

**068713**

---

**SUBJECT** GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING – MAY 17, 1999

**TO** Distribution

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

**DATE** May 20, 1999

**ATTENDEES**

See Attached List

**DISTRIBUTION**

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

---

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

Next Meeting: Monday, June 7, 1999 – 1-2 p.m.  
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 May 17, 1999 in Richland, Washington at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

**PROJECT REPORT:**

**REGULATORY PATH FORWARD WORK GROUP (Bruce Ford):**

The Regulatory Path Forward Work Group has a meeting scheduled for this Thursday (May 20) from 1-2 p.m. in BHI Room 1B40. Everyone is welcome to attend.

QUESTION: Who will be there from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)?

ANSWER: Tom Post was the EPA representative, but he is leaving EPA at the end of this week. I haven't heard another name from them yet. Rich Holten will call Doug Sherwood to find out who the EPA link to the Project will be.

QUESTION: What is the agenda for the meeting?

ANSWER: Tom Wintczak will bring in the updated pathway charts he's been working on, and we will continue discussing and filling those in. Tom has been incorporating comments over the past few weeks. We will also begin to define what products are expected out of this process. That's not something we'll be able to cover completely at this meeting, but it's a start. Phil Staats has said that he would like to have the assumptions in a suitable condition to be able

to take to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) staff and get review comments from there.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY WORK GROUP (Bob Bryce):

We are planning a System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group Meeting on May 26. There are two topics planned. The first is a continuation of our discussion on general assessment concepts. The second is to initiate discussions on how the work group operates and how we should move forward through the next few weeks. We'll be taking input on the conceptual model through June, and we have a work group meeting scheduled to discuss the model on June 6. We need to focus and make those useful meetings.

QUESTION: How long will the May 26 meeting be?

ANSWER: We have the BHI Assembly Room reserved from 1-4 p.m.

QUESTION: When will we see an agenda?

ANSWER: The plan is for a work group meeting on those two general subjects. There will likely not be a formalized agenda. We will contact the individuals previously expressing interest in the work group with scheduling information.

OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION (ORP)/PROJECT HANFORD MANAGEMENT CONTRACTOR (PHMC) UPDATE (John Williams):

We are planning on meeting with the Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and Ecology this week to discuss comments on the S/SX Waste Management Area Preliminary Work Plan. We need to discuss that soon so the work on decommissioning the 41-09-39 borehole can begin on or about June 1 as we had hoped. Also, the Notice of Construction for SX-115 and 41-09-39 is moving through the system. Everything seems on track to support the planned work this summer.

QUESTION: Were there any comments on the work plans to come out of the meeting in Hood River?

ANSWER: I am not aware of any comments that would cause changes in this particular document. However, there were comments on the overall milestone structure itself.

COMMENT: The S/SX Workplan shouldn't change. The general comment was that the public is not so much interested in the tank farms, but rather the contamination plumes. We need to be looking at the worst of them and understanding the geochemical migration through the vadose zone.

COMMENT: The location of the proposed borehole may end up returning data on nothing but technetium.

ANSWER: There has always been a divergence of opinion on the proposed location, but there is general agreement that this is a good place to start.

COMMENT: I'm hearing people say that we may never agree specifically where to start, but everyone agrees we do need to start somewhere. Let's get going.

COMMENT: This location might end up being an expensive hole that finds nothing useful. It could be a real public relations black eye.

RESPONSE: We discussed the issues surrounding the location with the GW/VZ Expert Panel. They indicated we should get on with it.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UPDATE (Terri Stewart):

The Washington Advisory Group (WAG) was onsite last week conducting interviews with the Project as part of their scope of work with the National Science and Technology (S&T) Program. I think the name of the company has misled some people. This group is not here advising us. This is a team comprised of former leaders of technical-based companies. Their scope is to do individual evaluations of the DOE S&T programs at the various sites, specifically on the topics related to vadose zone and groundwater. They are focused on the policy and management structures that ensure DOE is using S&T effectively to solve vadose zone and groundwater problems.

