

# Meeting Minutes

062569

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 - OCTOBER 5, 1998

**TO** Distribution

**FROM** Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

**DATE** October 8, 1998

## ATTENDEES

See Attached List

## DISTRIBUTION

Attendees

GW/VZ Distribution List

Document and Info Services H0-09

**NOTE - THE PROJECT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 12 HAS BEEN CANCELED DUE TO A FEDERAL HOLIDAY. THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE HELD ON OCTOBER 19.**

## NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING:

Date: October 19, 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 October 5, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room.

## PROJECT REPORT:

### VADOSE ZONE TEXTBOOK

Questions have come up recently about the Vadose Zone (VZ) Textbook. The VZ Textbook was initially started through DOE-HQ. Under Secretary Moniz wanted to capture the state-of-the-art for VZ monitoring, remediation, and modeling. The Subsurface Contaminants Focus Area (SCFA) and others are pulling this information into a book describing where we are today. I (Jim Hanson, DOE-RL) have been working with them through the last few months to make sure that things are accurate and up to date from a Hanford perspective, and to make sure that it reflects what we have been doing within our group. There have been a couple of meetings to date involving various universities, DOE, the National Labs, and other government agencies. People are essentially working on this book on their own time, and it is being pulled together by the Savannah River Technology Center in South Carolina. The book will hopefully be published by the start of the next fiscal

MIN10-05.WPD

year. The purpose is to pull together case studies and other information and decide where it applies to VZ monitoring, modeling, and remediation.

QUESTION: I saw a press release that said DOE had been pulling together a textbook to help people working on the vadose zone. It is also being intended for use on a college level.

ANSWER: I saw that too, and I'm not sure if it's the same thing, but I imagine that it is. It might have originated from someone participating on this project or it might be something else.

QUESTION: Could you tell us a little about SCFA?

ANSWER: SCFA is the Subsurface Contaminants Focus Area and is within DOE's EM-50 project. It manages technology projects both from a local perspective and from a national perspective. The amount of funding that goes into science and technology must take into account the national perspective, as well as specific site issues, and then build accordingly. Some project funding might come to the Hanford Site, but part of that might be funding that goes to National Labs that might be crossed with Savannah River and others.

QUESTION: Does DOE-HQ understand how bad it sounds that this is proceeding without the inclusion of the Expert Panel?

RESPONSE: I think you're getting the wrong impression. This is not at Hanford specific textbook.

COMMENT: That's the impression I'm getting.

RESPONSE: No. It's intended to be a national resource for everybody. In fact it might even be coming along a little too late for us to benefit from.

RESPONSE: One of the purposes of it is for graduate students to compliment their regular textbooks. It's main focus will be on case studies.

QUESTION: Will it also include the times we've encountered situations where the models haven't matched reality?

ANSWER: I don't know.

RESPONSE: They are still in the planning stages and pulling together the individual case studies. Verification of the models is ongoing. The editors are aware of the problems and are trying to address them.

QUESTION: Is there a rough table of contents?

ANSWER: Yes. There are basically the three areas I've mentioned: monitoring, modeling, and remediation.

### PROJECT WORKING GROUPS

We are in the process of establishing and convening the teams that we discussed in last weeks meeting. We've decided that weekly updates of the team's progress would be helpful to keep everyone up to speed.

Policy Team Status:

We had the first meeting of the team this past week. It was a small group, but we are hoping for larger meetings in the future. We spent the majority of the time talking about the purpose of the team and discussing what we felt should be focused on. There was a first cut of the issues discussed at last Monday's Weekly Project Meeting, many of them from the Project Specification and Public Consultation Plan. This group is focused on the policy issues rather than the technical issues.

We talked about developing a charter but decided against it for the present time. We decided that this team didn't need the rigid schedules that the other teams need. Instead we thought that this team would be more of a standing committee to handle issues as they come up. There are several issues that were identified as needing immediate action.

