142:5 190:21
fully 14:12 73:16	28:17	106:7,10 121:6,6	grinding 191:15	hazardous 14:16
80:7 128:6	generating 142:7	122:8 135:18,20	grossly 78:22 92:18	26:15 27:5
<b>function</b> 47:18 49:9	generation 26:7	136:10 137:5	group 33:19	hazards 27:6,15
58:16 110:7,7	getting 11:17 93:18	139:10 140:1	guess 56:13 61:15	35:21 40:6 47:3
120:20 148:11,17	117:14 118:9	141:13 143:18,22	69:21 73:19 77:15	48:6 52:13,19
154:12 157:1,2	141:18	148:21 151:14	82:11 86:2 133:9	57:16 59:13,18
173:3 187:18	<b>give</b> 6:19,22 69:1,1	155:14 159:10	171:17 182:17	60:15,19 61:1
188:1	81:11 130:4 141:4	160:18,19 164:3	185:19	84:6 108:2 109:19
functional 22:4	143:16	165:5,11 166:5,10	guidance 43:10	137:3 144:15
29:17 82:21	given 9:22 14:21	167:8 169:10	175:10	156:6,13 158:6
120:16 125:18	38:3 47:21 58:6	173:12 174:4,7	guideline 44:22	161:4,10 162:1,10
140:5 144:21	68:12 70:5 76:18	177:8 178:3,6,7	45:13	162:15 163:2
148:21 149:12,19	76:18 88:2 106:12	178:16 180:11	guidelines 44:13	164:8 196:22
186:7 188:19	128:10 155:18	182:21 183:1,11	guides 47:17	197:5
functionally 25:14	giving 190:4 202:7	184:16,17 186:2	<b>guys</b> 62:5 63:1	head 181:14
186:8 188:21	<b>glad</b> 91:19 170:15	191:11,12,13,16	79:16 95:22	headquarters 5:17
functions 21:18	<b>go</b> 58:11 64:1 67:18	191:21 192:1,2,6	108:21 138:18	74:13 87:12
47:9 100:5	72:9 79:16 93:2	192:7,8,10,22		health 8:10,19 10:2
fundamental	95:22 105:2 119:1	193:1 201:8	H	10:8 12:10 15:7
154:10 160:17	119:14 120:19	going-forward	<b>H</b> 1:15	171:3
170:2	122:8 125:14	156:4	Hague 123:14	hear 54:21 79:15
fundamentally	127:4,5,22 129:1	good 23:20 33:14	handled 59:8	139:19 142:3,10
35:2 82:18	133:17 138:22	54:19,22 84:8	handling 27:2	heard 72:9 82:6
further 7:10 15:21	140:9 141:13	95:21 104:13	handpicked 92:7	94:2 174:20
20:20 38:10 46:21	143:21 149:1	129:13 142:4,6	Hanford 4:20	hearing 1:5 4:6,21
47:20 48:5 102:14	150:7,10,11	144:6,7 166:19	10:11 11:7 34:15	5:6,9,11 6:3 7:5
169:16	154:17 158:5	172:20 176:1	34:19 43:11	7:11,13,19 9:3,8
future 12:9 15:22	163:22 175:20	181:13 194:19	147:13 196:2	15:21 16:8 17:8
85:18 90:14 142:4	178:4 190:3 194:1	gotten 91:22	Hanford's 27:14	18:11 51:5 54:6
147:6 165:18	199:18	197:20 199:14	35:19 36:10	54:14 62:22 86:8
191:9	goal 67:18 69:17,21	governance 124:6	hang 153:21	94:4 202:10
	goals 15:8	governing 44:13	happen 123:3	<b>heart</b> 55:14
G	goes 26:21 123:21	Government 5:4	168:19 191:22	<b>heat</b> 128:3,4
gain 15:18	125:15,21 169:21	grade 150:3,4	happened 95:16	heated 36:5
gas 16:17 26:13	going 15:3 38:16	Grandridge 1:11	happens 64:3 74:10	heavily 121:7
27:18 32:5	60:20 62:21 63:6	grapple 170:19	106:17	height 117:18
gaskets 151:18	63:8 66:12,13	171:1	happy 87:6,9	<b>held</b> 5:3
gee 102:15 119:13	68:5 70:17 72:11	grave 142:6	201:21	help 13:5 58:12
gel 111:11 112:8	76:5 78:12 79:16	gravity 199:19	harbor 164:17	63:8 93:4 97:5

	l		1	l
136:2 155:5 184:7	28:3 29:19 30:21	<b>ideal</b> 133:14 134:3	177:14 183:11	31:1,8,12 32:7
<b>helps</b> 173:6	31:1,8,12 32:7,8	134:14,15	<b>impose</b> 80:15	91:6 173:16
<b>HEPA</b> 149:8	32:18,20 55:14	<b>identified</b> 25:9 42:9	imposed 138:8	176:16
hierarchy 60:16	57:8,21 82:20	47:1 56:21 57:3	impossible 87:15	indicated 13:16
63:16	106:14 108:15	58:3,10 60:17	111:12	34:10 49:13
high 11:7 16:18	116:19 129:7	74:6 81:20 100:18	<b>improve</b> 20:4 24:21	181:21 195:1
23:9 26:12 34:19	144:9 146:1	131:4 142:13	32:22 70:19 90:2	<b>indicates</b> 179:16
35:20 36:8,13	151:19 152:20	identify 21:15 30:3	improvement 68:6	indicating 43:16
47:3,6,9,9,13	153:8 155:2,6	84:1,17 159:16	70:16	individual 60:6
67:15 78:3 80:4	173:16 176:16	166:6	improvements	160:7
88:1 116:14 117:7	192:3 196:22	imagine 117:18	157:11 161:6	individuals 89:14
117:8,13,16	197:21	immediate 4:9	improving 90:20	91:3,4,6 92:11
120:22 141:11	HPAV-related	immobilization 9:6	inadvertent 27:4	95:5 121:20,21
186:11 199:4	151:9	33:22 90:9 105:16	inappropriate	individual's 121:15
higher 75:18 76:7	<b>HSS</b> 171:3 174:5	immovable 112:11	200:1	industries 13:4
79:4 150:2,21	181:2,5,16	112:12,15,17,19	inappropriately	<b>industry</b> 127:12
159:6 199:19	huge 197:13 198:15	112:20 116:12	42:4	167:5 175:19
highest 25:15	human 88:2	impact 12:20 38:9	<b>include</b> 16:13	177:13
137:21 187:5	hundreds 96:1	46:11 52:8 56:5,9	22:18 69:11 82:20	<b>Ines</b> 2:18 53:12
High-level 193:6	160:2	115:1 161:9	included 27:6	86:18 87:1
hinted 140:16	hurrying 201:17	impacting 39:2	includes 20:7 118:5	inevitably 16:18
historical 80:19	hydrating 62:12	<b>impacts</b> 38:6	<b>including</b> 10:2 26:5	<b>inferior</b> 48:18
historically 67:22	hydrogen 16:16,17	161:17 175:12	119:20	<b>inform</b> 13:5 176:15
history 11:6 68:9	16:20 20:1,2,9	implement 16:20	incomplete 38:4	informal 9:15
HLP-22 193:6	21:6 25:5 26:8	25:3 29:5 32:8	inconsistencies	information 7:3
HLWP 78:3	28:16 30:4,10,20	76:6 84:19 86:10	175:12,13	15:20 38:4 58:12
hold 198:12	31:11 39:19 40:10	143:14 158:18	inconsistent 25:17	105:10 162:18,21
holding 161:13	43:6 48:21 49:4	168:9,15 169:18	incorporated 17:12	informed 15:6
holistic 123:13	51:1,2,11,16	implementation	18:5 24:11 29:3	38:21 40:16 43:8
holistically 137:13	55:19 75:19 82:13	16:19 57:4 83:7	29:12 173:17	101:14 102:14
hook 113:6 154:22	85:8 90:11 116:21	174:3	incorporating	infrastructure
hope 173:5	117:2,9 147:3	implemented 20:7	194:2	33:19 70:18 78:20
hot 14:14 26:17,18	162:5,21 163:10	50:20 51:7,17	incorporation	infrequencies
26:21 27:7 46:12	171:22 172:18	52:6,21 63:18,19	50:13	165:21
46:20 49:17 88:1	197:1	83:12 174:8	incorrect 180:1	inherent 71:5,21
110:22,22 114:7,8	hydrostatic 132:1,4	implication 128:2	increase 21:16	73:9
114:9,16 116:1	hydroxide 112:22	159:4,5,6	68:15 70:3 73:10	inherently 71:11
117:16,19 120:15	hypothetical	implications 28:4	136:10 200:16	72:1
125:17 130:3	101:22	124:20,22	increased 27:4	<b>initial</b> 11:9 163:18
149:18,20 150:20		implicit 15:4	36:19 70:2 72:2	initially 29:10
151:12,16 152:6,8	I	important 13:8	72:19	123:8
153:14 154:9	<b>ICD</b> 78:10 192:18	21:18 47:7 71:3	increases 37:18	<b>initiated</b> 12:12 40:1
181:22 186:10	<b>ICD-19</b> 73:6,7,21	81:19 94:22 96:10	increasing 26:11	initiating 12:22
187:8,8,8,11,20	77:15,22	114:18,19 115:14	191:18 193:15	60:21
hours 57:13 108:22	Idaho 11:19 196:13	119:18 121:1,2	incurring 201:13	<b>initiator</b> 185:10
HPAV 20:2 21:2	<b>idea</b> 71:21 73:5	127:18 131:3,8	independent 19:4	188:20
23:5 25:6,10,21	102:7	158:7 170:18	22:14 30:18,22	initiators 183:3