We were the first DOE site they have looked at. They were particularly interested in our project level S&T Roadmap. It is currently the only one in the DOE system. They want to compare it to the system level roadmaps.

They will conduct interviews at other DOE sites through June. There is talk about coming back for small discussion sessions, with the group reconvening in the September timeframe.

QUESTION: Will these future meetings be open to the public?

ANSWER: These will be discussions among the principles of the group. They'll just be taking their observations from the interviews and having a discussion back at their headquarters in Washington D.C.

COMMENT: The State of Oregon would like to advise you that excluding the public is not in accordance with the open meeting requirements and that we will be submitting a letter reflecting our position.

RESPONSE: So noted.

We have had discussions with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to provide peer review of our S&T Program. The proposal to move forward on this should be moving through the system in June. If accepted by the NAS, they should begin forming a team in July or August to come to Hanford in the early fall to get familiar with Hanford and Project problems. That would lead to a S&T Peer Review Process in the Fiscal Year 2000 (FY00) timeframe.

COMMENT: This was an initiative from Under Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz to the head of the NAS requesting that this be established.

We are working with the Project in revising the S&T Roadmap as part of the revision process for the GW/VZ Integration Project Specification. The S&T Roadmap is included in the Project Specification as Appendix I. We're gathering comments from the public, the Expert Panel, and the projects. There were some comments to come out of the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process as well. We're taking those comments and assumptions and making appropriate revisions.

The leads from the National Labs for the various technical elements will be onsite this week interacting

with the Project. They'll be taking a look at the comments and addressing them. There will be an intensive effort in the next three weeks to have a productive dialogue. We'll see the outcome in late June. We plan in June to discuss progress to date on the inventory, vadose zone, groundwater, and river technical elements and addressing the issues surrounding those.

QUESTION: How do you plan to address release functions?

RESPONSE: You mean as part of the inventory element?

RESPONSE: No, as its own technical element.

ANSWER: We have not deviated from the eight original technical elements.

COMMENT: Release is a very major element, and it deserves more focus than being a sub-element.

RESPONSE: I don't have an answer for you today. We'll start going through the comments this week.

COMMENT: Every nuclide and element has several release assumptions, and those assumptions carry through all of the important technical elements.

COMMENT: Folding release into inventory might be a little clumsy and possibly misleading, but once you're used to it there should be no real harm in doing it that way.

QUESTION: How will your assumptions be validated?

RESPONSE: That's an issue related to the SAC and how release is handled between those technical elements. S&T will be used to bolster their assumptions.

QUESTION: But how will you validate?

ANSWER: Take inventory for example and the release from tank residuals. We'll look at past activity and data to understand what will release from tank residuals, and we'll verify the assumptions by analyzing actual data collected.

COMMENT: The point is that each assumption needs to be validated and documented.

COMMENT: There was another point made about the single-shelled tanks at the meeting in Hood River. These tanks have exceeded their design life by 30 years, and that might have reached 40 or 50 years by the time remediation on them is complete. You have to factor in the possibility of severe, or even complete, tank failure.

COMMENT: I (Marty Bensky) understand the issues you have and I agree with them to an extent, but aren't we starting to go into things way beyond what we can resolve in this room today?

QUESTION: I have a question about data gathering going through the core projects. What happens when they're not gathering the data you need?

ANSWER: We plan to work with the Core Projects to establish a matrix of opportunities where the

work they are doing in the field can provide us with data. We're interested in adding the wrap around science and collecting the data in concert with their projects. This should be helpful with their future closure decisions.

QUESTION: In that context, how do you define closure.

ANSWER: From my (Terri Stewart's) perspective, it's moving from active remediation to passive stewardship.

COMMENT: Could we please move on? We've gotten way off track.

RESPONSE: No, if you're focusing on closure and it has a particular meaning, then it should be defined. I'm (Dirk Dunning) worried that S&T is not encompassing the full suite for evaluation.

