

Meeting Minutes

CCN: 063394

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 26, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE October 29, 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: November 2, 1998

Location: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

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

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on October 26, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

INTEGRATION OF GROUNDWATER PROJECT (MICHAEL GRAHAM): Let's start with an item not on the agenda. George Henckel is the manager of the Groundwater Project here at Bechtel, and it is one of the projects that will come under the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project (Project) as a way to better organize things. This is something that we've decided to do sooner rather than later. We're going to go ahead and start to pull the Groundwater Project under the GW/VZ wing. George will stay in the same position during the transition. We don't have all the kinks worked out yet, but we wanted to get this information out in the form of a general announcement. This should help us with the rest of the integration.

QUESTION: What's the work scope of the Groundwater Project?

ANSWER: Bechtel's portion of the scope includes groundwater remediation under Interim Records of Decision and removal actions under authority of Action Memoranda. It also includes managing well drilling, maintenance, and decommissioning. Pacific Northwest National

Laboratory (PNNL) is handling long term monitoring (including vadose, groundwater, and seismic monitoring) and modeling. That's the short and sweet version.

QUESTION: So it basically covers all of the groundwater modeling and monitoring?

ANSWER: PNNL has the scope for the groundwater monitoring.

QUESTION: Are the technical aspects going to fall under the Project?

ANSWER: The Groundwater Project will stay intact and still have the same workscope. The roles of the contractors will also remain the same. Bechtel has the primary role with remedial actions, monitoring will stay with PNNL, and much of the integration will be through the Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) will assist with the PNNL reporting to get it up to speed with the rest of the Project.

QUESTION: Where does the authority lie?

ANSWER: We'll pick that up in the Policy Work Group this afternoon, but we haven't really talked about that yet. The concept is to put all of the projects together in order to do things more efficiently and utilize the funds we have more effectively. Basically, George is coming over with his team, and we'll go from there.

REPORT FROM THE LONG RANGE PLAN (LRP) WORK GROUP (TOM WINTCZAK): There was a meeting of the LRP Work Group last Thursday. We've basically put together a draft of the LRP for the first 5 years of the Project. The team is now looking at it. Bruce Ford put together and distributed a logic, and he is now looking for input. We went through the technical objectives. Some were more like goals, so we are going back through them with the team. We are on track to bring in the annotated outline by the December time frame. There were originally two meetings scheduled for this week, but the Wednesday meeting had to be canceled.

QUESTION: What is the time of the remaining meeting?

ANSWER: 1:00 p.m. on Thursday in the BHI building, Room 1B40.

COMMENT: I (Dirk Dunning) am not sure I've seen a copy of the draft for the first 5 years.

RESPONSE: We'll make sure that you and Greg deBruler get copies.

REPORT FROM THE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY (SAC) WORK GROUP (TONY KNEPP): The purpose of the SAC Work Group is to define the expectations for the first modeling effects assessment. We are using the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) as the paradigm. We are going through the relevant appendices (A, B, and C) and listing what the capabilities will be in the first model. We have assigned responsibility to various individuals to work through certain sections and try to evaluate them. The SAC Work Group is meeting on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week in BHI Room 1B40 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon. We hope to go through the results of the individual efforts.

REPORT FROM THE POLICY WORK GROUP (DRU BUTLER): The Policy Work Group is meeting immediately after this meeting. We are planning to discuss the same issues that we have been going over in the last couple of weeks. We will discuss the “DOE Management and Decision Process” draft by Rich Holten. Defining Project authority is another topic. Casey Ruud and Phil Staats have been working on the regulatory drivers for the Project, and we will discuss them. There are a few new issues as well, for which Tom Page is the lead.

(Tom Page) There are a few issues coming out of the discussions of the LRP and SAC Work Groups. The first issue is determining the scope in terms of identification and source terms. Dirk Dunning raised this issue during the Weekly Project Meeting last week. It was addressed partially at the time, but it was not formally resolved. Is it within the scope of this Project to determine glass dissolution rates for example? Another issue is, who approves the candidate set and study set that comes out of SAC Work Group? A third issue is endstate. What is the assumption when the endstate is not clearly defined or obvious? These are the three main issues.

