

Meeting Minutes

061102

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 - AUGUST 24, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE August 27, 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 31, 1998

Location: PNNL Environmental Technology Building - Columbia River Room

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

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

If you have not yet replied to the Groudwater/Vadose Zone Feedback Form -- IT'S NOT TOO LATE. This survey will help us provide you with the right level of detailed information. Please send your responses by September 11, 1998. If you need another form, please contact either Karen Strickland (509-372-9236) or Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or visit our web site (<http://bhi-erc.com/vadose>) to obtain a copy. We hope to hear from you soon.

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on August 24, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at PNNL's ETB, Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

FY99 BUDGET SCENARIOS AND HELD INITIAL MEETINGS WITH ECOLOGY:

Last week we put together some FY99 Budget scenarios including the GW/VZ Integration Project, as well as core projects. We had discussions with the Department of Ecology on project priorities, both above and below the line. We will have follow-on meetings this afternoon with stakeholders to gain input on the budget list to help us with prioritization and pushing forward to resolve the budget issues.

DOE-ER has not yet made a formal proposal to the RL Site Management Board on what the budget ought to be. The reason is that we want to make sure we are lined up with the stakeholders, Tribal Nations and regulators and that is taking longer than we anticipated. One of the main things we are facing is that we have something of

8-24-98.WPD

a dispute on TWRS and we need to understand how big a role that will play in the budget scene. I prefer not going forward to management until I am sure that we are pretty well lined up (Rich Holten).

Right now what we have is a strawman of a budget that we are using in our discussions. We are trying to see where we should draw the line on a healthy program. We are not going to make that decision on our own, it needs to be a collective one.

COMMENT: Would you please send a copy of that document to both Stan Sobczyk and Doug Huston.

Our intent is to have separate meetings with the Tribes. However, we would like to line up with the regulators first (EPA and Ecology) so that we can have an understanding that we are heading in the same direction and then we would share with others. Once we have received additional input, we would then have follow-up meetings with the regulators.

COMMENT: With David Shafer leaving DOE-RL, there are holes in getting information to and from TWRS. Would you please make sure that information is being shared with the proper individuals.

RESPONSE: There is an interim project manager for the TWRS-DOE, Jim Poppiti, who will be reporting to Carol Sohn.

QUESTION: So Dana Bryson will no longer be involved?

ANSWER: No. They are looking to hire someone full-time to replace David.

QUESTION: What is Carol Sohn responsible for?

ANSWER: Safety Analysis and Tank Characterization.

QUESTION: Will Jim remain in charge of regular tank characterization?

ANSWER: I don't know, that is a good question that I did not ask. It sounded like a full-time assignment.

QUESTION: David Olson also?

ANSWER: We made an offer to have David help out. It would be a pretty heavy job, but it sounds like they are going to have him provide assistance.

LONG RANGE PLAN:

As discussed last week, we have begun working with a small group of people interested in participating in the Long Range Planning process. This group will look at what we have in place and when they need to be in place to make defensible decisions. If there is anyone interested we welcome your participation. We will be meeting every couple of weeks for a few hours.

EXPERT PANEL:

Last week we sent out an information package to the eight members of the panel. It included the names of the individuals on the Project, telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, web site location and some backup documentation. We hope to have the contracts in place this week. Our desire is to have everything in place for a mid-September meeting (September 15-17), which would be the first meeting to exchange information. The panel members will be hungry for information.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN:

We have gone through our first draft and it is now in internal review with the contractors and DOE-RL. The main issues are how this Project will be managed with three contractors and what their roles and responsibilities will be. This Project takes on a different importance than normal in terms of what its Project Management Plan entails. We hope to have the document out for a broader review by the end of next week.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY (SAC):

We have initiated work on accelerating the System Assessment Capability. We have reprogrammed money this year to begin work. What we are working on this year is determining what we can do to leverage our activities for next year. We have pulled together a team of people from the Project to gain a running start with Charlie Kincaid as the lead.

