



**Inter-Agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT)
Meeting Minutes
February 18, 2016**

Approval: G. Thomas Tebb
by John B. Price Date: March 22, 2016
J.A. Hedges
Ecology IAMIT Representative

Approval: [Signature] Date: 3/16/16
R.J. Corey
DOE-RL IAMIT Representative

Approval: [Signature] Date: 3/22/16
T.W. Fletcher
DOE-ORP IAMIT Representative

Approval: [Signature] Date: 3/30/16
D.A. Faulk
EPA IAMIT Representative

Minutes Prepared by: [Signature] Date: 3/11/16
M.J. Turner
Mission Support Alliance, LLC

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

Inter-Agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT)
Meeting Minutes
February 18, 2016

Topic: IAMIT Action Tracking

The IAMIT action tracking table was discussed as follows (see handout):

Action No. 1 – DOE-RL reported that Ecology is reviewing the final updates to the change request, and when Ecology has completed its review, DOE-RL and Ecology should be able to sign off on the change request. DOE-RL noted that the dispute regarding the 200-IS-1 work plan has been extended until the end of March 2016. This action remains open.

Action No. 2 – DOE-RL stated that this action is directly related to action No. 1, and once Appendix C has been updated, the 200-IS-1 work plan will be updated. This action remains open.

Action No. 3 – This dispute has been extended out to March 31, 2016, and it is still at the project manager level. This action remains open.

Action No. 4 – DOE-ORP stated that this action was elevated to the IAMIT level on February 16, 2016, which started the 21-day clock for the IAMIT members to make a determination about whether the dispute can be resolved formally under the TPA or to elevate it to the director's determination. DOE-ORP transmitted a letter to Ecology with the statement of dispute on 2/16/16. DOE-ORP provided background today on the dispute regarding the change control form associated with milestone M-045-92 (see action table). The milestone identifies due dates for construction of SX barriers 1 and 2 and design and construction of barriers 3 and 4. DOE-ORP stated that the general premise in its statement of dispute is that insufficient funds, along with the uncertainty of emergent projects, turned the focus to higher emergent projects. DOE-ORP cited two main examples of higher emergent projects: 1) AY-102, which is under a settlement agreement with the State of Washington, is moving forward to retrieval with a start date of March 4, 2016; 2) the vapor issue, which is currently under litigation by the State of Washington.

DOE-ORP stated that FY 2015 funding was received in October 2014 in the form of a continuing resolution (CR). DOE-ORP stated that in February 2015, a review was done on the impacts from a cost perspective regarding the vapor issue and AY-102. By the March 2015 time frame, a determination was made that the barriers could not be attained, based on what was known about AY-102, the vapor issue, and the remaining work scope driven by retrievals in A/AX and C farm.

DOE-ORP noted that it agrees with Ecology that the barriers mitigate impacts to

human health and the environment.

Ecology stated that it had a list of questions for discussion today, and the questions will also be emailed to DOE-ORP. Ecology pointed out a correction that should be made in the statement of dispute on page two that refers to paragraph 148G, and it should state 149G.

Ecology noted that up until the March 2015 time frame, DOE-ORP believed there was enough time to construct the barriers, but the FY 2015 funding became the limitation. Ecology asked why DOE-ORP didn't move the milestone out seven months (into FY 2016) to construct the barriers, instead of moving the milestone out three years. DOE-ORP responded that planning and funding requests follow a two-year budget cycle. DOE-ORP noted that when funding is requested, it is assumed it will be received for that two-year cycle. DOE-ORP added that funding for the barriers was submitted in the compliance requested for FY 2017, but was not part of the President's budget. Ecology stated that when DOE-ORP submitted its change request in March 2015, it was based on a different set of facts than what is now known about the FY17 budget. DOE-ORP responded that those set of facts have no relation to the dispute. Ecology stated that if DOE-ORP was operating under the set of facts that the appropriated funds were not available, it should have assumed it would receive the FY 2017 funding request and moved the milestone to FY17. DOE-ORP responded that there were other factors to consider, including balancing Hanford's challenge with funds and the reasonable ability to receive funds. DOE-ORP stated that when considering all the factors, it was determined that the funds would be received for FY 2018. Ecology pointed out that when DOE-ORP received the Continuing Resolution (CR) in October 2014, the funding impacts should have been understood at that time, and the TPA rules require DOE-ORP to communicate with Ecology within two weeks. DOE-ORP stated that it communicated with Ecology via phone that there was a CR and there would be impacts. Ecology stated that the communication needed to be in writing. DOE-ORP responded that written communication was not required. Ecology and DOE-ORP disagreed on the point about what form the communication should take.