QUESTION: Is that beyond remediation?

RESPONSE: In other words, if you don't collect a broad enough suite of data, then it invalidates the S&T. You still haven't defined closure.

RESPONSE: That's why I used a generic definition for closure as a series that progresses from active to passive. The concept of closure is fluid right now.

COMMENT: Hopefully the S&T Roadmap isn't something that's tossed together in a few months and then never changes. It should change as the situations change, and that should take care of your concerns.

RESPONSE: That is exactly right. The S&T Plan is going to change over time to reflect changing needs.

SYSTEMS ENGINEERING (Mike deLamare):

I just wanted to give people a brief overview of what the Systems Engineering group is doing. We had received some criticism because people didn't know we had commenced our work until we presented to the Expert Panel.

We started up five weeks ago. We are trying to build a framework for the Project to proceed in a products driven manner. This will have an impact on the SAC and S&T portions of the Project. We're looking at the Project Mission and gaining an understanding of the state of knowledge. We're determining how best to frame the problems broadly enough for all areas to be covered.

We've managed to develop some degree of detail. We've covered system definitions in general, as well as top level program requirements. Some of the work has been specific to SAC work planned this summer. I'd like to share some of the details, but I'm not sure this is the right forum. We'll make plans to talk to the stakeholders, regulators, and Tribes in the near future.

COMMENT: Systems engineering used to be used to tell how fast the airplanes had to fly with so many tons of bombs and so forth. These were genuine, easily defined requirements. Now it's interpreting equal opportunity requirements. You must find the drivers - the real requirements, otherwise you're in for a nightmare, and you're doomed to failure. There is a difference between real life and books about real life.

RESPONSE: No disagreement here. Part of our effort is focused on trying to bracket things into different buckets. We're separating customer requirements, program requirements, technical requirements, and so forth. We realize we're facing something more complicated here than how fast the plane needs to go.

COMMENT: Much of our focus is on SAC issues. We're trying to understand the systems, their behavior, and figuring a way to quantify them to help build models.

QUESTION: Are you patterning any of your work on the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) system engineering effort? I've watched some of what they've done, and it seems like a sound effort. I liked how they defined interface. They did a good job identifying linkages to outside influences as well.

ANSWER: My (Mike deLamare) background is that I was a TWRS system engineer for the last five years. I wrote a good deal of their material. The interface control process you're describing is my work. I'm very familiar with that.

QUESTION: What visual tools will you use? Will you use things like critical path diagrams, s-curve tracking, and things of that nature?

ANSWER: We're developing a logic and tracking system. We'll be using a logic diagram technique similar to the one used by TWRS.

QUESTION: Will you be using some of the techniques employed by Westinghouse? They had some massive sheets showing links between operations.

ANSWER: Personally I don't feel that those diagrams did a good job of communication.

RESPONSE: That's the answer I was looking for. The reason I asked is that there are some tools that are usable by humans and some that you can wade through for years and never understand.

RESPONSE: We're conscious that what we do will need to make sense.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY (SAC) DATA CONSISTENCY (Bob Bryce):

I just wanted to update everyone on some support the Project has received in the past two weeks. Susan Pickering was here from Sandia National Laboratories sharing experiences and lessons learned from the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) licensing activity. She was here helping us identify data management processes and quality assurance and data consistency needs with the core projects. She plans to return in the future, but she left us with some recommendations from this first visit.

We also wanted to point out early in the process that we plan on adopting a screening system known as FEPs, which stands for Features, Events, and Processes. We'll go through the system and classify FEPs that influence the process of the system, contaminant migration, etc. This will just be a starting set. It goes to the issue of completeness. You can look at various technical issues and determined why or why not they would apply to your system.

QUESTION: Is this FEPs system documented?

ANSWER: Yes. We'll provide you (Dirk Dunning) with it.

