

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

CCN: 071877

SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION OPEN PROJECT MEETING -
AUGUST 2, 1999

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

DATE August 17, 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, August 16, 1999 – 1-3 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 August 2, 1999 in Richland, Washington, at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

PROJECT OVERVIEW AND STATUS (Tom Wintczak):

Much of the recent GW/VZ Integration Project focus has been on the Fiscal Year 2000 (FY00) Detailed Work Plan (DWP). We've been fleshing out the scope, schedule, and funding estimates for the various pieces of the Project, and last week we had a bit of a reality check. We re-explained to the leads for the various Project components that we have funding targets that we have to meet. We're working now on getting our estimates down closer to those targets. We're getting our draft scope, cost, and schedules all worked out, and we have a last check with the Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) this week. There is an open meeting scheduled for August 12 to run through that. We'll be covering the GW/VZ Integration Project in the morning and the Groundwater and other core projects in the afternoon.

We gave a briefing to the Site Manager, Keith Klein, this past week and brought him up to speed on the Project's upcoming meetings. We gave him a heads-up on the August 12 DWP meeting, a potential meeting with DOE-Headquarters (HQ) in Washington, D.C. in August, and the GW/VZ Expert Panel meeting coming in September. Klein also met with Mike Thompson and Karl Fecht on Friday to discuss Project hydrology and geology issues.

071877

COMMENT: I (Rich Holten) think that the one thing to point out here is that Keith wants to be personally involved. I think the meeting on hydrology and geology was the longest meeting the Site Manager has had on one topic with any field manager. It's just one of the indications that Keith has a different approach than the previous manager. He is very interested in the GW/VZ Integration Project and wants to understand what's going on, and what we know and don't know. He wants to develop his own perspectives, and he's beginning to do that. There will be changes in RL as a whole, and he'll be looking to the site for changes as well. He plans announcements on that by October.

QUESTION: You mentioned the Expert Panel. Where are you on developing an agenda for that?

ANSWER: I (Virginia Rohay) left a voice mail for the Panel Chairman, Dr. Ed Berkey, earlier today. There is likely going to be significant participation from DOE-HQ for this meeting, so we're wanting to get at least a draft agenda together as soon as possible. I'll be getting together with him later this week.

QUESTION: It's always nice to see an agenda early to be able to give input and plan ahead, but don't rush and get it out before you're comfortable.

COMMENT: One thing we're noticing is that the big Expert Panel meetings don't seem to be quite as productive as the smaller meetings, such as the Groundwater Panel or the Expert Panel Subpanels. Also, what does the structure of the Expert Panel meetings need to be? Should it focus on presentations or on interaction? Another problem is that the members of the Panel are not all interested or experienced in the same topics. That's the kind of thing we're discussing with Dr. Berkey. We're directing them to look at what subpanels they want to convene and getting them here for two-day interactive sessions.

COMMENT: At the Groundwater Panel meetings there was more of a chance for the public to interact. It seemed more productive that way.

RESPONSE: That's the model we're trying to emulate. It seems more productive than the big, formal meetings.

COMMENT: It gives the stakeholders a chance to express their concerns up front, and it seems that the Panel is better engaged as well.

The Project has also been working on a report for Congress, and that was completed today. It is being reproduced as we speak. This was a task given us by DOE-HQ, and it was not something we had planned for in last year's DWP. It's a report on funding issues, accomplishments, and the GW/VZ Integration Project in general. It's for DOE-HQ to use to brief the congressional delegations about the Project. We'll be producing these reports twice a year from this point forward. The plan is to release them yearly in November and May. It will be almost like a year-end/mid-year review.

QUESTION: When will these be available for the general community?

ANSWER: They should be available by the next meeting, assuming that they have been given to DOE-

071877

HQ and they have distributed them to the various congressional people. We want to make sure they are the first to get copies. We want to be sure they have a chance to look at it before they start getting calls about it. We're not going to make them generally available until we get the okay from DOE-HQ.

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY (SAC) WORK GROUP UPDATE (Amoret Bunn):

There will be a meeting of the System Assessment Capability (SAC) Work Group on August 10 to discuss the risk conceptual models, metrics, and critical habitats. This meeting is a continuation of the various meetings that have been held on the conceptual models for the various technical elements. The risk conceptual model covers human health, ecological, cultural, and economic risks. The conceptual model will bring in the metrics we've been working on identifying this summer and identify the critical habitats. It will identify where those habitats are located, and we can use those as starting points for the assessment. This meeting will be a discussion about Hanford risk and impacts identified in the past, what we are considering for the SAC Rev. 0, and how we plan to deal with uncertainty.

