

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

Job No. 22192
Written Response Required: NO
Due Date: N/A
Actionee: N/A
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: GW/VZ100
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 8830/4170

CCN: 078794

SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING - MAY 1, 2000

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

DATE May 8, 2000

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

Next Meeting: Monday, May 15, 2000 – 1-3 p.m.
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on May 1, 2000 in Richland, Washington, at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

OVERALL INTEGRATED PROJECT SCHEDULE (provided at meeting) – (Michael Graham):

Under the System Assessment Capability (SAC) on the schedule, we have delivered to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) a draft of the SAC Rev. 0 Design Report for review. Coming out of that review, it will go out for a 45 day public comment period. We will discuss the document later on the agenda. A review of the SAC Rev. 0 Design Report is scheduled in an open Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP) workshop chaired by Dr. Mike Cavanaugh and Dr. Ed Berkey. It is scheduled to be held June 20 - 21.

The Science & Technology (S&T) Roadmap draft document has been circulating and will be delivered to DOE Richland Operating Office (RL) later this week. We expect comments from Mike Thompson, and we'll incorporate those and turn that back around for public review.

QUESTION: Will there be a conceptual model white paper?

ANSWER: No. Typically, a conceptual model is set. A white paper means different things to different people. Using a white paper as a template is the standard approach. (The conceptual model to be used in SAC Rev. 0 was presented in the document "Preliminary System Assessment

C:\WINDOWS\TEMP\0787941.doc

Capability Concepts for Architecture, Platform and Data Management”. This document was produced in September, 1999, and is available on the Integration Project website.)

QUESTION: Dib Goswami is on the phone from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), but there’s no one from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). When the SAC document goes out for review, do we have a commitment from Ecology to review that document and to participate in the IPEP workshop in June? It seems to me that it’s really important that we latch up with them. I don’t mean to put Dib on the spot, but I’d be interested in the answer.

ANSWER: Yes, we will give our comments during the 45 day comment period. Ecology also plans to participate in the workshop.

COMMENT: We have two meetings scheduled to go over the SAC Design Document. We’ll meet with EPA this week and then the following week we have scheduled a meeting with Ecology.

QUESTION: Is Doug Sherwood still the EPA lead?

ANSWER: Yes.

TRITIUM/618-11 BURIAL GROUND PHASE II UPDATE (Michael Graham):

We want to remind people that the Phase II Characterization Plan for Plume Investigation Near the 618-11 Burial Ground is out on the Integrated Project website. We had an abbreviated review period on this document. **The review period continues through this week and closes next Monday (May 8, 2000).**

COMMENT: I hand-delivered copies to everybody. I asked Dan Tano to send copies to the Tribal Nations.

COMMENT: We haven’t heard any comments to this point. We heard comments from Dirk Dunning from the Oregon Office of Energy (OOOE) on the Data Quality Objective (DQO) document when it first went out, but no comments on the plan yet. Ecology is giving our comments to EPA and will finish up the review by the end of this week.

TECHNICAL REVIEW (Virginia Rohay):

Integration Project Expert Panel January Closeout Report:

We mentioned at the last Open Project Meeting that the IPEP Closeout Report from the January IPEP meeting had been released. We handed a few of those out at the last meeting, and the document is also available for downloading from the Integration Project website. We just wanted to open the floor up for discussion of that report.

QUESTION: I (Gordon Rogers) had asked if I might have some time during this meeting to respond to some of the IPEP concerns and recommendations. Are there any of those comments or recommendations that you would like to dispute, or if you agree with them, what are you doing about them?

ANSWER: We've expressed concerns to the IPEP Chair, Dr. Ed Berkey, about this report. The principle concern we had was that we found it difficult to make the connection between the agenda and topics covered at the January meeting, the verbal closeout given following the meeting, and this report. There is material in the report that they're commenting on that we haven't even discussed with the panel. The Integration Project really has no way of knowing where they got their information or what they are basing their observations on.

We will post the draft agenda for the upcoming IPEP meeting on our website. There is an agenda item on the first day for a dialogue on the report. The draft agenda is attached (Attachment 1), and you can see the agenda item on Wednesday, May 24, 2000, mid-morning.

COMMENT: There are a couple of recommendations that we have taken note of and are tasking out. One of them is to try to compile the range of uncertainty in the SAC. That's something the SAC team has started on.