COMMENT: This system was used at WIPP to support their licensing process. I'm bringing it up so that everyone will be familiar with the acronym. You should be hearing it often in the next few weeks.

RISK UPDATE (Amoret Bunn):

Concurrent with the Expert Panel meetings last week, there was a meeting of the National Resources Trustee Council (NRTC). We briefed the NRTC on the dependency webs and asked for their input on how well this fits with their desires and perceived issues. We are in the process of preparing meeting minutes from that.

QUESTION: Who is on the council?

ANSWER: The trustees are laid out in the TPA. There are representatives for the Tribal Nations, US Fish and Wildlife, Washington State Department of Wildlife, and public interest groups, among others. The group itself is laid out under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).

COMMENT: It's an important group for us to interact with. The trustee activities overlap with the purpose of the SAC.

Another thing that we want to make sure is on everyone's calendars is the Dependency Web Workshop that we are planning for Monday, June 7 (Attachment 1). It will be from 9 a.m. to Noon in the BHI Assembly Room. On June 7, there will be our workshop in the morning, the Open Project Meeting after lunch, and the SAC Work Group meeting following that. These meetings are reflected on our Project Calendar (Attachment 2). Holding all the meetings on the same day benefits stakeholders that need to travel to attend by giving them a full day's activities, instead of them having to travel a long distance for only a half day.

PEER REVIEW (Virginia Rohay):

Everyone here today was present for most of the Expert Panel meetings last week, so I'll just give a brief summary and let everyone add their own comments.

Dr. Edgar Berkey provided the panel's closing comments (Attachment 3), and those are available to anyone who wants a copy. The Panel will be providing an official closeout report to the Project in three to six weeks. That report will include three recent sub-panel meeting reports, which will be appendices to the report from the full Panel. The sub-panels were Field Investigations and Data Gathering, Peer Review, and Risk. The next meeting of the full Expert Panel will be Wednesday, September 15 through Friday, September 17. We would like to thank you for your participation.

(Michael Graham) I'd like to thank the members of the Project and friends of the Project for all of the effort they put forth to make this meeting successful. I thought it was a defining meeting for the Expert Panel and how they will interact with us as we go forward. It still needs to be firmly established whether the focus of the Panel is to be merit or peer review.

QUESTION: Are you satisfied with the advice from the Panel to this point?

ANSWER: The question really is has the Panel added value to the Project, and I (Michael Graham) would have to say yes. They have been helpful in steering us in a positive direction. I think they provide an overall motivation and focus to the Project Team. However, I would like more definition and depth to their advice.

COMMENT: My (Rich Holten) charge to the Panel was to not focus so much on the past. The previous Expert Panel meeting in February was focused on what we had done to that point. This meeting was more to show where we are going and to get their help in shaping the future of the Project. I still felt like we needed more engagement. Also, we have to look at how to structure things to get the Panel enough meat for them to make an evaluation. If we want them to give sound advice, then it's the Project's responsibility to make sure they have sufficient background information and to set up the meetings in such a way as to help them accomplish what we ask. If they think they might be lacking information, then they need to ask for further materials. It's a two-way street.

QUESTION: Are the closing comments available electronically?

ANSWER: Yes. They will be posted on the Project website. If you do not have internet access, contact Gary Jewell at 509-372-9192 to obtain a hard copy. (or see Attachment 2)

COMMENT: I (Gordon Rogers) was distressed at the amount of carping from the Panel. It was much as you said. They were relating more to the past than the future.

RESPONSE: That didn't happen as much on Friday and Saturday. There was a reconfirmation of what needs to be accomplished, and things followed the rules of conduct for a productive meeting.

COMMENT: There were some very simple and effective messages in the closeout, the most important of which was for the Project to provide them with sufficient materials so they can do their work.

