

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: 4170; 8830/4170

062436

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING - SEPTEMBER 14, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE September 21, 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: September 28, 1998

Location: PNNL Environmental Technology Building - Columbia River Room

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 Weekly Meeting was held on September 14, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at PNNL's Environmental Technology Building - Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: The GW/VZ Project received Ecology's comments on the Project Specification Document. Some of their comments are difficult to address. A number of comments were technical in nature and will be included into plan modifications that we hope to have completed by the end of the month. A couple of comments were regarding the level of participation in document preparation and a greater value added with a different participation process. We had received similar comments regarding the Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan which we feel would be more appropriately addressed in that venue.

QUESTION: Will there be a meeting regarding the technical elements of their comments?

ANSWER: We will put together a summary and call Ecology to discuss.

COMMENT: We need to talk about what a successful process is. There are other folks from other organizations who should participate.

RESPONSE: The majority of the comments came from Ecology and need to be resolved with Ecology.

MIN9-14.WPD

QUESTION: What is the process you would prefer, to trade information back and forth? There could be some work groups formed that would be more interactive. What process would be preferred?

QUESTION: Is there any need for a process different from any other project? The process has been that a document is received for comments, comments are submitted, a response is given on the comments and the agency re-issues. Hopefully if comments are not resolved to complete satisfaction, at least there is a response given. Is there a need for a different approach?

ANSWER: Some comments were on the decision making process. The Project is struggling with how to resolve those comments. We will not have resolutions to those comments by the end of the month because the Project hasn't resolved the big issues of management. We would like to address the comments regarding technical issues in the Project Specification Document and move the management issues to being resolved in the Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan.

COMMENT: A responsiveness summary on the Public Consultation Plan satisfies me as a public participant. However, I can't speak for Ecology and EPA and whether they have a right to be more involved in the process.

RESPONSE: We are going for consensus and haven't gotten together to discuss the issues. We need to have a meeting to discuss the Project Specification Document and address the comments regarding management and the Public Consultation Plan with a different set of people and in a different framework.

COMMENT: Another way of doing it is to develop an agreement with the cleanup program and those who submitted comments, and then to sit down and talk about who wants to work on those issues.

RESPONSE: We will schedule a discussion to address those things that need further clarification.

QUESTION: Suppose that you do that and Ecology or EPA says, "I don't agree." Who is the decision maker?

ANSWER: Today that would be DOE.

COMMENT: Ecology is concerned that we need a higher level of interaction. One of the things that has held up the Project is the role of authority. As long as you make progress, you shouldn't care who is involved in the process. The work on the Project Specification Document should be set-up as a joint effort.

COMMENT: It is important that this is resolved. The way I see it, there are two classes of stakeholders; the general public which includes the HAB, and then the regulators that have a special standing on this and every other cleanup program. Currently there is not a system to mediate disputes, whether on milestones or whatever, that would handle a dispute and know who is in charge.

QUESTION: What is the dispersal of authority on this project? This is a discussion on dispersal of responsibility and it is my understanding that DOE is responsible for the work being done properly.

QUESTION: When is the Project Specification going to be complete?

ANSWER: We are planning on having a draft done by the end of September. The comments on technical issues can be managed. Policy comments are another issue, and those comments in the letter from Ecology will not be resolved in the next couple of days. The Project does not see the need to hold up the Project Specification while we work to resolve issues on policy. Those issues should be resolved in the Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan.

COMMENT: We still don't have the mission finalized.

COMMENT: We need to separate the hard technical issues and resolve them with those who provided the comments. The policy issues, which are tied to the letter, ought to be something that Ecology, the contractor, and DOE take on. They should look at policy issues and determine if they require management decisions or more discussion. In the meantime, we can resolve the technical issues now.