Ecology pointed out that the monthly project manager meeting minutes should have reflected that the milestone was at risk. DOE-ORP agreed with Ecology, and noted that this was a communication issue and that issue has since been addressed. Ecology agreed that DOE-ORP has rectified the communication issue.

DOE-ORP requested separation of the communication issue from resolution of the dispute at the IAMIT level, and not move it up the chain to the Pollution Control Hearings Board (PCHB). Ecology referred to the offer that was made to DOE-ORP along those lines. DOE-ORP stated that Ecology's offer, in the form of a draft notice of penalty to pay \$10,000, was in regards to reporting and not to move the milestone. DOE-ORP noted that the offer was rejected.

Ecology referred to DOE-ORP's statement of dispute where the cost to address AY-102 was listed at \$46 million, and asked if that was FY15 costs. DOE-ORP responded that it was solely FY15 costs, and noted that the total cost for AY-102 is estimated to be over \$100 million. DOE-ORP added that AY-102 is considered emergent higher priority and higher risk work, and it is in regards to risk reduction to human health and the environment. DOE-ORP pointed out that during the time period from October 2014 to March 2015, it was still in the process of evaluating the impacts from AY-102 in FY15/16 and beyond, and it wasn't known for certain the cost would be \$46 million. Ecology asked if it was fair to assume that when DOE-ORP signed the settlement agreement, that DOE-Headquarters had provided a cost number. DOE-ORP stated that a rough order of magnitude was provided, but it did not include any extra funding, and the funding was absorbed by other work that was not getting done.

Ecology asked if DOE-ORP had an estimated cost for building barriers 1 and 2. DOE-ORP responded that an estimate of \$12 million was put together several years ago for both barriers. DOE-ORP added that today the estimate would be between 10 to \$15 million. Ecology stated that based on DOE-ORP's statement of dispute, DOE-ORP is waiting on Ecology from July 22, 2015 to March 31, 2016 to decide on the design for barriers 3 and 4. DOE-ORP stated that neither party initiated a discussion after the July 2015 meeting to decide what the barrier placement would be, and the intent was not to imply that Ecology was at fault. DOE-ORP added that in the July 2015 time frame, the discussion was tabled because the barriers were being discussed as part of the Consent Decree. Ecology asked if DOE-ORP had been planning to complete the designs in FY15 for barriers 3 and 4. DOE-ORP responded that there was a plan to do both designs.

Ecology inquired about DOE-ORP's reasoning for moving barriers 3 and 4 out three years, since they weren't heavily dependent on FY 15 funding. DOE-ORP stated that it was keeping the same logic that there would be a sequence of barriers. DOE-ORP noted that the cost for the barrier design is minimal, and the construction is what drives the cost for the barriers. DOE-ORP stated that it does not expect to get the full congressional funding on the President's FY17 budget, and the barriers will be fit into a funding profile based on their priority. DOE-ORP stated that it was willing to collectively elevate the priority for the barriers.

Ecology noted a difference in approach between the two agencies is that DOE-ORP is making a realistic budget plan, and that Ecology's focus, as a regulator, is to complete work as soon as possible and depend on the TPA priority discussion to move the work out when realistic budgets come through. DOE-ORP acknowledged Ecology's comment, and stated that is why it believes the dispute can be resolved at the IAMIT level. DOE-ORP noted that in the future, there will be challenges regarding setting priorities on the Hanford Site in view of the budget outlooks. DOE-ORP stated that it appears that Ecology and DOE-ORP

are in agreement on the path forward to building barriers, and asked if it was time well-spent arguing about the side issues. Ecology responded that that was why it is interested in resolving the dispute, and that internal discussions will be needed to decide on the next steps.

EPA stated that when there are funding issues, the TPA provides a process for the agencies to decide what the priorities are and then change the milestones. Ecology noted EPA's characterization of the TPA process, and stated that the issue was DOE-ORP's lack of communication in a timely manner regarding a milestone. DOE-ORP responded that Ecology's written dispute refers to the placement of barriers and protection of human health and the environment, and it does not mention timeliness or communication issues.

