

Meeting Minutes

062435

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 - SEPTEMBER 21, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE September 22, 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: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 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 21, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room (agenda attached).

PROJECT REPORT:

AL YOUNG VISIT TO HANFORD: On Wednesday and Thursday, September 23-24, Al Young from the Center for Risk Excellence will be here at Richland. We are setting up meetings for people to spend time with him. Tony Knepp is setting up the agenda and will include time with DOE-RL and the Tribal Nations. There aren't going to be any big meetings, rather we will have small one-on-one working meetings. If anyone would like to be on the agenda, and have not yet been contacted, please let either Michael Graham (372-9179) or Tony Knepp (372-9189) know.

QUESTION: Did he express an interest in meeting with Oregon?

ANSWER: He did not, but we can make arrangements for him to meet with you.

COMMENT: Oregon is extremely busy right now and we have budget constraints that will make it difficult to travel to meet with Mr. Young.

RESPONSE: We can make arrangements for a telephone conversation if that would be helpful.

COMMENT: Please do so.

COMMENT: On Thursday Gordon Rogers would like to meet briefly with Mr. Young. Marty Bensky would like to sit in on that conversation.

OWENDOFF VISIT TO HANFORD: As most of you are aware, Mr. Jim Owendoff will be here at Hanford for a project review on Monday and Tuesday, September 21 and 22. The Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project will be meeting with him all day Tuesday. That meeting will be open and will begin at 7:00 a.m. and be held in Bechtel's Assembly Room at 3350 George Washington Way. The purpose of the meeting is to get Mr. Owendoff up to speed on the technical issues we are dealing with. It will not include presentations, but will instead be one-on-one dialogs on the issues. This will be an odd meeting in the respect that it will consist of a dialog between Mr. Owendoff and another person. That is not like our typical project meetings. Originally, Mr. Owendoff wanted to meet with various offices and sit down with a modeler at his machine and see what is being done, but that isn't the way it is going to work.

QUESTION: Isn't Ecology going to be with Mr. Owendoff around 1:00 p.m.?

ANSWER: Yes. Ecology will talk about the project at that time. Mr. Owendoff wants to understand the regulator perspective and where you stand with characterization. He will be asking a lot of questions on how much characterization is needed and why. He needs to hear where this project stands as a priority to Ecology since he has heard differing positions in the past.

QUESTION: So there is something set-up?

ANSWER: Yes.

Please review the agenda. We will spend about 2 hours focusing on the bigger picture and orient him on the conceptual model of the site. We provided him with some background material on Friday of last week. We have limited copies of the document available today. If you would like a copy, please call Karen (372-9236) and request one.

QUESTION: What is in the document?

ANSWER: It is a write-up on what we know today, what has been done in the past in regards to characterization, a summary of each technical element and where we stand with uncertainties, and some of things from the roadmaps that aren't complete. Basically, what it is a snapshot of where we are today. By the end of the month we expect to have draft roadmaps out, but we were unable to put that in the document that was sent. It was assembled very quickly and is very roughly put together. You will notice that there are tables without any text references and text referencing tables that don't exist in the document. It is hard to read at this point, but provides good background for Mr. Owendoff to ask questions.

QUESTION: So basically it was throwing together as much information as was available, the best you could in a short time frame, so that Mr. Owendoff would be able to get up to speed to ask some questions?

ANSWER: It was a big effort to pull the information together and get it out the door. Now that we have produced it, we will need to determine how it fits in. At the very least it will be a resource document for preparing the Long Range Plan.

COMMENT: Please send a copy to Dirk Dunning.

COMMENT: It is too bad that Al Young can't be here since we are still missing that part of the analysis.

COMMENT: Risk is too broad, but it is the effects we need to define.

RESPONSE: Michael Graham met with Al Young on September 11 and encouraged him not to come during the Owendoff meetings because it wasn't the right venue for what he wanted to accomplish.

COMMENT: We are not yet embracing the whole system effects.

RESPONSE: We want to move ahead to the last piece where we have an integrated characterization and assessment. Also, how we are going to work with the regulator community to come up with a strategy in content of negotiating the TWRS corrective action. That is the area where we would like Ecology to fit in. As we look at the Long Range Plan ahead for this project, we will be negotiating with Ecology at the same time, and to some degree it will be interlocked. We need to hear from Ecology what they are looking at for negotiation.

QUESTION: What issues are we talking about?

ANSWER: TPA milestones.

QUESTION: No remediation?

ANSWER: It will lead into that.

COMMENT: We have identified several things on TWRS that we want to see; characterization, contamination extent and transport, remediation integration measures, the opportunity to establish drivers for this program, high level drivers for characterization of TWRS and this program. We haven't been able to talk with Roger because he has been out of the office, but we will start those discussions next week.

RESPONSE: If you can summarize the important points of the project that would be helpful. He needs an appreciation of the 200 Area characterization.