One issue to be tackled in the near future will be the authority of the Project and the priority of the Project within DOE. There are questions of how the Project works in relation to the Core Projects. We also need to determine what mechanisms are in place to integrate the project and how to establish the authority of the Project in relation to the other projects.

Another issue is establishing the same thing for regulators. What are their roles and responsibilities within the Project? The team didn't take this on as a priority at this time.

A third issue to be confronted will be the FY99 budget. We are currently spending as though the Project has funding totaling \$5.6 million, while in reality the current budget is only \$2 million. This group will address the adequacy of the funding and determine the priority of funding for the various elements within the Project. The interaction of this team with the System Assessment Capability Team was also discussed. The teams will work together to determine funding needs for the System Assessment Capability, including the CRCIA requirements.

Another issue to be raised is that of paying for stakeholder travel to and from GW/VZ meetings.

Other issues that the team is planning to discuss, that weren't covered in detail, include the issue of credibility, the Project scope, who the decision-makers are, stakeholder involvement, and FY99 approach. There are going to be other issues that surface as well. We are going to keep an ongoing list of issues and track who is working them, what they are doing, and at what level they are working. We will add new issues as they happen to come up. We'll be meeting today, immediately following this meeting, if anyone is interested in attending. We will keep the conference call active as well for the people on the phone that wish to participate.

QUESTION: There are certain assumptions within the Project that aren't policy but aren't really technical either, such as the time frame. Is it 100 years? 500 years? What is it?

ANSWER: That is a question the System Assessment Capability Team will work initially.

COMMENT: I don't see these types of assumptions as a function of any particular work group though.

RESPONSE: I think I agree with you. There are things like end states and uses and other things that are outside of policy issues as opposed to System Assessment Capability or Long Range Plan.

COMMENT: If it is at all a technical issue then the System Assessment Capability team should take a stab at it. We need to decide who the decision-makers are, and this group can float it up to the decision-

maker if it's something they get stuck on. The System Assessment Capability work group should go ahead and give it a try first.

#### System Assessment Capability Team Status

The System Assessment Capability group met this past Thursday for about two and a half hours. We set up expectations for the team and discussed the approach and other potential approaches. We also proposed a draft schedule.

A lot of issues were raised, and there were a lot of differing views in regards to approach. Tom Woods gave a presentation of the CRCIA approach, which is the approach that most people agree will be taken. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 8, in Bechtel Room 2D01, from 9 a.m. to noon. We will try internally to define the product and approaches we can progress on. It's hard to talk process before you define and agree upon an approach. This coming meeting is to agree on approach, deliverables, and time frame. I'd like to encourage people to come. We're trying to come away from this with some specifics to build on, and get away from generalities. That's what this group is going to be for.

We need to come to agreement on the length of the study, as well as some other issues. We can get through the high level issues and then work our way down to the lower ones. I think the CRCIA approach is very similar to the one that we will agree upon. We need to determine what needs to be done first, and then work on what everyone wants to be done. We're past the talk phase and we're ready to move on to a first pass of listing the expectations. There may not be agreement on all of the issues, but we should get a list of what they are and start to move ahead. I want to once again encourage participation. We're going to get more serious here in the next few weeks. It's time to get off of philosophy and on to detail.

COMMENT: I think the perspective should be what we are going to accomplish this year, and then outline the steps needed to get there. We need participation to make sure that we're doing things that everyone agrees are important for this year. That's a key.

COMMENT: I'd like to have Martin Bensky join the group. He's had a lot of interest in this area. I don't know if he is back from his vacation yet, but I'm sure he would want to be involved.

RESPONSE: We'll welcome him if he wants to participate.

QUESTION: Are we sure this is not moving too fast in terms of locking things into place?

