

# Meeting Minutes

064008

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 - NOVEMBER 16, 1998

**TO** Distribution

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

**DATE** NOVEMBER 19, 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: December 7, 1998 (SEE NOTE)

Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

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

NOTE: The GW/VZ Integration Project Weekly Meetings will be moving to a bi-monthly schedule. We will meet on the first and third Monday of each month. The location of the meetings is changing as well. The meetings will be held in the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room instead of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), Environmental Technology Building (ETB), Columbia River Room. Badging is required for the new location. Please contact Karen Strickland at 509-372-9236 if you need badging assistance. Please make a note of the schedule and location change.

Our next Project Status Meeting will be December 7 at 1 p.m. at the BHI Assembly Room.

## MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on November 16, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Environmental Technology Building, Columbia River Room.

## PROJECT REPORT:

POLICY WORK GROUP UPDATE (DRU BUTLER): We had about an hour long Policy Meeting today just before this meeting. The main topic of discussion was Rich Holten's paper on the "Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Department of Energy (DOE) Management and Decision Processes" and the Authority Matrix that goes with that. It's a snippet of how DOE-Richland (RL) works regarding the GW/VZ Project. Rich is still accepting comments and this issue is still open, so let me know if you want to see the paper and matrix. We need to be clear on what it is and what it isn't. It more or less defines how we interact with the

specific projects and how DOE decisions are made. We also talked about three new issues that have come out of the System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group. One of these issues is the role of the CRCIA Board in approval of the SAC candidate data set. No agreements came from that discussion, but we plan to go into it further in the next meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for two weeks from today at Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI). (NOTE: The next Policy meeting will be held on December 7 at 11:30 a.m. due to a decision later in this meeting.)

LONG RANGE PLAN (LRP) WORK GROUP UPDATE (TOM WINTCZAK): I'll cover the LRP during the discussion about last week's DOE-Headquarters (HQ) visit. The meetings with DOE-HQ included a discussion of the LRP and Project Baseline and what their expectations are.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY (SAC) WORK GROUP UPDATE (FRED MANN): We went through the portions of the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) Appendices that dealt with the topic of risk, and we basically clarified things and added comments. We identified the things that, in our minds, needed a little more detail. We're just making sure that everything is well defined. Tomorrow we are planning to cover Appendix A.2 which covers release.

QUESTION: By release do you mean loss of containment?

ANSWER: It is more how things release from the system into the environment.

MEETINGS WITH DOE-HQ TO CLARIFY EXPECTATIONS ON THE PROJECT BASELINE (TOM WINTCZAK): Last week we had Bob Alvarez and Mary Harmon here from DOE-HQ. They arrived Monday and attended this Project Status Meeting. The Project and others met with them all day Tuesday. That meeting was to provide them with an understanding of what the deliverables are for December and how we currently see them, and for us to determine what expectations DOE-HQ has for the deliverables. Wednesday, the Tank Waste Remediation Systems (TWRS) baseline was discussed. Thursday included a discussion with Terri Stewart about the Science and Technology (S&T) Plan, a portion of the Hanford Advisory Board Environmental Restoration Committee (HAB-ER) meeting, and a SAC meeting. They departed Friday. A list of some of the DOE-HQ expectations that were discussed is attached (Attachment 1).

For those of you that could not be there last week, I have a chart of the LRP and Baseline pinned up on the back wall. It is a little older version. I'm working on a revised version currently. I wanted to have something to put up as an example. The goal is to provide a baseline and communications tool that people can walk up to, pinpoint a particular project or activity, and see if it feeds something or if something feeds it. At the top are all of the major decision points. We're trying to tie all of the Project activities to those and see the interfaces in order to see what is driving what. The next section is project management. It's mostly the planning that helps make decisions for budget and workplans for the following years. The next section is the S&T. We're still working on producing the detailed roadmap. The SAC is broken out by its individual technical elements. The second sheet contains ongoing things like TWRS, 200 Area Assessment, Groundwater (GW) Monitoring, GW Remediation, GW Modeling, River Monitoring, etc. It will help us identify the opportunities for integration. It will help to see where the points are that we can drive towards that will allow us to bring these projects together and integrate them. Generally, the expectations of HQ were in line with what we are doing.