QUESTION: So what are you looking for from Ecology?

ANSWER: A path forward on negotiation. We need to hear why you value characterizations in the 200 Area and why it is important. Mr. Owendoff understands the regulatory process, but he needs to see why we recommend drilling holes, how many, and other points you want to make. He needs you

to put the importance of this project in perspective. That is one thing that is in question, the priority of the projects. What do the regulators see? That is what we are looking for.

COMMENT: My understanding is that he is very specific about saying he does want to hear about TWRS and how they are looking at the vadose zone as an open project. One of my thoughts is that we talk about milestones/regulator path forward. Maybe each project has a regulatory path forward and some are already along that path, but what we are missing for this project is not well defined, and we need to work as a team to define it. How do you put it in a process framework? What is the process framework? Typically, most of us are only familiar with a couple of processes. Maybe what we are talking about is that each project is on a regulatory framework and there isn't an overall framework for the site. That needs to be defined by this team. We don't want to throw out the others, they have pieces that are valuable, but we need to frame it on what is the framework for the entire site. If we don't do that, you will continue to loop around and nothing will ever be done. If this team doesn't do it, no one will.

COMMENT: I want to endorse what was just said. So many have worked on this that have said that the various and separate projects and process are inadequate to address the whole site and the concerns of the potentially effected population, much less the ecological impacts. If we restrict ourselves to regulatory issues then we are not being responsive to what we need to be responsive to.

COMMENT: When we started with the canyon disposition we said that everybody owned a different piece, but what we are going to do for the final disposition needs to be laid out, the pluses and minuses of all the guidelines. That needed to be decided up front so we could then follow a process that we had locked into. Otherwise, we would have separate courses. We need to have a framework where everyone would recognize we have stepped through the framework. I'm not suggesting throwing out the laws and regulations, but we need to come to a decision up front of our framework and then start down that path.

QUESTION: Is part of the framework the path forward?

ANSWER: It is and it is what I intended to cover in our integrated assessment path forward. Right now we don't have an integrated path forward. We can say what our intent is with input from the stakeholders and regulators, but only in general.

Another thing we will emphasize is our long-term strategy, which will be complete in December. I suspect that it will take a couple of iterations to hit on something we can stick with. Adjustments will have to be made. Even in ER, the long-term plan took 2-3 iterations. Headquarters has the expectation that we will set-up some kind of master plan for the next 15 years. I suspect that we will have a different understanding after some modeling is done that will take us down some different directions. We want to make sure that they are aware that we won't have all the details of an ER Long Range Plan.

COMMENT: If there are two visitors who are walking in cold to this project, the first thing they need to see is a cartoon which says, "Here is our system. Characterization flows from this and identifies things where we need greater knowledge." It sounds like you are plunging in a little downstream of that.

COMMENT: Steve, I desire to know why the regulators have more of a thirst for knowledge on characterization rather than focusing on things as an integration project. The process is really important. We can debate all we want, but we need a process to get to where we want to go.

COMMENT: Following on that thought, I suggest when you are looking at regulations and their applications that issues and concerns of others may not be taken into account. That is a delta that needs to be identified, and a decision needs to be made on how we will deal with it.

ANSWER: I suspect that those things will fall out real quick as we move down the path.

COMMENT: One thing that I would hope you would not do is get down in the leaves. There has to be a policy level on how this integration will occur and what we are trying to do. At the core of that is the assessment and how we integrate the various programs. If you head off in the canyons you will run down a blind alley.

RESPONSE: It was just an example.

Are there any more comments on the Owendoff agenda? If there is nothing else, then please mark your calendars that 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. as an open time for people to provide their perspective and input on the project. Keep in mind that Mr. Owendoff has to catch a plane at 7:00 p.m., so things cannot run over.

COMMENT: Sounds like it will be an open process and people's thoughts about the subjects will be expressed as we go through them.

RESPONSE: This will not be handled like our typical project meetings. Mr. Owendoff will be talking to individuals.

QUESTION: Can stakeholders get involved in the discussions?

ANSWER: Michael Graham will be acting as a traffic cop to manage the process so we can get through all the agenda items for the day. There may be opportunities for comments, but if they get too lengthy he may have to ask if they can be held to the end. I suspect that they will be more one-on-one discussions where Mr. Owendoff can ask questions of say Lockheed management, for an example. Michael will be tasked with keeping things moving ahead and apologizes ahead of time if things have to be cut off. However, if you really disagree with something that is being said, make sure Mr. Owendoff knows and that there is an opportunity to address your concern.

COMMENT: It looks like from 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. it will be discussions on technical decisions; S&T Roadmaps, data gaps and those kinds of issues, including what the National Labs are doing and where we stand now on site.