ANSWER: I think we're trying to see what we're going to be producing in the next year rather than locking things in place. The technical side is just getting capabilities. We're determining what they are at a high level, and then driving down to various other levels. There are really two keys. We need to determine what the attributes of the System Assessment Capability are and what we are going to use as a set of tools to decide impacts on the Vadose Zone/Groundwater/Columbia River pathway. We need an understanding of what to embody in the set of tools. Then we have to begin looking at what to do this year to take the first step. We have to decide what the ultimate outcome is going to be and what we need to do near term to head in that direction.

#### Long Range Plan/Strategy Team Status

We will have a kickoff meeting on Tuesday, October 6, at BHI Room 1B40 from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. We'll have the conference call set up and open to anyone that wants to call in to join the discussion. We want to look at

expectations and what the products are. We need to come to agreement on the general approach and the schedule. This meeting will be a look at where we're headed.

### DRAFTING OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PLAN

Last week we had a meeting with the National Labs and began working on a draft S&T roadmap. We focused in the summer on the S&T technical elements. Now we are in the process of capturing them. Last week we pulled together the Lab leads and their information and we are now trying to get everything into a common format and uniform level of detail. I'm putting together a briefing package and it will be available to see what was captured in those meetings. Input from the group as well as the information shared will be in that briefing.

QUESTION: Will you have the briefing ready in the next week?

ANSWER: Yes, I hope to. Some of the info will be used in the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) meeting.

### NAS MEETING

COMMENT: I'm interested in Ecology's role with the NAS. Maybe somebody from Ecology should give a presentation to the NAS as well so that they have a chance to hear the perspective of the regulators. If this is a baseline kickoff, then this is where they will be setting their own perspectives. We would like to give a presentation in addition to your proposals. Is that OK?

RESPONSE: I'm not positive of the agenda. I believe there is an hour presentation followed by an hour discussion.

RESPONSE: The purpose of this meeting is to give an overview of the technical challenges. It should be 90 percent technical. This is just to give them an overview of the challenges and get their help.

COMMENT: No one from Ecology had a chance to have discussions with the NAS before the TWRS EIS came out, and their comments came out a week after the TWRS EIS was issued. I'd like to have the NAS be aware of the regulator perspective before making decisions, not after. Undersecretary Moniz said to me that the entire process lies in the hands of the NAS and the Expert Panel. His position was that if this Project is to have credibility, it would rest with them. If we can't communicate with the NAS it weakens their credibility as far as this Project is concerned.

RESPONSE: I agree with you. I'm just wondering if this is the right meeting for bringing our regulators in.

COMMENT: Maybe we need to add a bit to the front of this meeting for this. They're not naive. They understand that there are political issues involved here as well.

RESPONSE: We need to talk with the NAS and determine if this is the right time. They are apparently setting up a separate committee that will be dedicated to this project. We need to find if this is the right time to express viewpoints.

COMMENT: There is a separate committee being set up, and the Long Range Plan will be the first document submitted to this committee for comment.

RESPONSE: We will get with them to find their reaction to this request. I appreciate Ecology's point.

COMMENT: If this is going to be the board that selects the subcommittee, then this is the time to be heard, not after the selection has taken place.

RESPONSE: Last week we sat down and discussed the NAS, and the subject of TWRS EIS did come up. If we are asking for some kind of endorsement of the whole GW/VZ process, then it's a good idea to make sure the NAS gets the whole picture.

COMMENT: They are interested in getting an idea of the overall GW/VZ activities, and they will appoint a panel specifically for this Project.

QUESTION: Can you check with them and get back to this group?

ANSWER: Absolutely. The first official feedback will be on the Long Range Plan, and the Long Range Plan itself is a major group effort. They should have a group perspective.

RESPONSE: Please get back to us before the dry run on Friday.

QUESTION: Are there any individuals from here on the panel?

ANSWER: We are going to be talking to the board members only.

RESPONSE: Kavanaugh is on the board.

COMMENT: He chairs it.

RESPONSE: We'll get back to Ecology on their role in the NAS meeting.

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION AND PROJECT LOOK AHEAD

After the Weekly Project Meeting is over, we'll keep the conference phone open for anyone wishing to participate in the Policy Team meeting. The Long Range Plan Team is meeting tomorrow and the System Assessment Capability Team is meeting on Thursday.