COMMENT: We want to keep pushing the idea that we have seen more success when we go beyond merely answering issues one at a time over the telephone. We would like to see the Environmental Restoration Program succeed, with ad hoc groups working at the level they want to and defining how they want to play. In technical issues, they should be working at the same time. They need to have a dialog to gain understanding of the content of the technical issues, resolve the issues and then come back together to make sure they have been resolved. If they are hard policy issues they shouldn't be mixed into the technical issues, but handled by the management team.

RESPONSE: The show stoppers need to be flagged to see what category they fit into. Be sensitive to which they are as far as technical versus policy. If they are technical then we need a group to go through and resolve those issues.

COMMENT: It can be hard to decide whether it is technical or policy.

RESPONSE: What usually happens is that the project resolves as many as they can, and the project gets back together with those who provided the comments that couldn't be resolved. Typically the project says the policy issues are ones that they can't resolve and management will need to address. Let's resolve what we can. We can have a couple of teams that work at doing that or we can do what has been done in the past that has worked. Whichever way we approach it, we need to continue to work at resolving the technical issues and go back and forth to hash things out.

QUESTION: What are the real issues here? First, does EPA have similar policy comments?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: That is distressing. Second, it appears to me that certain stakeholders groups, who are not regulators, are insisting that they have some say in how to proceed, is that correct?

ANSWER: DOE-RL is between a rock and a hard place because DOE-HQ has given clear expectations from Dr. Moniz and others that a quick turnaround is necessary on what the Project Specification contains. They want to see and approve and understand that document. Also, we have made an effort to involve the stakeholders and bring them to the table to help with this Project. However, DOE-RL is responsible and will be held accountable for meeting the demands of DOE-HQ. What we hope to do is to put together something with participation from a full range of stakeholders and develop something with an acceptable level of consensus to control the work. From my reading of the comments, that has not been accepted by Ecology. Ecology is saying to start over again. Those sort of comments DOE-RL will have a tough time with.

COMMENT: I'm not sure that I have heard it discussed openly that what is underpinning the difficulty to deal with this is that many of these issues go beyond regulations. If the issues are only being addressed from a regulatory point-of-view, then that leaves out the people raising some of the issues and raises the question, does the Project need to pay attention to issues outside of the regulations? The Tribes feel that is the only way to handle it.

COMMENT: I share that concern. Perhaps we need a different perspective. It seems to me that the forum for addressing these decisions has to be with Congress with discussion by the NPCR as well as the regulatory agencies. I hate to see this project delayed in issues that the participants can't resolve.

COMMENT: It would be sad if the path of resolution would cause that the key cleanup decisions are made before we have the necessary information to make them.

COMMENT: We haven't heard on the table the definition of other issues which are not in the regulatory framework.

COMMENT: Let's turn out a response to all the comments received. Through discussions we need to resolve all the issues and group them into either policy, technical, not addressed, etc. However, because of the Owendoff Briefing Document request and the Expert Panel Meetings we won't be able to get to them until next week.

QUESTION: How many stakeholder groups provided comments?

ANSWER: For as many people as received the document, we have received very few comments. To date we have comments back from Ecology and Gordon Rogers.

COMMENT: Our concern is that apparently all of the stakeholder groups have not bought into this. I'm not saying that circumstance is your fault, but they haven't accepted the process. My concern is how can you make progress and move ahead if you haven't got the stakeholders in your camp? Further down the road you may find you are on the wrong track.

ANSWER: We have worked diligently to get things resolved.

COMMENT: My recommendation would be to stop the project until you have a buy-in and clear understanding and involvement of the stakeholder groups. Otherwise you are wasting your time and money.

RESPONSE: We have an expectation from DOE-HQ, which we have to meet, that says we will define the project and how it will be run. We have provided opportunity and given an open invitation to

participate in the process. Whether individuals choose to participate or not is their decision. So far, there has been limited acceptance of the opportunities provided. It is clear that some stakeholders would like to define the project for DOE, but we have a goal and mission we need to accomplish, which Congress will hold us accountable for. We are now at a critical time in the decision making process and I feel a real need to make decisions, or decisions will be made for us.