Ecology stated that there are three paths to consider. The first path would be if there had been a settlement and the penalty was held in abeyance, DOE-ORP would have been motivated to do the barriers in preference to other milestones, which would mean there would be different priority discussions in the future, but there would be some assurance that the barriers would be constructed. The second path would be to sign the change package, and there wouldn't be any more assurance that the barriers would be constructed in 2020. The third path would be to elevate the dispute to the PCHB and order DOE-ORP to construct the barriers, which would provide some assurance it would happen, but waste a lot of time. DOE-ORP reiterated that it was not ready to go to the PCHB, and that the dispute could be resolved at the IAMIT level. This action remains open.

Action No. 5 – This dispute has been extended until March 25, 2016, and it is still at the project manager level. This action remains open.

Action No. 6 – This dispute has been extended out to March 31, 2016, and it is still at the project manager level. This action remains open.

Action No. 7 – This dispute has been extended out to March 31, 2016, and it is still at the project manager level. This action remains open.

Action No. 8 – DOE-RL reported that Ecology and WCH have been coordinating the Waste Identification Data Services (WIDS) update for the 100-N Reactor description within WIDS for 100-N-66. DOE-RL stated that agreement was reached on what the new N Reactor waste site description should be, and once a copy has been received, it will be sent out for review. DOE-RL added that Appendix C was updated to incorporate any waste site changes, and that package will be redistributed for review. DOE-RL noted that the reactors were taken out of Appendix C and put into Appendix J, and the change control forms will be sent out for approval. This action remains open.

Action No. 9 – Ecology reported that it has been coordinating with EPA on the TPA Appendix B updates, and that EPA has indicated its agreement with the

updates. Ecology stated that once internal approval is confirmed, the change control form should be ready to be signed. This action remains open.

Action No. 10 – DOE-RL stated that TPA documents are required to be stored as hard copies in the Administrative Record (AR), and an initiative was proposed to eliminate the hard copy requirement and store the documents as electronic copies. DOE-RL stated that EPA agreed with the proposal, and Ecology also agreed, with the caveat of getting approval from the public. The proposed change from hard copies to electronic copies in the AR went out for public survey, and the majority of the public agreed with the change to electronic copies. DOE-RL stated that Ecology raised some concerns last month regarding the status of the AR and whether it was ready to accommodate the change from hard copy to electronic copy. DOE-RL noted that there have been issues with retrieving and searching for documents within the AR, but that is unrelated to how documents are stored in the AR.

DOE-RL stated that Ecology raised the concern about improving the process for retrieving and searching for documents in the AR, and tied that initiative together with the initiative to remove the hard copy requirement. DOE-RL indicated that going paperless would save about \$250,000 per year, and there was a discussion about whether the IAMIT would potentially pursue using the money to fund upgrades to the AR to improve it or apply the money to milestones. DOE-RL noted that the topic will be discussed during the coordination meeting next Thursday with Ecology and EPA.

Ecology stated that in concept it supports eliminating hard copies, and that some upgrades to the AR have been identified and what the cost for those upgrades would be. Ecology asked if DOE-RL had a plan for upgrading the AR and how the cost savings would be spent. DOE-RL responded that in September 2015, a meeting was held with Ecology and EPA, and there were 22 upgrades identified for the AR. DOE-RL's subcontractor reviewed the 22 upgrades and determined the cost would be about \$550,000. DOE-RL directed the contractor to select the best upgrades in an effort to lower the cost, and the contractor provided a reduced list of upgrades at the end of January 2016.

DOE-RL stated that accessibility to the AR website and how the documents are stored are two different topics, and that will be discussed during the coordination meeting next Thursday. EPA pointed out another issue associated with searching the AR for documents is that decision documents are not always located under a specific operable unit, and there may be documents or some other information that may need to be added to the operable unit in the AR. EPA suggested including that issue for discussion during the coordination meeting next Thursday. EPA added that it had no issues with going from hard copies to electronic copies, but the information should be accessible, especially if a decision is being based on certain documents. Ecology noted that there have been numerous complaints from stakeholders who have had difficulty with accessing records. DOE-RL

noted that the phone number for the AR staff is on the website, and they are available to assist in locating a document.