On the 6-week look ahead calendar (attached), we've already covered the items for this week. Secretary of Energy Richardson is now tentatively scheduled to visit Hanford on the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> of October. It looks like he will cover projects other than this one. To our knowledge, he has no special time scheduled for this project. The HAB-ER Committee is meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup>. The time for the NAS meeting is still not finalized but it will be either the 22<sup>nd</sup> or 23<sup>rd</sup>. The next Expert Panel Meeting is scheduled for November 19-21. That date of the 21<sup>st</sup> is correct (it is a Saturday).

#### PROJECT SPECIFICATION

We need to hold a meeting to close out the technical issues of the Project Specification document. There were only two people that submitted issues. Who would like to come to a meeting to close this out?

COMMENT: Tom Post, Dib Goswami and Dave Holland will meet about the technical issues.

QUESTION: This meeting will be just about the technical Project Specification issues?

ANSWER: Yes.

ACTION LETTER FROM ECOLOGY

QUESTION: Since it looks like the TWRS Interagency Team is dead, what is the status of the TWRS group in response to the action letter from Ecology?

ANSWER: Our main focus is on preparing for the upcoming negotiation related meeting with Ecology on Wednesday. I don't recall the time. This is to lay out the path forward. We've had some informal discussions and we think we can work it out. As far as the Interagency Team goes, we've been encouraged to consolidate that into the GW/VZ Integration Project. It won't go away; it will just be under the auspices of a different group. We need to have a discussion of how best to accomplish that. This direction to consolidate came from the Executive Committee.

RESPONSE: Right now we are proceeding on a path forward based on Ecology's letter that will have a narrow scope. TWRS is in pre-negotiation to see if that is sufficient or if we need to draft a letter of agreement.

COMMENT: One of the first things we would like to discuss is whether or not it will be okay to do some characterization while the negotiations are in progress.

QUESTION: Are Lockheed and CH2M involved as well?

ANSWER: CH2M is under a small contract.

RESPONSE: Stan called me (Michael Graham) and asked if I could enlighten him and I said no because I'm unclear myself. I hope to broker a meeting to get information on the table for everyone. It's confusing who's involved, what the issues are, and what the path forward is. There are a lot of people involved in this and it's not apparent what's going on.

COMMENT: Project Hanford Management Company (PHMC) can brief everyone on Monday during the Weekly Project Meeting. It's probably the best way to keep everyone up to speed.

COMMENT: The first meeting hasn't taken place yet, so the path forward is still unclear.

COMMENT: There are two things happening here simultaneously. First there is this negotiation. Who's involved with that and what is it about? Second there are the various contracts to do work across the site.

RESPONSE: The Lockheed contractor's experience in the RCRA Facility Investigation area isn't what it could be. They found people with more experience within the contracting community and brought them on board. These people are involved to simply add more experience.

COMMENT: TWRS leads this activity, with DOE input from David Olson and Jim Poppiti, with Rich Holten as needed. Janice Williams is leading the effort for the contractors.

QUESTION: Does Janice have the authority to okay work?

ANSWER: You (regulators) will okay the work.

COMMENT: This will be a good test of the Integration Project.

RESPONSE: In preparation for this meeting, we've worked on the path forward internally and it's been reviewed with the Executive Committee. It doesn't have all the details yet, but we will go over it on Wednesday and see if it's a good place to start. It's always been my intent that TWRS must fit under the whole Integration Project. Not doing that would be counterproductive. This is the whole reason we have the Project in the first place.

RESPONSE: To answer your question, yes, Janice has the authority.

COMMENT: We need to look at who signs off on things. We need to share paths within the group instead of being briefed on what the path is, after it has already been determined.

RESPONSE: It will be a good test to determine how to operate, and we can come out of it with lessons learned.