PROJECT SPECIFICATION: Last week we talked about going through some of the areas that are hard spots and making an attempt of putting them in the appropriate bin of either technical, policy, and budget. We would like to work this afternoon to put things in context when Owendoff is here, as well as for Dr. Moniz when he goes to the Government Accountability Project Conference on October 2-3. We would like to try moving ahead off of dead center.

COMMENT: If we can start sorting things out and then assigning some actions it would be helpful. No one is going to resolve these issues for us, not even Mr. Owendoff. We need to do some sorting and then give some actions as step one. It probably won't be perfect, and you won't get everything binned in one shot, but it will be a start.

COMMENT: If you don't have a high level analysis done (for example a sensitivity analysis like Jacobs just completed) then you haven't got a gap analysis. No matter how sharp the experts are it can't be focused until this thing is strategized and has an architecture. Without that, no one can tell where the real thin spots are in our understanding.

RESPONSE: Is this a semantics thing? I believe all of us agree that we need to put together a top level analysis that we can all agree on what needs to be done so that people who look at the vadose zone won't say they don't understand.

COMMENT: You don't know how relevant something is until you have the whole picture. You have to know what the contributors to contamination are.

QUESTION: Should we call it something else so that it doesn't lead to misunderstanding?

COMMENT: The obvious things are just that, obvious, but once you go beyond 2 millimeters no one knows how deep to go.

RESPONSE: I agree, but if you wait until you study everything then you waste a lot of time. We have some things that we know are right to get started on and Mr. Owendoff will have questions on what those things are. We know that conceptually we have learned a lot, and there are some things we can move out on.

COMMENT: When the experts talk about what they need to know, that's fine. We need to put it on the table. But in the same context, we need to nail down what we don't know and say what we need.

RESPONSE: A gap consists of two things. First, identification of technical unknowns, and second, to put things in context and relevance.

COMMENT: It troubles me that the only impact identified thus far is human cancer. Cultural values need to be on the table. I will give my regular sermon on dose response. We have major data gaps in understanding.

COMMENT: You could also have the other direction which says that data is below the noise threshold, and if that is so you will never figure it out.

RESPONSE: Help me understand what has been said. I heard two things. I heard a policy and program process issue which states that you must make sure you arrive at a gaps analysis and understand how you do that, and that isn't fixed. Also, there has been some specific work already done by technical experts, and whatever that technical expert came up with there is a question that their focus is only on their work. We need to have a discussion on how we will handle things when we disagree. How things will be clarified and resolved is another process issue. Those are two issues that we have identified that need binning.

COMMENT: Analysis has to compute something that hasn't been defined.

COMMENT: True. CRCIA was to help us figure out those things and help us focus our effort on the appropriate pieces.

COMMENT: But there isn't a process with CRCIA, it is a set of priorities.

RESPONSE: Let's try to capture some of these things and bin them.

COMMENT: I would like some response from Rich of what we are trying to do here. It seems that we are having recurring discussions of the same things. The issues come up and nothing happens. I would like to hear if you have thought about the process that is needed to manage these issues. We have been identifying them for months. We don't have a problem identifying problems. What we have not defined is how we are going to resolve them.

RESPONSE: The suggestion was made last week that we needed to bin the issues and set-up some groups to deal with them individually, both regulatory and technical issues. If there are some things where we get stuck, then let's jump them up and see if the mission of the project will assist us.

We need your help. Things on this project have a tendency to get mashed together, and it is difficult to see how they fit together.

COMMENT: There may be some things that Rich can't touch. He won't be the right person to resolve them and may need to take them higher up, such as Wagoner.

COMMENT: That is why we want to identify the issues so that we can identify those that no one in the room can resolve.

COMMENT: One of the hard spots seems to be that we can identify policy or technical issues, but it is difficult keeping an issue resolved. If we are going to set-up groups to resolve issues then we have to be willing to stick to the decisions made and move forward with the resolution.

COMMENT: Maintaining the answers are as difficult as coming to the answers.

RESPONSE: It depends on the way you want to go. I understand the conversation and it is not new. Remember what we had to do for the TPA process. That had huge, tough issues and decisions, and resolution started with project teams. If they couldn't resolve them, they had a tendency to go to "never-never land," and when they went to a higher level they couldn't really resolve them either. So as a result the IMIT team came together, which was the stop in between. We hear that the Sight Management Board is where we need to take issues that can't be resolved, but I don't think they are the right venue. We need to decide on a diverse group of several level management decision makers equivalent to an IMIT that will help us resolve issues. I have never seen a successful project that drives the decision making to the top because nothing is ever resolved. Things don't get done in that kind of process. We need to work on that piece. I don't think we have defined who solves problems in this project process.

COMMENT: If we propose a sitting team, then it should be something you can kick problems up to, either documents or issues, which will provide an internal assessment to see if it can be resolved at a meeting with that team.