There are two pieces of the SAC. The first is to develop a high level tool to make decisions, and the second is to begin work on the inventory component.

CRCIA WHITE PAPER:

We received comments from Tom Woods on the CRCIA White Paper. To date, we haven't had time to review those comments, but we plan on doing that this week. We want to be sure that we aren't talking past each other, and we want to begin working on those things that are important.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

Right now the Project Specification document is out for review with comments due September 4.

Tomorrow and Wednesday (August 25-26, 1998) are the National Lab Science and Technology meetings. All the current elements will be addressed: vadose zone geochemistry, inventory, river, geohydrology, groundwater and inventory. The agenda was attached to last's weeks meeting minutes. We would like to have the foundation laid this fiscal year for the other initiatives, recognizing that things will evolve as we develop capabilities, we will hit risk and monitoring in the first quarter of next year. We will need to continue to work the funding issues and provide input on priorities to determine the kind of things that should get funded from an integrated standpoint.

QUESTION: Are we talking about movement around the site to "ante up" in like numbers to ER's \$2M?

ANSWER: What we are hearing is that everyone has a deficit. TWRS may be the one place where money may be available. We are competing with other programs; Spent Fuels is short, Waste Management is short for operations of the WRAP, Facility Stabilization is short money to hit compliances. The latest numbers show that we are short \$150M site-wide. We can't delay too long, we need to make our pitch to get the money needed for this Project. We have had some discussions with Jackson Kinzer on kicking in additional money.

QUESTION: On one hand I see the benefit of the GW/VZ Project in addressing the project as if it has \$30M, but it really doesn't, that money is there for other project activities.

ANSWER: There are a lot of decisions to be made.

COMMENT: The mission statement of this Project says we need to get an effects assessment and that remains as it has been for three years - unfunded. If it stays unfunded, it is my understanding that the Yakama's will be very distressed and will take other measures to get something done. Beyond safety, we see very little point in doing things that we don't have a defensible basis for doing. Hopefully, someday soon someone will be listening.

RESPONSE: There will be a time of reckoning to decide how to use TWRS' money. We have been asking for additional money for this Project that will be frozen for its use.

COMMENT: This group is beginning to become a much better working group than we have had in the past; however, we don't think anyone else has been listening.

RESPONSE: We have not yet communicated what we need to management. We need to understand some things with EPA and Ecology before we feel we can do that. It doesn't make sense to make a plea unless the table is all lined up. If we are lined up, we have a better chance to make things happen.

COMMENT: Over the years everyone has been saying that working on the assessment is what is needed if we want good, reliable, defensible, peer reviewable decisions. The time frame for that kind of an assessment is 3 years, with \$5M in the first year, \$6-7 in the second year, and the balance in the third year. We only see \$1M in this Project budget, and that is below the line. We don't want to miss the message. If the assessment is so far in the future that there would be nothing to show for the money being spent in a defensible manner, then it is hard to justify continuing.

RESPONSE: I think there is more than \$1M, we need to dialog that and determine what is key to address this first year.

COMMENT: The whole group is working towards this in the form of a total architect and strategy plan in December, unfortunately it misses the budget timing. Although the labs are doing a piece of the assessment, we need to have something around \$5M in October and we don't see anything close to that.

RESPONSE: When we get with the Tribes let's look at the budget. We have the \$1M committed.

COMMENT: Even the \$1M for assessment is below the line right now.

RESPONSE: There are things above the line in terms of model development and we have parts flying around that need to be tied together. We would like you to see what is in the other blocks and help us prioritize. If we are still short, then we will address that. A lot of the things we have down here are actions and work that will have input to the assessment, those things would add to the \$5M needed to do an assessment.

COMMENT: It is very apparent that it won't go over very well with EPA and Ecology if you are implying that we need to take a look at the current TPA milestones in order to prioritize what is on this list. If that is what is being implied, you will have a very negative response. We do not understand nor support that rationale.