PROJECT PARTICIPATION:

COMMENT: I was looking at the minutes from the previous GW/VZ Open Project Meeting (May 3), and I (Greg deBruler) would like to clarify something. Gordon Rogers suggested that the interested members of the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) Team select a representative to act as a liaison to the Project. His suggestion was that this person should be somebody that does not require additional funding with the thinking being that it would satisfy the need to have the CRCIA Team working with the Project on a constant basis, while at the same time handling the issue of funding. While I appreciate the comment, I have to disagree.

One of the unique aspects of the CRCIA Team was that it was composed of the members of the affected populations, and the Board did a good job of balancing the various needs. The Tribes and key groups need representation in the SAC process on an almost daily basis. The current process is to have the public interfacing with the Project on the different portions in a sort of monthly workshop format. While it's a nice idea, this kind of interface is insufficient to work out all of the bugs. It's going to take deeper participation.

RESPONSE: I (Gordon Rogers) can see your point in general, but take a look at Barbara Harper. She's a representative of the Yakama Indian Nation and has been personally involved in the ongoing development of the dependency webs. I don't believe she's receiving additional funding. While I realize the various Tribes don't necessarily see eye to eye, it still shows strong Tribal representation. Also, I believe that Stuart Harris from the Umatillas has also stated that he wouldn't need added funding to participate. Part of what disturbs me is that CRCIA was agreed to as a consensus, and although there were various groups not happy with all the portions, everyone agreed to live with it. The singular purpose of the group was to produce the document, and that has been accomplished. You're saying the CRCIA group needs to continue. I don't know how to take that.

COMMENT: CRCIA was a collaboration of efforts. There are particular things that the Yakamas think are important that the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) could take or leave. There are still issues. Appendix D, the management section, is an example. EPA didn't agree with how it was structured, but they agreed to leave it in as a starting point. As you go through the document, there are going to be questions of meaning or intent. The players from the CRCIA Team need to be integrally involved as a sounding board. There are things that were discussed over the two years it took to create the CRCIA document that weren't necessarily captured inside the document.

COMMENT: There has also been an ongoing problem with organizational representation. People need to be representing the views of their organizations rather than their own personal views. There have been several times that a person representing an organization at one of these meetings has made strong statements only to find out later that the organization as a whole had a completely different stance.

RESPONSE: There are several people that work behind the scenes for each of these organizations that can't attend all of these meetings.

COMMENT: That's what I mean though. For example, the voice for the people at ODOE today at this meeting is Dirk Dunning, but when he says something it's unclear whether he's speaking for ODOE and the people behind the scenes there, or if he is stating personal opinion. All I'm saying is that there should be someone from the Yakamas that speaks for the Yakamas. The same for the Nez Perce, or the State of Oregon, or any organization involved with the Project. If you want to have a caucus, that's fine too, but organizational representation needs to be clearer.

RESPONSE: I appreciate what you're saying, but it seems like you're driving a wedge into the team concept. The CRCIA Team is still here, and it's not going anywhere. As long as CRCIA is the basis for the SAC, the CRCIA Team needs to be integrally involved.

COMMENT: The CRCIA document has already been reviewed and the requirements were walked through item by item for clarity and definition. The requirements of the document have already been incorporated into the Project and that's that. We can refine details as we move forward.

COMMENT: The problem is that the CRCIA methodology is fundamentally different.

RESPONSE: CRCIA is not a process. It's a collection of assessment requirements.

COMMENT: This is an old argument. It's the same things just being said in a different way. The issue is continued participation, either as a group or as individuals. It sounds like people are currently participating with energy. It even seems like too much energy at times.

COMMENT: If you go back to a couple of meetings ago, there was a discussion about expanding the interface of CRCIA with the Project and working out an increase in funding to make that happen. There are a lot of pieces to this Project that require involvement and answers in a timely manner. If this had all been done as a partnership with CRCIA a year ago, then you'd be a lot further down the road now. That real-time interface has to happen.