QUESTION: Will this include establishing background, or is that a different part of the SAC work?

ANSWER: That's a good question. Part of the risk technical element is pushing back on that issue. It's a big issue with the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) folks. We'll be determining how to measure impacts and determine what's Hanford related and what isn't. If it's not in our risk conceptual model, then it needs to be in the August 25 SAC conceptual model overview. We need to determine if the risk technical element or a different technical element should identify background.

RESPONSE: If it's not there, then show a definite tie to where it is. It would help to keep continuity.

COMMENT: There are two risk layouts; the total picture and the Hanford portion. That's how it is in the DWP.

QUESTION: Was anything learned in the screening assessment?

ANSWER: Yes, and that is something we will discuss at the meeting.

QUESTION: The pieces aren't falling together. For example, what's going on with heavy metals? How much of an impact will they have on the screening assessment? How does it all fit into the quantitative picture? Is the overall picture more important than the Hanford only picture? What is the makeup of the number? How much is Hanford and how much is not?

ANSWER: At the August 10 meeting, there will be a portion of the discussion devoted to the other Hanford related studies, such as CRCIA.

COMMENT: As a side note, last week in the Oregonian there were articles on the Priest River dams that focused on the issue of putting a price tag on intangibles. You should try to hook on with the people who are doing the assessment work there for the Army Corps of Engineers and see how they are going about defining metrics.

071877

RESPONSE: That's something we should get knowledgeable on.

REGULATORY PATH FORWARD WORK GROUP (Moses Jarayssi):

We are in the process of trying to re-energize the Regulatory Path Forward Work Group. As some of you may know, I joined the GW/VZ Integration Project three weeks ago. I've looked at the history and minutes for the group. The group has not met for some time. We're trying to establish a clear set of expectations and deliverables for the group to focus on and give us something to bite into. What do we need to do to support the other subprojects? We need to establish where we're at, and where we're aiming to be. We also need to clarify the links between the Regulatory Work Group and the rest of the Integration Project. I've talked some with the other work groups, the SAC team, and the waste inventory group.

There was a table from the earlier meetings showing the various waste sites and types of waste on the Hanford Site and the regulatory requirements applying to each of those. I'm hoping to hold the first meeting before the end of the month and prioritize which waste sites and categories to look at first. If we try to do them all at the same time, we'll fail. We need to find out what others are doing and see what we can do to help them.

COMMENT: At the start of the last open meeting, you used a chart that showed the system logic for the Project. It doesn't show where the regulatory path fits in. Impact assessment is included, but not regulatory constraints. If the regulators say something has to be done, it has to be taken into consideration for the model, even if there are no impacts.

RESPONSE: That would be a peripheral module of the overall system chart that you saw last meeting.

COMMENT: It would just be nice to see more clearly where the regulatory work, and the work of the core projects, fit into this chart.

RESPONSE: Mike deLamare has taken a shot at that and tried to show how each relates in the DWP to the chart.

QUESTION: What happened to the Regulatory Work Group? Why has there been such a gap between meetings?

ANSWER: The main reason was a lack of resources from the Project. The Regulatory Work Group was put on hold until the Project could bring in someone to focus on regulatory issues. This was discussed with Phil Staats of the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). In the interim, Ecology has looked at the tables showing the waste sites and regulations, and they've updated those. Now we're looking for agreement on approach and deliverables for the Regulatory Work Group.

QUESTION: When will you begin discussions with the core projects? I know the River Protection Project (RPP) is in the middle of discussions with Ecology on regulatory path.

RESPONSE: The idea is to have the Work Group and the core projects agree on the products the group should be working on and determine how the projects would make use of them. We want to make sure the products we're working on are the ones you want to see. Right now, we're

only at a starting point of looking at potential uses for our products.

071877

COMMENT: There are at least two projects ending in the near future. The sooner you start discussions the better.

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

We are still in the process of decommissioning the 41-09-39 borehole. We've been working through some difficulties, but we continue to move forward. There was a problem with the removal of the casing that caused us to miss one sampling point, but we think that's resolved now. We're proceeding smoothly now and continuing to take samples.

Last week we drove in the starter casing for the well by SX-115, and we began reverse air circulation drilling this morning. We hope to have the first sample today by the end of the shift.

We're also working on an internal review of the overall Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation/Corrective Measures Study (RFI/CMS) Single Shelled Tank (SST) Waste Management Area (WMA) Workplan. We'll have that complete this month. We're also working on the Detailed Workplan for S/SX that's due in October. Both are Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones, and both are on track.