COMMENT: Going ahead with our current understanding and knowledge on how to retrieve waste from the tanks may cause more problems than good.

COMMENT: The only tank that activities will be going forward on in the next few years is C-106.

COMMENT: We need to go ahead with something, but we need to get together a site-wide approach. Ecology's concept is that it is DOE's responsibility to come up with a TPA compliant budget. If activities are outside of the TPA then you need to come up with more funds. We have been preaching and have agreement that DOE needs to go to the site board and talk about system assessment needs and tell them that we are going to go forward on this activity, we are not going to go forward on that; but to date we aren't moving forward in that direction.

COMMENT: We don't have any magic solutions on setting priorities. Let's get on with it, but not wring our hands prematurely.

RESPONSE: We need feedback from Ecology and EPA on the list of activities. DOE needs to understand where you stand so that we can say you will support this program. Before we do that, we will want to make a round with the stakeholders. In our meeting with Ecology this week they said that they wanted to take time to look at the list. The longer we wait it become more critical, but we can wait until next week to write the letter.

COMMENT: I am concerned with the regulator actions, but regardless of what happens there, we believe that the assessment is important and that it needs to be a priority.

RESPONSE: A priority over the corrective actions?

COMMENT: We are not going to allow priorities to be an excuse. We don't want to hear that now the corrective action is going to be an argument for shifting money. They are on-going. We have been saying that for a long time so let's go forward. If the issue is that this is a trade-off list, if you want to this as a priority you have to give other things up, then Ecology is unwilling to do that. If that is your answer, then we will need to bump up the discussions to someone who can make those decisions.

RESPONSE: We are talking about priorities in the GW/VZ Project, and what we are asking for is your assistance in determining what the GW/VZ Project priorities are. If we can agree on what this Project's priorities are, then it makes our request for additional funds more solid. If we don't agree, I will still need to go ahead with a memo, but I would prefer to wait and have Ecology and EPA behind us.

COMMENT: For the stakeholders it is clear that the assessment should be above the line. It is a major concern that it shows below the line.

ANSWER: The line is what is on the paper and that is what we need help in prioritizing.

QUESTION: When do you need to have input so that it is productive to the budget cycle?

ANSWER: By the first of September. However, the quicker it comes in, the sooner we can say what our position is, and the stronger we are.

QUESTION: It appears that TWRS may have some money to add to the kitty?

ANSWER: Stretching the schedule for the privatization may provide some additional money.

COMMENT: You are going to have an enhanced budget problem with interim stabilization.

ANSWER: We have to make our case, and what we will get will always be less than what we asked for. Off the top of our head, we are hoping for \$10M extra. We have worked up increment A and increment B, which would be about \$10M extra, however, it is possible that funding may not happen.

The other thing not to forget is to look above the line and determine what things are there that could be swapped out, everything we need is not a supplement to the budget, in reality we need to reprioritize.

QUESTION: Whatever happened to the concept of going to Congress and asking for more money?

ANSWER: We said that we would do that for FY2000. We are out of line for doing that for FY99.

COMMENT: The Yakama's would support the line that it is appropriate for those responsible for the management of the site to prioritize what needs to be done. It is inappropriate for anyone other than the site to make those decisions. Without defensible decisions there isn't any way you can say what is more important than another. Right now it is a political fight and the strongest wins. We would like to see a more rational way of doing things.

RESPONSE: The reality is that you are never going to get as much money as what you would like.

COMMENT: Everyone faces that, but there must be a defensible basis for the decisions.

COMMENT: Let's look to the future. We may have to take a look at how we are going to do this, and it may have to be out of the box from the way we have always done things. We may have to take on some risks to get some work done. Doing things the same way just hasn't rendered the cleanup results we would like to see after ten years. We all want to advance the cleanup of Hanford, but we keep marching down the road on decisions that don't have backup to defend the priorities. We are going to have to push forward, and Ecology will push, to make changes. Hopefully we will be part of the solution and not part of the problem.