We want this process to be as open as possible. This is what our plans are for the short-term. We'll have a summary of the LRP ready for the Expert Panel. We will have a Project Specification Working Draft out by this Friday hopefully. It will be a working internal draft with an extremely short turnaround time, probably around the first of December. If anybody would like to take the time to look it over, we'll be happy to take your comments. I will have copies to share by next Monday.

DOE-HQ is basically looking for path forward and opportunities for integration. Bob Alvarez wants these opportunities identified, as well as where we can begin to integrate S&T products.

TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEMS (TWRS) VADOSE ZONE (VZ) NEGOTIATIONS UPDATE (DOE/ECOLOGY): (Jim Poppiti) I'm going to ask Roger Stanley to start off with the Ecology viewpoint. He gave a summation of the negotiations at the HAB-Environmental Restoration (ER) Committee Meeting last week that I think would be appropriate here.

(Roger Stanley-by telephone) This process was initiated about a month ago partially as a way to try to pull together the pathways and integrate the GW/VZ Project with the work on the Single-Shell Tank (SST) Farms. It is partly a result of the people in this room and the other stakeholders bringing the GW/VZ Project higher on everybody's respective screen, and partially a result of the State being dissatisfied with the progress on SST leaks. In July, the State came close to enforcement action, but they eventually backed off. The result is these negotiations. They are being done under the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) rather than the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) authority. The negotiations are between DOE and regulators and are set to reach agreement by December 4. The focus is on three main things. The first is identification of interim SST leak Corrective Action activities for the tank farms and immediate surrounding areas. Issues like run off control, sealing boreholes, etc. are examples. We need to identify what kinds of near-term actions can be undertaken in the next couple of years.

The second item is the overall site-wide integration. There are a number of different types of activities on the table from a GW/VZ standpoint. We need to integrate things like groundwater monitoring, activities related to TWRS, retrieval of waste, tank farm closure, etc.

The third thing is developing a regulatory pathway to enable us to collect VZ or GW information in the tank farm vicinity when we need it in the future. Right now things are running under TPA major milestone M-45, which has a target date of 2024. There are a number of steps. One is trying to incorporate RCRA Corrective Actions into the M-45 milestone so that the process will allow us to identify interim Corrective Actions, as well as paths for getting information for retrieval and closure. I have looked at that these negotiations as setting in motion a process for the next few years, and also identifying a list of Interim Corrective Actions that have been being tossed back and forth between the stakeholders.

(Jim Poppiti) We're still on track to finish the negotiations by December 4. We've had good discussions thus far, and there is another session scheduled for this week. There is a session scheduled every week between now and December 4. In the meeting this Wednesday morning, we have scheduled time from 10 am to Noon for stakeholders to give their input. It's just a chance for people to give their comments as to their view of these negotiations. The meeting Wednesday will be at 2420 Stevens, Room 308.

QUESTION: How did you announce these meetings? This isn't the first notification, is it?

ANSWER: We sent out a letter from DOE-RL, but we're using this forum and the HAB-ER as well.

RESPONSE: The letters were sent to Oregon, the Tribes, the City of Richland, and some others. It was also announced at the most recent HAB meeting in order to make them aware.

QUESTION: What is the date for the stakeholder participation and comments?

ANSWER: It is Wednesday November 18.

COMMENT: We can put those types of things on the GW/VZ calendar too. It would be a useful way to get this information out.

QUESTION: Is this open to the public?

ANSWER: The intention was to get specific input from specific people and organizations.

QUESTION: How many Corrective Actions are you developing dates for?

ANSWER: That's one of the things still in discussion. It should be in the range of six to eight.

QUESTION: How many have Ecology and DOE agreed on so far?

ANSWER: We haven't agreed on anything yet. We're still in the discussion phase. I think it's fair to say that we've agreed on a framework for ultimate agreement though. The devil's in the details right now.

RESPONSE: The basic list right now is between six and eight items. The focus is on the RCRA Corrective Action process and those types of regulatory documents. The initial discussions last week showed that we've already identified many of the Interim Corrective Actions that need to be in this agreement, but we haven't agreed on the process we will use to include those.

COMMENT: We'll finish with maybe ten or twelve Interim Corrective Actions, with ten or so separate milestones or groupings. It all comes down to details. We just want everyone to understand that we are making good progress. We're on track for December 4. We've agreed on the general framework but not the details to this point.

QUESTION: How is the GW/VZ Integration Project involved?

