

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

062531

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING - SEPTEMBER 28, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE September 30, 1998

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Info Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING:

Date: October 5, 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 28, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

ISSUES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 21 MEETING: In the last couple of weeks we've struggled as a group with issues (Attachment 1), and we just keep coming back to them. We have to watch that we don't just focus on the negative. We need to remember to focus on the positive as well. There are clearly some policy issues that this Project brings to light, either issues specifically related to this Project or policy issues in general. We need to raise those up so they can be resolved. We've received a commitment from Ecology and others to get a team together to work the policy issues. We need to work out solutions to these issues as a team and not let these issues keep us from accomplishing our goals and getting on with the real work. We need work these while forging ahead focusing on the positives.

We had a discussion of how this Project moves ahead in the coming year. We're caught in a budget crack, where we are clearly needing to move ahead, but we only have a couple of million of dollars to accomplish it. Casey Ruud suggested that we move ahead with the Project while working the budget in parallel, and that is

how we are going to approach the Project for the first quarter of FY99. We need to focus on the things we need to move out on, and get people together that want to work with us to develop a strategy.

First, we know that we have a December deliverable to produce; the Long Range Plan. It's clear that this is due, and we've given a lot of thought to it. Second, we have to move out on the System Assessment Capability. We don't have a schedule on how to proceed as of today, but we will have the schedule in the near future. We also know that we have the S&T Roadmapping, Gaps Analysis, Expert Panel meetings, and National Academy of Sciences (NAS) coming up. The effort that's hooked to everything is the scrubbing of the work plans and the supplemental work that's being proposed.

If we can identify the policy issues that are blocking us, and figure out a way to handle those in a manner that doesn't bog down the technical work, then we will be on our way. I hope today to step out, take a deep breath, and take steps to resolve those issues.

COMMENT: I don't know if we are going to tackle the issues today so much as identify who wants to work, and create some teams to work these issues.

RESPONSE: The idea was to get EPA, Ecology, DOE, BHI, and all other interested Tribal Nations and stakeholders to make a commitment to work them.

COMMENT: I (Rich Holten) volunteer from the DOE-RL side. I'd like to ask the organizations here today to talk about it and let us know if you want to participate and who your representatives will be. I know that these are policy issues and some organizations might not want to become too involved with those. We want to request that the people at this meeting go back to their organizations and get back with us by the end of the week. These are the types of policy issues that will be covered, but of course there could be more.

RESPONSE: We're trying to figure out the issues and how they break down.

COMMENT: We can include the volunteers here who wish to participate in the policy issues in the meeting minutes, and then move on to the technical issues as well.

COMMENT: The idea is not to talk about the topics, but to determine which organizations want to work them.

COMMENT: We can get the names down of the people that are here now, get in touch with other organizations later, and then begin to work on process. We need to tackle the issues and see who we can get to work them.

RESPONSE: Let's go ahead and lump all of the policy issues together for the sake of building a team to confront them.

(NOTE: Individuals in parenthesis were confirmed or added on Tuesday 9/29)

Policy Issues Team

- Dru Butler – BHI – Team Lead
- Rich Holten – DOE
- Tom Post – EPA
- Steve Alexander – Ecology
- Wade Riggsbee – YIN
- Mike Hughes and/or Michael Graham – BHI
- Tom Page – PNNL

COMMENT: Oregon isn't here today. I'm certain that they will want to be involved. We will call them to invite them to participate. (Steve Sautter and Dirk Dunning confirmed 9/29)

COMMENT: Someone should also be included from PHMC. (Janice Williams confirmed 9/29)

QUESTION: Should someone from DOE-HQ be involved? Are Bob Alvarez or Mary Harmon still involved with the project?

ANSWER: We will contact them about participating.

COMMENT: Looking at some of these issues, maybe somebody from TWRS should be involved, as well the other projects.

RESPONSE: Rich Holten will take the lead and call people to set up the first meeting before next week's meeting. (Dru Butler is now the team lead. The first meeting was held on 9/30. The next meeting will be held immediately after the 10/5 Project Team Meeting.)

COMMENT: The technical issues need to be broken down, such as the System Assessment and the Master Plan.

RESPONSE: Everything here will fold into the technical elements.

STRATEGY /LONG RANGE PLAN What I want to do now is go through the schedule, approach, and deliverables for the Long Range Plan.

We've all seen in the paper the Master Plan idea from DOE-HQ. I've also heard it referred to by the stakeholders as the project logic, the project strategy, or the project focus. The key to being successful in building this will be meaningful involvement from the stakeholders, regulators, and Tribal Nations. The GW/VZ needs this plan in order to build a strategy and baseline to bring the project into focus.