QUESTION: What form does that take? Is it separate from data parameter distribution?

ANSWER: If you look at the schedule, and you look at the complete data parameters, part of the task is to capture the range of uncertainty.

COMMENT: I thought it was odd that it was separated out from the SAC development.

RESPONSE: Right. Us too.

COMMENT: The problem we have with some of the IPEP comments received is that it's very difficult to deal with general recommendations. They tell us to commit to a minimum credible characterization plan. We don't know what to do with that. We need to come back with specific challenges for the IPEP to help us with.

COMMENT: One thing that caught my eye was a criticism, not of the Integration Project, but rather of DOE-RL and ORP. When they talk about a lack of participation in terms of other key projects, I assume they're referring to the ORP. The IPEP doesn't think that participation is happening at the level needed to be able to proceed rapidly and as required. It's hard looking in from the outside to separate the general feeling that Dick French is doing a good job as the ORP Manager and the fact that his group is not spending time integrating with others. I wonder if that's worth chatting about specifically at some point on the agenda. Another panel observation that I agree with is that the lack of a large characterization effort is one of the core problems that we need to get a handle on. You need the data before you can input it. That's something needed for a credible assessment.

COMMENT: DOE-RL staff are going to meet Thursday to go over some of the comments the IPEP put in their report. I frankly can't see how some of the comments were generated from the input the panel received from us. Some of them seemed to be based solely on perceptions.

COMMENT: For example, they think that the site is retreating from doing characterization. I don't know how they could have gotten that perception from the presentations they were given. We're collecting more data in the 200 Areas than we ever have in the past.

COMMENT: It sounds like the response from the Project isn't mature at this time.

RESPONSE: It's fine to discuss viewpoints at this time. There's no problem talking about it, but we will discuss this in more depth in a few weeks with the IPEP at the May meeting.

COMMENT: If you don't have at least a Rev. 0 of the SAC in your hands, I don't see how anything happens. How can you evaluate the S&T Plan if you don't know the system? How can you define what a minimum credible characterization plan really is? Maybe you have enough data compiled from older plans though.

RESPONSE: That's what we had to do in order to get started.

RESPONSE: There is 50 years of research out there. There are numerous models to use as resources. The old information gives us a good start toward putting our finger on where uncertainty lies.

COMMENT: I don't think that point has been made clear throughout the process. There is a wealth of information driving this planning. The perception is that there is no data available anywhere, and as a result you can't possibly know where to start. You're getting criticized from all fronts that you need to study everything since you do not know anything. The fact is that you really do know a whole lot already, and you need to say that somewhere.

COMMENT: That comes out in looking at the inventory work. We've compiled data from a lot of sources, and we have taken a lot of credit for that. The same thing is happening in other areas, but it's just not as visible.

COMMENT: That was the whole purpose of the workshops and other early work a couple of years ago. We went through the core data and gaps and those kinds of things. It laid the foundation.

RESPONSE: I guess I agree with that to some extent, but then it brings you to the question of why the dose and risk assessment work has gotten so short changed.

RESPONSE: Risk is included as an element on the S&T Roadmap. It's a matter of not being able to do all things at once. Anyone can criticize us for things that we purposely decided to defer, and risk was one of those things. We have deferred risk, monitoring, and remediation.

COMMENT: Risk shouldn't be set aside since it really should be driving so many things.

COMMENT: I (Gordon Rogers) can't help but bring this up. The vitrification plant just came out with their huge budget request. I went back and saw that there was an NAS core review done of the effort. I urge you to look at it. They make some very sensible points, and they talk a bit about cost estimates and assessing human health impacts. I was tickled that they rejected

the plausibility of predicting things for the next 10,000 years and using the collective dose method to assess risk. It irks me to see human health risks dismissed in the larger group of papers from across the site. It's generally dismissed as being regulatory driven, which I know is true legally, but does that mean we need to live with the regulatory values until changed? It's worth exploring those assumptions since human health is such a huge cost driver without a lot of science supporting it.

RESPONSE: Human health has played a more significant role in the last year at Battelle and PNNL. There has been a lot of work initiated in the human health risk field. There's a push to go back to the basic science and build from there to individual response. It's just getting off the ground. It's an area that over the last few months we've recognized had to mesh with the work of the Integration Project. We have a lot of folks with expertise on the risk side to use as resources. We need to see where we can get some leverage off of their efforts. There have been a few million dollars invested in this area over the last year. We've also been going out and finding others interested and working in this area, and determining of there's ongoing work that can be linked. We've been developing good linkages to those. That's information that will be brought forward through the NAS review.

