

Environmental  
Restoration  
Contractor

**ERC Team**

---

***Meeting Minutes Cover Sheet*** 096947

Please find attached the Open Meeting Minutes from the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project of February 4, 2002.

If you have any comments or changes to these minutes, please reply to this email and your comments will be incorporated into the next meeting minutes.

Environmental  
Restoration  
Contractor

# ***ERC Team***

---

# ***Meeting Minutes***

---

**SUBJECT** GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING -  
FEBRUARY 4, 2002

**TO** Distribution

**FROM** Greg B. Mitchem, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

**DATE** February 27, 2002

**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, March 4, 2002 – 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 February 4, 2002, in Richland, Washington, in the Assembly Room at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Building.

**PROJECT REPORT:**

**Schedule Update (Greg Mitchem)**

I won't spend a lot of time on the schedule, as things will change with the transition. By next month, the schedule will be updated with the new baseline. At the end of June, the project will transition to Fluor. We will show July, August, and September in a shaded area on the schedule.

**Site-Specific Advisory Board (Gordon Rogers/Greg Mitchem)**

The Site-Specific Advisory Board meeting was in Savannah River last week. The purpose was to have a meeting with stakeholders from numerous sites to discuss the topic of groundwater. The group met to produce statements in an advice format. The result represents a "one size fits all" type of exercise. There were final statements agreed to by the group. We have a handout which lists the agreed upon final statements in four categories, Communication and Public Participation, Regulatory/Decision Making Statements, Groundwater Technology, and Stewardship of Groundwater. Representatives from each site were involved in each group. All attendees made comments, which were revised by the group as a whole.

Then, the representatives returned to the original smaller groups and considered the suggestions made to refine the statements. It was a multi-step massaging of the statements.

QUESTION: Was there any discussion about the “shall” statements?

ANSWER: There is a substantial desire to be more formal and specific.

This is the fifth of a series. There was a little bit of technology transfer but not a lot.

Gordon provided us with copies of the final statements, and we can fax them out, if needed. Please let us know if you’d like a copy.

**Transition Update (Greg Mitchem)**

We will provide a transition update each month. This month there’s not a lot to share. Michael Graham is heading up the Central Plateau effort. A draft of the transition plan was issued for our review. The transition is to start March 18, 2002.

QUESTION: In the last meeting, it was stated that the transition plan will be out by the end of January. Is that for public review? When will it be available for the public to view?

ANSWER: I believe it will be at the end of February. I will check with Michael Graham regarding public review of the transition plan.

**System Assessment Capability (SAC) (Bob Bryce)**

At the end of the last fiscal year, we completed running the initial assessment. Since then the Characterization of Systems (COS) folks have updated the inventory. We also have made some changes to the vadose zone templates to improve representation of vadose zone transport. We have also been working on the new hardware, which is a 128 processor cluster that will allow us to run things more quickly. We are testing the hardware now. The hard drives haven’t arrived yet, but Pacific Northwest National Laboratory had some hard drives that we can use until the new ones arrive. The software is running great. We have achieved a 50% reduction in run time relative to the initial assessment and are very pleased. We are also incorporating the three dimensional groundwater model in the SAC. The previous model wasn’t moving the contaminants to the river as quickly as the monitoring data indicate that it moves. We are running a couple of realizations with the new software to make sure it is running right. After those realizations, we will kick off a re-run of the initial assessment. We are planning 25 realizations in two weeks or less.

We’ve been asked by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to set up a deterministic run using the median values for each of the parameters we have. We will be able to use this as the basis for doing some “what if” scenarios. We are setting up those input files so we can run that by the end of the month.

QUESTION: Can you be more specific in terms of three-dimensional modeling?

ANSWER: Several improvements have been made to the site-wide groundwater model since we tried three-dimensional modeling a year ago, mainly in the consolidated modeling task. Since then, the way the grid is set-up has been improved, so the software runs much more quickly.