ANSWER: Janice Williams is representing the GW/VZ Project, as well as the Project Hanford Management Contractor (PHMC). Dave Olson and Jim Poppiti are involved for DOE, but they are also involved in all of the GW/VZ meetings.

COMMENT: A piece of this is the TWRS negotiations, but there is definitely a longer term view of site-wide integration here too.

RESPONSE: That's a good point. We recognize that you can't look at Corrective Actions for the tank farms by themselves. There are other things around there that impact, and are impacted by, the tank farms. We're discussing ways to come to agreements and milestones that make sense from an integrated site-wide approach as well, not just from a tank farm perspective. Part of the challenge is reaching an agreement everyone can accept and understand that looks at things from a site-wide viewpoint.

COMMENT: The term Interim Corrective Action keeps popping up, but there are only a few Interim Corrective Actions that would have a significant impact that you can actually go out and do. You really need to start the characterization work.

RESPONSE: The State is very much behind that. In fact, the reason the State began this course was due to slow progress in characterization activities. One of the focuses of the negotiations is to move that forward.

RESPONSE: The Interim Corrective Actions are no-brainers really. They are mostly things that we would go ahead and do anyway. They are simply things that we have agreed to that make sense. We'll determine if there are any additional Corrective Actions that make sense, and also collect information to move toward tank closure.

QUESTION: Is one of the big issues the removal of water in the tanks?

ANSWER: That is a big issue, but it's not part of these negotiations. It's interim stabilization, and that is part of a separate agreement.

QUESTION: This is an item that is in front of the public more than any other. It's simple, and it's easy to understand the logic behind it. Water that can move and carry contaminants shouldn't be there. Why isn't this item number one?

RESPONSE: The State agrees that this is item one, but it's not part of this particular negotiation. The removal of liquids from the tanks is such a high priority that we agreed on court approved order to oversee that. We are finalizing language that will put in place a plan to accelerate the interim stabilization work plan even further. That program came close to being crippled in the last year, and is now getting back on track. We expect a draft plan to be finalized early next calendar year.

RESPONSE: Clearly we understand that the most important thing is to get the waste out and work toward closure. We are mindful of that in these negotiations.

QUESTION: How do you see the results of the assessment that the GW/VZ Project is doing affecting this process? Are you planning on using the results for topics like closure and others? Is there any effect on this at all?

ANSWER: That's something that we would dovetail into the RCRA Corrective Action process. It will drive acquisition of groundwater and vadose zone info over time, along with the closure of the tank farms. When we get some information from beneath the tank farms it will provide guidance for decisions about possible additional Corrective Actions and things associated with the M-45 milestone. An example would be to take tank farm retrieval project scheduled now, back up a

little bit, and make sure that we take the information generated on contaminant movement through the vadose zone to better plan future data needs and overall decisions.

COMMENT: You are talking about the characterization data, but I'm talking more along the lines of the SAC and assessments. I'm getting the feeling that they are too separate and not being tied together.

RESPONSE: I understand your point, but I don't think that's the case. There are some broader questions for the overall site being dealt with in the SAC that would be inappropriate for these negotiations.

QUESTION: Suppose that tank closure issues are big hitters in the assessment. Wouldn't you have to tie those in?

ANSWER: These negotiations are a little bit narrower in scope than that. That does feed into these issues, but for now this is a pretty narrow near-term piece we're discussing.

COMMENT: I'm wondering if it should be that narrow.

RESPONSE: We committed to come to agreement on the things that make sense in the near-term while still being mindful of these bigger site-wide issues. The whole process of these negotiations is accelerated and being completed in a very short time frame. It's fair to say that we're remaining mindful of the bigger picture, and that the framework that is being set up will be flexible enough to take that into account.

QUESTION: How are you going to deal with the Integration Project and other projects tied to TWRS. How are you looking at those? Have you come up with anything yet?

ANSWER: So far, it has only been in the form of initial conversations with Rich Holten. He came to one of the negotiating sessions. While we're not tying the commitments for the SSTs to any other site-wide programs, I suppose it's possible that we could do that. Rich expressed the idea of moving in the spring or summer from an SST focus to site-wide under the TPA. We don't know if it's going to happen yet, but we've had initial conversations. It really hasn't gotten that far yet though.

