

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor **ERC Team**
Meeting Minutes

CCN: 060769

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: 4170; 8830/4170

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING - JULY 27, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE July 30, 1998

ATTENDEES

See Attached Distribution List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
See Attached Distribution List
Document and Info Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING:

Date: August 3, 1998

Location: PNNL Columbia River Room - Richland, WA

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

Toll Free Call In Number: (800) 664-0771

UPDATE:

The Detailed Work Plan (DWP) documents are available for review. However, because of the size of the documents (approximately 120 pages), we cannot send it electronically. We will have copies available at our Monday afternoon meeting on August 3. If you would like to have a copy prior to Monday, please call Karen Strickland at (509) 372-9236 and we will make arrangement for you to be able to pick up a copy at the Bechtel Building, 3350 George Washington Way, Richland, Washington. Also, copies of the Project Specification document will be available for our Monday meeting.

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on July 27, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at BHI's Assembly Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

GW/VZ Integration Project Detailed Work Plan Package: The Project is working on the DWP Package which will include the Gaps, Science and Technology Roadmaps, Peer Review Process, Expert Panel and National Academy of Science. The second piece will be the System Assessment Capability - the design of the capability. The Project has also been talking about putting together a module which would use pieces of what we know now as a prototype. The third piece will be the integration of core projects (TWRS, ILAW, Waste Management, etc.). The Project can't manage everything across the site, but with the core projects it will cover approximately 90%. The fourth piece is new work. Right now that is a place holder for actually doing work and filling gaps.

7-27MIN.WPD

QUESTION: This includes additional characterizations?

ANSWER: Correct. What there will be is essentially a duplicate book, which will allow the Project to see 90% of the Groundwater/Vadose Zone activities on the site in one place.

COMMENT: Hopefully we are working on related activities so that we can work to goals and requirements that satisfy TWRS and what is needed to integrate.

RESPONSE: The Project is not just collecting activities, but integrating and understanding what the activities are.

COMMENT: It sounds like the information is flowing outward and you are not the focal point. This Project is the place where information will be for the whole system.

RESPONSE: You have to start somewhere. For this first year the Project will collect information about what others are doing in FY99, and people will continue what they are doing. In FY2000 the Project expects to have the integrated program playing hard in the budget process. This is a transition year.

QUESTION: How do you read the climate? Are the other folks open or are you having to move against a headwind?

ANSWER: In discussions with people, they have been open to persuasion.

COMMENT: The other projects shouldn't be drilling a borehole unless they have had guidance from this Project.

RESPONSE: In the next couple of months the Project will be asking why a particular activity is being done and where, at which time we will challenge the need for the activity. The GW/VZ Project is all about getting more for our dollars. The Project intends to have concurrence on other projects DWP's. They can go ahead without our signature, but the Project will carry the flag as far as it needs to go. John Wagoner and Lloyd Piper have both concurred that this is how they see the role of the this Project.

Later today the roll out, feedback, and review process will be addressed.

QUESTION: When will we be able to see an outline of the DWP?

ANSWER: This is something the Project hasn't been through yet. We have meetings scheduled for the afternoon of August 10 and the morning of August 11 to have a validation meeting with DOE-HQ, the core integration projects, the regulators and the public to walk through in detail what is being proposed for the Project, both above and below the line.

COMMENT: We would have hoped that we could have had an opportunity to test assumptions and give input.

RESPONSE: This is only Revision 1.

COMMENT: It is two weeks before we will be able to see the information and people will be set before we get there.

RESPONSE: This is the first cut. There is a lot more for the initial cut, with a lot of conversation around the proposed scope. The intent is to get the packages out ahead of the August 10-11 meetings so everyone is prepared for meaningful dialog.

COMMENT: We would like to see a Table of Contents so that we can gain consensus.

RESPONSE: The Project will take a look at what can be done in terms of getting that information out. What is available now is just a rough cut with \$4-6 million in scope for a \$2 million project. As stated before, the intent is to have the packages out to people so they can look at them prior to the meetings so that there can be meaningful dialog rather than a presentation.