QUESTION: These are from the SAC and LRP Work Groups?

ANSWER: Yes, and there is also one issue from last week’s Weekly Project Meeting.

RESPONSE: When issues of scope come up in the technical groups, the issues are identified and passed to the Policy Work Group for resolution.

COMMENT: It would be easier to follow the flow of the Policy Work Group if they had a set of issues. Is there any way we can have a summary of the issues in discussion?

RESPONSE: Minutes are prepared after every Policy Work Group meeting, with a table of the items currently being discussed. The minutes get sent out to the members of the Policy Work Group and a few other interested parties. We’ll add anyone else to distribution who wants to get those minutes.

COMMENT: Right now all I receive is the minutes for this weekly meeting. I would like to be added to the other three groups too. (Greg deBruler)

RESPONSE: We’ll add you.

QUESTION: I have a question about the glass. This seems like a purely technical issue. How does this end up a policy issue?

ANSWER: Dirk Dunning felt that the proposed approach was incorrect, and he asked the group to take some action. It was determined that this was really a scope question. Does this Project deal with that type of scope?

COMMENT: I’m just confused about why this is going to the Policy Work Group.

RESPONSE: The problem is where do you stop? There has to be a line somewhere where scope becomes the responsibility of someone else. We can’t determine every little thing. The question is “do we pick those up or do we just accept a peer review? Should the Expert Panel review that?” Somebody needs to go through determining where our scope stops and others begin. It’s a valid point.

TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEMS (TWRS) VADOSE ZONE (VZ) NEGOTIATIONS (JIM

POPPITI): There was a pre-meeting held on October 7, and we had our first meeting on October 21. It was a productive meeting. We discussed the framework of how to come to agreement on the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action. We are still quite a ways off from agreement, but it was a good discussion. There is a meeting with just the technical people on the 30th, and there is another negotiating session scheduled on the 3rd. Suzanne Dahl-Crumpler was at the meetings representing Ecology, and I'd like to ask her to give the Ecology perspective on the negotiations.

(Suzanne Dahl-Crumpler) This is old news to many of you. Almost a year ago, eight tank farms were determined to be affecting the groundwater under the Hanford site. Ecology sent a letter to DOE demanding Corrective Action. It was decided to proceed with the Corrective Action under the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) rather than under RCRA. Ecology decided to work with DOE to develop TPA milestones for those tank farms, including protective measures and remedial field investigations (RFIs). Ecology and DOE decided on short deadlines as a way to keep the pressure on. Ecology reserved the right to proceed under the RCRA Corrective Action if the TPA path fails.

In the negotiations so far, we have looked at the initial scope and considered public involvement and schedule. We're specifically concerned with what's happening under the tank farms. We would like to do an overall RCRA field investigation of the tank farms to provide the big picture, and then break it down and have specific work plans and appendices for each of the waste units. It's also important to tie vadose zone to groundwater and merge them as a single entity. The Corrective Actions need to be meshed with sitewide integration and closure efforts. We need to make sure that this dovetails into tank farm closure requirements.

(Jim Poppiti) In this last meeting we decided to use these Project Weekly Meetings as the forum to keep as many people apprized of negotiation status as possible. We all agreed that this meeting is the best place to get the widest audience. There are two other avenues for public involvement that were added. First was to brief the Hanford Advisory Board Environmental Restoration Committee (HAB-ER) on the negotiations, providing them with background and so forth. The second was to have a meeting with interested stakeholders, regulators, and Tribal Nations early on in the negotiation process to get input from those groups as well. We are hoping to hold this before the next negotiation meeting, if we can get all of our ducks in a row.

QUESTION: Is there an specific impact assessment to help define the Corrective Action?

ANSWER: In the RFI process, you consider potential impacts and Corrective Actions.

RESPONSE: Under the RFI, you have to do an impact assessment. The data that we have currently for beneath these tanks shows that they have impacted the groundwater. Under a RCRA assessment, impact means groundwater. We need to determine the nature, extent, and risk to be able to make effective decisions.