INTEGRATION PROJECT EXPERT PANEL MAY MEETING DRAFT AGENDA:

As mentioned earlier, there is a draft agenda available for the May 24-26 IPEP Meeting. Basically, the meeting will be split into four broad sessions, in addition to the general Integration Project update and the dialogue on the January Closeout Report recommendations that Mike Graham mentioned. The first of the four sessions will be on Wednesday afternoon. It is shown on the agenda as Monitoring and Characterization I, and the focus will be on vadose zone monitoring. On Thursday there will be Monitoring and Characterization II and III, with focuses on approaches to inventory and updates on characterization results with plans for FY01. In the afternoon on Thursday they'll have the fourth session on Remediation with a focus on carbon tetrachloride (carbon tet). For each of those sessions we've identified a contact person, both on the Integration Project and on the IPEP. We are still painting a broad view of the proposed agenda. We're having an ongoing dialogue on the specifics of the presentations for those sessions. As in previous IPEP meetings, Friday's session will consist of a panel only closed session in the morning, followed by IPEP closing remarks after lunch. On both Wednesday and Thursday there has been time allotted for stakeholder, regulator, and Tribal Nation input and comments.

QUESTION: How much time has been set aside for the regulators, stakeholders, and Tribes?

ANSWER: We've left that open. The IPEP intends to listen until everyone has had his or her say. We've put that as the last agenda item on both days so there is no pressure of time constraints.

QUESTION: Why the carbon tet remediation focus? Has a method been selected for remediation or is this just a discussion of options? Is there a different option for each characterization method? I'm just trying to view this as input for a risk analysis. Do you have to lay out the characterization alternatives and determine the risk from each?

RESPONSE: In my discussions with the IPEP, they recognize that carbon tet is one of the key contaminants at Hanford that could cause risk. There is a great deal of uncertainty in our

conceptual models for carbon tet. We volunteered that there are carbon tet remediation options driving remediation decisions, and they said they'd like to look at the options.

COMMENT: We don't have a good handle on the source term yet and are evaluating field testing options. This is something we've discussed with the regulators, and it's part of the Innovative Technology Remediation Demonstration (ITRD). We're putting together the cost and other technical issues. Dr. Michael Kavanaugh from the IPEP has a wealth of background in this area, and we've started a dialogue with him.

QUESTION: When do you need comments back on the IPEP agenda?

ANSWER: The IPEP panel sets the agenda, but if you have comments, we'd be happy to pass those along.

COMMENT: I think there needs to be a discussion right at the beginning about the Hanford Site vision. I know that Keith Klein wants to present that to the panel as early in the meeting as possible.

RESPONSE: That's the purpose of the item on the agenda named Hanford Site Vision/Outcomes/Planning.

COMMENT: That should be moved right to the front of the agenda. I know Keith would like to address that right away.

COMMENT: The IPEP had some nasty comments in their January report on uncertainty of endstates.

RESPONSE: They also said that it's something beyond the Integration Project's control. Definition of endstates needs to come from DOE. Keith Klein is working on that and we're supporting him in doing that.

COMMENT: Alternatives for carbon tet remediation is outside the Integration Project as well. Source term and potential risk belongs to the Project, but someone else needs to define the remediation options.

RESPONSE: That's something that will be the responsibility of the Integration Project eventually, but we're not to that point yet.

QUESTION: Two hours seems like a lot of time to set aside on the agenda for that. The cartoon from the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) is just two or three elements. Why not focus the efforts of the panel to this or that piece of the system, starting with the dose and ending with receptor?

RESPONSE: One of the things that will eventually become part of the Integration Project is remediation technology. We're just not there yet. One of the recommendations was to drive more towards remediation. This carbon tet is one of the burning Hanford Site issues. The IPEP sets the agenda, and we try to mold around that.

COMMENT: If you decide to respond to the comments in the IPEP Closeout Report, Ecology would like to see your responses.

RESPONSE: We could certainly do that, but at this point we don't have plans to respond in writing prior to the meeting later this month.

COMMENT: You submitted written responses for the report before this one.

RESPONSE: Yes, but probably not this time.

