

Environmental  
Restoration  
Contractor

# **ERC Team**

## **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: 8830/4170

066128

---

**SUBJECT** GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING – FEBRUARY 16, 1999

**TO** Distribution

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

**DATE** February 19, 1999

**ATTENDEES**

See Attached List

**DISTRIBUTION**

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

---

**NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:**

Date: Monday, March 1, 1999  
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)  
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 Open Meeting was held on February 16, 1999 in Richland, Washington at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

**PROJECT REPORT:**

**REPORT FROM POLICY WORK GROUP (Dru Butler):**

The Policy Work Group had a meeting earlier today. The main topic of the work group was the Regulatory Framework meeting on February 9 and follow-up actions. It was proposed at that meeting to form some new work groups. One of the groups would focus on endstates and assumptions. It would support requests from the Hanford Advisory Board Environmental Restoration (HAB-ER) Committee and provide a basis for development of the System Assessment Capability (SAC). Doug Sherwood and Tom Wintczak will work together to get us moving on that group, depending on what the HAB-ER Committee decides in their meeting on February 18.

The second new work group focuses on regulatory pathway. Phil Staats will be the lead and Tom Post, Bruce Ford, Rich Holten, and Tom Wintczak will help him get this group rolling. Members for the initial group should hear from them in the next week or so.

The SAC Work Group will continue as before. Bob Boutin, Bob Bryce, and Charley Kincaid will continue to be the leads for that group. Their next meeting is an open workshop scheduled for February 24 in Richland, to be held in the BHI Assembly Room.

066128.DOC

**066128**

The next Policy Work Group meeting is on March 1. We plan on discussing the status of the work groups.

REPORT FROM THE EXPERT PANEL MEETINGS (Virginia Rohay):

We're following up with the Expert Panel on their deliverables from the February 1-3 meeting. The Panel will produce a formal report on the meeting. They're also working on the issue of sub-panels for specific topics. Risk and field characterization are two of the panels being planned.

QUESTION: When are their formal comments from the last meeting supposed to be out?

ANSWER: The date they have given us is February 19.

COMMENT: Sometime in the next couple of weeks, I (Dru Butler) would like any comments you have on Tribal and public involvement related to the Expert Panel meetings. I'd like to get everyone's input on how we could do better in the areas of agenda, scheduling, and input. This is an issue that Dr. Edgar Berkey has expressed interest in as well. Let me know what your comments are and I'll pass them along to the Panel. For example, are Saturdays good for public involvement? The next meeting is planned for Thursday through Saturday. Please get your comments to me (509-375-4669) or Virginia Rohay (509-372-9234) in the next week or two.

DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE (DQO) PROCESS (David Olson):

The Tank Waste Remediation Systems (TWRS) Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Change Package starts its public review period today. The comment period lasts 45 days. The official end date for comments is April 1. In the meantime, we are proceeding with the draft milestones.

The first step is the preparation of a preliminary work plan for the accelerated characterization in the S/SX Waste Management Area. The plan is to get something to Ecology this spring to allow us to begin work in fiscal year 1999 (FY99). After that, we will work on the workplan for the Remedial Field Investigation (RFI)/Corrective Measures Study (CMS).

We had a kickoff meeting this past Friday. Members of the Tribal Nations and Oregon Office of Energy (ODOE) were invited due to their prior connection to the TWRS Interagency Team. Ecology was represented, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was invited but unable to attend.

We have standing meetings scheduled every Tuesday and Thursday from 8 a.m. to noon. From now until March 4, we'll be working on the plan for the S/SX characterization. From March 9 to March 30 we'll be developing the framework for the overall Single-Shell Tank (SST) RFI/CMS workplan. The preliminary plans need to get to Ecology by the end of April. We'll also give the plans to the GW/VZ Expert Panel at the same time to allow them time for review of the plans prior to the May meeting. There is a possibility of bringing in a sub-panel from the Expert Panel. Protocol may allow us to bring them in around mid-March so they can provide feedback into the main Panel.

QUESTION: So the Expert Panel will see this before Ecology?

ANSWER: Not really. We'll share what we have to that point with the sub-panel in March, and then in April we'd send the finished product to Ecology and the full Expert Panel. Working with the sub-panel in March would allow for the possibility of midstream corrections in our

**066128**

thinking if they are called for.

QUESTION: Who from the Expert Panel would be on the sub-panel?

ANSWER: Possibly Matuszek, Conaway, Patt, and maybe others. It would basically be the members of the old SX Expert Panel.

QUESTION: Since the Expert Panel is providing overview, why have the Kovach group?

ANSWER: It's simply not feasible to have a representative from the Expert Panel here at all of our meetings. Although the group headed by Lou Kovach is not totally independent, they do provide input from somewhere outside the GW/VZ Project. They are more of a steering group with a lot of horse power and a wealth of expertise in this area.

QUESTION: Do you really want somebody like Kovach in charge of this steering group when his position is to default on the milestones?