QUESTION: When can the Project have a readable copy ready?

RESPONSE: Every attempt will be made to have something out by Thursday or Friday so that at next week's meeting we can discuss and review.

QUESTION: Both the Project Specification and the DWP will be discussed in Monday's meeting?

RESPONSE: Yes.

COMMENT: Without adequate opportunity to go over the information you won't have a meaningful dialog.

RESPONSE: Meaningful dialog is the intent of the Project. In the past there have always been two days of meetings. One day to present the package and another one several days later for a final review. What is proposed for this year is one meeting for review, with the package coming out prior to the meeting. The intent is that you will have the package before our Monday meeting on August 3, 1998, so that you will be prepared to discuss it on August 10-11.

Project Specification:

The Project has had its internal review of the document with DOE comments due to be received today. Some of the Project's own comments are being incorporated. Next Monday we plan to release the document for public review and comment.

QUESTION: The draft that I have seen is a boiled down version of the 10-12 page essay distributed earlier. Do you see a requirements document being attached to that document?

ANSWER: The Project Specification is a high level scoping document which details what is in and what is out, as well as the general approach to the Project. In terms of work, for example the System Assessment, which will be a full blown effort document, there are tiers of work that will be proposed for next year. All of these will be seen in the System Assessment package and will be hit hard early next year.

COMMENT: CRCIA is very interested in that document.

RESPONSE: It is anticipated that there will be some real time on that document.

Project Management Plan: Michael Graham has had very limited resources in getting this document done. Hopefully, we will have a draft out early next week. The principle issues in this document are the roles and responsibilities on this Project. Whatever we have available next week will be shared at our Monday meeting.

QUESTION: What does the Expert Panel look like?

ANSWER: The Project has not yet had confirmation on the number. Somewhere between 4 and 12.

QUESTION: So in next Monday's meeting we will look at three items: 1) DWP, 2) Project Specification, and 3) an update of where the Project is on the PMP?

ANSWER: Yes.

National Lab Meetings on Groundwater and Inventory: The highlights from the previous meetings on July 16 and 17, as well as the highlights from last week's meetings on July 22-23, will come out next week. This has taken longer than anticipated, but they will be made available as soon as possible and will be posted on the GW/VZ web site.

The National Lab meetings are gaining momentum. Another meeting is scheduled for August 12-13. We are aware that this is right in the middle of DWP week and some HAB meetings, but this is the only time that they key players were available in August.

The meetings are seeing a better focus on what the labs need out of these meetings. Rich Holten sat in on the river workshop and thought that they were starting to generate the conversations necessary to get the gaps listed and get the labs more involved. People were pretty energized.

COMMENT: We are still in the early phases and so there is still a lot of fuzz on things. It isn't clear if they are doing the assessment or working in support of the assessment. Those are two different perspectives. Also, the perspective on gaps, if you ask a welder what his gaps are he will tell you, but there may not be relevance or significance of his gaps in terms of the scope of the Project. None of the labs have a grip on what is significant in the total view instead of just their narrow specialty.

RESPONSE: To know what is important you have to go through a lot of things. You need to see them bring in their expertise and what was an issue in other places that may be relevant to this Project.

COMMENT: At this stage that is okay, but we need to plan to converge on the openness and prioritize and define what will give us the most good.

RESPONSE: You are correct.

COMMENT: Tom Woods had a chat with Shirley Rawson last week that was very productive and focused on the different ways we can conceptually zero in on what is important. We need to credibly, sensitively analyze and sort out what are the real areas the labs can help us with.

COMMENT: On the systems model, I would like to see a conceptual module and see “where the voids are.” I am bothered that inventory is viewed as merely inventory and not source terms. I may have a listing of the amount and name of a contaminant, but what I really need to know is how it is going to link to the rest of the system and there doesn’t seem to be an effort in that direction. Who is going to predict how tanks deteriorate? We need have a better picture than what is currently being discussed.