COMMENT: As the information catches up, you refine the project. You don't fail to start because you don't have all the information. There is a limit to the amount of hand-holding you can do. That is the way things happen.

ANSWER: There was an opportunity given and a good representation of the stakeholders have defined what the project needs to look like. What is difficult is redefining that which the stakeholders have said was acceptable. The stakeholders have given their opinions.

COMMENT: That is a perfect example. When DOE is told they have to do a true integration we have yet to see it happen. You say you want participation, but the department blows it off, takes suggestions and flushes them, and then they can't understand why the stakeholders refuse to participate in a flawed process. They decide and then try to sell it to the stakeholders after it is already done.

ANSWER: From my viewpoint, we put out a strawman on how the DOE would suggest we carry out this project, which is open for comment. If we are down the wrong path, then we need specific comments. In the past the agency put out the Tri-Party Agreement, or like CRCIA, all participants came to the table to gain consensus and attempt to write something acceptable to all. However, CRCIA took 2-1/4 years and we don't have the benefit of that much time.

COMMENT: I am concerned that we aren't hearing issues on technical scope. We need to look at comments on policy that need to be addressed, but let's not hold up the work in progress. The fact that we are still having these discussions says that we need to address the policy issues and be able to set them aside. In the meantime, we are not getting the technical issues resolved.

RESPONSE: We will take an action to form working groups that will resolve what category each items falls into, technical or policy. Afterwards we will come together and have a discussion that will allow us to deal with those that we can, and provide next steps for those that are still open.

There is a need to come to terms on process and policy, but we shouldn't stop what we are doing to accomplish that. It is clear there are big issues to work on. The end of next week the project will contact Wade and Casey to work through their issues.

COMMENT: Ecology will be looking for answers to the policy issues.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: On July 8, 1998 we issued a Draft Tribal Nation and Public Consultation Plan. The document was delayed because there were a lot of issues to be resolved, which at that time we were unable to do. So, we went ahead and put together a draft document. In that document we talked about the decision making process with an appendix that talked about the activities for FY98. The public comment period was extended to August 21, with a final plan due September 30, 1998, in the form of a responsiveness summary. We received comments from several individuals: The Yakama Indian Nation, the CRCIA team, Gordon Rogers who is a HAB member, Tom Post from EPA. We held a workshop on July 14, 1998, to deal with credibility

and trust. Ecology submitted several comments on the Project Specification Document, which we feel should be covered in this Public Consultation Plan.

Some of the major issues were:

1. The assurance that the CRCIA will be implemented and funded and be identified as a major project stakeholder.
2. The need to define a methodology for meaningful participation in the project management and decision making process. An open process is not enough. The Project needs to define ways that the regulators, stakeholders, and Tribal Nations can participate.
3. The Project must be accountable for recognizing the value of the stakeholders.
4. The need to define a participation process that will build credibility with all stakeholder groups.
5. Issues of project management and meaningful participation is defined in Appendix D of the CRICA and has never been opened for debate or resolution.
6. The concern that we don't recreate the wheel, but use a duplicate process that other site projects use.

Many of these issues are policy related, which we are not ready to answer yet. There is more work to do. Other issues need to wait until we resolve our budget, and without funding it feels as if we are at a deadlock.

The process issue is something that we can talk at the HAB, and it is something we need to take "head on." When you try to create your own process, it becomes very difficult because this is a difficult project, and it could require that we spend all our energy in this area. We don't want to do that. There are processes that exist that can assist us. We need to lock into them and follow those steps that we can take advantage of and see where they fit in. That is something we need to explore more as an entire team. We need to move forward and take both the ideas generated by this project and those that have gone before and continue to work the issues.

QUESTION: Is there confusion in this room that we have come to a major stalemate?

COMMENT: I can assure you that we have seen it from the start. There are regional stakeholders who are unhappy and have boycotted the project, others have walked out.

