

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes Cover Sheet

Please find attached the Open Meeting Minutes from the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project of April 1, 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

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

SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING - APRIL 1, 2002

TO Distribution

FROM Lynn R. Curry, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Acting Project Manager

DATE April 22, 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, May 6, 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 April 1, 2002, in Richland, Washington, in the Assembly Room at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Building.

PROJECT REPORT:

Schedule Update (Greg Mitchem)

The latest schedule reflects what's happening. I want to give a couple of highlights.

Under Management and Integration, the Expert Panel is scheduled to hold its eleventh meeting later in August. Moses Jarayssi and John Morse will talk about the groundwater control and monitoring strategy a little later in the meeting. Three modules for the Virtual Library are in progress with planned completion in June through September.

Under the System Assessment Capability (SAC), the hardware was installed in January through March. The software was implemented in February and March and alternative assessments will be run from April through September.

Under Science and Technology (S&T), roadmap planning took place in February, with the remainder of roadmap work – completion of the update – scheduled for July. Also under S&T, the report on the laboratory studies for the biological transfer of technetium uptake is scheduled for late July.

Under groundwater management, the second UP-1 extraction well tie was placed online in December, and the ZP-1 Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) well was completed in March. Several work plans were completed in December with M-13 milestones in April, May, and June. System upgrades for the In Situ Redox Manipulation (ISRM) and HR3/KR4 pump and treats are on schedule.

QUESTION: Are there products – control documents for the GW/VZ project – ready for review related to items on the schedule?

ANSWER: Not at present. We're supporting the C3T (Cleanup Challenges and Constraints Team), which is seeking to do things better, smarter, faster. What happens in that process must be integrated into project documents.

QUESTION: I have a schedule question – when will the notification for second Tribal consultation occur?

ANSWER: These are more like discussions or updates with the technical staff than formal consultations. We met with Umatilla in March for a half-day session. We are trying to set up a discussion with the Yakama and Nez Perce this month.

QUESTION: What about the CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980) 5-Year Review drilling?

ANSWER: The drilling is complete. We're adding one extraction and one injection well at KR-4, which should be done by the end of May.

Remediation Roadmap Workshop Update (Mike Thompson)

A number of people on line participated in the workshop, and progress is being made. Mark Freshley sent files with lists of items to be incorporated. There is no draft document yet, but a final product is due in June.

Groundwater Strategy/C3T (Moses Jarayssi/John Morse)

This basically is a series of meetings with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), the Office of River Protection (ORP), and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Richland Operations Office (RL) aimed at groundwater monitoring, assessment, and modeling coordination between agencies. We're looking at Data Quality Objectives (DQO) as a method to integrate monitoring work on the Central Plateau. We want to tackle the basic philosophy/principles for remediation strategy by June. The CERCLA and RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976) process looked at existing and potential GW plumes and worked through the strategy. Last time, it took one year to do this process to get input and values from stakeholders. Another outcome will be an initial list of monitoring wells to be developed during the next couple of years. This information will resolve current groundwater problems on the Central Plateau.

COMMENT: The upcoming draft advice from the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) demands that you do exactly what you're doing. I hope the HAB isn't saying stop until integrated. There is a desire on the HAB

to find fault. They need to be more privy to meetings like this.

ANSWER: We've put out a lot of information, and the three agencies are putting together a document on the state of groundwater to help them understand what's going on.

We will present the results of the second Central Plateau Risk Framework workshop during the first week of May, depending on the HAB meeting. We plan to explain exactly what we're doing on remediation and strategic planning.

COMMENT: A simple logic diagram would help to know what's going on.

ANSWER: We can do that.

QUESTION: So, the meeting in May will be part background on ongoing remediation and strategic planning, then risk assessment and remediation?

ANSWER: That's a fair description. We started one year ago to generate the framework, phases of management on the site, land use, and scenarios. The HAB wasn't willing to engage, but now we are working with their ad hoc group.

COMMENT: You must define what they would like to do when DOE walks away – must agree that we can't protect everything. Meanwhile, people should be able to input.

ANSWER: People must recognize that we're doing interim action remediation for several years before moving into final remediation activity. Risk framework bridges these.

QUESTION: Will you be describing what work is being done now?