QUESTION: The meetings have been improving, but there isn’t clarity on how it will all mesh in with the rest of what is going on in the Project. There is not clarity on inventory, what is the intent of the areas of concerns, where do they quit and vadose pick-up? There are some different perspectives on these questions. We have heard a couple of times that this round was designed to go for the “low hanging fruit,” and it sounds like there may be more down the road as we get a better handle on what the real issues are. However, I don’t see a design of what the real pathway forward is and how it will fit together. Where are we heading?

ANSWER: When you bring together people on such a complex problem you don’t organize to the point that people can’t think outside the box. If you define the box too tightly there are opportunities to miss things. Flexibility to think about the problem first and then come together and work the interfaces is where the technical issues will come from.

COMMENT: As soon as we can, we need a first cut on what is needed in the way of output from each of the areas, such as inventory. The vadose zone people need to thoughtfully say what they are going to need from inventory. Is it release time, release rates, concentrations, etc.? That will help us focus without boxing in. Right now we aren’t telling them what is going to be needed from their areas.

COMMENT: There is an assumption that in 500 years the tank containment will disappear. We would like to know more than that assumption, therefore, we need to know about corrosion.

RESPONSE: Currently, when people do an analysis on the site, they assume everything is a lot more; inventory is a lot higher, tank loss time is 500 years, then they can say, “I’m okay” in my assumption. You can’t do that if you are looking at things in an integrated fashion. You can’t assume these things, because when you add it all up it won’t work.

COMMENT: If you don’t think that the ultimate definition is cancer in humans, then you are going to lose some credibility. We must view it as a total.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

Public Involvement Workshop/Forums: We need your assistance with preparing agendas, formats, and locations for the regional public forums. The Project has defined Seattle, Portland, Spokane and Richland. Are those the right locations? We need anyone who has some time to provide their views and comments so that the Project can begin planning these meetings now. Attempts have been made to contact the HAB-PI Committee, but unfortunately they don’t meet again until September.

QUESTION: Could we have a conference call with the members of the PI Committee?

ANSWER: Yes, but the chair has been out of the office for several weeks. We can work with Shelly Cimone from Oregon Department of Energy and see what can be arranged.

QUESTION: Did you receive comments from Doug on the forums, I believe he provided some feedback?

ANSWER: We had feedback on the Public Involvement Plan, but we haven't received anything on the forums.

COMMENT: Ecology's public involvement people have some comments and Dave Holland will make sure that Dru Butler gets them.

Once again, any help planning the September regional forums would be appreciated.

There was an August Workshop scheduled, however, with the DWP meetings and the National Lab meetings in the same week we wanted your thoughts on whether those meetings could be considered as the August Workshop.

QUESTION: So those meetings would be the workshop for August? If so, I would say that they would cover the need, unless we have other topics that we need to get to.

ANSWER: The DWP Meetings would cover the critical items in a timely fashion. So we will plan that the DWP Meetings will take care of the August Workshop.

QUESTION: What do you want from the public on participation? If we hear that the plan is to do three boreholes; here and here and here; are you expecting the public to say we feel that there should be four boreholes and they should there, and there, and there? I don't see where we are involved.

ANSWER: DOE-Headquarters will be asking questions on how an activity was determined, what the background is, and what is the process for doing it.

There are a couple of different things that will happen at the DWP meetings. DOE will be interested in ensuring that we are doing the right stuff and that the baseline is correct. That may not be the expectation of the public. We hope that the public would tell us if we are working on the right things and whether the timing is correct.

COMMENT: Then we need to see a drawing of the conceptual model on the board to be able to make those determinations.

RESPONSE: There will be different levels of conversations. Some people will ask about the timing, DOE-Headquarters will look at the baseline and probe how much we know. It is beneficial for people to listen to both. The Project has been asked to provide and open 2-hour meeting to share high-level planning details, let's give it a try and see if this one meeting can give both parties what they need. If not, then we will make other arrangements.

