

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: 084920**

---

**SUBJECT** GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING -  
DECEMBER 18, 2000

**TO** Distribution

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

**DATE** December 20, 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, January 8, 2001 – 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 December 18, 2000, in Richland, Washington, at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

**PROJECT REPORT:**

**General Project Update (Michael Graham)**

**Schedule Update (Michael Graham)**

The Project Review was completed last week. There are no major changes. As for scheduled activities, the ongoing work at 618-11 was added to the scope. We'll do that in January.

QUESTION: Nothing has been said about the Project Review (Requirements) Document in a while. What is going on with that?

ANSWER: The purpose of the Project Requirements Document was to go through about eight key documents with a focus of establishing the project requirements from an engineering aspect. The intent was to gather the information and provide it to the staff as a guidance document. It does not require DOE approval.

QUESTION: Does this go beyond the Systems Assessment Capability (SAC) requirements?

ANSWER: That is in next year's scope. Until we got SAC Rev. 0 out, it was premature to define requirements. We will review the results of SAC Rev. 0 this year. Preparing formal design requirements for SAC Rev. 1 does not make sense until we looked at SAC Rev. 0.

The April date for the Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP) meeting is pretty well established. The focus of that IPEP meeting will be on SAC. As for the July IPEP meeting, we are waiting to hear from Dr. Ed Berkey regarding scheduling.

**Staffing Changes/Introduce Lynn Curry (Michael Graham)**

Jeff Armatrout will be head of Project Controls for new vitrification plant. Greg Mitchem will be stepping into Jeff's role. Lynn Curry will fill Greg's position as project engineer. We are fortunate to have Lynn join us.

QUESTION: Are you changing offices, Greg?

ANSWER: Yes. I will be moving next week and I will let you know my new phone number then.

**Review of December 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting With Senator Wyden's Staff (Mike Thompson/Michael Graham)**

On December 12, 2000, we delivered a draft of the Semi-Annual Report to Senator Wyden's staff in Washington, DC. They requested that a couple of minor editorial additions be added. When we complete those additions and the report is formally delivered to Congress, we'll release it to the public. We should know if the additions are satisfactory by the end of the week.

They have added Kathryn Parker to their staff.

QUESTION: Is the report reviewed by others in Congress? Is Senator Wyden's staff the only one from Congress that reviews it?

ANSWER: He was the requestor, so we interface with him. Senator Wyden's staff appreciated our coming back to talk about this and was very complementary.

QUESTION: Are they concerned about the scope of the project? Or are they thinking more in terms of evaluating impacts?

ANSWER: Feedback from Senator Wyden's staff has been generally positive. They want to see continued momentum.

COMMENT: (Mary Harmon) Joshua Shenkman of Senator's Wyden staff noted that he's well aware of how you touch other areas in Oregon. Knowing what's going on brings him a lot of satisfaction.

**Update on Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Drilling (Greg Mitchem)**

We are finishing the tenth well. In our negotiations with Ecology, we agreed to a series of three sets of five *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) monitoring wells to be done to meet the agreement for this year. The first two sets of five are done. Because we encountered some contamination with one of the wells, we designated another well to meet the requirement of ten wells. The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) change package names specific wells that need to be completed to meet the milestone.

The next set appears to be 20 wells. We are scheduled to meet with Ecology to go over the details of those wells.

QUESTION: There is a letter from Ecology to you regarding that the wells are to go through the deepened zone. Are these wells all going that deep?

ANSWER: For the next set, we will drill down to 100 feet. I believe the actual number of wells to be drilled that deep is seven. We normally drill down to 35 feet.

QUESTION: Wasn't there was a problem with contamination in one well?

ANSWER: We were installing groundwater monitoring wells at about 35 feet and we hit some contamination. It was a thin layer and we assume it is coming over from lateral migration. We are in a tight zone. When we hit it at 35 feet, we took it seriously, but it was not a major surprise. We abandoned that specific location and moved over about 25 feet to drill again. It really wasn't a major technical problem, but it did take some time to re-plan and re-organize for the new well.

Samples of the contamination were taken by Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). Those samples are now in the lab. I'm not sure on when the data will be coming back. I'll have to check on that.

QUESTION: Are there any plans to try to find the extent of the contaminated area? Is there any reason to want to do that?

ANSWER: We are going to keep it in the wings for now. If we had been using the cable rig tool, it would have been easier to recover. We had to decontaminate the drill rig. Certain locations seem to always give us problem, and this is one of those wells. That's why we like to be flexible on the wells we choose.