COMMENT: If the tanks are the biggest hitter, the assessment of the tanks should give you a perspective of how important it is to go site-wide as early as possible. If it turns out that the tanks are relatively harmless at this point to the overall system due to the work already done, then you need to concentrate on getting a handle on the other big hitters.

RESPONSE: That's a good point.

COMMENT: From listening to this update, I've heard that you are discussing several issues in these negotiations such as infiltrations, leaks, integration of 200 Area, retrieval, closure, planning for GW/VZ data for tank closure, RCRA Corrective Actions, etc. You've indicated that the agreement is going to control work for several years down the road, but then I hear that these negotiations are of a fairly narrow scope. It seems contradictory.

RESPONSE: They are narrow in terms of our main focus of moving characterization of the SSTs forward. It's initiating a regulatory process with which we can move forward. It's not scheduling for many years down the road, but instead using RCRA to focus on near-term issues. However, the process is being designed with a eye to providing information when needed in the future.

RESPONSE: I think it's difficult to answer that question without getting into the discussions that we've had to this point, and I'm not sure if it's appropriate to discuss some of those yet. We understand your point, and we are setting up the framework to be flexible enough to handle that, but we're only agreeing to things for the next few years. The process itself is trying to be set up for the long-term.

QUESTION: I understand that you are trying to follow a Remedial Field Investigation (RFI) protocol?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Once you're done with the RFI are you moving to Corrective Action study? How do you see the schedule for moving beyond that to a Corrective Measure Study? Is it just way to early in the process to worry about that?

ANSWER: We haven't gotten into the schedule that far yet. It's safe to say that it will be a few years away, but we haven't finalized times. We're probably looking at somewhere within the next 5 years though.

QUESTION: Could it even be 3 years or less?

ANSWER: Probably.

QUESTION: When is the first tank farm going to be characterized?

ANSWER: That milestone is under discussion. There is no date yet.

QUESTION: Which tank farm will be first?

ANSWER: That is also under discussion. The two main contenders appear to be SX and BX.

QUESTION: We need to look at how to integrate this stuff. I understand that this process has a narrow focus, but how will this tie in with the 200 Area and other projects?

ANSWER: We're making the framework flexible enough to incorporate things later without getting into details about it now. Everybody seems to want details, and we don't have those.

COMMENT: One of the reasons we're here is to try to manage things from a holistic view, instead of looking at everything like a bunch of individual pieces. I see this process furthering the individual pieces viewpoint. This all needs to be done from a system point of view. This site behaves as a system, and it needs to be managed that way.

COMMENT: I disagree. These negotiations needed to get rolling from a TWRS perspective. Things simply aren't integrated enough yet to approach this that way, and these negotiations needed to move forward. However, the people that are involved encompass site-wide perspectives.

RESPONSE: We're simply moving ahead with the information we have. Ecology was there, as well as PNNL and DOE. We brought in who we thought were the right people. We're working under the RCRA Corrective Action and trying to involve the right people, including the Integration Project.

RESPONSE: There have been meetings identifying how the S&T Plan is going to work, but it isn't in effect yet. They can't say specifically what is required of the TWRS Program. The holistic approach isn't far enough along to be able to ask the right questions yet, so TWRS is going forward.

COMMENT: S&T is one of the items on the table for the Expert Panel this week.

COMMENT: All I've heard so far is that they've identified the approach and are finding the holes. I'm sure they haven't completed that between this week and last week. Hopefully TWRS will be receptive when the plan and roadmaps are complete.

COMMENT: That's part of the beauty of the LRP. You put all of those things up there and encourage everybody to find the disconnects, as well as identify what's too narrow and what's too broad. Right now, the level of disconnect is acceptable as long as there is open communication and sufficient public opportunities to be involved. There are a lot of things working in parallel right now. We need to be sure we're asking the right questions.