ANSWER: I don't believe that is his position. He came across Friday to challenge the team to explain why they need to go out and get additional data. That's a valid question. He's providing a voice that says "why do this?"

QUESTION: Who are the members of the steering group?

ANSWER: It is headed by Lou Kovach and includes Kent Reynolds, Kevin Lindsey, Glendon Gee, Charlie Cole, Vern Johnson, and Jeff Serne.

QUESTION: Where do these people come from?

ANSWER: These are generally all Hanford people. Many of them are from Pacific Northwest National Labs (PNNL) but there are other organizations represented.

QUESTION: Are these people working on the deliverable or simply steering or both?

ANSWER: Both. Vern Johnson is involved with the GW Assessment work, and part of the idea here is to integrate. It's hard to get a totally impartial third party panel for this. Even the GW/VZ Expert Panel has a lot of experience with this.

COMMENT: My (Dirk Dunning) problem is that we've had 15 years of decisions and we need more data. Three years ago the SX Panel recommended digging more holes. Now this new group comes along and says "show us why we need to drill." There's a strange credulity going on there.

RESPONSE: I imagine what Kovach is doing is asking us to articulate what the data needs are.

COMMENT: That would be nice, but that's not what he said.

QUESTION: Where are these meetings taking place? I (Ron Skinnarland) might want to be involved.

**066128**

ANSWER: Here at BHI in Room 1B40. We've invited the Tribes and ODOE and all of the other organizations and individuals we think need to be involved. We didn't want to open these meetings up in order to keep the number of people involved manageable. There were 25 people there today. Zelma Maine-Jackson is there as a representative from Ecology.

QUESTION: Who is in charge at these meetings?

COMMENT: Roger Ovink is the facilitator for these DQO process meetings.

SAC WORKSHOP (Bob Bryce):

The agenda has changed somewhat recently (agenda attached). We felt like the full group needed to stay together instead of breaking into multiple sub-groups. Some of us would have liked to be in both sessions at the February 9 Regulatory Framework meeting, but we were unable because of the format. We think there are definite advantages to keeping the group together. However, it means keeping focused in order to accomplish everything that we want to during the meetings. We are open to comments about this approach.

We plan to start at 8 a.m. in order to give us a full day. We'll start with a discussion of the SAC process and what we've accomplished to date, and then go right into the criteria that have been drafted for determining the Study and Candidate Sets. We'll finish with a discussion of how we move forward from here, and how we can gain and maintain stakeholder, regulator, and Tribal input.

QUESTION: You list Inventory and Risk & Impact as the first sets to talk about. Is the agenda listed in order of priority?

ANSWER: We have the items ordered by how we think they should be approached. Inventory has been identified as a major area and it feeds into all of the other areas. We plan to work Impact and Risk second because of the need to have a real understanding of the factors, such as environmental and socioeconomic issues, that are not easily identifiable.

PROJECT PARTICIPATION (Dru Butler):

I'd like to recap on some of the public outreach things we've done recently. The Project met with ODOE, including Dirk Dunning and Steve Sautter, on February 8 and received some input from them on the GW/VZ Project Specification (Spec). We met with the Hanford Watch that same evening in Portland. These one-on-one meetings with interested groups seem to be a good way to keep groups informed and get input.

We briefed the full HAB on February 11, and we are having the same opportunity with the HAB-ER Committee this Thursday. We plan to talk with them about policy needs, the role of risk, and the SAC. Ralph Patt is also planning to attend and provide a prospective from the Expert Panel.

We have a couple more of our one-on-ones scheduled. We're meeting with the Army Corps of Engineers in Walla Walla on February 22 to talk to them about risk and assessment issues, and we've agreed to give a briefing to the Oregon Hanford Waste Board at the end of March. We've begun planning on Tribal visits with DOE to discuss risk.

QUESTION: Are you getting constructive feedback, or is it just the standard complaints about the

**066128**

Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA)?

ANSWER: Both meetings on February 8 were very productive. We didn't expect to get 100 percent endorsement. A couple of issues raised were that we need to better develop the purpose of the SAC and determine our risk approach, both of which are valid points. We're hoping to get additional written comments at the conclusion of the public comment period for the Project Spec on March 12.

COMMENT: If there are any other groups that would like briefings, please let us know. We'd be happy to talk to anyone about risk, the Project Spec, the Project in general, or any other areas of concern.

COMMENT: There really haven't been any groups in the Tri-Cities interested in a briefing right now. The big thing on everybody's plate seems to be tomorrow's meeting on the dams. Maybe once that's over the focus will shift.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPATION (Michael Graham):

There are currently two documents connected to the Project that we are looking for public input on. Comments for the Center for Risk Excellence (CRE) Draft Risk/Impact Technical Report are due to Doug Hildebrand by February 26, and the comments for the GW/VZ Project Spec are due by March 12.

We're still having internal discussions about how to handle the CRE report, and how we go forward with that. Does this need to stand as a separate document, or should we just take the relative pieces and fold them into something else? There are discussions going on between the Project, CRE, DOE-RL, and DOE-HQ about that.