COMMENT: We'll decide in this meeting how to respond to comments. We don't want to spend days responding to the difficult issues if it's not necessary or productive. At this point, unless directed otherwise, we have no plans to respond in writing. We'll just talk to the panel at the meeting.

UPCOMING TECHNICAL REVIEW MEETINGS:

There will be a workshop in June chaired by at least two members of the IPEP, Drs. Ed Berkey and Michael Kavanaugh. This workshop will be held to discuss the SAC Rev. 0 Design Document. That workshop will be held on June 20-21.

At the last Open Project Meeting, a tentative date was announced for the second meeting of the NAS scheduled in June. It was tentative pending calendar checks by some of the NAS committee, and after checking their collective schedules, they've changed the date. The committee will now hold the next meeting on June 28-30.

COMMENT: I just wanted to point out that the SAC review is scheduled for the dates when the NAS used to be. With the NAS schedule change, there is now no conflict of meetings.

QUESTION: Is the NAS review limited to S&T?

ANSWER: No. They're going to look beyond that to the relevance of the S&T work to Hanford, and they will also take a look at the SAC.

COMMENT: From looking at the original statement of work, I got that impression.

QUESTION: Is the study really going to be completed in 18 months?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: What is the best way to make comments to the NAS committee?

ANSWER: They have a feedback button on their webpage. There is a link to the NAS website provided from the Integration Project webpage (under the Peer Review section).

TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT MILESTONE M-24 RCRA WELLS (Mike Thompson):

An agreement has been reached concerning the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement) Milestone M-24 Resource Conservation and Recover Act of 1976 (RCRA) well drilling Calendar Year 2000 (CY00).

An agreement was reached with Ecology to place 15 wells for M-24. DOE provided Ecology with a list of suggested locations. All of the wells are within the 200 West Area Tank Farms. Marv Furman successfully completed a workshop with Ecology on that and resolved specific issues. The resolution was close to what we had recommended. My understanding is that unless something went south in the last couple of days, we have an agreement for CY00. We agreed to extend it into CY01 a bit due to the late agreement and the number of wells involved.

Part of the plan is that we will hold workshops with Ecology to get a three to five year plan in place for installing RCRA wells. In the past, this was generally done toward mid-year, but we can't do that anymore. We were okay then because we had a capital line item budgeted for the RCRA wells, but that has been exhausted. Now we're trying to get a planning window for the wells in the same window as the budget to insure the wells get funded.

QUESTION: Are you planning to go out and get a new capital line item for the budget?

ANSWER: As explained to me by the budget people, it doesn't get us new money. We'd hold funds from the overall budget aside in a capital line item and we'd need Congress' approval to do so. What they do is they take it out of the overall Hanford budget. It really doesn't help us in terms of getting additional funds, just earmarks money for specific items.

RIVER PROTECTION PROJECT UPDATE (Tony Knepp):

We've finished the slant borehole testing and are de-mobilized now. The testing allowed us to refine our methods and test a couple of back-up technologies. In the second week of the month we'll be in the Tank Farm and ready to do the hot work. After 22 days of field work and 17 samples, we will be finished. One sample per day, more or less, and we'll be out. This corresponds to about \$400,000 worth of lab work.

To this point, the work's gone pretty well. The drilling, sampling, and recovery methods are all brand new. These are unique methods. Nothing like this has ever been done before at Hanford. Next fiscal year, we'll move into the B-BX-BY Farms. We are planning that now.

QUESTION: Are you analyzing the practice hole?

ANSWER: No. We've drilled in that area so many times before there's really no purpose. We do have some samples that we took over to the lab to allow them to practice opening them for analysis. They are 18-inch long, lead lined samples. So, they have some dirt, but we don't see a reason to analyze it. There are RCRA wells in the same area.

QUESTION: Why didn't you drill someplace where the data would be useful?

ANSWER: It was so much less expensive at this particular spot. Any place else we would have had to do the whole nine yards of permits and clearances.

QUESTION: My idea was that you just picked it because it looked like a good spot.

COMMENT: We did collect some geological data that was useful.

COMMENT: We collected some core samples. This was purely a mechanical problem. The collection of dirt was important to us from the standpoint of refining the process. Everything is done by remote more than 100 feet below our feet. Actually collecting samples at the same time would have compounded problems. This got out the bugs.

COMMENT: We did some geophysics work out there but we're not doing lab analysis.