EXPERT PANEL MEETINGS (BOB PETERSON): We are attaching a copy of the Expert Panel Agenda for the meetings this week (Attachment 2). They will be held at the Bechtel Assembly Room on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Most of you are probably familiar with the main points. The two main topics will be a discussion of the LRP in its current form and the S&T plan. On the agenda, we've tried to indicate where there are open sessions and where there is time set aside for the panel to work by themselves. Most of this has already been covered through the course of this meeting. The only other thing I'd like to reemphasize is the time scheduled Saturday for stakeholder input. I want to make sure that people know that that is the time that has been included to bring issues before the Expert Panel. It's from 8:30 to 10:00 Saturday morning. Everyone is welcome to observe the LRP and S&T presentations, but the time for comments and presentations from stakeholders is Saturday.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE WEEKLY PROJECT STATUS MEETING SESSIONS (DRU BUTLER): I'd like to propose that the Weekly Project Status Meeting scheduled for next Monday, November 23, be canceled. I'd like to suggest conducting these meetings on a bi-weekly basis. The Work Groups are consuming a lot of people's time and are more vital to the Project's success at this juncture. The Work Groups have become more of a focus of the Project for getting things done. I'd also like to propose moving all of the meetings to the Bechtel building so that they can all be in the same place. The downside for that idea is badging, but that's something that can be worked out.

COMMENT: Badges are really very easy to get.

COMMENT: I'd like to see the meetings occur on the first and third or the second and fourth Mondays of every month instead of bi-weekly. It would make long-term scheduling easier.

COMMENT: These Weekly Project Status Meetings were originally a way to give weekly updates to the regulators, but they've evolved into a Project update for everybody. The big issue now is making sure that the right people are attending the Work Group meetings. We'll use those groups to iron out problems and do the work, and use this meeting as a status.

COMMENT: What you're proposing isn't really a bi-weekly schedule. It really two meetings a month.

RESPONSE: Let's start having this meeting on the first and third Monday of every month. We'll see if we can get it scheduled into our Assembly Room at Bechtel.

**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:**

- 1) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar
- 2) GW/VZ Document Information

**ATTENDEES:**

Martin Bensky - General Public

Tom Woods - AO Systems

John Brodeur - Mactec-ERS

Dru Butler - BHI

Dirk Dunning - Oregon Office of Energy

Bryan Foley - DOE-RL

Mary Harmon - DOE-HQ

Doug Hildebrand - DOE-RL

Gary Jewell - BHI

Tony Knepp - BHI

Bob Lober - DOE-RL

Fred Mann - FDNW

Dave Olson - DOE-RL

Bob Peterson - BHI

Jim Poppiti - DOE-RL

Mary Jo Ramicone - CRE

Wade Riggsbee - YIN

Gordon Rogers - General Public

Ron Skinnarland - Ecology

Stan Sobczyk - NPT

Phil Staats - Ecology

Roger Stanley - Ecology

Janice Williams - PHMC

Tom Wintczak - BHI



## **Attachment 1**

### **GW/VZ Integration Project Expectations From November 9 through November 12, 1998 Discussions**

#### **Project Baseline/Long Range Plan**

The following are the actions/clarifications that resulted from the discussions on the Project Baseline/Long Range Plan, with DOE-HQ and the Regulators. The actions/clarifications have been sorted by the deliverables to which they apply.

#### **Project Specification**

Roles and Responsibilities of both the Integration Project and Hanford Site Projects will be captured in the Project Specification. The completion of this item is dependent on the acceptance of the DOE-RL letter outlining the roles and responsibilities of the Integration Project.

The technical element of Risk needs to clearly stated that it includes the impact analysis and ecosystem webs

Need to provide a description of the boundaries of the Integration Project relative to such data as release mechanisms

Provide draft of technical element descriptions to HQ for review. They need to be “more” than a description.

Provide complete hierarchy of documents. Include SAC and S&T dcoments.

Include S&T Roadmap in Project Specification.

Need to discuss data control and configuration process. Should include best data, uncertainties, and assumptions. Not just a question of consistency. Include “data mining”.

Need to address the issue of “design criteria” for the SAC. (timeframes, geographical extent, standards, endstates, scale)

Public Involvement needs to be addressed outside of the Project Baseline/LRP

#### **Long Range Plan**

Need list of overlaps, disconnects, etc that are integration opportunities

Key project/regulatory decisions will be included with the milestones on the Long Range Plan

Include K Basin milestones

Key interfaces and logic ties will be added to the Long Range Plan

Strategy associated with SAC needs to be highlighted

Barrier testing needs to be included under the technology

The technical element of Risk needs to clearly stated that it includes the impact analysis and ecosystem webs

Need to show strategic objective ties to cleanup decisions

Need to develop critical path logic to show how the activities of the GW/VZ drive major decisions/ milestones. This is needed to support the IPL process.