RESPONSE: We may agree, as part of the negotiations, that there are some simple measures that can be implemented fairly early on.

QUESTION: Is your characterization going to be for the purpose of impact assessment and corrective measures?

ANSWER: Yes, and we still need to be mindful that this data is also going to impact closure decisions, schedule, etc.

COMMENT: It is important to tie this to retrieval as well for decisions.

QUESTION: Are you going to work the Corrective Actions in parallel?

ANSWER: What we are talking about, to help focus the characterization, is determining what the initial things are that we can implement to decide what data to collect to make sound decisions. It's part of the RFI.

QUESTION: Is there a model involved here? Something that covers from leak to impacts? That's a piece of the SAC model, and if it captures that, it becomes a big piece.

ANSWER: Initially, we are looking at significant data beneath the tank farms, with some sort of Corrective Action study, so you know why you are collecting the data. The first thing we need is more data, and we need to move forward to get the data. RCRA is odd in that it doesn't necessarily lead toward an impact analysis. It is more of a regulatory viewpoint.

COMMENT: It's risk based, but it's not a risk analysis.

RESPONSE: At the end of the negotiations there will be an agreement of what needs to be done and when, and then we need to look at how it can be integrated from a broader perspective.

COMMENT: If your plan is to collect data from these eight tank farms now, part of the benefit would be refining methods that could be used on the others in the future.

COMMENT: I'd like to recommend that U-Farm be considered as one that impacts groundwater.

COMMENT: The intent is to keep this update of negotiation status as a standing item for the Weekly Project Meeting for the duration of the negotiations.

QUESTION: Roger Stanley of Ecology would have liked to share his viewpoint today as well. If we are going to have this as a standing item, is there any way to have this update at a particular time?

ANSWER: To be predictable, it has to be the first item. Since this will continue to be a high level interest item, let's plan on having it first every week for the duration of the negotiations. Let's say 1:10 p.m. to allow for newcomers and introductions.

CENTER FOR RISK EXCELLENCE (CRE) PROJECT ASSISTANCE AND APPROACH (AL YOUNG):

DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ) recognized the importance of risk in the decision making process. They established the CRE to serve as a arena of excellence in risk assessment. We have been invited to put our expertise to work on this Project.

What is our role? How do we see risk being addressed? We are going to prepare a risk/effects plan for the Project. Our target for that is sometime in March or April of next year. This is just an evaluation/presentation framework, not the assessment. We are also going to provide input to the "Science and Technology (S&T) Risk Roadmap" in order to help guide future research activities. We are working with Terri Stewart on that.

What will the plan address? We will address risk integration across the Project elements. You have to determine how to use the S&T, and how you are going to do monitoring and surveillance. We'll assess the health/ecological risk and non-economic endpoints, such as cultural and socioeconomic effects. The standard

paradigm is not going to work here. We also need to determine how to look at, and plan for, key uncertainties and their impacts. We also hope to be able to tell you how risk fits in through enhanced communication. Our goal here is to be able to make more effective decisions through better risk information.

The CRE is using a four-team approach.

- . Scoping values: partnering with stakeholders
 - What are the endpoints that you are concerned about? We want an effective partnering with the public.
- . Fact finding: consolidating existing information
 - That is basically inventory and gaps. Once you find what's not known, we can bring S&T to bear in it.
- . Risk characterization: integrating the facts
 - Once we know the endpoints, how do we use the models and other resources to paint the most accurate picture?
- . Communicating risk: presenting the information
 - This is another example of how your involvement is essential to us.

We will be holding meetings to solicit input from interested parties, to share what we are doing, and to help coordinate with other ongoing activities. We are considering the meetings for Wednesday November 18, Tuesday December 15, Wednesday January 13, and Thursday February 18. (These meetings are still in planning and dates are tentative.)

We have an office set up in the BHI building, Room 1B38. We have a website, and a phone with voice mail. We are going to have fun. This is a real challenge. It's unique and will create a new paradigm for looking at risk. We will have two or three people on site for the next few months.