**January Science and Technology Workshop and Plans for the Next Workshop (Mark Freshley)**

Most of the people here today participated in the workshop. Summary notes are posted on our website. The summary notes describe the agenda and information from the breakout groups. Each of the task leads is working to update the roadmap table to be completed by the end of February. The one element that was not completely discussed was on the Columbia River risk. We worked with Dib Goswami from Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) this morning and will follow-up this week to discuss those elements. That meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, from 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. in the Ecology office, including a call-in number for those out of town. A second workshop will take place next week to address soil and groundwater remediation. This one will be at the Red Lion Hotel in Richland, Washington. The intent is to add the new technical element of remediation to the roadmap and to address a specific set of contaminants, which includes contaminants that we have either active remediation systems or are contaminants of known concern. We are bringing in individuals from Office of Science and Technology (EM50) and other national laboratories. It is a two-day session.

We are excited about this additional element of the roadmap. It focuses on getting the cleanup done. Hanford will be poised to capture some of the new EM thrust area funding. We've demonstrated that we can and will get things done.

**Integration Project Expert Panel September 2001 Closeout Report Available (Moses Jarayssi)**

We wanted to make the report available to any of you are interested in looking at it. There are copies here. We are going to be working on the disposition of these recommendations

**Other (Greg Mitchem/others)**

At the Site-Specific Advisory Board meeting, I received a copy of the DOE Top to Bottom Review. The secretary gave a speech, rolling out the budget. In the 2003 budget, there was an \$800 million hold back. There is an incentive program for DOE field offices in expediting clean-up to receive a portion of it.

MARY HARMON: I went to the website for the White House and downloaded a copy of the budget roll-out. I recommend everyone read pages 119 to 135. It's negative for us, I think. They talk about how we are ineffective in clean-up and completion costs are escalating. It's written that DOE feels Congress has earmarked money for projects that are actually ineffective and these funds should be couched. There's a management performance chart in here in which they give ratings. Hanford gets a yellow for mission, for performance we are red, and a yellow for reform.

COMMENT: Our base is the same and we have a chance at a piece of that \$800 million.

Congress has to agree to it and that's basically a year process. This went to the President today.

QUESTION: Do you have anything on the top-down roll out?

ANSWER: There's nothing on the system.

COMMENT: It looks like Hanford gets \$250 million less next year.

QUESTION: At large?

ANSWER: Yes.

I don't have a combined chart.

There are currently more tables on the web.

QUESTION: Any other information that anyone wants to share or questions for the group?

**UPCOMING EVENTS** (Greg Mitchem)

**NOTES:**

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

If you have questions or comments, please contact Barbara Howard (509-372-9236) or Alison Bryan (509-372-9192).

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1) GW/VZ Integration Project Four Month Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Alison Bryan – BHI  
Bob Bryce – PNNL  
Don Clarke – DEC  
Bruce Ford – BHI  
Mark Freshley – PNNL  
Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ (by phone)  
Stuart Harris – CTUIR  
Barbara Howard – BHI  
Kathy Huss – SAIC (by phone)  
Moses Jarayssi – BHI  
Edye Jenkins – ERC  
Ken Kapsi – DOE-RL  
Sandra Lilligren – Nez Perce  
Stuart Luttrell – PNNL  
Doug Maddox – DOE-HQ (by phone)  
Fred Mann – CHG  
Greg Mitchem – BHI  
Ted Repasky – CTUIR  
Gordon Rogers – HAB  
Sue Safford – Oregon Office of Energy (by phone)  
John Silko – DOE-RL  
Mike Thompson – DOE-RL  
Rob Yasek – ORP

*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*  
**February 4, 2002 – MAY 6, 2002**  
*FOUR MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*

<b>February 4</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
<b>February 13-14</b>	Remediation Technical Element Workshop (Red Lion Hotel, Richland, WA)
<b>March 4</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
<b>April 1</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
<b>May 6</b>	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)