	<b>T</b> ( <b>B T C C</b>	100.0	100 10 100 1 1	
inner 47:5	Interface 73:6	188:9	182:18 183:1,4	156:17 157:4,4,8
input 44:18 45:6	interfaces 26:14	issue 51:6 57:6	184:5,7 189:6	158:15 164:13
124:22	internal 13:1	58:10 73:21 89:4	jumpered 113:14	166:10 174:21
<b>inputs</b> 85:3 161:21	internally 144:3	89:6 95:11 104:19	<b>jumpers</b> 154:8,22	177:10 192:17
163:16 172:7	internet 5:7	111:20 118:14	182:5 187:12	193:11,17 194:18
inquired 11:1	interpret 47:11	119:5 135:19	198:15	198:13,14,18
inquiring 7:17	interrupted 115:7	149:15 151:8	justified 29:7 45:15	201:6
inquiry 15:21	interruptions	160:22 197:1,2,21		knowing 79:20
inspection 102:15	115:8	198:14	<u> </u>	knowledge 80:11
installed 26:16	introduce 4:8	issues 11:2 14:9,12	Kasdorf 33:14,16	80:19 105:5
instance 64:8	18:17	15:6 21:17 22:16	55:15 60:17	known 9:7 20:1
151:16 192:4,6	introduced 123:18	30:17 35:3,4 38:8	142:12 147:20	56:20 58:8 74:21
instances 21:14	introductory 18:14	39:8 52:7 56:21	149:9 187:15	99:4
instinctively 93:15	18:19 24:2	57:4,10,19 58:1,8	keep 81:19 96:5	Knutson 1:25
instituted 175:17	intuitive 95:2,5	92:1,8 111:15,16	145:11 197:8,17	53:16 71:2,16
Instrumentation	136:8 138:12	132:8,8 139:22	keeping 15:5 197:3	73:4,19 81:17
145:14	intuitively 136:15	143:21 144:10	Kennewick 1:12	99:22 101:22
integrate 57:17	invalid 74:22	146:8 159:10	kept 25:18 92:11	102:3.6 120:5.9
64:17 84:11	inventory 187:19	163:11 178:4	key 14:12 24:13	120:17 121:10
144:18 163:1	187:20.21 188:7	185:22	42:13 57:3 65:9	124:19 125:7
integrated 57:14	invest 127:18	<b>iterate</b> 140:17	68:10 75:12 164:4	148:4
59:16 60:10	invested 51:14	iterating 126:12	kicked 144:12	<b>KOSSON</b> 2:12
102:11 123:18	investigation 21:5	iteration 24.16	kind 77:5 85:16,22	<b>Krohn</b> 166:22
124.15 16 125.4	investment 128.1	57.18 59.9 141.13	138:21 165:2	170.15 174.11
131.1 141.10	159·1	143.13 144.6	178:15	181.4.13
144.5 11 146.4	invite 18.12 53.9	162.20	kinds 84:18 159:10	101.4,15
156.6 193.12	involve 11.2 26.13	iterations 126.21	knew 93:8.14	L
integrates 1/1/16	101.16 18	1/15.22	know 32:10 58:2	lab 97:4 191:14
$\mathbf{m}$	171.10,10	143.22		
integrating 10/1.18	involved 1.18	itorativo 71.21	59:22 60:5 66:14	196:13
integrating 104:18	involved 4:18	<b>iterative</b> 71:21	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1.16	196:13 <b>Jaboratories</b> 13:4
<b>integrating</b> 104:18 <b>integration</b> 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17	<b>involved</b> 4:18 121:7 174:5 <b>involving</b> 25:6 50:6	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5 13	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in line 21:18 46:4 7	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 J	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11 18 21 92:20	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:10 160:4	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 J Jessie 1:15 4:9	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1 6 94:2 5 11	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 Lag 193:6
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 J Jessie 1:15 4:9 iet 35:16 131:7	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6 8 19	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 integried 14:5 27:7	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 iob 68:11 122:22	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5 8 11 13	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2 10	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 icin 18:22 174:11	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3 21 94:20
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Leseph 1:15 4:12	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10 117:14 118:16 120:10 125:6	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 110:16 120:4
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 indee 25:16	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10 117:14 118:16 120:10 125:6 126:8 128:7	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1 17 101:15
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 indement 82:17	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10 117:14 118:16 120:10 125:6 126:8 128:7 120:10 120:16	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 107:14
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7 interchange 177:22	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12 ISM 158:6	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 judgment 83:17	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10 117:14 118:16 120:10 125:6 126:8 128:7 129:10 130:16	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 197:14 <b>Larger</b> 1:16 4:10
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7 interchange 177:22 interest 123:12	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12 ISM 158:6 isolate 187:18	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 judgment 83:17 89:14 166:17	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10 117:14 118:16 120:10 125:6 126:8 128:7 129:10 130:16 131:1,3,5,15,17	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 197:14 <b>Larry</b> 1:16 4:10 166:14
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7 interchange 177:22 interest 123:12 181:1	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12 ISM 158:6 isolate 187:18 188:6	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 judgment 83:17 89:14 166:17 July 5:1	59:22 60:5 66:14 66:21 67:1,16 71:16 72:10 78:18 79:19 80:5,13 83:11,18,21 92:20 93:1,6 94:2,5,11 95:19 96:6,8,19 97:5 98:5,8,11,13 98:17 99:7 105:11 109:18 111:2,10 117:14 118:16 120:10 125:6 126:8 128:7 129:10 130:16 131:1,3,5,15,17 134:8 135:8,16,19	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 197:14 <b>Larry</b> 1:16 4:10 166:14
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7 interchange 177:22 interest 123:12 181:1 interested 5:22	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12 ISM 158:6 isolate 187:18 188:6 isolating 48:14	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 judgment 83:17 89:14 166:17 July 5:1 jump 91:16 186:14	$59:22\ 60:5\ 66:14$ $66:21\ 67:1,16$ $71:16\ 72:10\ 78:18$ $79:19\ 80:5,13$ $83:11,18,21\ 92:20$ $93:1,6\ 94:2,5,11$ $95:19\ 96:6,8,19$ $97:5\ 98:5,8,11,13$ $98:17\ 99:7\ 105:11$ $109:18\ 111:2,10$ $117:14\ 118:16$ $120:10\ 125:6$ $126:8\ 128:7$ $129:10\ 130:16$ 131:1,3,5,15,17 $134:8\ 135:8,16,19$ $138:17,19\ 141:7$	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 197:14 <b>Larry</b> 1:16 4:10 166:14 <b>late</b> 25:1 29:15 20.15 50 22
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7 interchange 177:22 interest 123:12 181:1 interested 5:22 105:9	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12 ISM 158:6 isolate 187:18 188:6 isolating 48:14 isolation 187:11,12	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 judgment 83:17 89:14 166:17 July 5:1 jump 91:16 186:14 jumper 109:4,6,12	$59:22\ 60:5\ 66:14$ $66:21\ 67:1,16$ $71:16\ 72:10\ 78:18$ $79:19\ 80:5,13$ $83:11,18,21\ 92:20$ $93:1,6\ 94:2,5,11$ $95:19\ 96:6,8,19$ $97:5\ 98:5,8,11,13$ $98:17\ 99:7\ 105:11$ $109:18\ 111:2,10$ $117:14\ 118:16$ $120:10\ 125:6$ $126:8\ 128:7$ $129:10\ 130:16$ 131:1,3,5,15,17 $134:8\ 135:8,16,19$ $138:17,19\ 141:7$ $145:1\ 150:10$	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 197:14 <b>Larry</b> 1:16 4:10 166:14 <b>late</b> 25:1 29:15 38:15 52:22 104.12
integrating 104:18 integration 69:4 84:9 100:2 104:17 121:21 integrity 46:6 intend 71:19 169:4 174:17 intended 14:5 27:7 48:22 58:15 66:15 intensive 197:11 intent 63:14 76:12 76:17,21,22 153:3 interacts 130:7 interchange 177:22 interest 123:12 181:1 interested 5:22 105:9 interesting 138:21	involved 4:18 121:7 174:5 involving 25:6 50:6 137:20 in-line 31:18 46:4,7 46:11 49:3,6 152:13,14 153:4 153:18 154:17 ion 157:17 158:2,11 158:12 198:2,3,4 199:6 irrespective 190:20 Island 171:7,12 ISM 158:6 isolate 187:18 188:6 isolating 48:14 isolation 187:11,12 187:13,16 188:1,4	iterative 71:21 126:10 139:19 i.e 188:5 Jessie 1:15 4:9 jet 35:16 131:7 job 68:11 122:22 123:1 128:8 161:3 John 1:17 4:11 join 18:22 174:11 Joseph 1:15 4:12 judge 25:16 judgment 83:17 89:14 166:17 July 5:1 jump 91:16 186:14 jumper 109:4,6,12 113:4 155:19	$59:22\ 60:5\ 66:14$ $66:21\ 67:1,16$ $71:16\ 72:10\ 78:18$ $79:19\ 80:5,13$ $83:11,18,21\ 92:20$ $93:1,6\ 94:2,5,11$ $95:19\ 96:6,8,19$ $97:5\ 98:5,8,11,13$ $98:17\ 99:7\ 105:11$ $109:18\ 111:2,10$ $117:14\ 118:16$ $120:10\ 125:6$ $126:8\ 128:7$ $129:10\ 130:16$ 131:1,3,5,15,17 $134:8\ 135:8,16,19$ $138:17,19\ 141:7$ $145:1\ 150:10$ $152:10\ 155:15$	196:13 <b>laboratories</b> 13:4 <b>lack</b> 15:21 36:15 43:21 <b>ladies</b> 138:18 <b>Lag</b> 193:6 <b>Lagdon</b> 170:17 181:15 <b>large</b> 10:9 15:19 27:16 28:4 72:13 88:3,21 94:20 96:5 119:16 120:4 131:1,17 191:15 197:14 <b>Larry</b> 1:16 4:10 166:14 <b>late</b> 25:1 29:15 38:15 52:22 194:18

<b>T I</b> ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )			150 00 170 1	
Laughter 80:14	legs 32:3 87:21	lines 111:21 115:14	153:22 172:1	maintaining
91:20 133:16,19	117:11,19 132:2,3	115:15 133:3	181:2 201:12	142:17
170:14	132:4 172:16	169:16 186:11	<b>looked</b> 60:2 114:22	maintenance 27:1
layer 47:5 154:14	Leo 2:17 53:22	<b>link</b> 5:7	115:1 129:12	152:17,19
layers 47:4 60:16	89:1	liquid 59:5 109:6	132:20 173:4	major 57:6 120:7
140:8,12	lessons 138:20	113:6 135:17	looking 69:5 82:12	124:17
<b>leach</b> 131:18	letters 9:14	200:7,12	97:10,14 99:17	majority 25:11
160:12	let's 109:10	liquids 201:5	118:3 121:8	making 7:6 123:11
leaching 36:5	level 11:7 16:18	list 6:4 92:2,15	124:15 137:12	151:22 158:22
lead 32:12 33:17,17	34:19 35:20 36:8	166:7 170:12	149:15 151:2	169:22 178:7
36:19 62:18 89:11	36:13 41:11 42:3	<b>listed</b> 6:6	156:16 167:8	179:5 181:6
139:11 141:3	44:7 47:6,13 58:2	listened 96:17	172:5 181:12	<b>man</b> 133:9
164:3 184:22	59:8 64:2,10,17	133:10	189:3	managed 73:5 93:7
leadership 94:15	70:15 78:4 80:5	listening 139:14	looks 184:12	management 27:10
lead-in 55:14	127:21 132:1.4	141:16	loop 32:3 131:14.16	38:3 53:14 59:17
171:18	141:2.9 150:11	little 51:15 63:4	131:16.17 160:16	74:13 141:10
leak 22:19 43:2	165.8 169.5	80.11 122.8 135.1	lose 173·3	142.18 161.9
44.14 48.5 8 49.7	184.10 200.11	138.13 139.4	loss 109.11 110.5	164.9 167.3 7 17
49.21 50.8 58.7	licensable 60.12	156.3	110.14 115.19	169.1 175.17
152.0 154.8 8	liconso 1/1.1/	150.5	154.2 20 155.12	176.8 105.10 22
155.11 17 182.0	1/2·18 150·8	lived 70.18	137.2,20133.12 171.13182.1421	managar 18.12
192.7 8 108.5 16	142.10 130.0	$\mathbf{living} 77.16$	171.15 182.14,21	10.2 24.2 52.15
103.7,0 190.3,10	100.11 <b>I:f</b> o 11.11 12.21	londed 21.16	10J.10 109.4	19.2 24.3 33.13 54.2 60.15 75.16
109.10 21	12.7 26.2 60.19	loading 20.4 26.7	70.17 20.16	J4.5 09.15 75.10 97.12 90.2 106.14
198:19,21	15.7 50.5 09.18	loading 50:4 50:7	/9:1/ 80:10	87:12 89:5 190:14
leaked 6/:1	80:3 84:13 100:13	location 5:2	118:19 119:7	managerial 63:5
leakers 12:3	126:14 158:9	logic 126:18	127:19 129:11	manages 36:21
leaking 12:1	159:2,5,7,11	logics 131:6	135:10 143:22	mandate 15:5
151:18	193:15	logs 36:8	154:1 156:14	manifolds 198:5
<b>leaks</b> 43:3 44:11,17	<b>liked</b> 171:12	long 32:2 66:22	162:19 176:17	<b>manner</b> 167:11
45:5 50:4,6 59:2	likelihood 16:21	67:17 107:9 108:5	197:9 201:2	Mansfield 1:17
149:17 182:11,14	75:18 120:19	111:9,10 115:19	lots 141:11 162:14	4:11 105:1 106:6
183:7,18 189:13	Likewise 21:2	115:19 117:19	162:16	106:7,21 107:7,9
189:13,22 190:1	<b>limit</b> 6:21 48:14	160:11	low 31:10 107:1	107:17,20 108:4,7
198:8	99:11 195:2	<b>longer</b> 31:22	lower 45:14 64:2	108:14,20 109:3,9
<b>learn</b> 14:18 138:20	limitations 16:21	115:19 201:12	141:9 150:7,17	109:20 110:3,10
learned 135:12	limited 7:2 14:15	long-term 11:4	159:17	110:14,18,21
138:18	limiting 63:20	LONI 2:13	luck 201:18	111:9 112:2,6,10
learning 62:11	limits 41:8 99:6	look 40:20 63:14		112:13,16,18
learnings 126:15	103:17	76:12 84:22 85:3	<u> </u>	113:3,19 114:1,4
leave 108:5 109:22	<b>line</b> 46:9 89:9 94:13	85:16 89:4 92:15	<b>M</b> 2:13	114:6,10 115:10
147:17 157:3	100:4 107:2 113:4	93:2,12 99:18	machinations 64:1	115:16 116:3,11
led 30:21 82:9 89:2	113:5,10 115:8,8	107:22 108:13	<b>Madam</b> 179:7	116:16 117:4,10
90:13 147:4	115:12 116:17	109:10 124:10	main 93:17	118:4 131:12
<b>left</b> 4:9.10.15	128:3 131:21	129:6 130:16	maintain 26:14	151:5.8.14 152:5
leg 84:3 106:22	132:9.13.17.18	135:15 140:22	166:10 182:2	152:12 191:7.8
173:3	142:7 152:8 18	145:9.22.146.4	190:15	192:21 193.19
legitimate 128.10	165:2 184:5 7	148.19 149.5	maintained 169:19	MAR 19.21 20.12
	1001-10110,7	1.0119 1.1910		
			1	1