RESPONSE: You have to have an issue owner. Someone who is present to defend it and then all must agree that we will live with the consensus. That is really hard to do. But we need to define where we take things if we don't agree. Right now it just sits here and it doesn't go anywhere. We have a heck of a team here and we need to get a hold on this process.

COMMENT: Part of the problem is that this integration effort has no authority. I find myself agreeing with Marty's statement last week when he said that a few stakeholders are holding this whole thing hostage. That is what is happening because this group doesn't have authority. HTI is doing their characterization, the ER project may reach a proper feasibility study of the crib sites and ponds they are going after next year, but how can you do a good feasibility if we don't have a good assessment of overall risk and understand migration through the vadose zone? We have the TWRS and ILAW programs doing characterization work that they believe they have the answers to, but I don't believe that we have the answers and we certainly don't understand contaminant migration. All those things need to be integrated through this project, but this project has no authority and so everybody is stove piped. Until the question of authority is resolved and it involves the other projects and groups, this project isn't going to go anywhere.

RESPONSE: The authority issues come within the project team as well. What responsibility do we have? I don't think it is any different than any other project I have worked on. This is the toughest issue on site overall for this project. You want to know how you start getting authority. You can write all the letters you want, but it doesn't do any good unless you start with the people in this room coming to an agreement on a couple of very specific things, and you present to the entire site that you can take on the authority and begin assuming that authority. You can never get it by putting it on a piece of paper. We have hundreds of issues. It has been my experience that if you can agree on a couple of things and take those items on with consensus and begin driving forward, that you will assume authority. Otherwise, no one is really going to give it to you.

COMMENT: Please capture that there are a number of issues on the site, which members of this team have raised, that we want to review. I don't think there is anything stopping us from doing that. My expectation is that this team will tell us what to do on site. The regulators are working on these projects and we can get a set of questions answered and that may be the place to start. We need to capture the issues and try to resolve them. There are things that need to be done right now on site and we have questions on priorities and scope that need to be answered. (Steve Alexander)

COMMENT: One mind set you will run up against is that people in power, say at the K-Basin clean-up, will say they are top priority. We know vitrification is a high priority. Others will say we don't need an impact assessment to say what needs to be done. An impact assessment is great, if it is timely, but while we quarrel the people who feel they know what they are doing are going to run ahead.

RESPONSE: Priority of the project is a policy issue.

COMMENT: If it serves the purpose, put priority of the project as an issue, but I think it is a matter of perspective. I know most people, and I don't think they would argue, would support those matters on site that have to do with eminent hazards, such as getting the liquid out of the tanks or

minimizing and eliminating contamination from the tanks. On that our focus should be fixed. Beyond that, there isn't a defensible basis for anything else. Trying to get a handle on a perspective and analysis is what is the concern and prevailing view of most. We need the tool to allow us to do that which will give us a defensible basis for the decision being made.

COMMENT: The issue of stakeholder involvement and how involved everyone will be in the process should be added.

RESPONSE: I think that what we are really talking about are the roles and responsibilities in the decision making process. Something else we are sitting on is the draft Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan and its underlying issues. It goes back to the regulatory process and who makes the decisions.

QUESTION: Excuse my ignorance, this is my first time here, but I am confused. Who are the decision makers within this project?

COMMENT: We have been told that the decisions makers are the SMB.

QUESTION: No. I am asking, within this project, who are the decision makers?

RESPONSE: I can concur or not concur on decisions made. (Rich Holten)

QUESTION: Who are you concurring with?

COMMENT: The overall money on site is with the SMB.

COMMENT: Ecology will be a decision maker under the TPA on primary documents.

COMMENT: That hasn't been discussed until recently.

RESPONSE: This question is the same as who solves what, and that is why we are stuck on a lot of things.

QUESTION: I need a yes or no, is Rich Holten a decision maker?

COMMENT: There are many decision makers. Many decisions will lie within the projects and what the contractors are doing.

QUESTION: What is the role of the Tribal Nations and the stakeholders?

COMMENT: Whoever the decision makers are, the potentially effected people of how Hanford is handled will either decide to let it go forward or to stop it. I don't know how you want to address decision makers, but the issue of decision makers comes back to credibility. There must be the right mix of objective management, intermixed with oversight boards and peer reviews. Whatever the combination is, we are still awaiting the design of the structure that says decisions make sense. At that point we will know who the decision makers are, from time to time they will be different, but we need the design of how it intermixes to answer the question of decision makers.

COMMENT: DOE will receive conflicting advice from various stakeholders and DOE is responsible for carrying out the task. They are responsible to make the necessary decisions.

COMMENT: Finding common ground is not easy, but unless we have that, we will have a constant morass. We must find common ground.

RESPONSE: Capture these issues and we will work them at our next meeting, or we can form groups that will address the issues.