COMMENT: If you're still discussing whether or not to include certain sections, or even the document itself, then we (Ecology) don't want to spend too much time on comments. If you decide not to include things, then it would just be wasted effort.

RESPONSE: Your comments will be instrumental in helping us decide what to do.

RESPONSE: If one of the things you're worried about is Appendix D, that's no longer an issue. DOE-RL has already decided to pull that entire section.

RESPONSE: It would be extremely useful at this point to get higher level feedback. Things like "this section doesn't belong" or "this needs to be fleshed out a bit and included in the final document" would actually be more useful than details at this point.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

(See attached 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar)

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669), Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or Karen Strickland (509-372-9236)

**066128**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) Agenda for the February 29 SAC Workshop
- 2) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

**ATTENDEES:**

Martin Bensky, Tri-Cities Caucus  
Bob Boutin, BHI  
Bob Bryce, PNNL  
Dru Butler, BHI  
Jerry Davis, Numatec  
Dirk Dunning, ODOE  
Dib Goswami, Ecology  
Mike Hughes, BHI  
Fred Mann, FDNW  
Dave Olson, DOE-RL  
Virginia Rohay, CHI  
Gordon Rogers, HAB  
Ron Skinnarland, Ecology  
Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce Tribe  
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL  
John Williams, FDH  
Rob Yasek, DOE-RL

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**System Assessment Capability Workshop - February 24, 1999**

Development of Candidate Sets/Study Set Criteria

Location: 3350 George Washington Way, Assembly Room

Please submit comments on the agenda to Charlie Kincaid, 372-9440

Objective: Initiate development of the Candidate Sets and Study Sets to be used in the minimum credible system assessment capability

Approach: Discuss Candidate Set Criteria, Candidate Sets, Study Set Criteria to form the basis for developing the minimum credible system assessment capability. Information packages are being prepared for each technical element to serve as a basis for discussion. Key areas to be discussed will include:

- Criteria for development of the Candidate Sets to be considered for each technical element
- Criteria for development of the Study Sets to be considered for each technical element to create a minimum credible system assessment capability
- Proposed scoping studies to be performed
- Process for prioritization of scoping studies
- Process for identifying which aspects of the minimum credible system assessment capability will be included in the first iteration of development.

The criteria and approach will be discussed during the meeting. Draft lists of items included in the Candidate Sets will be available for participants to take with them for review in the weeks following the workshop. Participants and other interested parties are encouraged to submit recommendations on the lists.

Proposed Agenda

8:00 - 8:15 Welcome

8:15 - 8:45 Overview of the System Assessment Capability effort and recap of FY 99 work to date

8:45 - 9:15 Description of the task at hand

9:15- 9:30 Break

9:45 - 12:00 AM working session: Inventory, Risk and Impact, and Columbia River

12:00 - 1:00 Lunch Break

1:00 - 4:00 PM working session: Vadose Zone, Groundwater, and Candidate Scenario Sets

4:00 – 4:30 Wrap-up

Recap results of working sessions.

4:30 – 5:00 Next Steps

Discuss decision making process for work to be included in first iteration of SAC.  
Process to be used to maintain stakeholder, Tribal Nation input.

**066128**

**ATTACHMENT 2**

**GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT  
6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR**

**FEBRUARY 22, 1999 – APRIL 5, 1999**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>February 22</b>    | GW/VZ briefing to the Army Corps of Engineers (Walla Walla)   |
| <b>February 22-23</b> | Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board visit to Hanford<br>(GW/VZ on agenda for 2/23)                      |
| <b>February 24</b>    | GW/VZ System Assessment Capability Working Meeting (Richland – BHI Room 2D01 – 8 a.m.-4 p.m.)               |
| <b>February 25</b>    | FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn – 1-6 p.m.)                                   |
| <b>March 1</b>        | GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)                      |
| <b>March 1</b>        | GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 1 p.m.)                                     |
| <b>March 9</b>        | <i>FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Portland)</i>   |
| <b>March 10</b>       | <i>FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Seattle)</i>  |
| <b>March 11</b>       | <i>FY01 Budget Development Process Meeting (Spokane)</i>  |
| <b>March 11</b>       | <i>Hanford Advisory Board – ER Committee Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)</i>         |
| <b>March 12</b>       | GW/VZ Project Specification public comment period ends  |
| <b>March 15</b>       | GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)                      |
| <b>March 15</b>       | GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 1 p.m.)                                     |
| <b>March 24</b>       | Tri-Party Agreement Quarterly Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn – 1-3 p.m.)                                     |
| <b>March 25-26</b>    | Hanford Advisory Board Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn)   |
| <b>March 30-31</b>    | Oregon Hanford Waste Board Meeting (Ontario, OR)<br>(GW/VZ on agenda for 3/31)                              |
| <b>April 1</b>        | Proposed TPA Change Package for SST Groundwater and Vadose Zone Characterization public comment period ends |
| <b>April 5</b>        | GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)                      |
| <b>April 5</b>        | GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 1 p.m.)                                     |

NOTE: *Italics denote tentative dates*