Г
٦

			1	
20:17 23:4 26:7	165:18 168:18	157:5 159:8,22	123:6	moment 15:15
28:10 29:16 32:20	182:12 183:19	160:21 162:3	minor 57:8 142:16	137:10 156:5
37:13 40:4,13,17	192:4	163:9 164:20	146:1 159:4 161:5	money 70:19 201:3
41:2,8,16,18 42:1	meaning 124:14	165:1 166:13	<b>minute</b> 200:21	<b>monitor</b> 8:14
55:14 72:12 79:12	meaningful 70:8	168:1,2,13 169:15	minutes 6:22 195:2	month 15:9 43:15
80:22 82:9,19	means 34:17 46:2	170:11 172:14,18	misalignment	<b>months</b> 37:5
90:11 92:2,12,14	96:20	173:1,21 176:19	155:1 189:6	144:14,14
93:2,4,8,18 97:6	measurable 153:9	178:2 191:8	missed 62:9	morning 9:3 15:17
118:16 138:5,10	mechanism 100:15	192:21 193:19,22	mission 10:15 23:4	72:9 82:2 97:2
138:14 140:4	mechanistic 189:18	194:5,9	23:17 24:19 33:5	100:2 101:5,12
141:22 142:2	meet 32:13 46:15	members 1:21 2:10	34:1 35:1 69:6,8	102:14,19 104:14
147:2	97:6 103:6,12,16	3:3 4:17 5:22	69:13 193:14,15	119:15 133:13
margin 21:16 64:6	123:21 134:4,7	6:14 7:5 18:8,16	misspoke 131:22	155:7 160:1
75:10	138:5,6 148:20	23:21,22 33:10,15	<b>mitigate</b> 47:19 48:4	202:11
market 127:17	162:10,12 186:2	53:7 194:21	154:5 155:14	morning's 17:21
mass 159:19	meeting 1:5 4:6,21	201:22	197:5	34:10 51:5 81:20
material 17:14	6:2 7:4,13,19 16:8	<b>memory</b> 92:6	mitigated 151:20	<b>move</b> 38:11,11
19:21,22 26:6	34:2,11 39:15	119:16 127:5	mitigation 43:6	74:15 75:10 79:19
28:2 34:6,7 35:6	51:5 162:6 165:6	mentioned 171:6	50:5	133:7 137:6 140:3
42:20,22 47:20	meets 17:3 29:8	191:14	mitigative 30:11	140:15 166:8
49:12 54:6 64:14	51:22 100:8	<b>met</b> 1:10 74:1	182:12 183:14	moved 196:7
74:17 75:8 76:9	167:18	88:16 103:13	190:19 191:2	moving 75:7 76:3
77:3 88:8,9 89:6	member 1:15.16.17	127:6 129:8	<b>mix</b> 16:14 32:18	<b>multiple</b> 47:4 94:20
128:4 137:17	33:11 54:4 106:7	method 44:16 45:9	35:17 77:8 103:6	100:12 183:19
138:6 142:12	106:21 107:7,9,17	123:9	114:3 135:9	<b>multi-day</b> 112:7
materials 46:3	107:20 108:4,7,14	methodology 30:14	<b>Mixer</b> 131:7	multi-decade 35:1
108:19	108:20 109:3,9,20	43:1 45:10 58:7.9	mixers 35:16	myopically 60:6
matrix 145:18	110:3,10,14,18,21	59:3 142:14	mixing 17:1 20:8	<b>M3</b> 57:6 92:8 103:1
matter 76:22,22	111:9 112:2,6,10	162:11 164:17	21:17 57:5,21	146:1
90:20 143:12	112:13,16,18	175:2	71:18 103:6	
165:12 202:13	113:3,19 114:1,4	methods 40:9 44:9	113:22 144:7,8	N
matters 7:18	114:6,10 115:10	metric 136:20	156:8 161:15	name 4:3 6:10
mature 162:15	115:16 116:3,11	mic 195:13	mixture 11:2	33:12,15 171:8
<b>maximum</b> 14:17	116:16 117:4,10	microns 101:10,21	mobilize 192:15	195:7,18
36:7	118:4 119:3 120:2	microphone 195:15	mobilized 11:17	national 13:4 17:11
<b>ma'am</b> 56:11 66:11	120:11,18 122:2,4	<b>middle</b> 123:19	model 37:10 97:5	18:5 23:8 24:11
<b>McMurray</b> 122:15	125:11,15,21	124:1,4,12	114:21 125:5	28:1 29:2,13 31:4
<b>mean</b> 47:11 61:17	126:3 127:1,4	mid-1950s 12:2	models 156:11	31:17 32:6,12
68:1,1,2 79:9 80:2	128:16 130:18	mid-1990s 12:12	modes 64:11	97:4 196:13
86:7.7 108:4	133:8.20 134:5.10	Mile 171:7.12	modification 82:1	National's 30:2
110:21 114:16	134:20 135:4	millirem 44:21	158:2.8.21	natural 71:7
118:15 124:18	136:4 137:9 139:3	mind 70:20 81:19	modifications 8:8	162:20 163:4
133:21 134:15	145:3.7 146:6.11	122:9 135:11	126:20 157:13.21	naturally 65:1
135:18 139:8	146:19 147:12.19	139:2 164:21	158:3	nature 52:16 72:17
140:7.9 141:8	149:16 150:18	minimize 38:6	modified 19:20	181:9 196:6
154:13 155:16	151:7.8.14 152:5	49:22 155:1	55:12 74:3 78:2	near 15:22 36:5
159:9.22 161:21	153:14 155:20	mining 122:21.22	modify 55:19 123:9	nearing 144:19
,		8		_
			1	

156:21	<b>nice</b> 119:9	0	114:1 125:14	operated 37:3
<b>nearly</b> 119:6	night 194:19	obligated 161:8	134:5 139:20	70:14,15
necessarily 15:22	night's 114:19	163:16 164:18	140:9,15,21	operating 9:22
165:21 175:20	nitric 113:1 158:1	obtaining 13:2	141:14,22 143:19	16:22 37:5 39:10
necessary 8:9,18	<b>non</b> 50:6 189:17	<b>obvious</b> 82:15	146:19 154:1,3,8	64:19 65:4 74:4
16:20 23:15 33:3	non-MAR 42:2	164:2	154:12 161:6	91:5 95:6 96:19
121:22	non-mechanistic	obviously 72:12	162:3 164:11,20	96:21 100:14
necessitate 143:15	189:14	124:17 126:13	164:22 165:1	130:15 159:2
necessity 118:6	non-safety 188:5	128:22 187:19	168:1 180:19	197:15 201:13
<b>need</b> 12:4 17:5	normal 21:9 59:9	196:18	181:17 183:7,21	operation 3:16
21:16 40:13 45:1	63:20 128:12	occur 16:7 30:9	184:1,20 185:12	9:19 10:7 11:13
56:14 57:13 58:11	164:8	31:11 68:19 101:7	185:21 186:10	13:5 16:12 20:5
60:14,22 64:18	normally 38:13	occurred 70:1	188:8,17 189:8	23:14 32:17 34:5
70:12,13 77:8	Northwest 97:4	occurs 69:2	195:18 199:13	34:14 36:3 65:11
82:14 83:18 84:10	<b>note</b> 13:8 150:8,16	OCTOBER 1:8	<b>old</b> 10:13,14 66:22	67:10 72:3 81:4
84:19 106:14	noted 16:4 41:14	offer 83:11 139:15	68:16 70:18 72:21	89:12,12,13 90:4
114:2 121:18	178:12,17	139:18	<b>Olinger</b> 18:22	91:8 107:5 108:1
125:20 129:2	<b>notice</b> 5:21	offered 33:10	23:20 33:8 61:13	108:2,3 119:8
130:13 131:12	noticed 4:22	offers 33:11	82:7 87:19 89:4	124:9 128:18
136:19 140:14	November 7:9	office 18:13 19:1	174:21	129:18 130:11
143:14 144:5,18	29:18 91:22 106:3	24:3,7,15 29:1,14	once 14:12 26:20	169:20
144:19,21 150:9	106:4	31:20 53:15 61:9	31:7 32:15 84:7	operational 12:20
155:3,13 156:21	<b>nuclear</b> 1:3 4:5,19	69:3,4,6,14 74:11	109:17 169:16	13:7 14:13 25:19
168:5,9 170:21	8:5 22:7,10,15	74:13 75:13,15	<b>ones</b> 57:9	26:21 28:4 33:2
173:19 191:22	24:6 29:11 33:18	87:11,13 89:3	<b>one-forth</b> 38:20	35:5 39:20 63:16
<b>needed</b> 26:16 73:14	54:2 59:18 63:13	143:2 167:3 169:7	one-of-a-kind	68:9 73:10 75:5
115:21 121:1	63:17 84:9 91:5	171:3 180:22	35:12 126:16	76:7 93:14,22
123:17 165:9	96:6 144:20 146:3	181:5	one-tenth 201:8	94:3
177:13	167:13 169:3,6	offset 43:21	<b>ongoing</b> 167:12	operationally
needs 71:4 95:22	170:17 175:19	offsite 109:11	<b>online</b> 169:19	66:16
102:6 171:22	176:5,10 177:12	110:5,15 112:2	<b>onus</b> 140:10	operations 11:4
neither 27:15	178:10,14 179:4,8	115:20 118:7	open 5:3 7:9	19:11 20:15 26:15
net 31:9	179:18 180:7	off-normal 132:16	opening 3:2,4 18:7	47:3 54:1 63:21
<b>never</b> 64:3 111:3	181:15 189:12,21	<b>Oh</b> 172:17 184:22	18:9 63:2 82:6	70:11,13,20 71:1
119:11 127:7	195:9,20,21 196:9	oil 127:15 196:7,9	100:10,11 147:20	72:14 73:15,16
185:6	196:12	196:10	152:3	83:4 90:15 93:6
new 8:4 19:22 23:4	number 20:6 25:10	okay 55:22 56:12	operability 39:3	96:9 100:11,21,21
32:8,13,20 41:7	27:16 28:5 74:20	56:12 58:5 61:7	89:5	115:6 142:5 147:6
48:9 51:20 69:3	78:6 81:21 92:11	62:20 63:6,10	operable 149:4	165:18 166:22
88:7,10,11 100:15	93:/11/:8119:18	64:21 65:7,13	operate 10:20	169:3
120:13 121:4,15	119:20 120:3,3,10	67:8 78:14 81:1	16:13 34:21 38:17	<b>operator</b> 76:14
128:9 137:17	140:6 148:14	81:14 85:6 87:3	39:1/86:68/:15	96:4 121:11
138:5,6,8 144:20	191:19,20 193:8	90:5 97:9 99:8,20	89:19 90:1,22	154:22 188:3
156:18 162:21	193:15 198:2	99:21 100:7 103:6	94:5,14,18 95:1	operators 94:21
177:13,15 178:1	<b>numerous</b> 22:11	103:12,17 104:20	95:14 105:7	95:14,18
news 104:14	198:6	106:5 107:4,8,11	119:11 147:10	opinion 75:12
Newtonian 50:7		108:20 109:10,15	160:10,19 166:9	91:10 92:19