ANSWER: Yes, we have good successes to share.

ISRM Update (Greg Mitchem)

Last month, we completed drilling of Phase III of the ISRM wells extending the barrier to 2,300 feet. Phase III injections were started last week. On the northern side of the barrier, a thicker aquifer than expected was encountered. In addition, treatability test area core samples are being collected to better understand reduction/oxidation left in the soil.

QUESTION: Can you estimate how much harm might be done to any river receptors?

ANSWER: We have been doing aquifer tube sampling at this location for some time now. These tubes allow us to take samples deeper in the gravel where the Columbia River mixing has not yet happened or has happened only minimally. We are getting some concentrations above background there but there continues to be ongoing debate on what concentration is "harmful" to the receptor. Since the concentration is greater than the regulatory requirement in the Record of Decision, then it does validate the need to continue to put in the ISRM barrier.

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Update (Virginia Rohay)

We completed drilling the groundwater well in March. The installation met the 5-Year RCRA requirement.

The purpose of the well is to characterize carbon tetrachloride (carbon tet) in ground water and vadose zone and drill a well that could be used for remediation. We took both groundwater and soil samples. It doesn't appear that the major source of carbon tet is where the well is. The soil/gas was highest at 49 parts per million (ppm) at 80 feet. The DQO requires that action be taken at 500 ppm. The groundwater was sampled every 10 feet, and the highest concentration was 2,800 micrograms per liter. We set the sample pump at 1,500 micrograms per liter. We don't think the finding indicates a hot spot.

COMMENT: That's still 300 times the drinking water standard.

ANSWER: What are of actual concern are localized areas of higher contamination. The conceptual model indicates that carbon tet was lost at the source. We sited the well inside the PFP fence to see if the source was in the vadose zone on protected property around PFP. Our concern is that there are no groundwater wells there; now, we can close contours with the new well.

QUESTION: Do you know where the source is?

ANSWER: Three cribs are the sources of carbon tet disposal. We are trying to locate non-documented sources in the 200 Area; the Integration Project Expert Panel suggested we drill a well there. Soil vapor extraction has been used since 1992 to remove carbon tet. We need to verify if carbon tet was lost to the soil through a major pipe leak between PFP and the cribs.

QUESTION: What position was the highest?

ANSWER: Twenty-five feet below the water table.

Reactions to Central Plateau Risk Framework Workshop (Moses Jarayssi)

The purpose of the workshop is to help develop a risk framework. We would like reactions from people who attended.

COMMENT: I think it got off theme too often onto conceptual models and not what ordinary people want the site to be capable of. The HAB draft advice missed the target totally.

COMMENT: Two observations. The only outcome of the workshop was to paper the walls with a list of values. No one was willing to mention that we have to recognize that the site may remain permitted – waste sites will be there forever. We must face this and get onto planning.

COMMENT: We should let people express their values even if they aren't practical. We shouldn't stop people from expressing themselves.

COMMENT: Do you have advice about what they should do?

COMMENT: Come in with a charter, have clear values, and reasonable understanding of the scenario.

Let's move on to the calendar. We have open project meetings. We will add July, August, and September to the May calendar. Does anyone have anything to add?

COMMENT: We can get the schedule of HAB meetings from Nancy Myers. Edye will add that information to the calendar.

COMMENT: The Oregon Hanford Waste Board will hold its meeting in The Dalles, Oregon, June 18-19. The GW/VZ project will be discussed on the second day. The invitations will be out soon. Edey will add this to the calendar.

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:

Marty Bensky – HAB

Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ (by phone)

Moses Jarayssi – BHI

Edye Jenkins – ERC

Sandra Lilligren – DOE-HQ (by phone)

Doug Maddox – DOE-HQ (by phone)

Fred Mann – CHG

Greg Mitchem – BHI

John Morse – DOE-RL

Ted Repasky – CTUIR

Gordon Rogers – HAB

Virginia Rohay – CHI

Sue Safford – Oregon Office of Energy (by phone)

Mike Thompson – DOE-RL

Dick Wilde – FH

Rob Yasek – ORP

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
April 1, 2002 – June 3, 2002
THREE MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

April 1	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
May 6	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
June 3	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)