200 AREAS UPDATE (Bruce Ford):

We're in various stages of development on three products in our efforts to get out and start work in the field.

The workplan for 200-CW-1 is undergoing review, and public comments are due on Friday. This area is the Gable Mountain pond and ditches. We're trying to be in the field by August 11.

We're also in the DOE-RL stage of the review process for the 200-CS-1 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Workplan, and we just initiated the first step for the 200-CW-1 RI/FS Workplan. We're in the process of laying that out with the regulators.

QUESTION: What products are you aiming for from these activities so far as characterization goes?

ANSWER: The process is to go through characterization, then into the feasibility study, and then to the cleanup plan.

QUESTION: You're not going that far without an impact assessment, are you?

ANSWER: What we're looking at now are the relatively simple sites, such as the chemical sewers. We can make decisions about these sites from existing data. After that is where it becomes a problem. We picked the easiest sites first.

COMMENT: There are waste releases with those sites, and there needs to be characterization.

COMMENT: We need to move ahead with the sites with the greatest potential impact. Maybe it was just your choice of words, but the impression is that these sites are not that important in the scheme of things.

RESPONSE: When compared to other sites, the sites we are working might not have the greatest potential impact, but there are elements, like strontium, at these sites that we are required to look at and which need to be dealt with. We have enough knowledge at these sites to move forward, while there are still things we need to know about other sites.

COMMENT: There is an issue about Gable Mountain, and the criteria that apply to it, that has been raised at DOE-HQ.

RESPONSE: The issue is that Gable Mountain falls outside of the boundary of the defined future site uses. The recommendation was that either the boundary be moved, or we need to make a commitment to clean it up.

GEOPHYSICAL LOGGING (Bob Boutin):

Over the past two weeks, we have asked an outside group to look at our work on geophysical logging and provide recommendations. Ken Skinner and George Juniel have been doing the review. They started out with meeting the prime contractors. From there they went to a series of one-on-one interviews. They were looking at the needs, overall program, the use of the data, and the consistency of procedure and data collection.

They came back with a few basic recommendations. First, geophysical logging should be under a single point of contact. The thinking is that it could be under the umbrella of the 200 Areas assessment work. Also, geophysical data should reside in a single database accessible to all users. Historical data should be used in planning and evaluation activities. Needs for future geophysical logging should be clearly defined. The projects involved should communicate and develop standardized practices, protocols, and formats.

COMMENT: The 200 Area sites to be logged in 1999 have already been identified. We'd like to know more about that and the planning of that, especially how the sites were selected.

RESPONSE: The plan was to look at the retention trenches first based on known inventory. 200 East was selected over 200 West for timeliness for Environmental Restoration (ER) and Office of River Protection (ORP) workplan development for the B/BX/BY Area. That soaked up the budget for logging this year, and the thinking is to do 200 West next year. We'll see how funding goes in the DWP, but honestly it's not looking too good at this point.

COMMENT: We're trying to match up the needs with what we are capable of doing. The review wasn't of specific places or details. It was more a look at available tools and capabilities.

COMMENT: The tools we can use are limited by the fact that the holes onsite are cased.

COMMENT: One of the areas of concern is that there has not been a good compilation of all the logging on the site. The work around the tank farms is documented, but the rest of the site needs data mining and to have that data put in a format where anyone on site can get to it, even folks on the outside. The web would be the ideal place, if feasible, but it's a big-ticket item. It could be put on the DWP list, but it's not there now.

RESPONSE: That's a problem. The visibility needs to be elevated.

071877

COMMENT: That was one of the recommendations from the review. We're laying the groundwork for FY00, but it probably won't happen this next year.

COMMENT: We need to develop the scope, schedule, and dollars required. We need those in order to make our argument of why it should be done.

COMMENT: There is some data available on the MACTEC-ERS website for the Hanford Tank Farms Vadose Zone Project. There have been attempts to get that site linked from the Hanford site, but there haven't been any results.

RESPONSE: If you give us the information on the MACTEC-ERS website, we'll see that it gets linked from our GW/VZ Project website. (NOTE: The GW/VZ Project website is located at <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose> and a link to the MACTEC-ERS website has been added to the "Related Sites" section of the website. The address to reach the Hanford Tank Farms Vadose Zone Project website directly is <http://www.doejpo.com/programs/hanf/HTFVZ.html>.)

OTHER ISSUES:

QUESTION: Is there an update on the system study that Bruce Napier mentioned at the last Expert Panel meeting?

QUESTION: Are you referring to the Inventory Scoping Study?

ANSWER: He described it as something better than that, but that was the name he used for it I believe. It sounded like it ran all the way through the system.