٦

176:14 180:16	166:22 169:5	72:15	17:1 54:1 58:8	<b>pipe</b> 31:10 32:13
198:22	176:3,10	particles 101:9,20	186:1	49:20 55:20
opportunities	overtly 130:14	191:15	performed 49:9	111:13,15 150:3
129:19	over-conservative	particular 87:11	175:5 178:21	155:15,15 163:10
opportunity 6:15	92:18	136:5,16 162:19	period 24:10 28:21	170:9 183:18,18
6:20 18:17 24:1	<b>owner</b> 24:6	169:2 174:18	165:11	185:1,1 191:5
83:13 84:1 107:22	owners 61:10 90:7	177:21 181:12	periodically 8:13	<b>pipeline</b> 122:15
opposed 123:12	105:13,14	particularly 36:14	permanent 49:19	<b>pipes</b> 30:20 35:7
<b>ops</b> 68:6	ownership 122:20	50:6,22 52:15	permeate 200:10	136:13 153:18
optimize 36:7	owning 122:22	72:21 127:16	permit 7:2	154:8,16 162:5,22
69:18	123:1	132:6 157:12,15	permits 195:3	165:11 171:22
options 14:14	owns 123:19	parts 88:7 144:17	permitting 32:2	182:15 197:1
136:19 159:3		passive 26:19 32:18	<b>person</b> 69:5,5 93:5	<b>piping</b> 17:18 20:1,2
oral 9:9	<u> </u>	148:12	94:11	20:9 21:5 25:5
order 6:7,9,18,19	Pacific 97:4	path 14:6 22:22	personally 94:3	26:9,13 27:18
47:16 138:4	package 29:5,14	108:5 161:11	perspective 19:8	28:18 30:9 31:14
175:22	pages 15:10	paths 151:17 152:9	24:5 25:19 56:2	31:18 32:10 43:2
orders 177:1	panel 1:21 2:10 3:7	<b>Patrick</b> 3:20 195:6	56:15 57:15 61:10	43:6 44:11 46:4,6
ordinary 106:15	18:6 53:9 54:4,17	195:7,19	61:18 71:17 82:12	46:8,11,13,20
organic 99:11	panelist 54:11	Paul 2:16 104:17	90:7 105:15	47:12 48:11,15,19
organization 56:4,8	panelists 54:7,8	<b>pause</b> 60:4	108:17,17 121:8	49:2,5,10,15,17
56:10 57:12 60:4	<b>paper</b> 129:12 138:2	<b>PDSA</b> 50:15,20	167:8 172:11	50:1 51:10,19
organizations	180:9	51:8,22 52:22	176:4 177:5 182:8	109:19 145:14
53:11	paragraph 8:21	55:7,8,13,17 57:7	<b>Peter</b> 1:12,14 4:4	149:20 150:15
original 6:21 129:7	parameter 42:19	57:7 59:1,1 85:14	PEURRUNG 2:13	152:1,6,9 155:8
originally 27:7	74:22 128:14	105:18 139:5,5,9	<b>phase</b> 74:11 143:13	181:22 182:2,9
126:7	178:15	140:19 141:20	phenomenology	185:5,14 186:3
<b>ORP</b> 61:8 90:13	parameters 44:18	142:11,21 143:14	22:20	187:3,8,9 189:16
147:5	45:6 64:9 65:9	143:15 145:12	philosophy 14:19	190:1,6,8,13
ought 138:19	73:22 76:8 89:7	146:4,8 149:21	phrase 185:22	pitching 122:12
outcome 124:7	103:22 104:10	162:12,17 163:7	physical 73:22	<b>pivot</b> 14:5
161:21	paramount 142:18	182:15	124:7	pivoting 13:22
output 161:22	part 9:4 15:13 16:1	pedigree 154:16	physically 124:3	14:22
outside 26:17 87:22	30:14 47:3 49:7	183:12	<b>pick</b> 154:10 155:13	<b>PJMs</b> 131:7.10
117:20	71:3,18 80:17	<b>peer</b> 180:11	156:21 157:1	197:10.10
outstanding 14:8	105:17,19 117:8	<b>people</b> 6:6 95:4	190:22	place 85:10 101:12
overall 24:21 32:22	117:22 122:22	136:12 139:19	<b>picked</b> 165:13	102:10 123:22
58:21 59:4 81:22	123:1 131:4	perceived 40:13	189:9	places 37:22 38:10
142:4	132:18 148:9	percent 13:11.13	<b>piece</b> 173:2	119:10 182:20
overconservative	151:21 156:4,6	13:14 19:14.15.16	<b>pieces</b> 144:17	<b>plan</b> 9:7 19:10 30:2
78:22	158:3 162:20	20:10 25:13 52:11	148:15	31:4.6 68:6 144:3
overcrowding	167:14 170:7	78:2.11.12.13	<b>pilot</b> 177:10.14.21	144:12.12 156:4
26:18	175:2 181:2	126:11 159:17	181:6.13	192:14
overly 89:7	188:14 190:1	200:14.15	<b>Pinto</b> 3:20 195:6.7	planned 88:13
oversight 4:18 9:17	participate 18:5	perform 47:8 58:15	195:8.16.18.19	191:20
12:14 74:12 75:13	176:5	73:17	199:9.13 200:17	planning 14:2 57:3
87:13 124:5	particle 36:12	performance 13:6	200:19 201:1.16	57:11 60:20
	-	r 1010		

Г

144:13 153:2	132:13.17.18.22	postulate 182:20	32:11 50:14.15.18	prevent 8:22 47:19
199:5	plugging/bursting	183:10	55:2 60:22 144:13	48:22 75:21
<b>plans</b> 173:11	35:6	postulated 140:21	premise 73:20	155:10,14,17
<b>plant</b> 9:7 10:5,7,18	plugs 133:2	postulating 183:12	158:16 199:15	157:16 182:11
12:11,11 13:6,11	plutonium 36:15	posture 73:11	preparation 39:15	183:18
13:12,18 14:11	36:16 101:9,20	post-DBE 187:17	prepare 29:3	preventative 25:7
16:10,12,14,16	197:2	188:2	prepared 31:4 53:3	27:17
18:1 19:3,5,12	<b>PNL</b> 132:20	post-seismic	pregualification	prevented 48:10
20:13,16,19,22	<b>PNNL</b> 2:13 97:3	187:17	160:9	49:5
22:1,5 23:2,4,6,15	pockets 117:1	potential 12:20	prequalified 37:4	preventive 183:15
24:13 28:2,11	<b>point</b> 16:6 26:12	17:9 30:4 32:4	present 1:13,18,21	<b>previous</b> 6:16 16:2
31:5,14 33:21,22	59:14,19 65:9	37:18 39:3 45:18	2:10 4:20 28:18	85:13 87:11 118:1
37:7 38:16 39:17	76:21 79:12 81:18	48:12,14 49:11,22	108:3 199:7	previously 37:9
40:2 53:18,19,21	83:19 88:1 91:2	62:5 63:15 70:3	presentation 6:11	78:11 148:10,16
54:3 69:10 71:1,8	97:1,21 107:1	83:14 111:15	6:15 29:9	152:22
75:11 76:3,7 78:4	117:7,8,13,16	132:9,13,16 144:9	presentations 7:2,6	price 127:17
78:9 87:16 88:18	120:14 124:17	148:18 155:1	presenters 6:21	196:10
89:5 90:9,22	126:10 128:20	183:3 189:4	presents 108:2	primarily 84:22
92:19 94:20 95:1	130:2,5 133:13	potentially 41:4	166:15	189:2
95:10 100:14	140:15 141:11	48:15 72:14 140:4	preside 4:6	<b>primary</b> 17:20
101:11 105:6,16	142:16 146:5	power 109:11,13	President 53:22	34:17 43:4 46:2
116:5 119:1	156:20 181:6	109:21 110:1,6,11	presiding 1:12	47:12,19 49:7,10
120:21 124:8	polices 167:10	110:15,15 111:7	press 175:22	100:5 153:17
126:1 128:19	policies 25:1	112:3 113:9,15,15	176:12	170:8 180:22
134:1,13 155:22	167:19	113:17 114:9,12	pressure 38:10	182:22 185:11
159:11 166:9	policy 23:7 33:2	114:16 115:11,20	152:17,19	190:6,8,12,22
173:8 175:8	46:22 166:17	115:22 118:8	pressurized 115:4	191:5
176:16 177:9,20	168:4,5	131:20 188:5	131:14	principally 25:6
178:16,18,22	polishing 200:3	<b>PRA</b> 136:17 166:14	pretreat 59:19	principle 25:18
179:15,19,21	<b>poor</b> 11:13	171:14	111:4,4 145:10	<b>prior</b> 20:17 24:2
180:4,6,11 196:17	<b>portion</b> 59:5,6	practical 25:20	158:4 159:1	26:2 38:13 125:17
197:15	202:4	28:8	pretreatment 3:9	priority 47:21
plant's 14:4 16:22	position 18:18,22	practice 5:20 176:1	3:16 17:10,13,16	private 196:19
17:1	33:12 39:7 100:1	177:12	18:20 19:8,13	privatization 12:15
<b>plan's</b> 31:2	100:4,16 125:1	practices 167:5	20:5,13 22:21,22	Probabilistic
<b>play</b> 130:15 140:1	169:13 179:9	175:19	24:4,9,22 25:11	136:17
<b>plays</b> 23:2	positive 135:11	precedent 194:6	26:8 28:18 32:22	probability 31:10
please 78:16 97:16	possibilities 151:18	precipitation 108:8	34:4,12 38:18	136:17
105:2 145:6	possibility 73:1	157:13	41:13 43:4 50:18	probably 62:22
174:15 186:14	88:15	preclude 156:17	52:8,10,18 53:1	81:12 84:2 108:11
195:17 200:22	possible 5:11 6:8	157:13 158:10	56:19 90:9 105:17	148:5 150:16
201:20	14:17 21:6 36:7	predecessor 18:21	106:11 155:22	155:6 173:18
<b>plug</b> 115:14 157:16	48:20 52:3 106:13	predicated 123:11	160:5 172:6	186:8
158:11	121:3 182:1	predicted 45:11	201:11	probe 118:13
plugging 111:14,16	post 131:18 149:2	171:11	pretty 57:9 120:22	<b>problem</b> 10:9
111:22 115:8,9,12	posted 6:5	Predicting 157:4	123:11 124:13	11:15 116:19
131:21 132:6,7,9	postpone 7:12	preliminary 19:19	151:3	135:8 136:11,14
		-		

137:5 166:14,15 171:1 172:20	procuring/instru 23:10	proposal 50:10 propose 197:6	43:13 44:20 45:3 45:11,17,18,19,21	165:3,5 166:5,15 167:5,9,18 168:7
173:6,7 195:13	produce 56:15	proposed 29:10	46:2 49:12 194:22	168:9 169:2,13,18
200:6,16	product 127:16,17	48:12,13 52:20	202:1,3	171:14,19 173:10
problematic 11:22	173:20	protect 63:10 65:10	publicly 4:22	174:3,19,22 175:9
73:1	professional	154:19 155:3	public's 201:3	176:2,12,14,21
problems 35:5 38:2	198:22	164:5 190:21	pulled 102:16	177:4,14 181:6,13
135:6,10 166:13	profile 78:8	protected 26:16	pulse 35:16 131:7	<b>QRAs</b> 52:2
198:19	program 28:21	85:5 163:20	<b>pump</b> 25:13 106:18	qualification
procedures 39:10	70:16 103:2 121:7	171:22	110:8 111:12	121:12 151:22
167:10	122:1 164:9 167:8	protecting 46:2	114:15	153:6,7,10
proceed 7:16	167:17 169:1	131:19	<b>pumping</b> 188:6,6	qualified 151:17
proceeding 7:8	175:17 196:4	protection 8:10,19	200:7	152:15,18 153:8
proceedings 15:8,9	programs 94:16	10:1 18:13 19:1	pumps 110:16,19	186:5 187:13
15:14	progression 20:18	24:3,7,15 27:3	110:20 111:1,6,8	qualify 187:7,10
process 13:3 18:2	21:9 71:7	29:2,15 31:21	114:7,9 115:22	quality 47:6,14
21:21 42:16 44:11	project 9:11 11:6	45:21 53:16 61:9	136:12 150:19	154:16
46:4 47:18 48:22	11:20 12:13,14,21	64:18 69:7 74:11	188:5	quantification
49:1,2,5 52:15	12:22 13:2,18,19	75:14,16 87:12,14	purge 148:12	137:3
59:17 63:6 65:15	14:21 19:5,14	89:3 143:3	purges 116:22	quantitative 30:2,5
71:22 76:12 80:11	21:10 22:2 23:9	prototypically	<b>purpose</b> 51:12 66:7	30:6 51:9 107:13
80:20 84:8 96:22	27:21 29:12 32:16	131:9	102:19	quarterly 41:21
97:13 122:6 124:1	38:3 39:9,12,22	proven 12:3	purposely 74:21	question 7:5 42:1
125:9 126:10	44:2 52:16 53:2	proves 50:4	purposes 117:12	54:12,13,17 55:1
127:9,12 128:5	53:17,18 56:18	<b>provide</b> 11:5 14:5	pursued 13:1	61:19 64:22 66:14
131:16 136:2	58:20 59:10 60:19	17:5 18:13,19	pushing 168:3	68:10,21 70:1
139:6,19 141:9	69:3,15 84:13	22:8 24:2,5 40:19	<b>put</b> 41:4 57:13	76:16 83:5 85:20
148:1,8,9 156:7	92:14 93:4 97:3	47:18 115:3 124:5	98:13 101:3,17	87:10 96:13
156:19 158:2,6,12	122:20,20 123:13	155:3 156:22	105:13,14 124:14	100:17 106:20
160:11,19 161:14	123:15 124:20	171:21	128:13 145:18,20	119:14 124:10
161:18 164:8,16	127:7 144:7	provided 15:10	<b>puts</b> 101:18	126:20 133:12
165:3,4,20 167:15	156:11 159:3	50:3 117:5	putting 130:1	137:11 140:2
169:14 175:16	196:14 198:7	provides 125:2	179:12	144:8,9 145:2
176:6,9 178:7	201:18	154:12 157:2	<b>P&amp;ID</b> 145:13	147:8,22 149:18
186:11 193:7	projected 10:14	providing 113:9	P&IDs 156:11	151:6,15 152:7
196:3 197:5 198:3	13:6	114:15 198:14	P-R-O-C-E-E-D	156:14 165:20
198:3 201:8	projects 186:13	provision 109:4,6	4:1	169:16 170:12
processed 26:4	project's 21:5	provisions 5:4	<b>p.m</b> 4:2 202:12	171:17 173:7,22
35:18 100:13	22:14 28:20 38:9	provocative 66:15		174:10,14 178:3,5
processes 24:18	182:13	prudent 14:19	Q	181:18 185:20
38:6 56:22	promulgation	62:14 179:20	<b>QRA</b> 30:5,13 51:9	questioning 100:4
processing 17:5	177:22	180:2	51:12,19 75:22	116:18 130:8
27:11,12 35:22	proper 10:6 192:5	<b>public</b> 1:5 3:19 4:6	83:12,18,22 84:9	questions 15:11,12
122:13 123:1	properly 124:2	5:3,16,22 6:2,14	84:15,21 85:1	15:16 16:5,6
134:17 142:8	132:11	7:19 8:10,19 10:2	136:18 155:5	39:14 53:5,7 54:9
Process/Cesium	properties 11:16	10:19 15:6,7 16:8	162:15 163:11,22	59:3 71:15,18
158:1	192:2	23:22 41:15 42:21	164:1,3,13 165:2	81:7 105:2 106:8