Ecology stated that transparency and clarity and how decisions are made over time comprise the intent of the AR, and asked if that is being considered in the AR review process. DOE-RL responded that all of the documents in the AR are in two forms, which are hard copy and electronic, and it has been approved in the system as far as storage. DOE-RL added that the AR follows the current recommended procedures for the use of .pdf files, and the AR follows Department of Defense requirements for multiple backup servers and maintenance. DOE-RL noted that the AR staff indicated the last time a member of the public came in to the AR to request a hard copy was in 2007 or 2008, and that the majority of the public accesses the AR electronically. EPA noted that the public also asks the agencies for information instead of going to the AR.

Ecology stated that the discussion regarding accessibility may not be appropriate for the coordination meeting unless the question is posed about spending the \$250,000 over a three-year period to upgrade the AR. DOE-RL indicated that the plan was to present the issue and ask if the upgrades should be funded at this time. Ecology suggested a separate meeting with DOE-RL to discuss the issue before making a decision about what will be presented at the coordination meeting for discussion. This action remains open.

Action No. 11 – DOE-RL reported that the change request associated with the M-091 milestone series was signed on January 16, 2016. A letter will be issued to all of the public commenters, and it was decided to send separate letters to the Tribes and to the Oregon Department of Energy. This action remains open.

Action No. 12 – DOE-RL stated that the public comment period for the Central Plateau started in October and ended on February 12, 2016. DOE-RL stated that it is planning to schedule a kick-off meeting next week with the original negotiators and the public involvement staff. DOE-RL stated that MSA has been binning the comments since January 2016, and the plan is to brief Ecology and EPA on the nature of the major comments during a comment-response kick-off meeting. DOE-RL added that the plan is also to determine the path forward for the milestones that will need to be changed in the change package, based on the public comments. This action remains open.

Action No. 13 – DOE-RL reported that this dispute has been extended until March 18, 2016, and the date on the action table should have been updated. DOE-RL noted that the milestone is due at the end of March 2016, and the decision between DOE-RL and EPA was to wait on addressing the issue because the milestone could potentially be met. This action remains open.

IAMIT ACTION TRACKING

February 18, 2016

#	Start Date	Action	Action Status	Updates/Needs for Closure	Actionee(s)	Date Closed
1	DOE provided change control forms to Ecology on 9/16/14.	Ecology provide comments on TPA Appendix Change Control forms C-13-01 and C-14-02 that align the waste sites for operable unit 200-IS-1.	Open	Stated at monthly IAMIT, impacts TPA M/S M-015-112 IS-1 work plan that is in dispute. DOE and Ecology reached agreement on TSD designations for IMUSTs. Revised C-13-01 is under review by Ecology.	ECY/DOE	
2	11/15/2013 transmits TPA chg ctrl form 12/3/2013 Ecology disapproves 12/10/2013. DOE initiates dispute.	Resolve dispute on Ecology disapproval of TPA change control form M-15-13-02. Milestone M-015-112, 200-IS-1 RFI wrk pln.	Open	Dispute extended at the project managers level to 3/30/2015 per extension agreement 1/29/15. Dispute extended at the project manager level to 09/30/15 in accordance with agreement signed on 05/14/15. (1501370) On 09/09/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level to 12/31/15. On 11/19/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute to 1/28/15. On 01/11/16, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 02/29/16.	Project managers resolve dispute.	
3	Ecology disapproved TPA change control form M-62-14-02.	Resolve dispute on Ecology disapproval of TPA change control form M-62-14-02. Milestone M-062-45, Comp. Neg's 6-Mo After Last Issuance of System Plan.	Open	On 05/11/15, the parties agreed to extend dispute resolution at the project manager level until 06/15/15. On 6/11/15 the parties agreed to extend dispute resolution at the project manager level until 10/22/15. On 09/21/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 02/18/16 (TODAY).	Project managers resolve dispute.	