RESPONSE: His scoping study was the topic of discussion at the SAC Work Group Meeting a couple of weeks ago on inventory. He discussed how he used some screening parameters to reduce the inventory list to make sense of transport from the 200 Areas on out. It included screens for human and ecological health. It included a screen for what we know about the groundwater contamination now, and it screened for things we know are important for transport of site contaminants.

QUESTION: Could we get a copy?

ANSWER: We have some copies upstairs that we can bring down after the meeting, and we will also make it available on the GW/VZ Website. (The document is now available on the SAC page of the GW/VZ website. The address for the SAC page is <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose/sac.htm>, and the document is on that page under the "SAC Background Information" heading.)

COMMENT: (Amoret Bunn) I have a concern to voice to the members of the SAC Work Group that are here. We're working on the presentation for the August 10 SAC meeting. We're trying to balance the time allotted for discussion with the time for presentations. There are four elements that need to be covered, and we're getting worried that there might not be enough time to cover everything.

RESPONSE: Try to send out the presentation material early. That way we could spend the minimum time on presentations and the maximum time on discussion.

RESPONSE: We have a dry run later this week. It might be possible to get those out a couple of days early, but we'll know more after the dry run.

QUESTION: What is the difference between a risk conceptual model and a SAC conceptual model?

ANSWER: The risk conceptual model is a piece of the overall SAC conceptual model. On August 25, we'll present how that piece fits together with the other pieces to form the overall picture, particularly with the groundwater and vadose zone conceptual models. We'll try to identify the points where they come together.

COMMENT: Also, I (Fred Mann) would just like to alert everyone that the next issuance of the Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) Performance Assessment (PA) document should occur around mid-September.

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)

ATTACHMENTS:

1) GW/VZ Integration Project Two Month Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Julie Atwood, BHI

Martin Bensky, Tri-Cities Caucus

Bob Boutin, BHI

Dru Butler, BHI

Don Clark, JAI Corp.

Mike deLamare, BHI

Bruce Ford, BHI

Dib Goswami, Ecology

Michael Graham, BHI

Kathy Huss, SAIC

Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ

Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL

Dave Holland, Ecology

Rich Holten, DOE-RL

Moses Jarayssi, BHI

Katy Makeig, SMS

Fred Mann, FDNW

Rick McCain, MACTEC-ERS

Wade Riggsbee, Yakima Nation

Virginia Rohay, BHI

Mike Thompson, DOE-RL

John Williams, FDH

Tom Wintczak, BHI

ATTACHMENT 1

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
AUGUST 16, 1999 – OCTOBER 18, 1999
TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

August 16	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
August 16-17	Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Federal Review Group PNNL EESB – Snoqualmie Room (Contact: Doug Hildebrand)
August 17	Hanford 200 Area Carbon Tetrachloride ITRD Modeling Workshop BHI Assembly Room – 8 a.m.-4:00 p.m. (Contact: Jim Hanson)
August 25	GW/VZ SAC Work Group Meeting – SAC Rev. 0, Conceptual Model Implementation – PNNL EESB Snoqualmie River Room – 9 a.m-4 p.m. (Contact: Bob Bryce/Bob Boutin) Purpose: Obtain advice and consultation from regulators, stakeholders, and Tribal Nations on Conceptual Model Implementation for SAC Rev. 0. and identify priorities on the overall approach for the SAC Rev. 0 analysis.
August 26	Regulatory Path Forward Work Group Meeting BHI Room 2D01 – 1:30-3 p.m. (Contact: Moses Jarayssi) Purpose: Reach agreement among regulators, DOE, core projects, and stakeholders on Work Group products and plans for completing products. Also, hold a quick review of the Hanford Comparison Decision Table.
September 9-10	Hanford Advisory Board Meeting Seattle – Radisson Hotel
September 15-17	GW/VZ Expert Panel Meeting BHI Assembly Room – Contact: Virginia Rohay Purpose and expectations to be determined by the Expert Panel
September 15-18	Energy Communities Symposium – Richland
September 16	HAB-ER Committee Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.
September 20	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
October 4	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
October 14	HAB-ER Committee Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.
October 18	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)

Public Comment Periods

Ends August 21	200-CW-1 Operable Unit RI/FS Work Plan and 216-B-3 RCRA TSD Unit Sampling Plan (DOE/RL-99-07, Draft B)
Ends August 23	Proposed Plan for an Amendment of the Interim Remedial Action at the 100-HR-3 Operable Unit (DOE/RL-99-04)
Ends Sept. 30	Risk/Impact Technical Report for the Hanford Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project - Final Draft