		1	1	1
107:16 119:2,9	118:13,22 123:9	recommended 28:9	refining 123:7	80:18 153:16,18
128:9,10 141:18	123:17 128:12,17	28:15	<b>reflect</b> 21:3 24:16	<b>rem</b> 44:21,22 45:4
169:12 193:20	130:2,13 131:7	reconfigure 95:22	55:12 74:16 141:2	45:12,19
194:10	136:2 141:17	reconvene 7:12	142:2	remain 5:12 7:9
quick 167:22	150:13 158:15	202:10	reflecting 55:5	36:2 42:11,14,17
<b>quote</b> 8:3 90:10	160:22 166:2	record 7:8 9:8	<b>reflects</b> 141:21	156:1
	172:9,10 197:20	15:14 33:13 54:12	refreshing 142:10	remains 11:22 15:3
<u> </u>	198:12,13	54:13 71:4,20	refuge 196:11	39:21
radioactive 10:10	reanalyzing 40:5	92:5 96:16 105:14	<b>regard</b> 36:14	<b>remarks</b> 3:2,4 18:7
14:13 17:19 28:17	reason 104:16	124:19 147:12	regarding 38:2	18:9,14,19 24:2,5
34:7,19 42:20	119:4 188:15	163:2,3 174:16	39:6 44:8	195:2 200:21
46:3 47:20	199:16	199:12 201:21	regardless 75:3,4	remediate 10:21
radiological 27:5	reasonable 8:8,15	202:13	77:9 135:19	remediation 34:15
122:17 128:12	45:6 93:3 94:19	recording 5:9	189:16,20	<b>remedy</b> 66:3
192:2	128:10	Recovery 158:1	<b>Register</b> 4:22 5:21	remember 79:17
raise 41:3 90:13	reasonably 43:10	recycled 98:8,9	registered 6:17	81:7 92:4 95:20
147:5	44:3 79:1 93:10	redesign 13:9,12	regulate 7:11	remote 27:1
raised 44:8 74:5	93:18,21 96:7	redlined 145:17	<b>Regulations</b> 30:15	removal 149:6
147:8	125:16,22	reduce 12:9 17:16	regulator 24:7	remove 64:22 65:2
<b>raises</b> 81:4	reasons 113:18	21:12 40:3,13	reinforce 151:15	68:13 76:15 87:21
range 21:6 36:12	rebooting 93:17	62:5 75:10 79:12	relate 35:3	87:22 88:1,2
59:21 72:13	recall 148:6 171:6	93:21 94:2 130:17	related 12:18 37:17	103:20,22 104:10
179:11 189:3	receipt 78:4	140:4,5,6	42:3 52:2,2	113:5 133:2
ranged 44:20	<b>receive</b> 159:16	reduced 20:19 21:3	173:10	158:12 200:10
ranges 150:1	received 41:6 78:3	37:13 42:5 71:9	relating 8:16	removed 40:15
Rasmussen 171:8	receives 74:12	150:2	relation 73:2	101:15 117:12
rationale 105:7	receiving 11:8	reduces 71:22	relative 132:21	removing 12:8
179:11	recess 7:12	reducing 32:4	186:22	40:18 41:2 140:14
<b>reach</b> 90:18	recessing 202:10	34:18 40:6 42:1	release 42:22 46:3	renoticed 5:1
<b>reaches</b> 42:21	<b>recipe</b> 97:6	79:2	48:14 49:11 154:5	replace 158:13
reaching 90:17	<b>recipes</b> 138:5	reduction 17:14	162:2	report 41:21 61:8
reactor 190:5	recirculate 160:15	19:21 20:12,16	released 84:7	93:1,16 95:3,4
read 71:14 125:12	reclassification	40:12 41:16 61:11	<b>releases</b> 47:20	105:20,22 119:22
147:1,8 168:11	148:18	72:12 74:18 82:8	48:10	132:14 143:11
reading 5:16 95:4	reclassify 42:10	82:21 118:16,22	reliability 33:3	171:8,8
ready 125:14	recognize 27:20	158:8,9	47:9 62:1 76:8	<b>reports</b> 29:22
real 67:17 135:6	recognizes 34:14	redundancy 83:3	90:14 147:5	161:16 167:13
184:18	34:21	reevaluating 40:8	reliable 24:18	198:8,22
realistic 140:18	recognizing 30:7	<b>refer</b> 157:9	32:17 89:11 90:4	represent 20:10
reality 74:16 75:8	145:9	reference 130:22	95:11,13 129:12	represented 10:22
77:1 81:3 127:15	recommend 8:7	referred 13:21 26:6	reliably 86:6 89:20	73:18
128:8 129:14	recommendation	149:9	91:1	reprocessing 195:9
realized 42:11	9:13 28:19 92:22	referring 77:7	relied 28:13 89:13	195:21
really 56:14 61:13	168:3 174:4	152:3	<b>relies</b> 47:6	request 18:11 27:8
62:16 64:3 70:1	recommendations	<b>refine</b> 84:7	relook 149:11	89:2 150:12
76:18 81:19 82:18	8:16 9:10,12 29:1	refined 21:11 57:3	rely 49:21	requested 18:4
88:22 93:4 95:11	29:6	184:11	relying 48:2 75:17	25:2
		•	•	•

Г

	I		I	I
requests 54:8	38:13 42:8 104:18	<b>review</b> 8:2,4,14	27:4 28:3 30:3,5,6	rocket 189:1
require 45:20	121:18 143:3	28:2 30:19,22	34:7,18 36:20,21	<b>role</b> 8:2 23:2 75:13
137:17 191:11,13	166:8 178:8,8	31:1,8,12 32:7	37:8,16 38:3 51:9	100:2,6,16,22
191:13,15 192:1,7	resolving 10:8 32:6	40:17 42:1 56:8	52:22 59:13 62:6	102:7 121:21
192:8,9 193:1	139:21	56:11 59:18 92:1	70:3,6,15 71:6,11	room 5:16 6:13
required 27:16	respect 9:5 24:8	92:3,11 173:16	72:2,19 73:10,11	70:22
29:3 37:16 46:15	144:9 165:19	175:15 176:16,20	73:18 74:17 75:8	route 165:13
47:8 85:17,18	169:12 175:16	180:9	75:10 76:3,9 77:3	routes 32:13
96:6 113:17 117:1	179:3 186:5	reviewed 180:12	77:4,5,12 78:8	106:13
133:2 135:21	201:14	reviewing 28:22	79:2,4 88:8,9 89:6	route-specific 30:3
163:8 164:3 190:2	respectfully 180:14	34:12 44:6 92:8	107:13 123:6,7	routine 57:2
192:3	respond 77:21	reviews 13:2 33:20	136:17 137:6,13	106:14 166:11
requirement 78:5	78:15 96:16	56:4 105:8	137:17 138:7	routinely 36:20
78:10,12 80:3	response 15:16	revised 39:19 40:19	142:12 166:1	107:4
85:5 98:19 101:8	21:5 22:13 39:14	41:10 44:7 51:1	168:4 176:14	<b>Roy</b> 33:16
149:12,13 152:16	53:8 69:1,2 81:6,8	82:13,20 138:9	risks 37:1 38:13	<b>Roy's</b> 152:3
153:3 192:22	102:4 131:13	revision 85:9 150:5	108:1 191:17	rule 164:17 166:1
requirements	178:13 194:13	157:10	<b>River</b> 11:19 18:13	rules 183:16
12:19 22:8 23:12	198:20 202:2	revisions 157:20	19:1 24:3,7,15	<b>run</b> 117:16,20
26:10 28:11 29:8	responses 71:15	rheology 72:16	27:13 29:1,14	131:8 200:6
39:11 41:4 43:5	88:14	108:13,19 192:17	31:20 53:15 61:9	201:11
46:17 49:14,18	responsibilities	<b>Richard</b> 1:19 4:15	69:7 74:11 75:14	running 83:21
50:21 51:22 52:4	9:18 121:15	202:8	75:15 87:11,13	94:13
52:5 55:4,18,19	responsibility 19:4	rid 197:20 199:1,6	89:3 98:3,10	<b>Russo</b> 2:14 53:18
63:19 65:17 76:13	responsible 33:19	<b>rig</b> 114:13 115:20	143:3	122:2,3,7 125:13
77:17,22 78:1	restored 112:5	118:6	<b>Rivers</b> 1:10	125:19 126:1,6
80:21 84:18 88:12	restrict 101:12	<b>right</b> 4:11,12,17	Roberson 1:15	127:3,11 128:21
90:11 103:7	restriction 81:9	7:10 55:6 56:6	4:10 54:18,19	145:5,8 158:20
134:16 138:7,8	restrictions 101:18	61:4 62:6 64:14	55:22 56:3,12	Rutland 2:16
141:4 143:18	restrictive 17:4	65:17 66:1,4,7	57:20 58:17 59:11	101:14 102:18
144:21 147:2	72:11	73:17 80:9 84:10	61:2,7,22 62:4,8	103:8,11 104:15
152:16 162:7,9	result 17:2 30:10	86:20 87:5 93:14	62:20 64:5,13,16	160:1
165:6,7 166:1	31:9 35:4 42:9	94:15,15 97:7	64:21 65:4,7,13	
174:2 175:10	43:12 44:15 73:8	104:3 114:10,17	65:20 66:1,6,9,12	<u> </u>
192:16 193:13,18	80:21 81:22 82:7	115:5 116:6	66:20 67:4,8,11	<b>S</b> 1:12,14 2:12
requires 192:14	86:11 120:13	118:21 126:2,12	67:12,19 69:20	<b>safe</b> 13:5 32:16
requiring 163:19	138:9 179:17	136:21 144:2	71:13 72:4,7	70:22 164:17
reserved 109:12	resulted 73:13	151:13 153:12	73:14 76:10 77:13	198:9
reserves 7:10	resulting 16:22	163:3 168:20	77:20 78:14 79:5	safely 10:20 18:1
resin 199:7	25:16 32:17 34:7	173:19 180:1	79:8 80:7,10,19	34:22 38:17 69:19
resolution 31:3	34:18 39:1 50:17	185:2 191:19	81:1 96:11,12	70:12,21
57:4,8 58:6	51:22	rigor 169:8	97:9 99:8,13,21	safer 89:13 171:19
111:20 173:15	results 28:20 32:12	rigorous 46:15	123:5 129:10	172:4,12
resolve 14:8 21:17	43:12 59:2 120:20	167:11	137:4,14 141:19	safety 1:3 3:9 4:5,8
30:17 40:1 57:10	156:8 175:15	rise 45:19 58:1	180:18,19	8:11,19 10:2,2,8
57:18 58:2 116:20	retaining 49:1	risk 11:3 17:15	<b>robust</b> 46:8,21	10:21 12:10,19,20
resolved 14:12 37:1	retrieved 37:4	19:21,22 26:7	49:19	15:7 16:11,19