COMMENT: The meetings you have bi-weekly are an appropriate interface, but they are designed as an informational update. There is quite a bit accomplished in the work groups, but even that is limited to a couple of meetings a month. The problem is the need for increased communications. One of the key issues from the Expert Panel was direct communication. It needs to be completely open and ongoing. It looks to you now like we are all participating, but you have to look at the money spent to this point compared to where you are. If it keeps going like this, then people will become frustrated or start to lose interest. There has already been a call from certain circles to de-fund the Project. We all generally agree on the need to continue to move forward, but the Project must do so with a good interface.

**UPCOMING EVENTS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PARTICIPATION:**

(See attached 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)

**ACTION:**

- Contact EPA and determine their new representative to the Project
- Provide FEPs documentation to Dirk Dunning

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1)
- 2) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar
- 3) May 15 Expert Panel Closing Comments

**ATTENDEES:**

Marty Bensky - Tri-Cities Caucus  
Bob Bryce - PNNL  
Amoret Bunn - PNNL  
Dru Butler - BHI  
Greg deBruler - Columbia River United  
Mike deLamare - BHI  
Dirk Dunning - ODOE  
Bruce Ford - BHI  
Owen Goodman - BHI  
Michael Graham - BHI  
Jim Hanson - DOE-RL  
Doug Hildebrand - DOE-RL  
Rich Holten - DOE-RL  
Michael Hughes - BHI  
Gary Jewell - BHI  
Katie Makeig - SMS  
Fred Mann - FDNW  
Gordon Rogers - Tri-Cities Caucus  
Virginia Rohay - BHI  
Ron Skinnarland - Ecology  
Terri Stewart - PNNL  
John Williams - FDH

**Attachment 1**

**System Assessment Capability Workshop on Dependency Webs**

**June 7, 1999 - 9:00 to noon**  
**Bechtel Hanford, Inc. Assembly Room**

**Topic:** Preparation of Risk and Impact Dependency Webs

**Background:** In traditional risk assessments, the primary focus is on human health impacts (cancer and some non-cancer effects). There is a recognized need to go beyond the traditional risk/health impact assessment to better assess the full impact of Hanford-derived contaminants on the Columbia River.

The GW/VZ Integration Project (Project) is preparing a truly comprehensive impact assessment approach that includes human, ecological, cultural, and economic resource impacts. Dependency webs are a tool that the Project is using to identify the multiple resources and their uses at specific locations on the Hanford Site or in the Columbia River.

**Objective:** Receive input and feedback from users of the Columbia River on the dependency webs to guide the risk and impact assessment approach. Location specific dependency webs will be presented. The information gathered from this meeting will be used to guide the assessment and communicate the results of the assessment.

**Approach:** After presenting introductory information on the dependency webs, participants will focus during working sessions on location-specific dependency webs.

*Agenda:*

9:00	9:15	Opening Remarks and Introductions	Pamela Doctor
9:15	10:00	Introduction to Dependency Webs Instruction for Breakout Sessions	Pamela Doctor, Nancy Lane, Barbara Harper
10:00	10:30	Working Session #1	
10:30	10:40	Break	
10:40	11:10	Working Session #2	
11:10	11:40	Working Session #3	
11:40	12:00	Next-step in the Risk and Impact Assessment	Amoret Bunn, Pamela Doctor
<b>Other System Assessment Capability activities for the day:</b>			
1:00	2:00	Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Open Project Team Meeting	
2:00	4:00	SAC Working Group Meeting on conceptual models (vadose zone, groundwater, or river) and/or update on holistic inventory product	Bob Bryce

**ATTACHMENT 2**

*GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT*  
**MAY 20, 1999 – JULY 22, 1999**  
*TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR*

