



**Inter-Agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT)
Meeting Minutes
March 19, 2015**

Approval:  Date: 5/11/15
J.A. Hedges
Ecology IAMIT Representative

Approval:  Date: 4/22/15
R.J. Core
DOE-RL IAMIT Representative


Approval: (see second page) Date: _____
T.W. Fletcher
DOE-ORP IAMIT Representative

Approval:  Date: 5/6/15
D.A. Faulk
EPA IAMIT Representative

Minutes Prepared by:  Date: 4/21/15
M.J. Turner
Mission Support Alliance, LLC

- | | | | |
|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|
| Bohnee, G. | NPT | Luke, J.J. | WRPS |
| Boyd, A. | Ecology | Lynch, J.J. | ORP |
| Brown, M.J. | Ecology | Menard, N.M.* | Ecology |
| Call, P.K. | RL | Nguyen, T.L. | RL |
| Cameron, C.E. | EPA | Niles, K. | ODE |
| Charboneau, B.L. | ORP | Peschong, J.C. | RL |
| Charboneau, S.L. | RL | Piippo, R.E.* | MSA |
| Cimon, S.* | ODE | Price, J.B.* | Ecology |
| Collins, M.S.* | RL | Quintero, R.A. | RL |
| Donnelly, J.W. | WRPS | Singleton, D. | Ecology |
| Eberlein, E. | Ecology | Skinnarland, E.R. | Ecology |
| Einan, D.R. | EPA | Teimouri, A.E. | HQ |
| Faulk, D.A.* | EPA | Teynor, T.K. | RL |
| Fletcher, T.W. | ORP | Turner, M.J.* | MSA |
| French, M.S. | RL | Voogd, M.J. | RL |
| Gent, P. | Ecology | Weil, S.R. | RL |
| Harris, S. | CTUIR | Whalen, C.L.* | Ecology |
| Hildebrand, D.R. | DOE | Welsch, K. R. | Ecology |
| Hedges, J.A. | Ecology | B.D. Williamson | RL |
| Huffman, L.A. | ORP | Zelen, B. J. | RL |
| Henry, D. | ODE | | |
| Jim, R. | Yakama | | |
| Knox, K.* | KCR | | |
| Lobos, R.A. | EPA | | |

* Attendees



Topic: IAMIT Action Tracking

The IAMIT action tracking table was provided for discussion (see handout). There are nine actions on the table.

Action No. 1 – Ecology reported that its attorney’s advice is in review and there are a few questions on the review. Ecology stated that once the questions have been answered, a response will be provided to DOE-RL and the aspects in dispute will be negotiated. The status of this action is ongoing.

Action No. 2 – DOE-RL, Ecology and EPA noted that action No. 2 is tied with action No. 1. Ecology stated that the status provided for action No. 1 was in relation to action No. 2 on the 200-IS-1 work plan. DOE-RL and Ecology agreed that the parties will meet before the end of next week and extend the dispute beyond the current March 30, 2015 extension date.

Action No. 3 - DOE-RL stated during the TPA quarterly milestone meeting held previous to today’s IAMIT, there was discussion on M-016-175 and that EPA made its position clear. EPA stated that after the meeting is held next Thursday, the parties will know whether a decision has been made regarding force majeure or if the dispute will move up the management chain. It was noted that the current extension date for the dispute is March 31, 2015. DOE-RL stated that the status of this action is that a decision will be made at next Thursday’s meeting. EPA noted that DOE-RL sent an email indicating that it is reviewing options for a SEP.


Action No. 4 – MSA stated that the reclassification forms are to split some of the reactors from their waste sites. Ecology noted that some of the reactors were in Appendix C and needed to be removed. Ecology stated that it had signed a couple of waste reclassification forms. MSA indicated that there are a couple more waste reclassification forms to work through the system for the 100-K Area. EPA stated its position that the reactors need to be in either Appendix C or Appendix J, and as soon as that has been done it will sign the change control form. EPA noted that the title for Appendix J will also need to be changed. MSA responded that an Appendix J change form is in draft and that it has changed the title. MSA stated that when the waste reclassification forms are completed and Appendix J is updated, the Appendix C change request will be revised for approval.

Action No. 5 - MSA stated that it has had several meetings with DOE-RL and its lawyers regarding Appendix B. MSA indicated that DOE-RL is in the process of getting aligned before meeting with Ecology. Ecology stated its preference to discuss updating Appendix B with DOE-RL before the process gets very far, and that the purpose is to ensure the parties are thinking about the same concept. Ecology noted that attempts have been made over the past ten years to update Appendix B, and the disconnect seemed to be with ORP. DOE-RL confirmed that the disconnect is with ORP. Ecology responded that it may be because there were versions

Inter-Agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT)
Meeting Minutes
March 19, 2015