Need critical path on LRP that reflects critical path logic

Timeframe discussions will be limited to format of the LRP. Performance measures will be focused on the near term (next 5 years).

The LRP will be formatted to show the first five years in greater detail, then through the completion of the current mission and beyond the current mission.

Show major Facility D&D on milestone/decision line

Show CDI line

Place vertical line that shows revision of 200 Area strategy

Need to show where, on the TWRS model line, more data is required to support development

#### Baseline Cost and Schedule

Where costs are currently unknown, provide a placeholder and associated assumptions.

Begin to prepare information for the PBS

Planning will be based on a compliance case with unconstrained funding beyond FY 1999.

#### **Project Involvement**

The following actions relative to project involvement activities.

The public comment period for the Project Baseline/Long Range Plan should be a minimum of 45 days.

The current schedule assumes a release of the Project Baseline/Long Range Plan for public review and comment by January 15, 1998.

Regional (tentatively Portland, Seattle, Hood River) public workshops, on the Project Baseline/Long Range Plan, will be scheduled near the end of the public review period.

Need to coordinate GW/VZ workshops with DOE "Budget" public meetings and workshops that are held in late February and early March.

Need to work within project team to determine approach for finalizing the PI Plan.

**Attachment 2**

**GROUNDWATER VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT  
EXPERT PANEL MEETINGS**

**NOVEMBER 19-21, 1998  
Bechtel Building – Assembly Room – Richland, Washington**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>SUBJECT/TOPIC</b>	<b>PRESENTERS</b>
<b>Thursday, November 19, 1998</b>		<b>OPEN SESSION: 7:30 am to 2:30 pm</b>
7:30 am – 8:00 am	Coffee	
8:00 am – 8:15 am	Welcome	Holten
8:15 am – 10:15 am	Integration Project Update	Graham
10:15 am – 10:30 am	Break	
10:30 am – 12:00 pm	Long Range Plan: Strategy and Baseline	Wintczak
12:00 pm – 1:00 pm	Lunch – Box Lunches Available at Cost	
1:00 pm – 2:30 pm	Long Range Plan Continued	Wintczak
Late Afternoon/Evening	<i>Panel Only: Working Session 1: Long Range Plan</i>	
<b>Friday, November 20, 1998</b>		<b>OPEN SESSION: 9:30 am to 12:00 pm</b>
Early Morning	Panel Only: Working Session 2: Panel Logistics and Focus	
9:30 am – 9:45 am	Coffee	
9:45 am – 12:00 pm	Applied Science and Technology Plan	Stewart
Afternoon	<i>Panel Only: Working Session 3: S&amp;T Plan and Project Logistics</i>	
<b>Saturday, November 21, 1998</b>		<b>OPEN SESSION: 8:00 am to 12:00 pm</b>
8:00 am – 8:30 am	Coffee	
8:30 am – 10:00 am	Stakeholder Input: Issues to the Panel	Open Process/ Butler
10:00 am – 10:15 am	Break	
10:15 am – 11:30	Comments from the Panel	Berkey
11:30 am – 12:00 pm	Closing Remarks	Holten/Graham

**Attachment 3**

*6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*  
**NOVEMBER 16, 1998 - JANUARY 4, 1998**  
*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*

<b><i>November 16</i></b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. - BHI - Room 1B40
<b><i>November 16</i></b>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL - ETB - Columbia River Room
<b><i>November 17 &amp; 18</i></b>	System Assessment Capability Work Group Meetings 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. - BHI - Room 1B40 (12th)
<b><i>November 19-21</i></b>	GW/VZ Expert Panel Meetings BHI Assembly Room
<b><i>November 20-21</i></b>	Hanford Groundwater Project (HGWP) External Peer Review of Site-Wide Groundwater Model Richland, WA
<b><i>November 30- December 2</i></b>	Year-End Project Review with DOE-HQ
<b><i>December 7</i></b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. - BHI - Room 1B40
<b><i>December 7</i></b>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - BHI - Assembly Room
<b><i>December 21</i></b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. - BHI - Room 1B40
<b><i>December 21</i></b>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - BHI - Assembly Room
<b><i>January 4</i></b>	Policy Work Group Meeting 11:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m. - BHI - Room 1B40
<b><i>January 4</i></b>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - BHI - Assembly Room