COMMENT: I will be looking for the entire total project from beginning to end. I am not necessarily looking for the details and timing of the entire Project. The timing I will be looking at will be at the front

end and how it compares to site decisions, only on that basis are we going to make comments if the money is right. The DWP can't be written until you get your hands on that.

RESPONSE: The DWP has to be written or there isn't any money at all.

COMMENT: You will have criticism if you aren't doing a lot of work and if you don't know where you are going. If you don't know the total, then you can't decide what to slice off. That's the way it is!

RESPONSE: We all want to get hard and fast on the whole picture, but let's recognize that we don't have a choice; we must do a DWP, even if we don't have the whole picture. The whole picture will be the Long Range Plan.

COMMENT: Let's remember that the DWP is revised each and every year and readjustments will be made periodically. Very few things are cast in concrete. The Project needs to get the DWP out for the current cycle.

COMMENT: It must be clear in these meetings that the DWP did not come out of thin air.

COMMENT: If it takes a year to figure out what you are going to do in the "X" years, then this Project doesn't have a chance. I can't believe that the conceptual level can't be mapped out for what we need to get to and to lay out the big chunks in enough depth to nail milestones and match them to key decisions. That is about a two week effort.

RESPONSE: If you could have a bunch of experts gather together for two weeks you could have a first cut. What gets in the way is that the Project has a lot of stuff on the books and the requirements are that we will use the process with the National Labs.

COMMENT: The second thing we will look at is what the technical approach is you are going to do on the assessment, piece by piece like a railroad train. We need a one page cartoon of what the technical approach is.

COMMENT: We want you to know what the expectations are.

COMMENT: I believe that the Project will be addressing many of your concerns in the DWP meetings.

RESPONSE: Let's look at what we have in our DWP package at next Monday's meetings. Hopefully there will be enough content. However, the DWP is not the Long Range Plan.

COMMENT: I will be looking for a view graph that underpins what the key documents are.

COMMENT: I feel that when the model finally gets together, it is likely to show that very few Single Shell Tanks will need to have waste removed from them. That is a long-term result we expect to see, therefore, if the DWP says that our highest priority is mining and sluicing the tanks, I would feel quite bad. The Project needs to identify the things that need to be done that won't later be shown as unnecessary.

RESPONSE: C-106 is the only Single Shell Tank to be tackled before 2001.

COMMENT: Without knowing what is in the DWP we are spending a lot a time arguing about what we don't yet know.

COMMENT: From a regulator perspective, where you put the boreholes is important to some of us. Not knowing what is in the DWP and to what extent, we don't know what detail you have.

RESPONSE: That is part of a work plan and the DWP says to prepare a work plan.

COMMENT: What isn't clear in this project is that there are going to be site programs and projects where we have direct involvement (TWRS, ER, etc.). Then there is the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project, initiated by DOE, where we are clumped in with the spectators. It is not clearly understood what relationship we have with the on-going activities and this Project. That is a question we have. We need to see how they play into this Project and what that relationship is.

RESPONSE: The Project expects that it will change over time and that there will be milestones related to this Project.

COMMENT: There is going to be an array of public with an array of different degrees of interest. One size won't fit all.

RESPONSE: The idea was to have openness and allow all degrees of interest to come on in and listen and ask questions.

COMMENT: By and large the work for the next couple of years is already committed in concrete.

RESPONSE: Next Monday the Project will give you what it has and will be prepared to dialog on the DWP August 10-11. The logic ties that you are looking for will come into the Long Range Plan in the December time frame. There are several ways to tackle a problem, the plan was to become smart about the site projects over the near-term, understand their work, and from that basis move forward. Some of the identified needs in the Projects can't be tied to a requirement. Until the GW/VZ Project gets some of the tools in place we will be back and forth over these issues. The next year will be a growing year and getting the Project's feet on the ground and running.

COMMENT: We want to be understanding, but back away and look at what we have said. This started last December, it is hard to understand why it takes a year to lay the plans for where we are going.

RESPONSE: We are staying with the schedule that was laid out in April.

COMMENT: We don't want to waste time on things that will be changing. Everyone knows that TWRS will go through a massive rebaseline effort and all the things we will track will be different.