COMMENT: And others have stayed in this room.

COMMENT: Yes, it's great that Tom Woods and the CRICA have stayed. I don't wholly agree with everything they say, but they have made major contributions.

COMMENT: The Project Specification and the CRCIA requirements are total scope statements and not totally different. I have heard "do CRICA," which essentially says to do everything. We need to define priorities and establish the order in which things need to be done. Dose response is the most important, but we need to be specific, because we can't do it all at once.

QUESTION: We are at a point now where DOE has extended an invitation to attend, some have chosen not to, but we are obligated to move forward to meet DOE-HQ demands. What Ecology is saying is that this needs to be more of an open process to involve the stakeholders. Those issues include that the stakeholders need to be involved in the process and in the room while the Project

Specification is being written. We need to break the log jam. Nothing else matters other than a resolve to this issue. In order to get us to success, we must resolve this once and for all. What do we do if others leave and say they aren't going to participate?

COMMENT: The only communication I have seen from the regional stakeholders is Jerry Pollet's letter which basically said that you need to pay for my attendance and the notification of meetings is too short. Paying for attendance is a touchy issue. From my experience in the government arena, I have never seen a project where stakeholders were invited to attend and offered payment to do so. As far as the short meeting notices, problems and conflicts do arise. Jerry is not the only person from the Heart of American who could participate.

QUESTION: What about Dirk Dunning and Oregon, who last week disengaged from the meeting?

COMMENT: That was a theatrical show.

COMMENT: The issue is not money. The issue is the process the Project has chosen to go with, which must have meaningful input from the stakeholders to be successful. You can't just say we invited you and you didn't like it. That isn't going to get us where we need to go.

COMMENT: The level of discussion is of abstracts. We need from DOE decisions on what are the specific technical issues that need to be resolved and discuss the priorities for doing the work. Shall we analyze this or that, develop a model, define where we get more money. These are the issues that need to be resolved.

COMMENT: We must have the right group together to do that.

ANSWER: We have started with the National Labs to answer some of those questions and that report from the labs should be available soon.

COMMENT: Something needs to be on the table that we can talk about. Doug Sherwood needs to have specific activities to lay out for himself that he can use to make a one year plan.

COMMENT: I would like to see that we have a resolution on the issue of DOE having stakeholders involved in developing the process and doing the work to define the priorities.

COMMENT: Anything can be thrown on the table, but the stakeholders should not have veto power.

COMMENT: I don't think there is an issue. We can all hear the plans and put out our comments.

COMMENT: This is my own opinion, but I honestly think there is deliberate intention on the part of some stakeholders to create an impasse. The approach, from where I sit, of boycotting says that there is an ulterior motive to creating a road block.

COMMENT: Let's assume that is true. Is it better to disengage and avoid the impasse, or to say we have an impasse and we are going to confront the issue and resolve it? If we avoid, we don't resolve the impasse from affecting progress.

COMMENT: If you say "Okay, stop the clock and go back to zero, we are not going ahead until we have a meeting to gain consensus," we will lose years and stop the cleanup progress. There is a lot on the table that needs to go forward.

COMMENT: Ecology supports going forward with the work.

COMMENT: So therefore, important cleanup should go forward. We need to say that we made the best effort to get participation, we may be wrong in the path we have chosen, but I am going to make it happen and we will adjust as more information becomes available in the future.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

Mr. Jim Owendoff, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, will be here next week. Michael Graham and Rich Holten are right now in a meeting to work on the agenda for his visit. Mr. Owendoff asked that we provide him with some background information so that when he is here he can ask the proper questions. That information is being put together right now and will provide past history, issues, management and policy for the GW/VZ Project. We anticipate some of the questions Mr. Owendoff will ask will be regarding budget and why we need an additional \$5-10M in 1999. Whether we agree on the entire package or not we need to agree on 1-3 pieces that we can move out on. We can say we don't have a full consensus, but we can move forward in these areas.