OPEN DISCUSSION:

QUESTION: Where are things now with this \$15 billion price tag on the vitrification plant? Has this changed the thinking? Maybe this will force people to go into risk based decision making. It clarifies that there isn't an infinite bucket of money. What are the thoughts on what this might do? Even if less than \$15 billion is spent, you have to do something.

ANSWER: It's kind of interesting. We met with Keith Klein from DOE-RL a couple of times and the subject of the vitrification plant came up. He does see the work of the Integration Project as providing help as the department makes decisions for how to approach the vitrification plant issue.

COMMENT: I would hope that the importance of the SAC modeling is recognized as more important now than it was three days ago.

COMMENT: Absolutely. We need a system model in place to address a bunch of this stuff. We need to know how much weight to put into health risk. We don't even have an idea of how far above the regulations we are, or if we are.

QUESTION: How can decisions be made without knowing this?

ANSWER: There is an extensive risk analysis available. It's not the SAC, but it does have risk analysis. Decisions were made based on that.

QUESTION: Is it affecting vitrification plant design decisions? Nothing seems to have changed from day one.

COMMENT: Yes, I can say that over the last two years the risk analyses have drastically affected vitrification plant decisions. However, much of that's proprietary and business sensitive.

COMMENT: Conceptually, that's fantastic, or the risk is far lower than we thought. The risk assessment has to be used to determine if we need more vitrification or less vitrification. What kind of lessons learned are coming out of the analysis and feeding into design decisions? It seems like a hell of a thing to have as proprietary, especially given the openness professed by the Integration Project.

COMMENT: If you look at the 1998 Immobilized Low-Activity Waste Performance Assessment (ILAW PA), there were requirements in that document that impacted the contract that DOE and BNFL signed. As a consequence of the 1998 ILAW PA, those requirements will be part of the contract this summer. The requirements are proprietary since they are right in the middle of contract negotiations right now. I'm not involved in the negotiations, so I don't know what the requirements are. I do know the supplied information impacted specifications after the initial estimate was given in August '98.

QUESTION: There should be a relationship between this kind of project and the SAC. The SAC should be the tool behind these types of decisions.

ANSWER: The SAC assesses cumulative risk, its spatial viewpoint is so big. This is a site specific analysis. The data used have been reviewed by the SAC and Characterization of Systems task, but the SAC doesn't have the capability to look at the performance of low activity waste.

COMMENT: It will be blended together. The ILAW will be part of the SAC model suite. I envision the SAC as a mega-model. The point is that \$15 billion is being spent without looking at the total system.

ANSWER: If you look at the 1998 ILAW PA, there are two things. The 1998 ILAW PA looked at cumulative impacts, things you and others have asked for. The Office of River Protection (ORP) continues to use risk-task based assessments to make decisions on the environmental operations. The ORP has changed the design of the disposal facility for better environmental performance, not only in waste form but in disposal.

COMMENT: The train is out of the station. When will we catch up? It's not your fault. There's an integration issue here.

COMMENT: Fred's right. You're not going to make individual waste site decisions on a landscape model like the SAC. It's just not going to happen, but the SAC has access to the ILAW PA data, models, and results.

COMMENT: I (Dib Goswami) have one other unrelated comment. I would like to request Mike Thompson and DOE-RL come up with language to define the scope of work for the NAS. I'm hearing things that sound like they will review more than just S&T. It sounds like they will be giving recommendations on some of the remediation decisions.

ANSWER: That's not quite precise. They will not be reviewing the remediation decisions in the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement). Their focus is on S&T as it applies to the cleanup effort, not a review of the remediation decisions.

QUESTION: Isn't there a statement of work?

ANSWER: Yes, out on the web. (Note: There is a link to the NAS Committee website from the Peer Review section of the Integration Project website.) They'll be looking at the S&T Plan and the relevance of that to Hanford.

COMMENT: That's a more accurate definition of their scope.

COMMENT: One of the reasons they want to look at the SAC is that the SAC incorporates outputs from the S&T. Their focus is principally the S&T effort.

COMMENT: One of the NAS Committee members said at the recent meeting that the SAC is a vital piece of technology in itself. I thought I heard them express an interest in looking at that as a piece of technology.

COMMENT: Kevin Crowley also stated at the meeting that the views of one member don't necessarily represent the views of the committee.