#	Start Date	Action	Action Status	Updates/Needs for Closure	Actionee(s)	Date Closed
4	Ecology disapproved TPA change control form M-45-15-01	Resolve dispute on Ecology disapproval of TPA change control from M-45-15-01. Milestone M-045-92 identifies due date for construction of SX Barriers 1 and 2 and design and construction of Barriers 3 and 4.	Open	<p>ORP transmitted change control form M-45-15-01 to ECY on 03/31/15 via letter 15-TF-0027, to modify M-045-92 due dates for barrier 1 and 2 construction, and barrier 3 and 4 design and construction. ECY disapproved the change control form on 04/14/15, and followed with disapproval letter 15-NWP-075 dated 04/17/15. On 04/20/15, ORP initiated dispute resolution in letter 15-TF-0042. On 04/23/15, ORP and ECY agreed to extend the period for dispute resolution at the project manager level until 08/16/15. On 07/30/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 10/15/15. On 10/15/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 11/16/15. On 11/13/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 11/20/15. On 11/19/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the PM level through 12/02/15. On 12/02/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the PM level until 01/29/16. On 1/21/16, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 2/16/16.</p> <p><i>*Dispute to be addressed in change control form M-45-15-04.</i></p>	Project managers resolve dispute	
5	Ecology disapproved TPA change control form M-45-15-03	Resolve dispute on Ecology disapproval of TPA change control from M-45-15-03. Milestone M-045-82, "Submit complete permit modification request for Tiers 1, 2, and 3 of the SST System to support final closure requirements for WMA-C."	Open	<p>On 07/16/15, DOE initiated dispute. On 08/10/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute resolution period until 10/20/15. On 10/19/15, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the project manager level until 03/25/16</p>	Project managers resolve dispute	

#	Start Date	Action	Action Status	Updates/Needs for Closure	Actionee(s)	Date Closed
6	Ecology Disapproved TPA change control form M-47-15-01 on 1/12/16	Resolve dispute on Ecology disapproval of TPA change control form M-47-15-01. Milestone M-047-07, "Submit CD-1 for the Secondary. Liquid Waste Treatment Project".	Open	On 1/19/16, DOE initiated dispute	Project managers resolve dispute	
7	Ecology Disapproved TPA change control form M-90-15-01 on 1/12/16	Resolve dispute on Ecology disapproval of TPA change control form M-90-15-01. Milestone M-090-13, "Submit a CD-1 for the Interim Hanford Storage Project".	Open	On 1/19/16, DOE initiated dispute	Project managers resolve dispute	
8	12/4/2014 DOE transmits draft TPA App C 12-12-03 change ctrl form to update 100 Area waste sites	EPA and Ecology review and provide comments to DOE	Open	Ecology EPA comments complete, and reclassification form for 100 K reactors tentatively accepted. Appendix J draft chg ctrl form provided to the regulators. Still at issue: 100-N-66 WIDS description under revision by Ecology and WCH.	ECY	
9	TPA Appendix B update	Provide draft TPA simple changes Appendix B change control form to regulators.	Open	DOE provided Ecology with revisions to draft Appendix B change control form (B-15-01).	ECY	
10	Change control form P-09-15-01 provided to regulators	P-09-15-01, "Modifications to Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (HFFACO) Section 9.4, Administrative Record to eliminate hard copy requirement".	Open	Public announcement reviewed and approved by parties. Draft change control form under review by Ecology.	ECY, EPA, DOE	
11	M-091-00 Series Tentative Agreement/response to public comment	TPA Agencies complete response summary and approve change control form.	Open	Public comments binned by DOE, and responded to by Ecology. Signed change control form provided to Ecology for final approval. Change control form M-91-15-01 signed by the parties.	ECY, EPA, DOE	1/16/16
12	M-15,16,37,85,94 Series' Tentative Agreement/response to comment	TPA Agencies complete response summary and approve change control forms.	Open	Public comment binning processes commenced. Establish response team, complete responsiveness summary. Approve and implement change control form. Public comment period ended 2/16/16.	ECY, EPA, DOE	

#	Start Date	Action	Action Status	Updates/Needs for Closure	Actionee(s)	Date Closed
13	12/14/2015 DOE transmits TPA chg ctrl form and EPA disapproves. DOE initiates dispute on 12/21/2015.	Resolve dispute on EPA disapproval of TPA change control form M-16-15-08, <i>Remove the 600-349 waste site from Tri-Party Agreement Interim Milestone M-016-149.</i>	Open	Dispute elevated to IAMIT on 1/13/2016 with EPA allowance to submit SOD on 1/21/2016. On 01/28/16, the parties agreed to extend the dispute at the IAMIT level until 02/18/16 (TODAY).	DOE/EPA/Ecology	