Mr. Owendoff will also hear that we are not in agreement on all things relating to policy, but we have agreement on characterization of vadose zone or tank farms, or that composite analysis work is something we should move out on in the System Assessment Capability, etc. If we are totally disjointed, then we will be in tough shape in getting help with the budget in 1999. As long as I have worked on some of these projects, I have never worked on one that has been in full agreement. The greatest success comes if we can find 1-3 things we want to move forward on to starting rolling and then we will go beyond that.

I do know that we have agreed on a few things we think are important. If we don't ask for those things, we are going to lose out, and we don't want to do that, because we have all invested too much energy into this project. This is how the program works and we all know that. We will share the outline of the Owendoff backup document so that others who may be attending will know what Mr. Owendoff will be asking for. Whether we agree on every piece, we should lock in on the things we can agree to and make sure that the message is heard loud and clear on the things in 1999 that would add benefit.

COMMENT: I assume that the Expert Panel will have some comments on technical issues.

RESPONSE: Yes, they will.

COMMENT: A lot of issues will be surfacing in the meeting. I would think that the Expert Panel would have some technical guidance on what we might do.

ANSWER: Some of them are just getting on the boat for this Project and the Site. There will be a lot of "why" questions, such as "why does Tank Farms do that, or why does ER do that." The answer will need to be more than it was recommended in the CRCIA. We need to be able to stand up and say what we should move forward on, and that needs to be clear and concise.

COMMENT: Michael Graham has just arrived. Maybe he can give us more details for the Jim Owendoff Meeting.

ANSWER: The agenda is not yet set. An agenda was put together that covered proposed topics. It looks like we are going to have to juggle things a bit. What Mr. Owendoff really wants to do is get into the project and understand what we are thinking, what capabilities we have here, and what issues we are wrestling with. Some of the kinds of things I wanted to present would be to start a discussion around CRCIA, the composite analysis, the RPE work of Jacobs, and what we know from all of this and where are we headed. Mr. Owendoff wants to look at everything from a site-wide perspective. He does want to hear from TWRS and understand their thinking and rationale for drilling.

COMMENT: We talked earlier to split out and move forward on what we can move forward on and identify the things we are stuck on, defining whether they fall into technical issues or policy issues. There are a lot of people who are not playing right now. Whoever is taking care of the agenda needs to be sure that they have some time with Mr. Owendoff. We hope that a portion of his time will be set aside for that.

ANSWER: The impression received from Mr. Owendoff is that he wanted to roll up his sleeves and talk "trash" as he calls it with the technical people. We need to work with Rich Holten to set aside time for these other issues that are more difficult than the technical issues. We will want to hear from EPA and Ecology from a regulatory perspective and what their recent activities have been, their future direction, and their current plans. He doesn't want to see that integration is putting parts into a bag. Clearly we need to have time to bring in the people that are feeling disenfranchised.

COMMENT: The scope still sounds like transport and we don't hear about dose response. I don't hear that we have our arms around the whole scope, and it is definitely transport oriented.

COMMENT: This is the wrong forum to propose changing regulations. They are what they are. I am encouraged that the NRC is looking at things, although it will be years before the regulators have authority to revise things.

COMMENT: But we are not hearing enough about the loss of containment and how the tanks behave.

RESPONSE: The lumping of behavior of all sources is part of inventory. We will look at transport and the breakdown of transport.

COMMENT: There has been a lot of work in TWRS to address those issues.

COMMENT: I would like to be educated later regarding the Jacobs Engineering work.

RESPONSE: Where do we want to leave this? We are pulling together background material for Mr. Owendoff, which has to be sent to Headquarters by Thursday. Our desire is for the agenda for his meeting next week to be open. There have been formal requests to participate. We have not yet heard from Mr. Owendoff to see if that is his desire as well. We have an 11:30 meeting tomorrow in which we will bring up these issues.

QUESTION: Once we get this document out, can we send a request to Karen to request a copy?