	I	l	l	I
17:12,17 18:20	166:21 167:13	198:8	45:22 159:6	<b>sheet</b> 6:13 52:12,18
19:3,9,18,19 20:4	169:6 170:6,16,17	says 60:5 90:6	161:11 170:7	123:19 124:16
20:13,14 21:18	170:21 171:4	147:1,7	selecting 74:21	125:4 127:9
22:2,7,15 23:7,13	173:3,6,6,7 175:1	scale 119:16 120:4	77:3	155:21 156:2
24:4,6,8,14,17,21	176:5,10 178:10	131:1,8	selection 22:3 71:9	157:6,9,10,18,19
25:1,7,10,14,15	178:14,18 179:2,5	scenarios 40:20	74:20 154:6 170:6	158:16 159:12,18
25:22 27:18 28:12	179:8,18 180:7	51:3 155:16	self-interest 123:12	159:19,20 160:4
29:4,8,11,22 30:8	181:15 185:6,14	<b>schedule</b> 7:10	send 98:18 99:6	160:10,18,22
30:19 32:22 33:1	186:2,9,15,21	38:10 69:19	101:9,20 124:2	sheets 156:10 160:2
34:8,13 35:3,4,11	187:4,6 189:21	science 189:1	129:19 133:22	Shell 122:13,22
39:10,11,20 40:14	190:2 194:2	scope 121:14 144:1	134:12 143:9	123:14
40:19 42:10,12,13	196:15 197:22	scoping 184:15	senior 100:15	shipped 37:6
43:3 45:1.20.22	198:14	scrub 166:5	121:5	<b>Shirley</b> 18:22 23:19
46:17 47:2.14.16	safety-related 3:12	scrubber 148:15	sensitivity 178:21	shocks 151:19
47:17.22 49:1.9	22:5 23:10 34:3	149:4	sent 99:2	Short 194:4
50:13.14.16.18.21	38:8 39:2 40:21	seated 4:15.17	separate 88:6	shortening 32:2
51:2.3.7.10.17	162:4 163:12	seats 53:12	201:6	showing 75:22
52:1.5.9.20.54:2	Sain 2:17 53:22	second 17:7.15	separation 201:4	shown 32:13
55.2 3 5 17 18	66·9 11 19 21	35.19 43.18 44.4	September 5.2	showstonners
56.5 7 14 15 58.4	67.6 14 78.15 16	44.5 153.22	143·8	156.15
58.14 16 59.4 17	79.7 11 80.9 13	Secretary 8.7 15 22	sequence 128.13	shut 106.17
59.18 60.1 61.3 8	89.1 14 91.16 18	9·10 13 53·13	sequencing 95.8	side 123:21 139:17
61.18 62.6 63.7 9	91.19 94.8 11	166.21 168.6	SER 61.8 121.4	141.7 188.11
63.13 17 19 64.19	95.13 97.7 8 19	179.8	series 106.8	sides 123.16 125.2
65.10 16 17 75.10	99.10 20 104.13	section 7.22 8.1	serve 177.14 21	sign 6.16
82.12 16 83.8 8	106.10 133.12 17	<b>77.</b> 1 <i>1</i>	181.7	signed 6:18 106:3
83.10 84.10 16 17	134.2 6 10 22	77.14 Socurity 171./	sorvice 100.16	10/1.72
85.5 86.9 90.14	135.5 138.11	See 71.13 73.7	121.5	significance 60.1
93.7 19 95.19 21	171.6 192.19	77.11 79.15 93.2	SFS 121.5	significant 13.9
96.6 105.20 21	salt 27.12	103.21 118.10 13	Session $17.7 \ 8 \ 21$	25.10 32.5 35.4
110.7 113.17	sant 27.12 sampling 101.13	105.21 118.10,15	33.0 51.6 54.17	18.8 83.8 02.20
110.7 115.17	Samping 171.15	125.15 120.5	77.15 10 107.10	+6.8803.872.20 150.27172122
114.10 110.4	122.11	170.15 173.15 10	162.20 202.4 5	150.2,7,17,21,22
110.20 119.0,21	122.14	170.15 175.15,19	$102.20\ 202.4,3$	132.1 133.0 103.0
119.21 121.2,17	satisfy 160.12	1/4.9 1/0.21	set 22.7 26.2 60.2	185.14 180.2,9,15
121.20 129.3	102.2	199.10 cook 106.11	62.19 61.2 101.5	100.21 107.4,0,20
130.11 140.0,11	192.5 Sevenneh 11.10	SEEK 190.11	$05.10\ 04.2\ 194.0$	sign up 6.12
$140.22 \ 141.3,10$ $141.14 \ 142.11 \ 10$	<b>Savannan</b> 11:19	<b>Seen</b> 59:20 85:15	sets 114:12	sign-up 0:15
141:14 145:11,18	27:12 98:2,10	185:7	<b>settle</b> 197:7 199:10	<b>similar</b> 27:10
144:20 140:3	save 159:1,7	segments 120:7	199:18	122:11 123:4
14/:6 148:11,1/	saved 115:18	<b>seismic</b> 40:10 46:15	settling 201:6	189:12
149:13 150:1,2,7	savings 199:4	153:6 185:7,9	seven 11:12	simple 25:19 96:9
150:17,21,22	saw 155:15 174:20	186:16,21 18/:4,5	severely 39:2	106:9 140:3
151:22 152:1,15	saying 88:20 96:15	18/:6,/,14 188:9	severity 41:11 42:3	164:20 199:1
154:12 155:8	97:10,14 99:14,15	188:10,12,13	44:6,7 184:10	simpler/safer 97:12
156:1,22 157:2	109:21 116:3,4	select 20:7 183:17	shared 156:5	simplest 134:21
161:1 162:6,9	176:14 177:3	selected 30:10 40:9	shear 192:5	simplicity 61:20
164:9 165:6,19	181:20 190:5	42:18 44:19 45:10	<b>sheer</b> 93:12	simplified 32:11

01.0	201.4 7	sponding 70.18	02.7 05.4 141.10	55.6 58.21 50.1
71.7 simplifies 27.1	201.4,/	spenuing /0:18	106.1	55.0 50.21 59.4 60.11 63.17 71.10
simplify 165.5	116.22 117.2	spoke 1/6.2 102.12	starting 13.10 16.6	82.17 18 84.10
simplify 103.3	136.6 166.15	spone 140.2 172.13	57.16 0/.17	85.0 17 00.15
simplifying 27.0	solutions 1/1.17	sponsor cu 1/1.J	startling 120.7	118.1 121.4 10
simply 62.11 71.6	173.11	AA.10 1A 17 A5.5	startun 22.11	182.12 17 182.17
simulation 121.12	123.14 comobody 81.12	44.10,14,17 45.5	statup 23.14	182.15,14 183.14
simultanoously	1/7·21 101·1/	40.5 50.7 59.1	174.15	101.2
	147.21191.14	180.13 100.1	174.15 stated 5.20 30.15	171.2 stroom 75.3 6 11
90.2 single 18:3	121.2 1/2.0	109.13 190.1	153.3 176.17	77.2 127.10 128.1
single-shall 11.0	1/6.16	sprayed $131.11$	133.3 170.17 statement 10.7	103.2 200.15
12.1 2 78.18	140.10 Sorry 86.17 121.5	Sprays 149.3,17	61.11 63.2 72.2	195.2 200.15 strooming 5:7
12.1,270.10	153.13 184.3	$SSC_{2} $ 82.22	73.20.82.6 105.6	strooms 200.3
<b>SH</b> 122.3 127.3 151.7 105.12 17	135.15 104.5	stabilization 23.17	105.10 110.10	strongth 102.6
131.7 193.12,17	sound 114.17	33.5	105.10 115.10	strossful 73.16
A2.11	sounds 150.8	stabilizing 12.8	147.12 140.13,14	strongly 144.4
+J.11 sites 11.18 135.6	Source 20.15 1/2.6	stable 12.0	147.1,21 100.12	structuro 16.1 58.1
situation 180.1	100.21	Stable 12.5 Stacy 1.23 124.21	statements 3.10	60.15 100.11
situations 14.16	170.21 space 82.16 83.10	staff 1.18 1.18	6.21 30.5 147.20	00.13 190.11 structures 3.12
114.21 176.22	100.7 8 1/1.1	22.15 22.22 23.11	152.4	1A·A 22·6 23·11
114.21 170.22 six 37.5 02.6	170.7,0 141.1	22.13 23.22 33.11	132.4 states 1.1 17.2	14.4 22.0 23.11 20.17 47.7 82.22
size 36.12 72.15	speak 6.8 20	33.17,20 34.3,12	stating 33.12 11.2	29.17 47.7 02.22 studied 111.17
02.12	178.11 104.20	<i>J</i> 4.14,20 <i>J</i> 7.4,0 <i>J</i> 1.1 2 12 17 <i>J</i> 2.7	170.11	studios 21.12 15
95.15 cloop 11/1.10	106.18 202.1	41.1,5,15,17 42.7	1/9.14 statuta 7.20	132.18
slowing 161.1	190.10 202.1 snaskar 195.1 5	45.22 44.8 40.10	statutory $7.17 \ 9.5$	152.10 stuff 68.18 08.17
sludge 07.22 08.2 /	speakers 6.4 9 10	40.19 40.10 49.0	9.21 10.5 15.5	105.8 135.15
08.1/ 101.17	speakers 0.4,9,10	49.14 30.2,7 51.18 132.15	9.21 10.3 13.3 staved 77.10 70.22	138.21
102.7 106.3 <i>I</i>	106.10	133.4 153.1	98.16.22	subject 7.18 18.10
sludges 192.7	specific 20.20	19/1.16	staving 129.5	2A·A 31·2 51·11
sluiced 196.5	56.17 65.11 71.10	staff's 35.7 11	steel 31.14 20	170.19
sluicing 196.4	104.8 10 109.15	stage 27:21 92:20	Steve 166.22	subjects $7.4$
shirry 115.13	110.6 6 19 20	127.8 162.17	Steven 33:16	submit 8.15 54.5
122.16	111.7 8 121.17	189.2 7	stock 128.11	198.21 199.11
small 81.21 193.8	152.14 153.9	stages 122.19	Stokes 33.16	201.20 202.6
197.16 200.3	160.13 20 162.9	stagnant 109.19	105.19 106.2	submittals 29.4
smartest 84.7	182.16 17 193.17	110.13	ston 158.11 188.5 6	submitted 29.13
sodium 112.22	specifically 89.4	stainless 31.13 20	storage 34.18	56.6
158.8	157.22 182.9	standard 47.1	193.7	Subnart 162.11
solely 10.16	183.14	standards 23.12	stored 10.10	subsequently $44.12$
solid 116.15 150.10	specification 28.10	167·20 174·2	storing 36.1	101.6
solids 36.6 13 15	specified 43.16	177.2 13 16 178.1	strategies 21.21	substantial 57.9
36.16 78.3 131.18	49.15	189.15 17 190.14	52·21 118·20	113.13 115.7
157.14 15 16	specifies 47.21	standnoint 185.5	strategy 16.17 21	substantially 74.6
159.17 193.5	specify 37.10 47.17	188.10	17.18 10.0 21.0	78·8
196.6 197.7 8 18	<u>49.4</u>	start 54.20 22	28.16 30.19 32.9	substantiate 39.7
199.16 18 20	speculate 156.4	130.13 195.17	37.13 39.20 43.3	successful 11.2
200.4 5 9 13 14	speech 201.17	started 60.21 86.1	50.19 51.20 43.3	successfully 51.17
200.1,5,7,13,17	Speccii 201.17	5.41.00.21.00.1	50.17 51.2,10	5400051411y 51.17
	1	1	1	1