COMMENT: We need to have the right people in the room for these negotiations, and have the right people here as well.

COMMENT: This is extremely short notice for Oregon to have somebody involved. This is the same problem that we've had in the past.

COMMENT: This will be an interesting test.

#### BOB ALVAREZ'S STATUS

COMMENT: I spoke to Bob Alvarez at the Government Accountability Project Conference. He stated that the rumors of his demise were greatly exaggerated.

RESPONSE: They were false.

COMMENT: It's not exactly clear what he is going to do. What is his role? Can you (Mary Harmon) keep us informed? Both Mary's and Bob's involvement with Moniz is a big issue with Ecology.

RESPONSE: I'd be happy to do that. There are still some things to iron out, but it looks like he's with us.

#### PNNL CRIB MONITORING PLAN ISSUES

QUESTION: PNNL recently issued a Crib Monitoring Plan for doing logging and analysis of the cribs. No one in Ecology was aware of it. We thought it was under the GW/VZ Integration Project. We need to know if it's true, and if it's true, why didn't we know about it?

ANSWER: This is work that was included under the FY99 work plan. It was discussed in the fiscal year work plan meetings, and as part of the process it had been submitted to several people for review.

RESPONSE: Logging has always been hit or miss depending on the contractor to come up with a plan. This will be folded into the top-level work product. DOE will review it and you will have a chance to review as well.

RESPONSE: This work is in the Groundwater RCRA program. This is one of the items in our identified workscope, and it is being integrated into the GW/VZ Plan.

COMMENT: If I'm interpreting what is going on, I just haven't been well enough aware of it.

RESPONSE: There has been logging work in the past.

COMMENT: Yes, but Ecology should have been aware of this current plan.

RESPONSE: We've been trying to tie it up as a more comprehensive plan and this is it. I honestly haven't even cracked the cover of it yet to look at it.

QUESTION: It's their proposal of what needs to be done and it was in the DWP reviews?

ANSWER: Yes. It's under the VZ monitoring section.

QUESTION: Do you have a number for it?

ANSWER: Go to the RCRA monitoring section. It's one of the sub-elements. If you would like, we can call Oregon and Ecology with clarification on where it can be found.

COMMENT: Please do.

RESPONSE: We have a long way to go before we are running the entire effort as a single project. There are activities we're just not coordinated tightly on yet. This is one of them. I'm not up to speed on what exactly this plan is and whether it is a draft or if it's final. We're trying right now to map out the tasks at a high level so that we can see how things are related. It's a first step where somebody proposed workscope and it has just been released.

COMMENT: It's really a small piece of work. We need to monitor the cribs. Everybody agrees on that. It's small and it's a plan to understand what the amount of scope that is covered.

COMMENT: There's an important piece to this. The goal of this project is to have the Tribal Nations, stakeholders, and regulators involved in this Project. My feeling is that, once again, we're going forward with work that was supposed to go through this Project. What I am hearing is that there is work going forward without being reviewed here first.

RESPONSE: I have an idea. I'm hearing a lot of the same old issues. Why don't we get the facts together and take an action item to decide what this really is.

COMMENT: That's great. That's the end of subject for me then.

COMMENT: My contractors are out there doing work and they gave me a document saying what they are doing. I'm willing to share that with the world. There are government dollars being spent here and this is being done simply to determine where the dollars are going.

#### PROJECT FUNDING

QUESTION: I talked to Moniz and Wagoner at the conference about project funding. They said there is \$12 million and there's always been \$12 million. Are you aware of the \$12 million?

ANSWER: I'm not aware of extra money in our piggy bank that we can spend right now. They're pretty sure they know where the money is and it's earmarked, but it's not in the bank right now. We hope to get it from the EM-50 budget. Is that what he said?

COMMENT: No. Moniz is putting a lot of stock in the Expert Panel and peer review. I asked if he was aware that they are currently below the line. He said that they are absolutely not below the line. They are fully funded. They've already got the money. It is there.