QUESTION: How are you funded?

ANSWER: At this time we are using CRE funds. In time, we hope that EM-50 will be reimbursing us. When our involvement in this Project was approved, we decided to go forward instead of waiting for the dollars to materialize. We are working on \$300K for our entire scope at this point.

QUESTION: What level of funding are you expecting?

ANSWER: Do you mean for preparing the plan? The execution of the plan is the expensive part, the identification of the gaps and putting the science to work. The modeling is not as expensive. Science is the essential element to make good decisions.

COMMENT: Al Young and I (Rich Holten) have talked with Mary Harmon a few times. From a personal standpoint, we both share the excitement over this opportunity, and we're looking forward to having the CRE as a part of the Project team. They add a great deal.

QUESTION: Have you had any communications with the CRCIA team?

ANSWER: We visited about three weeks ago and had the pleasure of meeting with Tom Woods. We also visited with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Ecology. We wanted to start to see what their concerns were, and we have read CRCIA very carefully. We also spent a day with Barbara Harper from the Yakamas onsite looking around and talking about concerns. The

scoping team that is coming on site now will be focusing greatly on stakeholder involvement and will update the CRE home office in Chicago of concerns. The CRE's Hanford on-site number is 372-9541. My (Al Young) Chicago number is (630) 252-2503. I have voice mail there too. Feel free to call any time.

FEEDBACK FROM THE HANFORD PUBLIC INTEREST NETWORK MEETING(GREG DEBRULER):

We basically talked about the various frustrations people have. The fact that there is no funding for stakeholder participation was discussed. Some people stated that they would be much more involved if there was funding for participation. A few said they wouldn't participate even if there was funding. I would be there physically if there was funding, but it's a long trip and I'll just keep attending by phone.

The organization was encouraged when it was decided that CRCIA was going to be done. It is something that the public and state have agreed should be done. There is some frustration that CRCIA lost speed when the Project took over.

Some people feel that the Project is not going in the right direction. It's just an underlying, general frustration. Under Secretary Moniz pointed to the Draft Strategy document that came out in September as proof of progress with the Project. Some of the individuals that read it weren't all that impressed, but most people are waiting to pass judgement until the December deliverables come out.

One other thing that was a problem for some was the way the Project meetings are set up. The SAC team for instance works over a three day period of time each week. Some people don't feel that this is an efficient way to utilize people's time, especially if they have to come any distance to attend.

The last piece was that Steve Alexander and Roger Stanley were asked to try to resolve the funding for participation. It was decided to put it back on the HAB. They are planning to bring it up with Marilyn Reeves.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (NAS) MEETING (MICHAEL GRAHAM): We had a meeting with the NAS last week at Stanford. The team that went consisted of Terri Stewart, Linda Bauer, John Zachara, and myself (Michael Graham). The meeting was in the form of a presentation to the NAS Board of Radioactive Waste Management (BRWM). We had about an hour to make our presentation. We described the Project, the challenges, and our approach to problems.

QUESTION: Could we (Greg deBruler and Dirk Dunning) get electronic copies of the presentation?

ANSWER: We used a lot of old photos of the site as background, so there isn't a full electronic version, and it's too big to fax. We will mail it to you both.

We had a positive exchange with the Board. Michael Kavanaugh is the chairman of the Board and is also a member of our Expert Panel. He deferred the chair to John Ahearn for this meeting to avoid any conflict. There were a few interested people from the San Francisco Bay Area that sat in on the meeting. One of the people was a former Hanford employee. He observed that the issues now are much the same as they were twenty years ago.

There were a few general comment and questions from the Board. For example, the use of the word "proof" in a geologic sense was discussed. They express a lot of interest in our stakeholder involvement process and how we manage that. The Board then met in a closed session, and we expect to hear something soon on their planned involvement with the Project. We expect the outcome to be a specific panel set up by the NAS to monitor this Project for the next couple of years. They will monitor approach and make sure that the S&T focus

is on the right things. The NAS is an independent agency. They set the agenda. There is an expectation that we may meet up to five times per year for the next couple of years.