We will draw from the ERC and TWRS Baselines as well as data from EM-50 to help pull this document together. The ERC Baseline would include information on 200 Area and Groundwater (GW) Remedial Action Assessments, GW Monitoring, GW Modeling, and GW/VZ Integration. The TWRS Baseline would include HTI, ILAW, and Vadose Zone Characterization. The EM-50 data would cover the System Assessment Capability, peer review, S&T Roadmaps and Implementation. The idea is to take that information as input to make a GW/VZ Strategy. That document would be a deliverable similar to the current Draft Strategy document, but revised and including a strategy section, S&T roadmap information, and a Project Logic Summary. Along with the Strategy document would be some level of logic that would include a detailed Project Logic for the next three to five years, as well as Summary Logic covering the full project lifecycle. Below that is the GW/VZ

Baseline. The Baseline would include scope, cost, and schedule for GW/VZ integration activities, core projects, and EM-50 activities. Then we will bring the Logic and Baseline together. The December deliverable, the Long Range Plan, becomes a combination of those two. The Long Range Plan will give this Project focus as to what needs to be done.

Everything needs to be related. The Strategy is where we are and what we're doing and the Long Range Plan is where we're going. We need to come up with a plan that will help us be successful and meet everybody's expectations.

QUESTION: When is the December deliverable due?

ANSWER: The date is currently set as December 18, 1998.

This is the approach we need to take for us to reach our goal of producing the December deliverable.

- Manage expectations of the deliverables and the approach through communication with all parties.
- Establish and maintain Product schedule
- Establish a DOE/Contractor/Regulator/Stakeholder/Tribal Team
- Establish ground rules for the team
- Establish team schedule and objectives
- Integrate with Systems Engineering and Strategic Planning processes
- Integrate with ERC, Integrated Site Baseline, and Program Baseline Summaries processes (budget)

COMMENT: I see the team looking at the strategy and logic. We need to figure out how we're going to operate and understand the schedule and objectives.

Proposed schedule:

- 9/28 - Kickoff with regulators, stakeholders, and Tribal Nations
- 10/2 - Establish team, tasks, and ground rules
- 10/9 - Establish objectives and schedule for team
- 10/19-10/30 - Team develops strategy and logic
- 11/13 - Draft deliverables are available for review
- 11/25 - Comments on deliverables received
- 12/4 - Comments incorporated
- 12/18 - Delivered to DOE-HQ

I'm building a more detailed schedule that will become available as we develop a team.

RESPONSE: There is a reason to have the draft deliverables ready on November 13. The next Expert Panel Meeting is going to be here on November 19-21. Even though this won't give them a lot of time, it will give them some time to review the deliverables and provide their perspectives.

QUESTION: Would it be helpful, as you try to get a team together, to have a cartoon of what we're trying to accomplish?

ANSWER: I've already got a couple of logics put together, and I'm hoping to color code them to S&T, gaps, and System Assessment Capability.

COMMENT: Use them just to stimulate thinking. Don't use them as anything more than that.

RESPONSE: I'm planning to enlarge them and put them on the wall as a way to help people understand where we are now.

QUESTION: Do you want to go through the elements now and take volunteers?

ANSWER: The other elements are not laid out now. When all of the issues surrounding the budget guidance surfaced, we lost focus. We've had to pick up our plan from July and reexamine it to get rolling again. We need to get the beginnings of a team for the Long Range Plan in place this week. I hope to get a team together for the System Assessment Capability this week as well. The other pieces, such as S&T Roadmaps, will convene later.

COMMENT: That would be great. The idea I have is to work the teams and have them come back each week with an update for everybody saying where they are. It would be the perfect way to work it. We can commit to some representatives now and add more people here or there as things get rolling. All of the team meetings should be open to everyone.

COMMENT: I think the eleven days scheduled for the team to develop a strategy and logic is a little much. We're going to have to have the members of the team set aside a couple of days just for this.

COMMENT: I agree. It would be easier for me to schedule a couple of days to sit down and really dig into this than it would be to juggle things for a two week period.

Strategy/Long Range Plan Team

- Tom Wintczak – BHI – Team Lead
- Wade Riggsbee – YIN
- Mike Thompson – DOE
- Tom Post – EPA
- Bob Bryce – PNNL

COMMENT: Ecology is in a process of reorganization. We need to figure out who will be our representative. (Steve Alexander confirmed 9/29)

RESPONSE: We'll contact Oregon. I imagine it would probably be Steve Sautter. (Steve Sautter confirmed 9/29) We'll also contact the other Tribes.

COMMENT: The thing I've encountered with the other Tribes is that they often have a problem with travel. I'd feel better if they were encouraged to participate. We should at least be able to get them in by phone as much as possible.

RESPONSE: We been thinking of getting Bob Alvarez out for a few days as well. (Bob Alvarez confirmed 9/29)

COMMENT: That's a great idea. He would be a real asset to the team.

COMMENT: I assume that someone from PHMC will be included also.

RESPONSE: Yes they will. (Dan Tyler confirmed 9/29)

COMMENT: There should also be someone from Systems Engineering.

RESPONSE: We already have that covered. It will be a good way for them to get their feet wet.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY: We need to get moving on the System Assessment Capability Team. I think a meeting needs to happen this week so that we can come back on Monday with plans to move ahead.

COMMENT: I (Tom Woods) would like to be in on that. If we could organize something tomorrow afternoon it would be great.