RESPONSE: The timing needs of when you need the assessments changes with the rebaseline.

COMMENT: We know it will be done in interactive passes, but still, in total we need to come up with where we are going to get there.

National Lab Meetings August 12-13: The National Lab meetings on August 12-13 will focus on interfaces. All groups will meet to be able to work together and link together. The people who are engaged in the Project will do the pre-work to lay out the conceptual passes of who is doing what, and how information will pass and to whom.

Risk and Monitoring are two modules that will not be addressed until next year. There are three workshops the first of next year to work on these modules. Where is it likely that the Project is going to affect work next year is in the groundwater, inventory and the river, and that is why we are addressing those modules this year.

Remediation options and regulatory path forward are not part of the National Lab meetings. They will be rolled under strategic planning.

Around December the Project is going to try to be at a foundation for the technical elements. Also, early in the year there will be workshops on issues around assessment modeling, which is uncertainty and a large system analysis platform for needs.

QUESTION: Those will be done in FY99?

ANSWER: Yes.

Schedule Conflicts: We would like to talk about the schedule conflicts for these meetings. The Project is having an important two-day National Lab meeting the same day as the HAB-ER Committee on August 13.

COMMENT: Maybe the HAB-ER could adjourn the meeting to the National Lab Meeting.

COMMENT: Oregon has more than one representative they can send to cover both meeting, if they choose.

COMMENT: Ecology has enough staff that they can cover both.

COMMENT: We would like, as soon as possible, any feel the Project has for the risk modules. Are you planning these for early next year, December/January?

RESPONSE: The Project has discussed using the Center for Risk Excellence out of Chicago and having them lead the discussions.

QUESTION: Aren't they just technical experts on waste management?

ANSWER: They have a full gamut of risk assessment. The Project will try in early September to lay those out, which you will see in the DWP.

QUESTION: Is that planned for early FY99?

ANSWER: The plan is to have monitoring, the system assessment, and risk all being addressed in the first quarter of FY99.

QUESTION: Concurrent?

ANSWER: However they can best be laid out.

QUESTION: The comments for the Public Consultation Plan are due on August 5. We will only get to hear a status of the PMP on the Monday prior to when the comments are due. Our concept is that the Public Consultation Plan and the way the Project is managed are linked. Needing the comments due before what we understand is in the DWP doesn't give us enough time. Is there any change that there can be an adjustment to the comment period?

ANSWER: Yes. That is the right perspective on those two document. We will extend the comment period to August 21.

NOTE:

Groundwater/Vadose Zone Web Site Location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

ATTENDEES:

Stephanie Alt, DOE-RL
Martin Bensky, HAB
Dru Butler, BHI
Don Clark, JAI Corp.
Jim Conca, UFA Ventures
Bryan Foley, DOE-RL
Michael Graham, BHI
Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ
Dave Holland, Ecology
Rich Holten, DOE-RL
Gary Jewell, BHI
Katy McKeig, SMS, Inc.
Gordon Rogers, HAB
Karen Strickland, BHI
Janice Williams, FDH
Thomas Woods, YIN

GW/VZ Integration Project Distribution List

Associated Western Universities, Inc.

Ruth Ann Kirk kirk_ra@awu.org

Bechtel Hanford, Inc.

D. H. Butler cc:Mail
R. L. Dale cc:Mail
P. G. Doctor cc:Mail
S. C. Foelber cc:Mail
B. H. Ford cc:Mail
O. T. Goodman cc:Mail
M. J. Graham cc:Mail
M. C. Hughes cc:Mail
G. F. Jones cc:Mail
R. Jundt cc:Mail
A. J. Knepp cc:Mail
B. S. Kuntz cc:Mail
S. D. Liedle cc:Mail
N. B. Myers cc:Mail
K. H. Strickland cc:Mail
T. M. Wintczak cc:Mail