COMMENT: One thing in particular we need to work out is the mission of the project. Integration of CRCIA is a central focus. One of the things we worked on in the past is the CRCIA White Paper, which was criticized by some. We were told that a revised White Paper would be forthcoming, but we have not yet seen it for a second look, and it is one of the central pieces we need to look at.

COMMENT: Ecology needs it clearly written down who the decisions makers are, specifically what they make decisions on, and the name of the responsible parties.

QUESTION: I would like clarification on the point made regarding the architecture approach. What exactly do you mean?

COMMENT: In order to answer the policy issues you have to step back and say, is this project, as defined, going to follow the TPA guidelines and if it is not, then what is it following. What we are doing then is making up our own framework, and that is hard to do. Whatever the process framework is, once it is defined the other issues will fall out quickly.

COMMENT: Credibility is still the least defined, but is something that comes up over and over again.

RESPONSE: Include general acceptance or credibility.

QUESTION: Technical gap methodology, gap process, how do you evolve?

RESPONSE: We need to have agreement on what we are going to do next year. We don't need to define how, but we need to agree on what. Those are the components that establish credibility and says that this is what we are going to do and this is where the money should go.

RESPONSE: We will be beginning the next fiscal year soon and we need agreement on some general descriptions of what we will accomplish next year. What are the 5-6 items where we plan to spend our money? Having a consensus on that would be valuable.

COMMENT: The work plan cannot be decided until there is a conceptual study and that takes three years, which is what CRCIA advocates.

RESPONSE: But that will be a parallel process.

QUESTION: What does the System Assessment Capability look like? What are the elements? What are the performance measures? What is it the module will calculate and when is it developed beyond human impact?

COMMENT: We need the gap analysis and an uncertainty model, which will lead us back into the gap analysis. We need a total approach, not just FY99.

COMMENT: We need to decide for the whole life of the project, and we must have a conceptual grip on the whole thing.

COMMENT: It is a policy issue to what degree this project integrates with the site. We must have tie-ins to the site decision making process. Relative timing is critical to when those decisions are made.

QUESTION: What are we doing here? Is it adding any value? We have heard this all before and it has been written down again and again. I like what I see on the board regarding the technical issues, I would like to see more, specifically, what can we do to help clean-up on site and help protect the resources.

COMMENT: Hanford is complicated. We are sharing some of the blame. When I first heard that this project was beginning I was hoping to hear about a technical process with authority on site to make the site projects accountable, which is needed in this project and across the entire site. If I was managing an EPA site and Ecology was managing a project which was entwined with mine, then it would be my responsibility to interface with them. Ultimately, the authority and accountability to make it work rests with all of those accountable, and it would be my duty to coordinate with others involved in my project. Now we are working with the 200 Area on strategies for integrating. We know that the project is suppose to come up with something, but as far as our feeling of responsibility and being accountable, we are not talking with one another. This project is a middle man that allows site specific projects to not accept accountability for integrating. I am disappointed. We are not integrating and we need to accept responsibility for making it happen.

This is a point that we need to understand, the interfaces between this project and those who provide information and recommendations. The responsibility for that needs to go back to DOE. Do we have someone from HTI, ILAW or the CERCLA 200 Area here? No. Maybe this needs to be done at the DOE level because I don't see the right interfaces here. What are the different programs doing? People should be telling this group what their decisions are and where they are going with their programs. Everything should be run through this group.

RESPONSE: Can this be captured in the FY99 approach? How we make decisions in FY99 should give you a clue if we are heading down the right road.

COMMENT: What I am saying is that this group should have a say in how the money is spent, the budgeting, and what is being done in FY99 to a certain extent. DOE should instigate resolution of that.

COMMENT: I agree, but what are we measuring it against? We need a baseline that we are measuring it against.

COMMENT: I understand that we can't jump in and say we now have authority, but there needs to be a start.

QUESTION: What would my basis be?

RESPONSE: It would be handled in the FY99 approach.

COMMENT: We need a common direction for understanding the vadose zone and right now each program has their own vision on what they need to know and where they need to go to get it, so there isn't any integration.

COMMENT: Supporting impact assessment is not the only thing on most projects plates. The other way of thinking is setting aside TPA commitments that don't support the project. We need a general theme so you don't forget why you are here.

RESPONSE: We have general principles to evaluate. If we had a Long Range Plan we could see how it all fits in. Until we have that we need to have some principles to evaluate if we support a project.

COMMENT: We need a list of what they are. Number 1 would be TPA milestones that we need to make an effort to meet. Number 2 would be to decide if the end point supports the end state.

COMMENT: I suspect that if this group isn't careful, they'll confront management of the whole site and not get anywhere. It would be a monumental achievement to just run an assessment and lay them out to the projects. Just doing that would be a monumental achievement. The other question would be trying to decide how to run it right, and if you take that approach then you can't move forward.