<b>May 20</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>May 26</b>	GW/VZ SAC Work Group Meeting - General Assessment Concepts and Work Group Operations (BHI Assembly Room - 1-4 p.m.)
<b>May 27</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>June 7</b>	GW/VZ Risk and Impact Dependency Webs Workshop (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-12 p.m.)
<b>June 7</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-2 p.m.)
<b>June 7</b>	GW/VZ SAC Work Group Meeting - Conceptual Models (BHI Assembly Room – 2-4 p.m.)
<b>June 10</b>	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)
<b>June 17</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>June 21</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
<b>June 22-23</b>	Groundwater Model Peer Review Meeting (Richland - Location to be determined - Contact: Doug Hildebrand)
<b>June 24</b>	Regulatory Path Forward Work Group Meeting (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
<b>July 5</b>	GW/VZ Policy Work Group and Open Project Team Meetings cancelled due to holiday
<b>July 15-16</b>	Hanford Advisory Board Meeting (Richland - Doubletree Inn)
<b>July 19</b>	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
<b>July 22</b>	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Expert Panel Closing Comments

May 15, 1999

#### This was the fourth panel meeting

- An opportunity to evaluate recent Project activities:
  - from promises to progress
  - from activities to accomplishments
  - from intentions to implementation
- An opportunity to improve communication with you
  - and vice versa
- An opportunity to set the stage for future interactions
  - to enhance prospects of Project success

#### Our take home message from the meeting

1. The potential benefits of integration at Hanford are more apparent to us now than ever.
2. We see many positive signs of people working in an integrated fashion at the implementation level... even though all the requirements for success are not fully in place.
3. We recognize that integration is difficult and that many barriers remain... but great rewards require perseverance... your best work is still ahead.

#### During the meeting we focused on...

- Status of the Project
- System Engineering efforts
- System Assessment Capability (SAC)
- Core Projects
- We tried to assess progress and momentum

#### This meeting was very valuable

- It helped us define our relationship to the Project
  - at many levels
- It resulted in a new mode of operating
  - with mutual responsibility and respect
- It reaffirmed our involvement with stakeholders, Tribal Nations, and regulators... to receive input
  - They are hopeful that real integration is on the horizon
- It clarified the role of the Panel
  - Independent review of Project merit
  - Focus on progress, plans, and scope

### Integration at Hanford

- We see tremendous value in integration
  - Consistent with the nature of the physical, chemical, biological, and human issues that exist
  - The boundaries placed on existing human organizations are not yet consistent with integration
- But the case for integration must still be made to others – especially to top management
  - You must go there
- What would successful integration look like?
  - How would it impact field work, modeling, etc.?
  - What differences would it make?
  - How would you know you were there?
  - What would the benefits be to concerned parties?

### Major requirements for success... our view

- Support of Hanford Site Manager
- Strong programmatic and intellectual leadership, support, and performance at multiple levels
- Ability to convey clear objectives and progress to diverse audiences
- Existence of clear benefits to Project participants
- Perseverance... perseverance... perseverance

### System Assessment Capability (SAC)

- We see important movement in the right direction
  - More resources being applied
  - More intellectual "energy" evident
- Result is a more coherent picture
  - Presentations with far more confidence
- But stated objectives for this "subproject" need to be clarified
  - For clean-up decisions?
  - For closure decisions?

### Core Projects

- Geophysical logging activities
  - Good. Mother lode for data mining.
  - But data mining is not data compilation... we mean data analysis and interpretation on an integrated basis.
- FY99 Tank Farm Borehole Program
  - Process for selecting location was well supported
  - On with it!

### Systems Engineering

- We support the initiative...
  - to organize your approach
  - to identify your interfaces and gaps
  - to encourage alternative solutions
  - to make decisions transparent
- It was too early to show us your work.
  - Keep trucking!
  - Document its value
- Please come back again during a future meeting

### At the next meeting we will expect...

- More emphasis on actual progress made
- More evidence on where integration is helping... and where it is not
- Thoughtful summaries for selected topics of
  - What is being done?
  - Why is it being done?
  - What beneficial outcomes are evident or expected?
  - Progress to date

### Closing thoughts

- We suggest you address three key issues:
  1. Developing a clear message on the benefits of integration at Hanford.
  2. Satisfying the "requirements for success."
  3. Encouraging Project personnel to focus on implementation and outcomes.