Benton-Franklin Public Health

Margery Swint Fax: 375-5750

Central WA Building Trades Council

Richard Berglund Fax: 547-2139

City of Pasco

Charles Kilbury Fax: 545-3403

City of Richland

Pam Brown Fax: 942-7379
Jill Monley Fax: 942-7379

City of West Richland

Jerry Peltier cc:Mail

Columbia River United

Greg deBruler cruwa@gorge.net

CRESP

John Abbotts abbotts@u.washington.edu
Tim Ewers tewers@moscow.com
D. Mercer dmercer@u.washington.edu

Critique

Mary K. Campbell cc:Mail

DOE-Headquarters

R. Alvarez robert.alvarez@hq.doe.gov
J. D. Berwick jberwick@doegipo.com
H. W. Calley harry.calley@em.doe.gov
M. K. Harmon cc:Mail
W. M. Levitan william.levitan@em.doe.gov
E. Livingston ellen.livingston@hq.doe.gov

DOE-RL

S. L. Alt cc:Mail
L. K. Bauer cc:Mail
D. H. Chapin cc:Mail
S. S. Clark cc:Mail
K. V. Clarke cc:Mail
B. L. Foley cc:Mail
J. B. Hall cc:Mail
J. P. Hanson cc:Mail
R. D. Hildebrand cc:Mail
R. A. Holten cc:Mail
C. S. Louie cc:Mail
G. M. McClure cc:Mail
D. E. Olson cc:Mail
M. J. Plahuta cc:Mail
K. K. Randolph cc:Mail
D. S. Shafer cc:Mail
M. I. Talbot cc:Mail
D. K. Tano cc:Mail
K. M. Thompson cc:Mail
A. C. Tortoso cc:Mail
J. K. Yerxa cc:Mail
J. H. Zeisloft cc:Mail

ECO Associate

J. S. Lewinsohn cc:Mail

EnviroIssues

Holly Delaney envissue@halcyon.com
Louise Dressen envissue@halcyon.com
Jennifer Kauffman envissue@halcyon.com

Environmental Management Advisory Board

J. T. Melillo james.melillo@em.doe.gov
M. R. Pfister mike.pfister@hq.doe.gov

Fluor Daniel Hanford

Janice D. Williams cc:Mail

Framatome

Rex Robinson send hard copy

Freestone Environmental Services

Daniel K. Tyler cc:Mail

General Public

Marilyn Anderson marnhar@3-cities.com
Joe Caggiano caggja@gte.net
Dr. Rob Drury hermes@owt.com
Chester Huang ulft77a@prodigy.com
Glenn Russcher send hard copy

Government Accountability Project

Pamela Burton jjs1@jps.net
Tom Carpenter gap@whistleblower.org

Government Accounting Office

Chris Abraham cc:Mail

Grant & Franklin Counties

Jack Yorgesen Fax: 1-509-932-4306

HAB's Hanford Work Force Nonunion/ Nonmanagement Employees

Madeleine Brown cc:Mail
Susan Leckband Fax: 372-2303
Jeff Luke cc:Mail
Wayne Martin cc:Mail

HAB's Public-at-Large

Martin Bensky send hard copy
Gordon Rogers send hard copy

Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council

Jim Watts cc:Mail

Hanford Environmental Action League

Todd Martin Fax: 1-509-326-2932

Hanford Watch of Oregon

Robin Klein Fax: 1-503-736-0097
Paige Knight Fax: 1-503-287-6329

Heart of America Northwest

Gerald Pollet Fax: 1-206-382-1148

ICF Kaiser Consulting Group

Barry Moravek BMoravek@icfkaiser.com

In Situ Technologies, Inc.