COMMENT: I agree. Today we have integration in name only. There is no functional integration.

COMMENT: I don't understand what the project is about. We need to agree on that one thing.

COMMENT: The point is that there isn't any process.

QUESTION: No process to define the project?

COMMENT: No process for integration, we must define the priorities.

RESPONSE: Where are we going with this?

RESPONSE: This is the team that is suppose to run this project. We need feedback on the time, direction and support needed to be effective. Next week, I suggest that we work together to define some policy decisions and set-up some groups to work on the technical issues, which is the stuff on the site we need to integrate. Then we need to tackle the roles of who will be responsible. We need to clarify how the project is managed. We all agree that it needs to be managed and there needs to be a core to make sure that happens.

COMMENT: I suggest that to move forward there are two or three pressing policy issues. First would be FY99 funding. The fiscal year is ready to start and there are deliberations of where the money goes. We need to talk about that in the next week and see if we can hit on a couple of items. Second would be to resolve the issue around travel reimbursement. That cannot be done here on site. John Wagoner has made a statement on that which says that site policy is, that beyond the HAB, travel money will not be provided. So if that continues to be an issue, it needs to be raised to Mr. Owendoff.

RESPONSE: We need to come prepared next week to talk about the issues that have been raised. Those that are of top priority are the FY99 approach and the authority of the project.

COMMENT: That is fine, but I would recommend reviewing the funding in the next week or so. If funding isn't defined shortly we will be in a morass, including the FY99 work plans. The other matter is that of the technical approach and what is necessary to begin to get at the gaps.

RESPONSE: We can handle one and not the other. Regarding the FY99 situation, there are a couple of things we can do. We can pick a handful of principles we want to use. We don't have the Long Range Plan and vision right now, we could scratch something up within the team, and we have thought about doing that with the involvement of the regulators and those involved in the TPA milestones. It would be a crash effort looking at things in the longer term. If we can't do that, we need to look at a short window and say here are the principles for the project for next year. I am amiable for a team laying out this project and how it fits in with other things.

COMMENT: I'm all for the bullets listed under technical issues and having a long range strategy to show how it all fits together to proceed. We need to know those key decisions of when and what are the key concerns for stakeholders. We need to know what the scientists say. I don't think we have all those things today, but we need those questions answered.

RESPONSE: What we need is a logic diagram for the project. We need it to provide resource loading and estimating. A logic diagram would go a long way to telling us where we are at.

RESPONSE: We have thought a lot about that. I am amiable to talking a day and sitting down this week to schedule this out.

COMMENT: It should have been page two of the Project Specification.

COMMENT: It seems to me we are jumping around. Ecology is baffled over the deadlines for things on the DOE budget cycle. We have been told if we don't put together something defensible it will die. We are unconvinced that DOE will let that happen. I am concerned that we are going too fast, for the wrong reasons, on the strategy and conceptual models. I don't want to be trapped into finding the time before Wednesday to get this done. This project needs to be kept alive so that we can work on what needs to be done first. I don't want to fall into the bureaucracy trap. It is more important that we have the time to work this through carefully.

RESPONSE: Do you want me to give Lloyd Piper's speech or mine. I react strongly to what has been said. We have to face facts. There are a bunch of people asking for money here at the Hanford site. That is the plain fact. The quicker we come in with our request, the better chance we have of getting money. If we don't come in with a request, what chance do we have? This Thursday or Friday there will be a meeting looking at how to find the necessary funds for a shortfall. We need to make sure that there is a recommendation that they provide funding for at least part of what we need. Secondly, there is the chance for us to request supplemental funding, which will go away if we don't have a case for it. We have to face the facts that there is a press of time on us. I don't know the exact time, but we need to put together a story.

COMMENT: If that is the only way, then it will fail in FY99. I want to focus on the list for FY99. We have some things people want to work on. If we can get together as a solid force, then we will have an

overwhelming force to do the right thing, but I fear this thing will fail because you don't have support for it.

RESPONSE: Whether you join with me or not, I will push forward for supplement funding. If I don't have your support I will not have a great case for that request. We haven't built the roadmaps and we don't have the Long Range Plan and vision to know how it ties together, but I will still go forward. There may be some funding for generic things that may change, but we need to go forward with a request.

COMMENT: I want to build a team here and I want to hear what they have to say. This project is not driven by just DOE and Ecology.

RESPONSE: What do you want me to do? Do you want Mr. Owendoff to hold \$25M for this project? Will that hold us to the end of the fiscal year? What commitment do you want from DOE? Spell it out for me.

COMMENT: I can't answer that here, if that means failure, then we fail. I hope that we can pick a date to tackle these issues.

COMMENT: I agree with Steve.

RESPONSE: I am not declaring failure, Steve is declaring failure. We have a limited time frame to get money. If we don't acknowledge that, then the only thing we can ask for is a blank check and that won't fly.