RESPONSE: If Moniz says it, it must be true. The only thing I can tell you is that there are private conversations that take place at a high level. I know that there is tremendous pressure being exerted to make sure the funding is there. We were working on the speech the day before he gave it, and the words in the speech were that we are "planning" to get the money. However, you might have gotten a different answer in your face-to-face conversation.

RESPONSE: This is an issue to get feedback on by next Monday if possible.

COMMENT: Wagoner said that we already have the money in the bank.

RESPONSE: It's just not possible. We don't even officially have a budget yet. There hasn't been congressional approval. John got some bad information. He had been told that the President had signed the bill, but that wasn't the case.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:**

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached).

**UPCOMING EVENTS:**

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached).

**ACTIONS:**

- Check with NAS to see if Ecology can be involved in the upcoming meeting.
- Hold a meeting to close out the technical issues of the Project Specification.
- Determine Bob Alvarez's role regarding the Project.
- Provide Ecology and Oregon with the areas of the Detailed Work Plan applicable to the PNNL Crib Monitoring Plan.

**NOTE:**

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

**ATTACHMENT:**

- 1) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Steve Alexander, Ecology  
Dru Butler, BHI  
Don Clark, JAI Corp.  
Dirk Dunning, Oregon Office of Energy  
Roy Gephart, PNNL  
Michael Graham, BHI  
Jim Hanson, DOE-RL  
Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ  
Barbara Harper, YIN  
Harold Heacock, Tridac  
Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL  
Rich Holten, DOE-RL  
Gary Jewell, BHI  
Tony Knepp, BHI  
Fred Mann, FDNW  
Katy Makeig, SMS  
Tom Page, PNNL  
Jim Poppiti, DOE-RL  
Tom Post, EPA  
Wade Riggsbee, YIN  
Gordon Rogers, General Public  
Ron Skinnarland, Ecology  
Phil Staats, Ecology  
Karen Strickland, BHI  
Dan Tano, DOE-RL  
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL  
Janice Williams, PHMC  
Tom Wintczak, BHI

**Attachment 1**

**6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD**  
**OCTOBER 5, 1998 - NOVEMBER 21, 1998**  
**GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT**

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b><i>October 5</i></b>        | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL -ETB - Columbia River Room                                  |
| <b><i>October 5</i></b>        | GW/VZ Policy Team Meeting<br>Immediately following Weekly Status Meeting -<br>PNNL -ETB - Columbia River Room |
| <b><i>October 6</i></b>        | GW/VZ Long Range Plan/Strategy Team Meeting<br>8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. – BHI 3350 GWW/Conf. Room 1B40         |
| <b><i>October 8</i></b>        | GW/VZ System Assessment Capability Team Meeting<br>9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. – BHI 3350 GWW/Conf. Room 2D01     |
| <b><i>October 13-14</i></b>    | Secretary of Energy Richardson – Visit to Hanford   |
| <b><i>October 15</i></b>       | HAB Environmental Restoration Committee Meeting<br>9 a.m.-4 p.m. – BHI Assembly Room                          |
| <b><i>October 15-16</i></b>    | National Laboratories Management Meeting<br>San Francisco, CA   |
| <b><i>October 19</i></b>       | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB – Columbia River Room                                 |
| <b><i>October 22 or 23</i></b> | Tentative Date - National Academy of Sciences Meeting<br>San Francisco, CA                                    |
| <b><i>October 26</i></b>       | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room                                 |
| <b><i>November 2</i></b>       | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room                                 |
| <b><i>November 3-4</i></b>     | Health of the Hanford Site Conference<br>Richland, WA - Doubletree Hotel                                      |
| <b><i>November 9</i></b>       | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room                                 |
| <b><i>November 16</i></b>      | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room                                 |
| <b><i>November 19-21</i></b>   | GW/VZ Expert Panel Meetings<br>Richland, WA   |
| <b><i>November 23</i></b>      | Weekly Project Status Meeting<br>1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room                                 |