Randy Price r4mprice@3-cities.com

Jacobs Engineering

Lynne Roeder-Smith cc:Mail

JAI Corporation

Don Clark donclark@gte.net

KEPR Television

Peter Michaels Fax: 547-5365

Local Business Interests

Dave Watrous cc:Mail

Lower Columbia Basin Audobon Society

Rick Leaumont leaumont@owt.com

MacTec-ERS

Jim Bertsch Jill_M_Meinecke@rl.gov
John Brodeur Jill_M_Meinecke@rl.gov

Numatec Hanford

Jerry Davis cc:Mail

Oregon Hanford Waste Board

Shelley Cimon Fax: 1-541-963-0853

Oregon Office of Energy

Mary Lou Blazek Fax: 1-503-378-2456
Dirk Dunning dirk.a.dunning@state.or.us
Mike Grainey Fax: 1-503-373-7806
Doug Huston Fax: 1-503-373-7806
Steve Sautter steven.p.sautter@state.or.us

Other Place Ranch

Louis Hamilton othrplcrh@aol.com

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Marcel P. Bergeron cc:Mail
Robert W. Bryce cc:Mail
Charles T. Kincaid cc:Mail
Phil E. Long cc:Mail
Bruce A. Napier cc:Mail
Thomas L. Page cc:Mail
Marilyn J. Quadrel cc:Mail
Shirley A. Rawson cc:Mail
R. Jeff Serne cc:Mail
Terri L. Stewart cc:Mail
Barbara K. Wise cc:Mail

Pacific Rim Enterprise Center

Vince Panesko vince@owt.com

Port of Benton

Robert Larson Fax: 375-6008

Systematic Management Service, Inc.

Katy Makeig makeig@erols.com

Tri-Cities Visitor & Convention Bureau

Kris Watkins 783-9005

Tri-City Herald

John Stang Fax: 582-1510

Tri-Cities Development & Economic Council

Dick Greenberg Fax: 735-6609
Harold Heacock Fax: 735-6609
Sam Volpentest Fax: 735-6609

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla

Indian Reservation

Stuart Harris Fax: 1-541-278-5380
Armand Minthorn Fax: 1-541-278-5380
Joe Richards Rjoey@ix.netcom.com
J. R. Wilkinson jr@ucinet.com

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS CONTINUED

Nez Perce Tribe

Dan Landeen Fax: 1-208-843-7378
Donna Powaukee Fax: 1-208-843-7378
Stan Sobczyk stans@nezperce.org
John Stanfill johns@nezperce.org

Wanapaum Tribe

Rex Buck rbuck@gcpud.org
Brent Lenz blenz@gcpud.org

Yakama Indian Nation

Barbara Harper bharper@nwinform.net
Russell Jim Fax: 1-509-452-2503
Lino Niccoli Fax: 943-8555
Wade Riggsbee riggsbee@3-cities.com
Thomas W. Woods Fax: 943-8555

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Craig Cameron send hard copy to B5-01
Larry Gadbois cc:Mail
Dennis A. Faulk cc:Mail
Tom Post cc:Mail
Doug Sherwood cc:Mail

WA State Department of Health

Nancy Darling ned0303@hub.doh.wa.gov
Debra McBaugh Fax: 1-360-236-2255

Washington League of Women Voters

Elizabeth Tabbutt Fax: 1-360-956-9287

Washington State University

James Cochran Fax: 372-7354

Waste Management Northwest

Don Moak cc:Mail

UC National Labs

Sandra Wagner swagner@lanl.gov

UFA Ventures, Inc., WSU Tri-Cities

Jim Conca Fax: 375-7451
Joseph Mockler Fax: 375-7451

University of Washington

Thomas Engel Fax: 1-206-685-8665

WA State Department of Ecology

Steve Alexander cc:Mail
Suzanne Dahl-Crumpler cc:Mail
Damon Delistraty ddel461@ecy.wa.gov
Jack W. Donnelly cc:Mail
Dib Goswami cc:Mail
Dave Holland cc:Mail
Stan Leja cc:Mail
Zelma Maine cc:Mail
Scott McKinney cc:Mail
Douglas Palenshus cc:Mail
Valarie Peery cc:Mail
Max Power cc:Mail
Casey Ruud cc:Mail
Ron Skinnarland cc:Mail
Phillip R. Staats cc:Mail
Geoff Tallent cc:Mail
Michael Turner cc:Mail
Mike Wilson cc:Mail

WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jay McConnaughey Fax: 736-3030