Approval: _____ Date: _____
J.A. Hedges
Ecology IAMIT Representative

Approval: _____ Date: _____
R.J. Corey
DOE-RL IAMIT Representative

Approval: _____ Date: 4/23/15

T.W. Fletcher
DOE-ORP IAMIT Representative

Approval: _____ Date: _____
D.A. Faulk
EPA IAMIT Representative

Minutes Prepared by: _____ Date: _____
M.J. Turner
Mission Support Alliance, LLC

Bohnee, G.	NPT	Luke, J.J.	WRPS
Boyd, A.	Ecology	Lynch, J.J.	ORP
Brown, M.J.	Ecology	Menard, N.M.*	Ecology
Call, P.K.	RL	Nguyen, T.L.	RL
Cameron, C.E.	EPA	Niles, K.	ODE
Charboneau, B.L.	ORP	Peschong, J.C.	RL
Charboneau, S.L.	RL	Piippo, R.E.*	MSA
Cimon, S.*	ODE	Price, J.B.*	Ecology
Collins, M.S.*	RL	Quintero, R.A.	RL
Donnelly, J.W.	WRPS	Singleton, D.	Ecology
Eberlein, E.	Ecology	Skinnarland, E.R.	Ecology
Einan, D.R.	EPA	Teimouri, A.E.	HQ
Faulk, D.A.*	EPA	Teynor, T.K.	RL
Fletcher, T.W.	ORP	Turner, M.J.*	MSA
French, M.S.	RL	Voogd, M.J.	RL
Gent, P.	Ecology	Weil, S.R.	RL
Harris, S.	CTUIR	Whalen, C.L.*	Ecology
Hildebrand, D.R.	DOE	Welsch, K. R.	Ecology
Hedges, J.A.	Ecology	B.D. Williamson	RL
Huffman, L.A.	ORP	Zelen, B. J.	RL
Henry, D.	ODE	Administrative Record	
Jim, R.	Yakama		
Knox, K.*	KCR	* Attendees	
Lobos, R.A.	EPA		

Topic: IAMIT Action Tracking

The IAMIT action tracking table was provided for discussion (see handout). There are nine actions on the table.

Action No. 1 – Ecology reported that its attorney’s advice is in review and there are a few questions on the review. Ecology stated that once the questions have been answered, a response will be provided to DOE-RL and the aspects in dispute will be negotiated. The status of this action is ongoing.

Action No. 2 – DOE-RL, Ecology and EPA noted that action No. 2 is tied with action No. 1. Ecology stated that the status provided for action No. 1 was in relation to action No. 2 on the 200-IS-1 work plan. DOE-RL and Ecology agreed that the parties will meet before the end of next week and extend the dispute beyond the current March 30, 2015 extension date.

Action No. 3 - DOE-RL stated during the TPA quarterly milestone meeting held previous to today’s IAMIT, there was discussion on M-016-175 and that EPA made its position clear. EPA stated that after the meeting is held next Thursday, the parties will know whether a decision has been made regarding force majeure or if the dispute will move up the management chain. It was noted that the current extension date for the dispute is March 31, 2015. DOE-RL stated that the status of this action is that a decision will be made at next Thursday’s meeting. EPA noted that DOE-RL sent an email indicating that it is reviewing options for a SEP.

Action No. 4 – MSA stated that the reclassification forms are to split some of the reactors from their waste sites. Ecology noted that some of the reactors were in Appendix C and needed to be removed. Ecology stated that it had signed a couple of waste reclassification forms. MSA indicated that there are a couple more waste reclassification forms to work through the system for the 100-K Area. EPA stated its position that the reactors need to be in either Appendix C or Appendix J, and as soon as that has been done it will sign the change control form. EPA noted that the title for Appendix J will also need to be changed. MSA responded that an Appendix J change form is in draft and that it has changed the title. MSA stated that when the waste reclassification forms are completed and Appendix J is updated, the Appendix C change request will be revised for approval.

Action No. 5 - MSA stated that it has had several meetings with DOE-RL and its lawyers regarding Appendix B. MSA indicated that DOE-RL is in the process of getting aligned before meeting with Ecology. Ecology stated its preference to discuss updating Appendix B with DOE-RL before the process gets very far, and that the purpose is to ensure the parties are thinking about the same concept. Ecology noted that attempts have been made over the past ten years to update

Appendix B, and the disconnect seemed to be with ORP. DOE-RL confirmed that the disconnect is with ORP. Ecology responded that it may be because there were versions done in the past that seemed fairly straightforward, but ORP wanted to do more. Ecology suggested asking ORP if they intend to address Appendix B any time soon, and if ORP would be willing to approach it step-wise. Ecology stated that there is simple cleanup that ORP could do first, and then there may be other things to address that would take more dialogue. MSA stated that updating Appendix B per the TPA requirement so that it's accurate would be the first step. Ecology agreed, adding that it still has the mark-ups to Appendix B that had been sent to MSA in the past and would be easy to do. MSA stated that it would follow up with ORP about completing the mark-ups to Appendix B.