COMMENT: You know that we all support this project. We all support the development of an assessment. We all agree that we don't have enough information on what is below the tanks. These things we know.

RESPONSE: The two things that have been related are on the list. We are asking for supplement funding for those items.

RESPONSE: We need to circle back. We are talking past each other. We need to have a commitment to get a team together to flush out a conceptual approach to the project. I can't commit to have that done this week, but I will start the process. A lot of thought has already been given to the framework and how it will fall together. What we are looking for is to have things put together and rationalized by the December time frame. What we have found is that if you pull on one thread you have a mess, but there are things we are presenting that are needed for supplemental funding and we will be sharing that with Mr. Owendoff. Hopefully, we can put that into the right bin and move ahead.

RESPONSE: What do we ask for from Mr. Owendoff? Do we ask for him to hold \$10M until December? Is that what you want us to ask for or is it another scenario?

COMMENT: Maybe that isn't the approach to take. If we collect the right information, we can create a request that will put together information from the right people on the site that can tell you what it will cost for the next year, and then you would know how much it would cost in FY99.

COMMENT: Then ask for it and show it to Mr. Owendoff.

COMMENT: We need to form a group of people to tackle this stuff.

RESPONSE: We have an important opportunity with Mr. Owendoff tomorrow, but I don't hear a specific request.

COMMENT: DOE is the lead agency and this team needs to say what we think is reasonable. As we get into the year, and the process goes along, we will often reprioritize and take areas where there are underruns and apply them to items of higher priority. That is how it evolves every year. FY2000 through 2002 is what we have to strategize right now or we won't get there. So tomorrow, with a lack of everyone signing off on a sheet of paper, we need as a project to ask for what is reasonable to fund the base plus the supplemental. As you know, we often come back and need to find money on the site and that is where we are right now. Tomorrow with Mr. Owendoff we have told him that we need \$10M for FY99 because \$2M won't get us where we need to go. The absolutes we don't know, but we do know that we need \$10M.

The CRCIA team has said that there is a formal cost estimate for DOE and Bechtel for this project. The Yakama Nation has given us guidelines on minimum funding. One member of the table has put in writing what the minimum funding should be and the multiple level of time and what the key deliverable should be. Oregon did the same for TWRS. We agree with the vast majority. We still need to work things out programmatically as to how and when. We don't have the specifics, but we do know the work that needs to be funded. We will present a case for \$10M.

QUESTION: Not a total program?

ANSWER: No, the total program is for \$41.8M.

QUESTION: What is the \$10M for.

ANSWER: I don't have the details in front of me, but to the best of my recollection \$10M will get TWRS to \$9M. We are recommending putting money in for peer reviews, finishing the roadmaps, \$2M for the System Assessment Capability, \$3M for characterization in the 200 Area. We are recommending \$1M for Conceptual Model development, which will answer key questions on inventory, and then \$1M for starting a Science and Technology initiative, which at this time we are uncertain what that is.

QUESTION: Did something accompany this one page sheet providing the backup of these figures in writing.

ANSWER: Some are well defined and others are not.

QUESTION: Could we rewrite the workscope element in the DWP? Delete the XXXX scope and stay with the XXX1?

ANSWER: There are other points of view that say we should fund everything in the TWRS vadose zone plan, which would require additional money. We have a concern about ramping up on funding.

COMMENT: Part of the problem is that the scoping statements and key assumptions you are used to seeing for the multi-year workplan with the ER project do not exist to that level of detail for this project. If that is what you are asking to see, we did not get to that level of detail, but I would expect that is where we need to go in the future.

COMMENT: I want to see this team succeed. If we are working on pieces that affect this project we need to share them with one another. That increases trust and credibility. That kind of information would be helpful to see. It was requested several times that we be able to see what was behind that one sheet paper on funding so we could better define it. (Steve Alexander)

RESPONSE: We were told not to do that and that is the path we followed.

QUESTION: Who gave that direction?

RESPONSE: Jack Donnelly said that we did not need to do that, I will talk with you after this meeting is over and give you more information regarding that.

COMMENT: A lot of the information we have received is disjointed. The very first 10 minutes of the DWP Meeting should have been a high level look. Because that did not happen, it raises comments and we run in circles in a dance.

RESPONSE: Is next Monday the best time to get back to the issues we have defined? I hope that the entire team will deal with those issues. We will get them typed up and send them to the regulators and project team so that conversations can be had before next Monday on how we should approach resolutions.

COMMENT: I suggest we each look at the issues and define who needs to be involved in them. Tom's issue needs to be considered to determine if we have the right people involved.

COMMENT: That kind of decision sounds like it will need to be made in a face-to-face meeting.

COMMENT: Dirk you need to be here.