RESPONSE: Strength comes when we are all pushing in the same direction.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

Nothing has changed on the 6-Week Calendar from last week, which was attached to last week's meeting minutes. The calendar can also be obtained from the GW/VZ web site.

September 1-2 Groundwater Workshop for the 100N Area. This is a process whereby you bring in inside and outside experts to put technology on the table for evaluation. In the 100N Area we agreed for a pump and treat for the strontium flow, but that is not a viable long-term solution. We are now going forward to try to select a long-term solution. There are some polarized ideas on what to do, so we are going to have some experts come to the table and say what the viable solutions are. In doing so, it is hoped that we will have a couple of viable technologies that can then be tested to make a decision on replacing the pump and treat.

September 9-11 HAB Committee Meeting in Pendleton, Oregon. It is anticipated that the GW/VZ will have an evening session on Wednesday the 9th for discussion of what we are doing and the direction we are taking.

QUESTION: Is this one presentation by the GW/VZ Project or several presentations to express concern?

ANSWER: The evening sessions are usually more informational. Usually the HAB asks the contractors to put together a packet of information. Your point is a good one and you may want to approach the HAB with an offer to make an additional presentation. I'm sure the HAB would be open to that request.

(UPDATE: The Draft Agenda for the HAB has the GW/VZ Integration Project on the schedule for Friday afternoon, September 11, from 1:45 to 3:30 p.m.)

COMMENT: If you are planning to go down you may find it is pretty late to find a place to hang your hat. You will want to make arrangements soon.

ACTION:

Send Stan Sobczyk and Doug Houston copies of the one page budget scenario.

NOTE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:

GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE ACTIVITIES - FY 1999 FUNDING

ATTENDEES:

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Don Clark, JAI Corp. | Tom Page, PNNL |
| Jim Conca, WSU | Tom Post, EPA |
| Bryan Foley, DOE | Wade Riggsbee, YIN |
| Dib Goswami, Ecology | Gordon Rogers, HAB |
| Michael Graham, BHI | Casey Ruud, Ecology |
| Dave Holland, Ecology | Stan Sobczyk, NPT |
| Rich Holten, DOE | Karen Strickland, BHI |
| Doug Huston, ODOE | K. Michael Thompson, DOE-RL |
| Gary Jewell, BHI | Dave Watrous, PNNL |
| Tony Knepp, BHI | Tom Woods, YIN |
| Fred Mann, FDNW | |
| Katy McKeig, SMS | |