ANSWER: Yes, let Karen know and we will get it to you.

EXPERT PANEL MEETINGS:

The agenda for the Expert Panel Meetings on September 15-17 is attached. We are going to have Shirley Rawson summarize the roadmapping process and where we are today. CRCIA has 15 minutes and the Umatilla Tribal Nation has requested some specific time in the morning because of conflicts in the afternoon. Fred Mann will update the Panel on the SX Tank Farm issues and recommendations. We will summarize the basic technical challenges with a discussion, module by module, of what the project faces. It will be at a very high level to make sure they have a broad view of where we are.

Dru has talked to a lot of people inviting them to come and share their perspectives and to orient and educate the panel members. She has not yet heard from Ecology. Possibly Stan Leja or Casey Ruud could update the Panel on the SX Panel work. We would like to make sure that Ecology is on the schedule for Thursday morning.

COMMENT: Ecology would like to have some time with the panel at 9:00 a.m. Thursday, but 10:00 a.m. would also work.

Thank you. Wednesday will be a site tour, both internal site and external site. They want to look at the Hanford formation and see what the geology is like.

Thursday is a wrap-up with the Panel where they will respond to what they think, how they want to participate in the future, and how they can be effective in helping us solve our problems. Because some people weren't sure that they could come back on Thursday for the wrap-up, we will post the summary on our website.

ALVAREZ UPDATE: While Michael Graham was in D.C. last week, he heard the information that Bob Alvarez was leaving. He had not heard or seen any hint of that happening while he was there. Since hearing that Bob is leaving we have been trying to trace down more information. We haven't been able to talk directly to Bob, but DOE has taken an action to get back to the HAB with a status of this situation. In speaking with Mary Harmon, she was not aware of it, so we don't know if it is a fait accompli, or if Undersecretary Richardson has asked for everyone's resignation.

COMMENT: The HAB must have thought there was something sinister in the situation.

COMMENT: The paper said that DOE-RL was involved in his resignation because it was felt there was disagreement between DOE-HQ and DOE-RL issues.

RESPONSE: Mary Harmon has a call into Ellen Livingston to see if she can find out what is going on. We will keep you informed as we find out more details.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

We have attached the six-week look ahead calendar so that you are aware of upcoming events.

Regarding the Owendoff visit, we have received a letter from Russell Jim requesting that it be an open process. Are there other recommendations for orchestration? We know that he wants technical issues. Should we set aside a couple of hours for public discussion at the end?

COMMENT: Some stakeholders have raised concerns about the ability to talk from their standpoint.

RESPONSE: I believe that everything will be open.

COMMENT: As far as the technical perspective from the stakeholders, that was the essence of the Yakama letter, and they will be happy to participate in giving their perspective.

ACTION:

Set up working groups that will resolve what category comments fall into, either technical or policy.

NOTE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Agenda - GW/VZ Project Monday Status Meeting - September 14, 1998 meeting
- 2) Tentative Agenda - GW/VZ Expert Panel Meetings - September 15-17, 1998
- 3) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Chris Abraham, GAO
Steve Alexander, Ecology
Marty Bensky, HAB
John Brodeur, Mactec-ERS
Bob Bryce, PNNL
Dru Butler, BHI
Jack Donnelly, Ecology
Dib Goswami, Ecology
Jim Hanson, DOE-RL
Harold Heacock, Tridac
Dave Holland, Ecology
Mike Hughes, BHI
Gary Jewell, BHI
Tony Knepp, BHI

Fred Mann, FDNW
Wayne Martin, HAB
Katy McKeig, SMS, Inc.
John Murphy, DOE-RL
David Olson, DOE-RL
Tom Page, PNNL
Marilyn Quadrel, PNNL
Wade Riggsbee, YIN
Gordon Rogers, HAB
Casey Ruud, Ecology
Ron Skinnerland, Ecology
Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL
Tom Woods, YIN