QUESTION: Is the Board familiar with Hanford?

ANSWER: The BRWM knows Hanford well, and they are inherently in support of any effort to pull the little pieces together to form a broader picture.

QUESTION: So you got their agreement to be a kind of oversight panel, and to give you advice on adequacy and shortcomings?

ANSWER: It's really more the latter. They're not going to be technically reviewing our project documents. They're going to be working on the higher issues.

QUESTION: Is this group going to have a charter? What is their relationship to the Project's Expert Panel?

RESPONSE: This group will be chartered. Their relationship to the Expert Panel is still being ironed out.

GROUNDWATER MODEL CONSOLIDATION: We're picking this up on the new fiscal year. There are two activities. On November 13 there is a meeting to delve into more detail on fourteen areas of interest in Groundwater Model Consolidation and how to talk in a geologic framework. There is also an external peer review scheduled for November 20 and 21. They already have documents with comments and data reports from past logging by BHI and PNNL. That's basically where we are at.

ISSUE ON VADOSE ZONE MONITORING (RICH HOLTEN): There are two things here. One is that I distributed copies of the PNNL Vadose Zone Program Plan in the last fiscal year, and they are soliciting comments.

QUESTION: Is there a specific date to have comments in before?

ANSWER: Sometime in the next three weeks would be good. There is no critical path here, so that would be fine.

The other issue is that John Brodeur picked up some information from the field on the work that's going on out there. We'll set up a meeting with him to talk about that, and we'd like to invite anyone else that wishes to participate to do so.

QUESTION: What about well installation?

ANSWER: That's something we will discuss today after the policy meeting.

RESPONSE: So one subject is the PNNL Vadose Zone Monitoring Plan, and the other is something that has to do with the new groundwater wells around the tank farms. There was a concern, brought up a couple of months ago, that there was a lack of integration. We became aware of some technical deficiencies. We missed the opportunity to collect some good quality data on the vadose zone by not having this better integrated.

COMMENT: We need to get together right away on this. There is the potential for even more missed opportunities. There doesn't appear to be anything on the immediate horizon, but if we don't

resolve this soon, we're taking a chance on missing out. We need to continue to drive for a sitewide perspective. At the end of the day it may not make a difference, but we need to make sure that we don't miss opportunities. We should have a meeting to determine the data quality objective (DQO) process. The well is going to be done. We need suggestions for the right way to approach that.

COMMENT: When can we meet? Most of the right people are here right now.

RESPONSE: We can reschedule the policy meeting. That will give us the chance to discuss this right away. We will move the policy meeting to next Monday. This gives everyone a chance to get their comments to Rich Holten about his draft.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

- The LRP Work Group has been trimmed to only one meeting this week on Wednesday.
- The SAC Work Group is meeting on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.
- The Policy Work Group meeting for today is canceled. Their next meeting will be next Monday.

OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION:

COMMENT: At the last Project Weekly Meeting (October 19) there was a discussion about the Office of River Protection (ORP). Is it possible to get copies of the guidelines of this organization?

RESPONSE: There was a letter from Jim Owendoff to John Wagoner that was a very rough sketch of the top level of the ORP. At an all-hands meeting last week, they passed out the box diagram of the organization. It is still in draft form, but I don't see any reason why you couldn't have it if you want one. I (Jim Poppiti) have asked Maureen Hunemuller and Jackson Kinzer to speak to this group about the ORP, but they were unavailable today.

QUESTION: Is there more than a box diagram?

ANSWER: Not really. The diagram was covered in the all hands meeting. It's pretty bare. After it was passed out, the people that actually worked on it explained the underlying rationale, but the diagram itself doesn't have that.

QUESTION: Who is the lead?

RESPONSE: What TWRS did was something different. The letter defined just the top level. There was nothing below the system manager level. TWRS gave the authority to the working level staff to design the structure. I've been describing it as, "somebody finally gave the inmates the keys to the asylum." They really put a lot of effort and thought into this. The staff gave the actual briefing. I don't know any additional details. Why don't we see if we can get the staff to give the same briefing at next week's Weekly Project Meeting?