**ATTACHMENT 1
GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE ACTIVITIES
FY 1999 FUNDING**

| Program Office | PBS Number | UAS Name | IPL 1999 | CUM |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------|
| EM40 | ER08 | Min Safe - Groundwater Management CERCLA/RCRA Monitoring & Reporting | 10,211 | 10,211 |
| EM30 | | Surface Surveillance - Columbia River Monitoring | 385 | 10,596 |
| | | Subtotal: Min-Safe | 10,596 | |
| EM40 | ER08 | Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration | 2,000 | 12,596 |
| | | Subtotal: Essential Services | 12,596 | |
| EM40 | ER08 | 100 HR Groundwater Remedial Action | 2,385 | 14,981 |
| EM40 | ER08 | 100 KR Groundwater Remedial Action | 1,201 | 16,182 |
| EM40 | ER08 | 100 NR Groundwater Remedial Action | 711 | 16,893 |
| | | Subtotal: Urgent Risks | 16,893 | |
| EM40 | ER08 | 200 ZP Groundwater Remedial Action | 1,615 | 18,508 |
| EM40 | ER08 | 200 UP Groundwater Remedial Action | 256 | 18,764 |
| EM40 | ER08 | Groundwater Management Well Maintenance & Decommissioning | 883 | 19,647 |
| EM40 | ER02 | 200 Assess - 200-CW-1 Gable Mtn Pond | 832 | 20,479 |
| EM40 | ER02 | 200 Assess - 200-CW-5 U-Pond/Z Ditches | 251 | 20,730 |
| EM40 | ER02 | 200 Assess - 200-CS-1 Chemical Sewer Group | 281 | 21,011 |
| EM40 | ER02 | 200 Assess - 200-PW-2 Uranium Rich Process Waste | 42 | 21,053 |
| EM40 | ER02 | 200 NPL Common - Prototype Barrier | 260 | 21,313 |
| EM40 | ER02 | 200 NPL Common Assessment/Remedial Action | 281 | 21,594 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Characterization Plan (\$300K in FY 98) | 200 | 21,794 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Initial Vadose Zone Characterization, 1 tank farm | 2,000 | 23,794 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Sampling & Decommissioning of SX Borehole | 500 | 24,294 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Corrective Measures | 650 | 24,944 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Retrieval/Closure Alternatives Model | 100 | 25,044 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Geophysical Logging and Analysis | 1,350 | 26,394 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS - Performance Retrieval Report | 330 | 26,724 |
| EM30 | | ILAW - Characterization and Performance Assessment | 2,600 | 29,324 |
| EM30 | | HTI - Vadose Characterization/Cone Penetrometer | 1,000 | 30,324 |
| | | Subtotal: Compliance | 30,324 | |
| EM40 | ER08 | Groundwater - Vadose Monitoring | 379 | 30,703 |
| EM40 | ER08 | Groundwater - Modeling | 969 | 31,672 |
| | | Subtotal: Baseline Funding | 31,672 | |
| | | Additional Requirements | | |
| EM40 | ER08 | GW/VZ - Peer Reviews | 725 | 32,397 |
| EM40 | ER08 | GW/VZ - Science & Technology Roadmaps | 800 | 33,197 |
| EM40 | ER08 | GW/VZ - Dev. System Assess. Capability | 1,000 | 34,197 |
| EM30 | TW03 | TWRS VZ - Initial Vadose Zone Characterization, additional tank | 2,000 | 36,197 |
| | | Subtotal: Increment A | 4,525 | |
| | | 200 Area Characterization | 1,500 | 37,697 |
| | | Large Scale Field Test | 2,000 | 39,697 |
| | | Conceptual Model Verification | 1,000 | 40,697 |
| EM40 | ER08 | GW/VZ - Peer Reviews, Data Control, S&T Roadmapping | 500 | 41,197 |
| | | 200 Area Characterization | 2,000 | 43,197 |
| EM40 | ER08 | GW/VZ - Dev. System Assess. Capability | 1,000 | 44,197 |
| | | S&T Roadmap Implementation | 5,000 | 49,197 |
| | | Subtotal: Increment C | 8,000 | |
| | | Total: Additional Requirements | 17,525 | |
| | | Total Funding Requirements | 49,197 | 49,197 |

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
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

Bureau of Land Management

Jake Jakabosky jjakabos@sc0126wp.sc.blm.gov

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

DOE-Headquarters

R. Alvarez robert.alvarez@hq.doe.gov
J. D. Berwick jberwick@doegjpo.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

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

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 cc:Mail
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
Page Leven 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

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: 1-503-373-7806
Dirk Dunning dirk.a.dunning@state.or.us
Mike Graine Fax: 1-503-373-7806

Oregon Office of Energy Continued

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

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

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS (continued)

Wanapaum Tribe

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

Yakama Indian Nation

Barbara Harper bharper@nwinfo.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 craig_e_cameron@rl.gov
Larry Gadbois cc:Mail
Dennis A. Faulk cc:Mail
Tom Post cc:Mail
Doug Sherwood 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

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 Physicians for Social Responsibility

Ruth Yarrow psrwase@igc.apc.org

Washington State University

James Cochran Fax: 372-7354

Waste Management Northwest

Don Moak cc:Mail