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669), Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or Karen Strickland (509-372-9236)

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) IPEP Draft Agenda
- 2) GW/VZ Integration Project Two Month Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Martin Bensky – Tri-Cities Caucus

Dru Butler – BHI

Dib Goswami – Ecology

Michael Graham – BHI

Michael Hughes – BHI

Kathy Huss – SAIC

Gary Jewell – BHI

Alison Kent – BHI

Tony Knepp – CHG

Fred Mann – FFS

Gary McNair – PNNL

Sri Mohan – Ecology

Gordon Rogers – HAB

Virginia Rohay – CHI

Steve Sautter – BHI

Stan Sobczyk – NPT

Dan Tano – DOE-RL

Mike Thompson – DOE-RL

Pricilla Yamada – PNNL

Rob Yasek – DOE-RL

Attachment 1

***Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project
Integration Project Expert Panel Meeting
May 24-26, 2000
3350 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington***

- DRAFT AGENDA -

**BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM
WEDNESDAY, May 24**

Moderator

7:30 – 8:00	On Your Own Coffee From Columbia River Coffee House	
8:00 – 8:15	Welcome and Introduction DOE-RL Welcome	E Berkey K Klein
8:15 – 10:00	Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Accomplishments and Status (since 1/00) Hanford Site Vision/Outcomes/Planning Alternative Baselines GW/VZ Project Outcomes	H Boston, W Ballard, M Graham, G McNair, A Knepp
10:00 – 10:15	Break	
10:15 – 11:00	Dialogue on Integration Project Expert Panel Recommendations in 1/00 Closeout Report	M Graham
11:00 – 12:00	Overview of Detailed Work Plan for FY01/02/03	M Graham
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch	
12:45 – 2:45	Monitoring and Characterization I (vadose zone monitoring)	Points of Contact: IPEP: P Wierenga GW/VZ: M Freshley
2:45 – 3:00	Break	
3:00 – Open	Opportunity for Stakeholder, Tribal Nation, and Regulator Input and Comments	E Berkey
Evening	Panel Only: Working Session #1	

***Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project
Integration Project Expert Panel Meeting
May 24-26, 2000
3350 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington***

- DRAFT AGENDA -

**BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM
THURSDAY, May 25**

Moderator

7:30 – 8:00	On Your Own Coffee From Columbia River Coffee House	
8:00 – 10:00	Monitoring and Characterization II (approaches to inventory)	Points of Contact: IPEP: J Matuszek GW/VZ: T Wintczak
10:00 – 10:15	Break	
10:15 – 12:15	Monitoring and Characterization III (update on characterization results, plans for FY01)	Points of Contact: IPEP: J Matuszek GW/VZ: A Knepp
12:15 – 1:00	Lunch	
1:00 – 3:00	Remediation (carbon tetrachloride)	Points of Contact: IPEP: M Kavanaugh GW/VZ: G Mitchem
3:00 – Open	Opportunity for Stakeholder, Tribal Nation, and Regulator Input and Comments	E Berkey
Evening	Panel Only: Working Session #2	

**BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM
FRIDAY, May 26**

Moderator

8:00 – 12:00 pm	Panel Only: Working session #3	
12:00 – 1:00 pm	Lunch	
1:00 – 3:00 pm	Closing remarks	E Berkey
3:00 – 4:00 pm	Panel Only: Wrap-up session	

Attachment 2

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
MAY 1 – JULY 3, 2000
TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

May 1	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
May 9	HAB Environmental Restoration Committee Meeting Richland - Federal Building, Room 142 – 8 a.m.-4 p.m.
May 15	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
May 24-26	Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP) Meeting BHI Assembly Room (Contact: Virginia Rohay)
May 31	HAB Public Involvement Committee Meeting LaGrande, OR
June 1-2	Hanford Advisory Board Meeting LaGrande, OR
June 5	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
June 6	HAB Environmental Restoration Committee Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 8 a.m.-4 p.m.
June 19	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
June 20-21	GW/VZ IPEP Subpanel review of SAC Rev. 0 Design Report Richland, WA (Contact: Bob Bryce)
June 28-30	NAS Committee Meeting on Hanford S&T Richland, WA
July 3	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting *CANCELLED* Due to Independence Day

Current Public Comment Period:

April 24-May 8, 2000

Phase II Characterization Plan for Plume Investigation Near the 618-11 Burial Ground