٦

70.01				
52:21	132:14 133:3	179:2 182:9	77:12 78:6,19	201:4
<b>suction</b> 106:22	135:4 139:13	<b>T</b>	79:3,3,10,13,14	<b>tell</b> 66:20 73:4
<b>suffer</b> 10:18	145:7 151:22		79:18,22 80:17,21	80:20 81:2 94:1
sufficient 43:19	154:17 161:8	table 6:12 151:4	81:4,10 88:8,10	101:19 139:7
176:11	174:18 185:2	take 9:12 15:14	88:19,20 96:21	147:11 149:18
suggest 197:3	surprised 68:2	53:11 54:11 95:14	97:3,17 98:16	telling 128:17
suggested 40:14	180:14	108:7,10,18	99:2,17 100:2,7	159:12
suggests 39:20	surprises 120:13	111:11 134:22	100:21 101:10,13	tenet 154:10
suitable 12:6 50:9	surrounding 39:19	138:19 180:5,12	101:18 106:13,13	tenets 170:2
suite 153:22 158:3	suspect 143:7	180:15 197:16	120:21 124:2,22	term 41:12
172:5 184:13	suspected 12:1	taken 27:21 51:21	133:13 136:9	terminates 188:4
suits 129:20	suspended 197:4,9	99:1 100:20	137:22,22 138:6,9	terminology 60:12
summarize 199:10	197:18	135:17	138:15 183:6	186:16
summary 25:2	sweet 97:17	takes 102:10	193:4,10 196:2	terms 84:11 119:15
161:16	switch 188:2.4	123:22 170:12	197:7.19.20 200:7	123:6.18 124:19
summer 29:11	system 42:15 43:3	197:9	200:9.11	124:22 126:11.15
sump 135:16	46:1 47:12 48:4	talk 82:2 107:15	tanks 10:11.12 11:7	131:6 132:5 140:3
Sunshine 5:5	48:15.19.49:10.16	111:3 149:2,17	11:9 12:2 5 34:20	142:7 149:6
super 77·10 79·22	49.18 58.4 15	152:14 157:21	36.10 67.1 16 18	152.13 169.17
98·16 138·15	69.8 109.1 113.20	160:6	69.9 72.20 75.4	181.8 192.16
superior 23:5	114.15 115.21	talked 101:4.8	78.18 115.3	193.5 13
24.21 32.21 76.6	126.4 7 18 19	104:17 121:18	134.13 135.5 7 7	test 83:21 131:2
82·0 15 83·10	131.2 10 14	132:7 148:18	135.16 17 196.5	153.1 2 9 166.11
87.20	1/1.2, 10, 14 1/1.10, 1/8.1, 8, 12	155:21 158:5	toskod 40.7	tostod 103.5 153.5
07.20 supernate 08:8	$141.10\ 140.1,0,12$ $149.12\ 12\ 14\ 10$	160.1 173.13	toom 28.22 20.22	testified 87.10
supernate 98.8	140.12,15,14,19 140.12,152.10	187.15 193.4	21.1 9 12 22.7	testimen of .19
192.11 ann antair 20.17	149:15 155:19	talking 64.8 78.17	51:1,0,12 52:7	19.10 22.10 11
<b>Supertank</b> 20:17	157:12,20 159:15	81.21 112.6 123.5	08:2 89:2 92:12	18:10 33:10,11
37:10,12,1575:1	184:21 192:14	150.14 153.15 15	125:15 1/5:10	54:5 18/:10
/5:6 / /:1 /8:21	193:7 195:15	155.12 159.21	1/0:1/	194:15 202:6
/9:9 92:12,17	199:1,5,7,8,14,17	155.12 156.21	teams 28:1,6,9,15	testing 9:19 28:20
99:1,15 118:15	199:21,22	102:4 101:21	technical 1:19 4:16	62:16 119:16,19
136:5 137:20	systematic 60:18	185:15 189:20	7:3 9:15 14:9,12	120:4,8,16 121:7
141:22	144:15	197:14	29:4 30:17 39:10	122:1 124:15
<b>supplied</b> 113:16	systematically	taiks 124:16	44:1 50:21 52:5	125:16,18,19
supplier 149:2	57:14 156:13	tank 10:22 11:13	56:20 57:10 58:1	132:21
supply 115:22	systems 3:12 14:4,7	12:1 16:15 17:3	58:10 63:18 84:17	<b>tests</b> 120:3
<b>support</b> 23:14	17:2 22:6 23:10	18:2 20:15,21	85:5 92:1,8	thank 15:15 18:15
39:11 84:15	25:13 26:9,13	27:14 28:12,14,14	139:22 140:16	33:6,7 54:15 82:4
supportable 74:20	27:17,19 28:19	36:2,10 37:4,18	141:3 143:18,21	133:6,8 139:3
supporting 162:18	29:18 30:12 31:15	37:19 41:5 61:4	150:10 167:1,6	145:8 146:6,19
supportive 75:14	39:2 42:11,16	65:16 66:3,16	169:4 171:21	147:18 149:16
supports 175:9	43:7 47:7 48:11	67:9,22 70:2,4,7	174:1 175:5,14,18	155:20 160:21
<b>suppose</b> 59:16	49:2 51:11,20	70:11,17 71:6,12	176:6,8,20 177:6	162:3 170:11,12
sure 62:14 63:4	69:11 83:1 113:2	72:3,13,19,22	177:18 181:14	173:21 180:17
67:6 76:20 79:7	113:12,13,16,22	73:8 74:2,4,5 75:3	technically 43:18	194:14,17 201:15
86:8 87:6 100:1	115:14 116:15	75:5,6,11 76:4,13	technologies 35:15	201:19 202:9
107:15 116:9	140:6 158:19	76:14 77:2,6,8,10	technology 200:2	Thanks 191:3
	-		Ov	_

Г

		<b>.</b>		
thick 50:6 122:16	184:2,3	155:7 202:11	transmittal 16:4	90:18 94:19 95:12
thing 77:14 79:15	thoughts 137:8	tomorrow's 107:19	transmitted 9:14	96:5 97:21 118:11
101:16 102:1	thousand 75:17	tonight 195:6	transparent 69:22	118:13 200:8
114:12 119:4	threats 12:9	tool 30:7 51:10	transuranic 129:21	<b>TSR</b> 163:20 164:6
131:11 135:12,14	<b>three</b> 1:10 6:1	84:5,22 85:12	<b>treat</b> 67:18 69:7,17	172:2
138:12,14 142:4	120:15 125:17	163:12,14 165:12	69:19 160:4	<b>TSRs</b> 84:17 85:16
146:21 164:4	130:11 171:7,12	165:17 168:10	treated 189:14	130:12 139:6
172:20	threshold 45:20	170:6,20 173:17	treatment 9:6,7	<b>turn</b> 23:18 73:13
things 62:19 72:16	THURSDAY 1:8	174:19 175:1	10:4,14,18 12:10	86:2 114:14 139:4
81:2 82:5 85:14	tighter 41:8	181:3,8	12:11 13:14,18	143:1
90:20 94:22 95:16	<b>time</b> 4:7 6:16 7:2	tools 32:8,9	16:10 19:3,5,12	turnover 105:4,5
107:12 113:7	8:8,16 11:4,22	tornado 197:19	20:13,16,18,22	<b>two</b> 68:4 73:3 74:14
119:20 121:1	15:1 21:11 24:10	total 92:6 109:11	22:1,5 23:2,3,6,15	92:13 119:6
136:11 138:17	28:21 33:6 38:17	totality 97:13 137:5	24:13 28:2,11	130:11 159:3
163:21 164:1	39:12 42:7 50:2	totally 92:17	31:5,14 33:21	168:2 185:13
166:8 171:11	54:14 64:8 66:22	127:13,14 199:4,6	35:21 37:7 53:17	196:22
think 55:13 58:19	67:17 86:14 92:8	touch 145:13,15	53:19,21 54:3	two-thirds 38:19
59:1,8,22 60:3	94:4 96:14 97:15	<b>toxic</b> 10:9	69:10,15 71:1.8	<b>type</b> 101:16 177:11
62:2.15.21 65:8	127:6.20 130:14	traditional 171:16	76:3.7 87:15	185:1 189:13
66:19 72:9 81:18	133:7 136:11	train 139:8	88:18 89:5 90:8	types 35:17
85:7 86:3 91:21	140:15 145:15.16	training 121:11	101:11 105:16	typically 47:4 48:9
94:4.8.17.18 95:3	145:22 163:8	transactions 68:16	120:21 133:22	59:9 128:5 182:22
95:7 96:8.15	171:10 173:14	70:2	134:13 173:8	186.11
100.3 104.13	195.2 3 201.9	transcript 5.13	175.7 176.15	
$108.11\ 118.12$	202.17	transfer 79.21 80.4	177.9 20 178.16	U
120:5 126:7	timeframe 15.4	103.17 106.13 17	178.18 22 179.15	<b>UFP</b> 131:13,15
129.10 22 130.9	105.22	108.17 109.11 13	179.19.21 180.4 6	160:16
130.21 131.3	timeline 139.12	109.22 110.2 8	180.11 192.22	ultimate 16:12
135.14 136.22	timely 15:16 50:5	134.9 151.17	196.17	178:14
139.14 130.22	timers 25.13	100.7	Triav 2.18 53.12	ultimately 45:17
1/1.16 18 1/2.12	times 81.7 1/7.13	transformed 16.15	71.0 76.20 80.18	104:11 165:10
141.10,10 142.12	160.15 201.12	120.20	81.1/ 87.3 6 9	ultrafilters 201:7
140.22 150.15	time-consuming	transforming 08.18	80.21 01.2 1/	ultrafiltration 32:3
149.22 150.15	36.11	transfors 72.21	137.10 166.20	157:14 198:2
157.3 150.22	<b>Timothy</b> 1.10 /.16	73.14 88.12 07.20	168.16 17 20	199:14 17 20 22
167.11 10 165.4 8	tirod 106.8	107.5 100.14	173.72 174.0 17	200:1.5
170.18 171.2 18	title 6:10 7:22	107.5 107.14	177.2 174.2,17	unable 39:7
$170.10\ 171.2,10$ $172.11\ 14\ 174.12$	<b>TMI</b> $05.15$ 17	170.0,7 transignt 154.10	170.1/ 180.2	unaccentable 70.15
172.11,14 174.13	1.011.93.13,17	transients 190.2	179.14 100.3	unachieveable
1//.1/ 101.11,10	09.2 20 120.1	transition 12:21	101.4 192.13	92.17
100.3 191.21	90.3,20 139.1	71.6 141.2 142.21	tmping 92.12	unanswered 156.1
190.11 thind 17:17 26:0	149.20 137.10	/1.0 141.2 142.21	true 190.12	uncertain 36.14
thorough 129.12	104.13 today's 4.21 51.6	101.12 transitioning 12.17	truty 70.1	38.3
thought 65.15	told 101.6 120.0	10.10	127.1 162.5	uncertainties 20.19
77.18 117.10	toloronco 47.10	17.10 translata 72.2	137.4 103.3	21.13 45.9
//.10 11/.10 122.11 165.16	tomorrow 51.5	translated 71.12	103.22 twing 17.22 62.10	uncertainty 21.3
155.11 105.10	107.17 100.12	translates 72.19	<b>u yillg</b> 17.22 05:10 75.20 76.15 00.16	22.17 26.3 36.20
100.3 172.10,12	107.17 100.12	u ansiates 72:18	15.20 10.15 90:10	
		1	1	