COMMENT: In the closing comments on funding, particularly on what is on the one sheet piece of paper. If the assessment is the core of this project, as I believe the mission says it is, then that is not what that piece of paper reflects, even below the line. It is not oriented toward the assessment, so we can't agree. We need to think through the project approach, technical approach, and the conceptual design and the length of time we will take to build the funding accordingly. If there is less than \$6M for assessment, then it will die, because it won't show people what they want to see. This paper does not put the assessment in the middle of this project.

RESPONSE: We have flexibility with some of the items on the funding paper, and some we don't. I don't think anyone here wants to deflect money from the pump and treat.

COMMENT: You are right, but we shouldn't have to deflect money from the pump and treat to have the assessment.

RESPONSE: We have an additional \$10M and we will have some flexibility on how it is spent.

COMMENT: If there is a commitment, you wouldn't find it going to boreholes in the TWRS Project, you would find a focus on getting the funding for the assessment and the funding doesn't reflect that.

RESPONSE: We will write-up these issues and come back next week to work on them. We will set-up some working groups to work on the assessment.

COMMENT: We need to focus on the unsolved issues and some of the hierarchy to know where it gets pushed after the team gets done with it. The team may give recommendations that we can't do anything further as a project, so who does it go to and who will take it there and defend it.

Right now we have defined the following issues:

POLICY ISSUES	TECHNICAL ISSUES
• Authority of Project	• CRCIA Principles
• Priority of Project on Site	• Gap methodology (includes uncertainty)
• Perspective	• System conceptual model - elements? Performance measure
• Stakeholder Involvement - Roles & Responsibilities for Project decision making	• Effective interfaces between GW/VZ project and core projects
• Decision makers for GW/VZ Project	
• Assessment vs or include Management/ Integration	
• CRCIA (funding)	
• FY1999 2000, 2001 Approach and actions agreement	
• Establish process framework	
• Pay for travel (Owner Jim Owendoff)	
• Credibility	
• Tie-in to site decision making process - timing	

Other issues that need to be solved are:

WHO SOLVES	PROJECT ISSUES PATH FORWARD
• DOE	• Project Specification Comments
• Working groups - ad hoc (us)	• Draft Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan
• Site Management Board	• Workshops, letters, HAB, Committees, etc.
• GW/VZ Executive Committee (AM and Senior Contractors)	
• HQ	
• Ecology/EPA	
• Peer review/oversight	
• Peer review/oversight	
• Potentially effective people	

UPCOMING EVENTS:

Please review the 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached).

ACTIONS:

- Review the policy, technical, and project path forward issues to be able to discuss them at the 9/28 Project Weekly Meeting.
- Set up a meeting with Dirk Dunning of Oregon and Al Young via telephone.
- Send Dirk Dunning a copy of the Owendoff document.
- Provide a revised CRCIA White Paper.

NOTE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Agenda - GW/VZ Project Monday Status Meeting - September 21, 1998
- 2) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Steve Alexander, Ecology
Marty Bensky, HAB
John Brodeur, Mactec-ER
Bob Bryce, PNNL
Dru Butler, BHI
Dirk Dunning, Oregon
Dib Goswami, Ecology
Michael Graham, BHI
Dave Holland, Ecology
Rich Holten, DOE
Mike Hughes, BHI
Gary Jewell, BHI
Tony Knepp, BHI
Fred Mann, FDNW
David Olson, DOE
Tom Page, PNNL
Jim Poppiti, DOE
Tom Post, EPA
Wade Riggsbee, YIN
Gordon Rogers, HAB
Casey Ruud, Ecology
Phil Staats, Ecology
Terri Steward, PNNL
Ron Skinnerland, Ecology
Karen Strickland, BHI
Dan Tano, DOE
Janice Williams, FDH
Tom Wintczak, BHI
Tom Woods, YIN

Attachment 1

**GW/VZ PROJECT MONDAY STATUS MEETING
SEPTEMBER 21, 1998 – 1:00 P.M.**

- AGENDA -

PROJECT REPORT:

- Dr. Al Young, Center for Risk Excellence – Plans for visit to Hanford on 9/23-24
- Mr. Jim Owendoff meeting agenda (agenda attached) for 9/22 – 7am to 6pm – BHI Assembly Room
- Comment and Issue Resolution Approach (comments from Ecology attached)
- New TPA Milestone/Regulatory Path Forward

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

- Acting Assistant Secretary for Environment Restoration, James M. Owendoff Meeting (September 22)

UPCOMING EVENTS:

- See Attached 6-Week Look Ahead

Attachment 2

6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD
SEPTEMBER 21, 1998 - OCTOBER 23, 1998
GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT

<i>September 21</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>September 22</i>	Owendoff Project Review – 7am to 6pm – BHI Assembly Room
<i>September 23-24</i>	Visit to Hanford by Dr. Al Young, Center for Risk Excellence
<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