Attachment 1

**GW/VZ PROJECT MONDAY STATUS MEETING
SEPTEMBER 14, 1998 – 1:00 P.M.**

- AGENDA -

PROJECT REPORT:

- Project Specification
 - Project Specification Draft Document
 - Comments Received
- Public Involvement
 - Tribal Government and Public Communication Plan Draft Document
 - FY99 Monday Project Meetings

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

- Acting Assistant Secretary for Environment Restoration, James M. Owendoff Meetings (September 21-22)
- Expert Panel Kickoff Meetings (September 15-17 – Agenda Attached)

ISSUES/RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS

- Bob Alvarez Situation

UPCOMING EVENTS:

- See Attached 6-Week Look Ahead

Attachment 2
TENTATIVE AGENDA
GROUNDWATER VADOSE ZONE EXPERT PANEL:
FIRST MEETING, SEPTEMBER 15-17, 1998

<u>Tuesday, September 15</u>	<u>EMSL Assembly Room</u>
--Coffee--	7:30 am
• Welcome and Introductions: <i>[Holten]</i>	8:00 am
• Expert Panel Members	
• Integration Project Staff	
• GW/VZ Integration Project: <i>[Graham]</i>	8:30 am
• Why Does the Project Exist?	
• What is the Project's Mission?	
• Expert Panel's Role in the Project	
• Science and Technology Road Mapping <i>[Rawson]</i>	9:00 am
• CRCIA Team's Perspective <i>[Woods]</i>	9:45 am
• Umatilla Tribe Perspective <i>[tbd]</i>	10:00 am
--Break--	10:15 am
• Hanford Site History and Current Projects <i>[Wintczak]</i>	10:30 am
• SX Tank Farms <i>[Mann]</i>	11:00 am
• Tank Waste Retrieval Evaluation <i>[Nichols]</i>	11:30 am
--Lunch (Purchase/Brown Bag)--	12:00 pm
• Composite Analysis <i>[Kincaid]</i>	1:00 pm
• Technical Challenges <i>[Knepp]</i>	1:45 pm
--Break--	2:15 pm
• Perspective from Stakeholders <i>[Butler]</i>	2:30 pm
• Questions and Open Discussion	4:00 pm
• Agenda for Wednesday	4:30 pm
--Reception (tentative)--	5:00 pm

Wednesday morning, September 16, is reserved for the Expert Panel members to tour the Hanford Site. The group will meet at 7:30 am in Room 2D01 of the Bechtel Building, located at 3350 George Washington Way, for badging and an introduction to the tour [Fecht]. The tour will return in the early afternoon (box lunches will be provided for the tour group).

<u>Wednesday afternoon, September 16</u>	<u>EMSL Assembly Room</u>
• Questions: Open Discussion	2:30 pm
• Working Session for Panel Members	3:00 pm

<u>Thursday, September 17</u>	<u>EMSL Assembly Room</u>
• Working Session for Panel Members continued...	[as req'd]
• Comments from the Panel <i>[Berkey]</i>	10:00 am
• Closing Remarks from the Project <i>[Holten, Graham]</i>	11:00 am
• Adjourn	12:00 pm

Attachment 3

6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD
SEPTEMBER 14, 1998 – OCTOBER 23, 1998
GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT

<i>September 14</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>September 15-17</i>	1998 Kickoff meeting with Expert Panel – PNNL’s Environmental Molecular Sciences Lab – Assembly Room 9/15 7:30-4:30 Orientation Meeting – 4:30-7:30 Reception 9/16 1:00-3:00 Challenges/Open Discussion 9/17 10:00-12:00 Comments/Path Forward from the Panel
<i>September 21</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>September 21-22</i>	Owendoff Project Review
<i>September 24-25</i>	Nevada Vadose Zone Monitoring Workshop (Sponsored by DOE Nevada Operations) Las Vegas, NV
<i>September 28</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>October 5</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>October 12</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>October 19</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room