37:8,17 171:5	183:6	<b>uses</b> 198:4	149:8	<b>view</b> 19:10 21:8
179:15	<b>unique</b> 35:8 186:22	<b>USQ</b> 169:22	ventilate 197:7,18	78:21 79:2 124:18
uncomfortable	<b>unit</b> 127:17 145:21	<b>usual</b> 47:17	ventilation 21:20	133:14 146:5
151:2	<b>UNITED</b> 1:1	utilization 176:2	30:12 42:14,15	<b>viewed</b> 16:1,6
uncomfortableness	unmitigated 40:6	<b>utilize</b> 169:10	46:1 48:4 49:2	174:22
60:9	41:12,14 43:13	179:19	58:15 113:20	viewing 5:15
undergo 157:10,19	44:10,19 45:2	utilized 76:9 181:9	148:1,8 153:19	<b>views</b> 180:17
158:5,17	140:20 150:6		154:7	<b>virtual</b> 197:19
underground	184:9,14 188:22	V	<b>Venting</b> 116:22	<b>vision</b> 143:17
10:10	189:7	validated 99:5	vents 26:12 88:1	<b>vital</b> 34:15
underlie 35:11	unnecessary 40:4,8	171:12	117:5,7,8,14,16	vitrified 18:3
underlying 10:8	40:18	Valley 198:18,19	132:2	<b>volume</b> 10:9 15:20
underpredicting	unprecedented	valuable 70:8	<b>verbal</b> 16:2	193:2
43:12	51:13	value 43:9 44:3	verbatim 5:13	
Undersecretary	<b>unproven</b> 35:15,16	45:14 93:3,8,10	verification 143:5	
167:14 169:7	unreasonable	93:19 178:20	verified 103:5	<b>W</b> 1:11,16
undersized 148:1,7	66:17	179:10,13,19	verify 161:3	WAC 72:10 123:21
understand 17:22	unrelated 144:10	180:1,2 194:3	vernacular 64:4	133:14 134:3,3,6
39:5 43:22 61:17	unresolved 42:18	<b>values</b> 42:18	versions 85:13	134:14,15
63:5 69:21 73:20	unreviewed 165:19	180:10	<b>versus</b> 123:6	wait 114:11,12
77:14 80:8 97:2	<b>unsafe</b> 172:12	valve 137:2 151:10	176:18 183:15	125:12
100:6 118:14	upcoming 180:9	187:13 188:9	<b>vessel</b> 20:8 21:16	waiting 143:4
128:15,17 130:6	<b>update</b> 57:2 143:10	198:4,19,21	78:4 148:8,11,12	1/3:15
144:8,20 152:11	156:10,11 161:4	valveless 199:2	148:19 149:8	walls 26:18
161:17 170:19,22	161:22	valves 109:5	161:16 189:22	want 15:14 18:11
176:19 183:16	updated 141:1	110:18 114:7	<b>vessels</b> 17:18 20:1,3	59:15 68:17 78:15
185:20	142:2 156:8	115:22 136:13	25:6 35:6 42:16	81:11 96:18 99:22
understandable	159:19 184:12	150:19 151:9	46:14 48:11,16	116:2,6 118:17
118:17	updating 103:2,4	187:11,12,16	49:1,15 103:6	126:11 130:18
understanding	upgraded 149:12	188:2,4 198:5,15	114:5 162:22	131:11 135:1
11:16 15:19 56:2	Upgrades 78:18	198:16 199:2	187:10,21,21	138:3,11 142:22
62:17 74:8 86:1	<b>upset</b> 63:15 158:10	valving 151:16	189:16	145:15 155:17
100:3 128:1	<b>URS</b> 1:23 2:17	vapor 197:18	Vice 1:15 4:9 53:22	157:16 171:9
143:17 147:15	53:22 54:2 121:20	vapors 27:5	54:19 55:22 56:3	178:11 180:20
163:10 171:21	<b>use</b> 30:2 35:14 37:9	variable 35:21	56:12 57:20 58:17	wanted 81:16,17
180:22 181:8	44:3 45:16 51:8	variety 35:17	59:11 61:2,7,22	82:5 85:22 91:15
understands 138:4	51:12,19 52:2	<b>various</b> 30:8 56:22	62:4,8,20 64:5,13	104:9 116:8
understood 25:21	112:22,22 135:2	63:22 136:19	64:16,21 65:4,7	139:15 145:13
62:15 77:19	136:1 165:5,22	velocities 132:21	65:13,20 66:1,6,9	146:12,20 167:4
undertook 13:9	167:4 168:12	133:1	66:12,20 67:4,8	wants 167:22
<b>undue</b> 78:7	169:4 171:18	velocity 22:19	67:12,19 69:20	180:10
<b>unduly</b> 53:1	173:10 178:16,20	42:19 43:9,17	71:13 72:4,7	warranted 28:7
<b>unfair</b> 127:14,14	179:17,17 180:2	44:5 45:15 103:14	76:10 77:13 78:14	61:12
unflushed 108:5	180:10 186:17	103:16 178:6,13	79:5,8 80:7,10	wash 157:14
unforeseen 90:12	189:14,17 192:10	1/9:10 194:1	81:1 96:12 97:9	160:15
147:4	197:10 199:5	vent 25:12 141:11	99:8,13,21 180:19	washington 1:12
unfortunately	200:2,4 201:5	148:8,11,14,19	<b>video</b> 5:7,8	5:17

Г

WASH-1400 171:7	178:18,22 179:15	Winokur 1:12,14	129:13	138:16 139:1
wasn't 86:14,20	179:19,20 180:4,6	3:3 4:3,4 23:21	workers 10:3,19	147:6 158:10
90:20 99:5 123:9	180:10 191:9	33:7 53:6 67:2,9	14:16 129:19	160:9 162:6
141:17 150:3	192:7 193:2,6	72:6,8 73:12	working 27:22 29:2	171:19 173:10
182:1 184:18	195:10,21 196:17	81:15 82:4 83:16	121:22 141:9	174:3 186:20
185:3 189:7	197:3 200:3	84:14 85:7,21	183:5 196:1,3,17	187:1,5 192:10
191:21	wastes 35:17 36:4	86:15,17,19 87:7	works 136:7	193:13,18
waste 9:6,7 10:4,10	112:21 160:3	89:15 90:5 91:12	world 142:17	WTP's 36:17 37:11
10:17,22 11:7,8	wasting 201:2	91:17 94:7,9 95:7	183:13 186:15	44:6 46:20
11:14,17,21 12:4	water 98:8,9	96:11 104:20,22	worried 152:7	WTP-specific
12:8,10,11 13:18	114:14	105:12,21 106:4	worry 198:10	44:16
14:13 16:10,15,19	way 74:3 77:5 84:2	118:12 130:20	worst 184:15	
17:3,4,19 18:2	88:20 99:19	133:6 147:11	189:10	Y
19:3,5,12 20:13	103:12 104:4	151:5 153:12	wouldn't 59:7	year 22:11 68:1
20:16,16,18,22	127:5,20 129:8	170:10 174:13	116:18 150:7	158:18
21:1 22:1,5 23:1,3	130:3 151:17	179:7,22 180:13	184:21 188:20	years 7:21 10:13,13
23:6,14,16 24:12	155:2,15 169:6	181:17 191:7	194:9	26:2 34:11 68:1
26:4,5,9,13,15	186:1 187:10	193:21 194:12	wow 119:13	72:21 93:7 119:6
27:11,12,14 28:2	192:1	195:12 199:9	wrap 14:2 99:13	120:15 122:9
28:11,14,17 31:5	ways 120:7 122:11	200:17,20 201:15	wrapping 14:22	125:17 126:15
31:14 33:4,21	183:19	201:19	wrap-up 133:9	130:11 135:12
34:19,20 35:20,22	website 5:8,10	wish 6:8,14 54:4	wreck 116:4	147:14 167:3
36:1,8,10,10,13	15:13	201:17 202:1	write 58:13 83:4,6	183:6 195:11
37:3,6,7,11,18,19	week 68:2 112:10	wishes 120:13	172:2	196:1
41:6,8 43:11 50:7	weeks 68:4	202:6	writing 142:8	<b>Yep</b> 164:4
53:17,19,21 54:3	weight 78:2,11,12	wishing 6:19	written 5:13 9:9	yield 23:5 24:20
67:18 69:8,10,15	78:13 159:17	withstand 48:11,19	15:10 16:2 54:5	32:21 199:21
69:18,19 71:1,8	welcome 5:21	witnesses 53:10,12	85:15 198:8 202:6	
72:10 73:22 75:2	18:16 24:1	wondered 147:21	wrong 64:1,7 95:8	<b>)</b>
75:6,11 76:3,6	welded 46:14	words 104:6 174:21	120:19 150:17	<b>\$6</b> 122:12
77:2,8 78:4 79:19	went 61:13 103:1	work 50:9 60:22	194:3 201:3	0
79:20 80:5 81:9	138:15 145:17	80:16 97:17,19	<b>WRPS</b> 2:16	$\frac{\mathbf{v}}{0.1.44.4.170.11}$
82:1 87:15 88:15	196:9,12 202:13	119:20 141:8	WTP 22:4 33:17	<b>0.1</b> 44:4 179:11 <b>0.2</b> 44:4 170:11
88:18 89:5 90:8	West 198:18,19	145:21,21 156:12	34:9,12,15,17,21	0.3 44:4 179:11
97:16 98:6 99:2	we'll 106:5 107:15	162:14,16 164:10	35:9,12,18 36:3,4	00 91.22
101:10 105:16	188:6,6	165:11 176:8	37:2,19,21 38:7	1
106:22 107:2	we're 67:15 83:14	177:17 180:8	38:22 39:3 40:11	
108:16 109:19	86:8 91:17 105:12	181:16 191:14	41:7 43:11,18	179.17 17 187.4 6
110:9 111:11	105:13 160:18,19	196:7,9,12	44:11,15,21 45:5	187.7 14 188.9 10
112:7 114:3	178:4 179:22	worked 57:12 60:4	45:12,16,19 51:17	<b>10</b> 30·14 78·13
120:21 129:21	183:11 195:12	103:9 123:15	52:16 61:4 65:17	101.10 21 144.14
133:22 134:7,9,13	we've 79:11 135:22	127:7 181:5	66:2 69:15 70:6	162.7 174.19
136:3 137:18,18	139:9 144:17	193:10 195:9,20	72:1 74:2 76:15	175:3 177:5
138:1 151:11	172:8	196:13	90:15 92:20 93:13	200:14 201.12
153:17 173:7	whatsoever 122:18	worker 27:3,4 48:6	96:20 97:16 99:3	<b>100</b> 10:13
175:7 176:15	<b>whiz</b> 119:13	49:13 62:6 68:15	99:7,10,16 100:2	11 200:14
177:8,19 178:16	wide 181:10	70:3,6 75:21	100:8,21 104:17	<b>1189</b> 186:17
				<b>100.1</b> /

		I	
<b>12</b> 144:14	<b>336</b> 106:12		
<b>15</b> 5:2 29:20 200:14	<b>35</b> 195:10,22		
<b>16</b> 78:12	, 		
<b>17</b> 144:1	4		
18 3.4	<b>4</b> 3:2 58:13		
1973.7	<b>40-year</b> 13:7		
<b>19</b> /0g 11.8	427:22		
19405 11.0	<b>420 1</b> 47.16		
195 5.20			
<b>1954</b> /:15	5		
19/3 196:2	<b>5</b> 151·4		
1980 196:7	5.00 1.2		
<b>1985</b> 196:10	<b>50</b> 10.16		
<u> </u>	50 19.10 500 mile 122.15		
	<b>500-IIIIe</b> 122:15		
<b>2</b> 3:16 29:18	<b>55</b> 3:7		
20 7:21	6		
<b>20-year</b> 11:11	$\frac{\mathbf{U}}{\mathbf{(0.5,12,10,12,72,20)}}$		
<b>200</b> 15:10	<b>60</b> 5:12 10:13 72:20		
<b>2001</b> 196:16	<b>65</b> 106:14		
<b>2002</b> 12:16	7		
<b>2003</b> 28:12			
<b>2006</b> 25:4 28:21	7 1:8 7:9		
2008 25:1 38:15	7 <b>th</b> 5:16		
89:18 90:21	<b>70</b> 10:13 13:11		
2008/2009 86.4	25:13 72:21		
<b>2000</b> , <b>200</b> , <b>0</b> ,1	<b>70-year</b> 68:16		
28.21 20.12 15 18	<b>7016</b> 1:11		
28.21 27.12,13,10			
<i>41.21 42.0 106.2</i>	<u> </u>		
41.21 42.9 100.5	<b>8:00</b> 202:11		
100:4	<b>8:25</b> 202:12		
2009-1 108:3	<b>80</b> 13:13 19:14,15		
2010 1:8 5:1,2 7:9	44:21 52:10		
16:5 24:10 29:20	126:11		
<b>202</b> 3:22	<b>830</b> 30:15 162:7		
<b>2286</b> 7:22	165:7 174:19		
<b>24</b> 108:22	175:3 177:5 181:1		
<b>26</b> 5:1			
3			
<b>3</b> 57:6 140:12 141:1			
143:16 186:16,21			
188:12,13			
<b>30</b> 13:14			
<b>300</b> 191:20			
<b>3009</b> 85:3 162:7			
163:14.15 165:7			
168:11 175.10			
181.1			
101.1			