COMMENT: The ORP is one of the items on the HAB agenda for their upcoming meeting. There should be some good stuff that comes from that. Let's see if the information that comes out of the HAB meeting helps first.

RESPONSE: (Jim Poppiti) I'll fax the draft to you (Greg deBruler) and Dirk Dunning to see.

QUESTION: What's the effect of this reorganization of TWRS on this Project?

COMMENT: As near as we can tell, nothing will change in relation to this Project. It's a dotted line under the Environmental Restoration program. It's not terribly different than TWRS is now.

QUESTION: Who is the point of contact?

ANSWER: Officially I think it is Jackson Kinzer, but he has a lot of help.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT (MICHAEL GRAHAM): Dru Butler, Linda Bauer, and I are heading northwest tomorrow to meet with EPA, Tom Carpenter, and some of the people from the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) at the University of Washington.

QUESTION: What is the topic?

ANSWER: It's just a general update on the project. We decided to try to talk face to face to some of stakeholders that haven't been able to take an active role, and tell them what's going on with the Project.

QUESTION: Was this something that they initiated? Is it a conference or something?

ANSWER: No, we just asked if they could take the time to meet with us, and they agreed. We tried to get someone from Heart of America too, but so far we haven't heard from them. We're not seeing them all at the same time. We have three separate meetings.

COMMENT: It seems that this Project needs to decide how they want to deal with stakeholders. I (Gordon Rogers) consider it a waste of time and money to keep pestering people and organizations that have already stated they don't want to be involved, for whatever reason.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached)

UPCOMING EVENTS:

See 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar (attached)

NOTE:

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

ATTACHMENT:

6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Marty Bensky, General Public
John Brodeur, Mactec-ERS
Bob Bryce, PNNL
Dru Butler, BHI
Bruce Church, DOE-CRE
Don Clark, JAI Corp.
Jim Conca, WSU
Suzanne Dahl-Crumpler, Ecology
Greg deBruler, Columbia River United
Dirk Dunning, Oregon Office of Energy
Bryan Foley, DOE-RL
Bruce Ford, BHI
Owen Goodman, BHI
Dib Goswami, Ecology
Michael Graham, BHI
Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ
Barbara Harper, YIN
George Henckel, BHI
Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL
Rich Holten, DOE-RL
Mike Hughes, BHI
Gary Jewell, BHI
Tony Knepp, BHI
Fred Mann, FDNW
Margaret MacDowell, DOE-CRE
David Olson, DOE-RL
Tom Page, PNNL
Jim Poppiti, DOE-RL
Tom Post, EPA
Gordon Rogers, General Public
Phil Staats, Ecology
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL
Janice Williams, PHMC
Tom Wintczak, BHI
Al Young, DOE-CRE

Attachment 1*6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD***OCTOBER 26, 1998 - DECEMBER 3, 1998***GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*

October 26	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
November 2	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
November 2	Policy Working Group Meeting - Immediately following Weekly Project Status Meeting - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
November 3	SAC Working Group Meeting BHI - Room 1B45
November 3-4	Health of the Hanford Site Conference Richland, WA - Double Tree Hotel
November 5	Public Meeting on Spent Nuclear Fuels Project 7:00 p.m. - Double Tree Hanford House - Columbia & Benton Rooms
November 5-6	HAB Meeting Double Tree Hanford House - Columbia & Benton Rooms
November 9	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
November 12	Tri-Party Agreement Public Forum - Spent Nuclear Fuels 7:00 p.m. - Portland, OR - State Office Building
November 13	Groundwater Model Consolidation - Technical detail discussion "Geology Framework" 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. - PNNL - EESB - Snoqualmie Room
November 16	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
November 17-18	Year-End Project Review with DOE-HQ
November 19-21	GW/VZ Expert Panel Meetings Richland, WA
November 20-21	Hanford Groundwater Project (HGWP) External Peer Review of Site-Wide Groundwater Model Richland, WA
November 23	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
November 30	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
December 3	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room