Action No. 6 – DOE-RL stated that M-016-173 was discussed during the TPA quarterly milestone meeting held previous to this meeting. EPA indicated during that meeting that DOE-RL does not need to write a dispute statement for M-016-173 since it is included in the draft change package. DOE-RL stated that there is agreement with EPA that each agency's headquarters is working on the stipulation of penalties.

Action No. 7 – DOE-RL noted that this action is closed.

Action No. 8 – Ecology reported that ORP is preparing a revised change package regarding M-062-45, and a draft will be sent to Ecology for review. Ecology indicated that there was a good discussion with ORP, and following review of the draft change package, an effort will be made to resolve the issue. MSA stated that an extension for the dispute was signed.

Action No. 9 – MSA stated that per the TPA, DOE-RL was required to provide a briefing to the regulators on the FY17 budget appropriations, and that a briefing had been provided. MSA noted that briefings also are required to be provided to the public. There was a brief discussion about how to document that the briefing was provided to the regulators. Ecology stated that the briefing it receives is not released until the public meeting is done, and that is why the briefings are not included in the IAMIT minutes. MSA stated that by the time the IAMIT minutes are approved and submitted to the Administrative Record (AR), the public meeting will have been held. DOE-RL suggested submitting an attendance list from the regulator briefing to the AR. EPA indicated that whatever DOE-RL and MSA decide to do would be acceptable. This action was closed 3/19/15.

Topic: Submittal of Electronic Copies to the Administrative Record

MSA stated that the TPA requires submittal of a hard copy documents to the AR, and that DOE-RL has discussed with Legal the goal to submit documents only electronically. A change request has been drafted to strike out the words "hard copy", and it has been sent to EPA. Ecology requested a copy of the draft change

request. MSA indicated that per EPA guidance, there needs to be public involvement in the decision to submit documents electronically. EPA offered a reminder that when a proposed plan and Record of Decision are to be issued, the lead regulatory agency and DOE-RL are supposed to go through the AR and call out documents that aren't part of the decision-making process. Once the agencies do that, an index is compiled of what documents were used and are available to the public. EPA responded that documents could be pulled from the AR, and cited the example of pulling documents that had nothing to do with the decision for 200-ZP-1. It was agreed to track the "Remove Hard Copy" change control form on the IAMIT action tracking list.

Topic: DOE-RL to Provide Rough Order of Magnitude Cost and Proposed Solution for 243-Z

DOE-RL stated that a ROM was developed, and since it was done within about a week, it is plus or minus 50 percent. The ROM is about \$1.1 million, and that includes all the engineering, the setups and construction at 243-Z, which is a low-level water treatment facility that takes the condensate drains and other fluids from the PFP facilities. DOE-RL stated that most of the water sources have been cut off and isolated. The contractor originally thought that the active French drains could be used, and a technical analysis was done that indicated the clean drinking water standards would not be impacted after 1,000 years, once it gets down to the water table.

DOE-RL stated that the information was shared with Ecology last week, and then Ecology requested DOE-RL to go forward with developing an estimate because of the concern about untreated water being put into the active French drains. DOE-RL stated that the proposed solution for the \$1.1 million would be to pump or truck the water over to the 200 West Area and treat it through the 200 West pump and treat system. DOE-RL noted that the contractor proposed an alternative of putting a pipeline down, which DOE-RL did not accept because of the path for the pipeline and the time, energy and cost that would be involved.

EPA suggested that Ecology discuss the proposal and its concern internally again, and that the French drain may be the most viable pathway. Ecology stated that its understanding of the issue is that the 200 West Pump and Treat was set up to treat groundwater and reinject groundwater, and when other waste streams are brought in, they do not fall within the purview of the ROD. DOE-RL noted that a lot of changes were worked to get to the proposal, and asked if the decision will be a policy issue or just a paperwork issue. EPA responded that it is a policy issue, and noted the issue that just emerged regarding ERDF leachate and groundwater reinjection would apply to DOE-RL's path forward. EPA brought up the issue earlier today at the TPA quarterly milestone meeting. DOE-RL asked when EPA would have a decision. EPA responded that it would have an internal discussion and then provide a response to DOE-RL. DOE-RL noted that

money is being spent towards the proposal, and that it's tied into the Effluent Treatment Facility transfer between contractors, occurring next week.

DOE-RL provided copies of the contractor's technical review to Ecology and EPA. DOE-RL stated that if there continues to be an issue with the proposal, another meeting will be scheduled with the experts to reassess that the path forward is still viable. DOE-RL noted that at this time the only path forward is the French drains, based on the policy issue that was just raised. DOE-RL stated that the other option is to wait until 291-Z is demolished, cut the steam fan supply, and then take it out. DOE-RL added that the rough estimate is about 100,000 gallons per year, which would be about 2,000 to 3,000 gallons per week to be trucked over to the 200 West Area.

EPA stated that it would follow up immediately on the issue. DOE-RL stated that discussions will continue in an effort to reach a resolution, noting that the goal was to get 243-Z down this year and that it was aligned with the D4 strategy.