#### **Update on In Situ Redox Manipulation (ISRM) Work (Greg Mitchem)**

There is a TPA milestone coming up at the end of this month for the chemical barrier along the 100-D Area. It is broken down into three phases – Phase I is for FY00, Phase II is for FY01, and Phase III is for FY02. The milestone at the end of this month is the completion of Phase I of the work. We had to spend extra time on the extraction from one well. We had to work out the definition of "completion" with Ecology. Does completion mean extracting out the chemical or establishing the treatment barrier? We worked through that. For Phase II and Phase III, we went out with a contract for drilling. We are hoping for a better price from the contractor, and it also keeps us from having to bid twice.

Jeff Armatrout suggested we find ways to streamline. There are opportunities because we've scaled up from "beaker to the field." We had full-scale implementation this last year. There must be a way to find some savings. Our Detailed Work Plan has us done by the end of the next fiscal year.

QUESTION: That's just for the barrier on the D Area plume. What's the time table for replacing the old pump and treat?

ANSWER: We'll have to sit down with the regulators to discuss that. We've put that in as an initiative with headquarters. That would have to be done through the regulators.

We've also been waiting for the Five Year Review from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which is due out in January. A lot depends on what we hear from that.

QUESTION: No clues yet as to what is in that review?

ANSWER: I've seen bit and pieces of early drafts, but nothing final.

Since Tony Knepp is here, we can give you an update on the drilling in the B Tank Farm.

We are drilling near tank B-102, the location of a major tank overflow. We have six or seven existing wells in the area. We are currently down at about 160 feet, sampling every two feet, right out of the drive barrel. We are ahead of schedule.

Next we will go over to D-110.

QUESTION: This year it is all in B farm?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: What about next year?

ANSWER: Next year we will be in the T Farms. We're thinking of using the drilling technique we used last year (a five-foot hammer) to drill through the very hot contamination. We are re-developing the tool a little. The contractor is working with us on that. As we get deeper, we will be able to use a cable tool, which gives us more flexibility. The holes in T Farm can easily be as hot as the holes in SX. The contamination in the T Farm is a combination of a number of elements. At T-106, about 115,000 gallons of waste leaked from the bottom of the tank.

**UPCOMING EVENTS (Michael Graham)**

We have rescheduled our January meeting for January 8, 2001. As for the Hanford Advisory Board-Environmental Restoration Committee (HAB-ER) on January 9, 2001, I haven't seen an agenda yet.

COMMENT: That will be out next week.

QUESTION: Can you give us a hint as to what might be on the agenda?

ANSWER: One thing I want is every presenter to be warned that I'm going to ask him what information or advice do you want from the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)? Our charter says that is our primary mission. As for topics, I asked for a follow-up on the success and problems of groundwater missions. And, there maybe something on the EPA Five Year Review.

QUESTION: Any pieces of history matching complete?

ANSWER: Not that I'm aware of. They may have finished the release history matching. Bob Bryce covered that last time.

QUESTION: Anything new on the 618-11 samplings?

ANSWER: No.

Regarding the Semi-Annual Report, as soon as we have final approval from headquarters we'll have it on the web site.

QUESTION: Moses, how are you coming on the report on the 200 Area soil sites?

ANSWER: We issued the minutes of the workshops we had. The report should be coming out soon.

QUESTION: You've had two different workshops with regulators?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: What's the next step?

ANSWER: We'll go to the 300 Area, the last area to discuss with regulators. The next workshop takes place in January or February on the 300 Area.

**NOTES:**

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

If you have questions or comments, please contact Steve Sautter (509-372-9097) or Alison Kent (509-372-9192).

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) GW/VZ Integration Project Two Month Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Marty Bensky – Tri-City Caucus

Lynn Curry – BHI

Michael Graham – BHI

Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ (by phone)

Stuart Harris – CTUIR

Kathy Huss – SAIC (by phone)

Moses Jarayssi – BHI

Alison Kent – BHI

Tony Knepp – CHG

Fred Mann – CHI

Greg Mitchem – BHI

Wade Riggsbee – Yakama Nation

Gordon Rogers – HAB

Steve Sautter – BHI

Sue Safford – Oregon Office of Energy (by phone)

Mike Thompson – DOE-RL

Ivana Witt – Yakama Nation

Rob Yasek – ORP

*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*  
**DECEMBER 18, 2000 – MARCH 23, 2001**  
*THREE MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*

<b>December 18</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>January 1</b>	**CANCELLED DUE TO HOLIDAY GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>January 8</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>January 9</b>	HAB-ER
<b>January 15</b>	**CANCELLED DUE TO HOLIDAY GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>February 1-2</b>	HAB, Kennewick, WA (West Coast Hotel)
<b>February 5</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>February 19</b>	**CANCELLED DUE TO PRESIDENTS DAY HOLIDAY GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>March 5</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
<b>March 19</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)