RESPONSE: We need to get it kicked off today. We particularly need to focus on what we are going to do this next quarter. Then we can meet weekly after that.

System Assessment Capability Team

Charley Kincaid – PNNL – Team Lead

Tom Page – PNNL

Tony Knepp – BHI

Doug Hildebrand – DOE

Tom Woods – YIN

Dib Goswami – Ecology

(Dirk Dunning – Oregon – added 9/29)

COMMENT: There also needs to be a PHMC representative for TWRS. (Jerry Davis confirmed 9/29) We're counting on this to help define work scope.

COMMENT: Dave Nichols and Bruce Napier should also be involved. (Both confirmed 9/29)

COMMENT: Lino Niccoli is retired, but I know he would want to be involved with this too. (Confirmed 9/28)

COMMENT: We will commit to Tuesday or Thursday to do this meeting.

RESPONSE: The lead for organizing this is Tom Page. He will make the initial calls and get the first meeting going.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (NAS) REVIEW: There is a NAS review coming up in a few weeks down in San Francisco on either the afternoon of the 22nd or the morning of the 23rd of October. There is a conference call scheduled with them on Thursday. We want to let them know our approach and goals so that we can get real time feedback from them.

COMMENT: It would be useful to have the S&T Roadmaps completed for this.

RESPONSE: We will have something on that by the end of next week.

COMMENT: We don't want the NAS to be working off of a work in progress to ensure that they are giving us good feedback.

COMMENT: Just talk to them about what your approach is and go with that.

COMMENT: If you are expecting feedback, it would be a mistake to go beyond your basic goals at this time.

RESPONSE: Terri Stewart and Michael Graham are getting together on Wednesday to discuss the strategy for the NAS conference call on Thursday. If anyone has input they are welcome to participate.

COMMENT: Dib Goswami will join the discussion on Wednesday.

GW/VZ DRAFT STRATEGY: Just a quick update on the GW/VZ Strategy document. There were a lot of errors in the document and it wasn't put together in a very readable form. We've put another version together. We hope it is a snapshot in time of what is being discussed. We see this as "feed" material for people wanting to work on the System Assessment Capability or Long Range Plan. We also see this at some point being the narrative of the Long Range Plan. It will have the background of the conceptual model with it. It is going out as a draft with placeholders for additional information as it is developed. We tried to stay away from stating opinions and instead included as much fact as possible.

QUESTION: It's the Long Range Plan? The S&T and all of the others will come together through this?

ANSWER: It will evolve further and we will need to decide what groups want to be involved in that evolution.

QUESTION: So this is the second draft?

ANSWER: Yes.

COMMENT: I thought it was helpful. When you get into the S&T and Gaps you can capture some of those things as well.

COMMENT: Some of the integration points can plug into this document as well. Keep it as a current summary of the state of the project, tying in the regulatory drivers as well. This document summarizes why we are doing this and what we know.

LAS VEGAS VADOSE ZONE CONFERENCE: I had the opportunity to go to the Vadose Zone Conference this past week in Las Vegas. There was a representative of the DOE-NV Community Advisory Board there as well. They are working with the public too, but the public doesn't seem to be too concerned yet. They've got the same problems there, but word is just now beginning to get out and people are just becoming aware of possible impacts to the surrounding area.

QUESTION: Are they thinking in terms of where the aquifer goes?

ANSWER: It's a very deep and flat system and the flow dynamics are not understood at all.

COMMENT: They think it's too deep. The thinking is that the contaminants will never get there and that the site's so big that it will never really matter.

COMMENT: What people don't realize is that many of the tests were set off below the water table.

COMMENT: I also talked with them about vadose zone monitoring. Their data seems inconclusive, but I wonder if we need to look at vadose monitoring on this site.

COMMENT: I think it's going to be a big issue and we need to see how it carries out.

WRAP UP: We've really got our work cut out for us this week. The leads will be in touch about organizing the teams. Good luck everybody.

ACTION:

- Organize and convene teams to deal with the issues of the Long Range Plan, Policy, and System Assessment Capability.

NOTE:

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

ATTENDEES:

Steve Alexander – Ecology
Bob Bryce – PNNL
Dru Butler – BHI
Don Clarke – JAI
Alexander Dykhne – Russia Academy of Science
Dib Goswami – Ecology
Michael Graham – BHI
Rich Holten – DOE-RL
Sue Kuntz – BHI
Fred Mann – FDNW
Katy McKeig – DOE-HQ
Tom Page – PNNL
Jim Poppiti – DOE-RL
Tom Post – EPA
Matt Sakach – BHI
Ron Skinnerland – Ecology
Mike Thompson – BHI
Dennis Wester – PNNL
Tom Wintczak – BHI
Tom Woods – YIN

Attachment 1

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN THE 9/21/98 MEETING

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	
• 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	
• Credibility	
• Tie-in to site decision making process - timing	
• Effective interfaces between GW/VZ project and core projects	

WHO SOLVES	PROJECT ISSUES PATH FORWARD
• DOE-RL	• 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)	
• DOE-HQ	
• Ecology/EPA	
• Peer review/oversight	
• Potentially affected people	