0073091



# Meeting Minutes

**October 26th, 1999**
**Inter-Agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT)**

Approval: _____ Date: 12/22/99
Peter M. Knollmeyer (A5-11)
*RL IAMIT Representative*

Approval: _____ Date: 12/15/99
Douglas R. Sherwood (B5-01)
*EPA IAMIT Representative*

Approval: _____ Date: 12/15/99
Michael A. Wilson (B5-18)
*Ecology IAMIT Representative*

Minutes Prepared by:
Approval: _____ Date: 12/17/99.
Deborah F. Iwatate (A5-15)
*Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.*

## DISTRIBUTION

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ballard, W. W. | RL | A5-12 * | Piippo, R. E. | FDH | A5-15 * |
| Blazek, M. L. | ODOE | OR * | Rodriguez, H. M. | RL | A5-15 * |
| Cusack, L. | Ecology | B5-18 * | Sanders, G. H. | RL | A5-15 * |
| Erlandson, B. G. | LMHC | R1-51 | Sherwood, D. R. | EPA | B5-01 * |
| Hertzel, J. S. | FDH | H8-67 * | Skinnarland, E. R. | Ecology | B5-18 |
| Iwatate, D. F. | FDH | A5-15 * | Sobczyk, S. | Nez Perce | |
| Jarvis, M. F. | RL | A5-15 * | Stanley, R. | Ecology | Lacey * |
| Jim, R. | YN | | Tilden, H. T. | PNNL | P8-34 |
| Kjarmo, K. J. | E2 | A1-14 * | Wilkinson, J. R. | CTUIR | |
| Knollmeyer, P. M. | RL | A5-11 | Wilson, M. A. | Ecology | B5-18 * |
| Miskho, A. G. | FDH | H6-06 | Yerxa, J. K. | RL | A5-15 * |
| Morrison R. D. | FDH | A1-14 * | | | |
| Murphy-Fitch, E. J. | FDH | A1-14 * | Administrative Record | EDMC | H6-08 * |

*Other/Attendees:*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dagan, E. B. | RL | S7-55 | Sinton, G. L. | RL | S7-55 |
| Foley, B. L. | RL | H0-12 | Wallace, J. | Ecology | B5-18 |
| Goody, C. E. | FDH | H8-67 | | | |

* w/Attachments

File: *IAMIT Minutes.OCT99*

RECEIVED
JUN 25 2007
EDMC

## Approval of Change Request M-13-99-01, Modify M-13-23/24
### (B. Foley, M. Wilson, D. Sherwood)

This item involved the signing of the Class II change request M-13-99-01 (Attachment 1) that would modify existing interim milestones M-13-23 and M-13-24. The change request also establishes new interim milestones to support 200 Area Operable Unit work plans. The change request modifies the TPA interim milestones related to the preparation of work plans and characterization of contamination at the 200-TW-1, 200-TW-2, 200-PW-2, and 200-PW-4 operable units. All parties signed without any further discussion.

## Approval of LDR Dispute Resolution Extension
### (P. Knollmeyer, M. Jarvis, M. Wilson, R. Stanley)

This item involved the signing of a letter of Mutual Agreement and Extension (Attachment 2) regarding TPA milestone M-26-01 (*Submit an Annual Hanford Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) Report*). In summary, the agreement and extension addressed the following major issues:

- Combined the resolution efforts for two ongoing LDR disputes into one
- Extended the deadline to elevate [the] two ongoing LDR disputes (currently at the IAMIT level) to the Director of Ecology's level, until January 31st, 2000
- Established the due date for a clarification letter from Ecology regarding alleged violation #4 (specified in the Ecology June 3rd, 1999 NOC) to December 13th, 1999
- Extended the deadline for completion and certification of the Corrective Measures Report on alleged violation #4 from December 8th, 1999 to February 8th, 2000.
- Extended the due date of the FY-2000 LDR Report (TPA Milestone M-26-01J) from April 30th, 2000 to July 31st, 2000.
- Documented Ecology's agreement not to issue any orders or penalties for violations described in it's June 3rd, 1999 NOC prior to February 8th, 2000.

A brief discussion was held regarding the incorporation of Ecology comments into the final agreement letter. Ms. M. Jarvis went through the document and noted where the comments had been addressed. A minor date discrepancy in the letter was noted by Mr. D. Sherwood (February 8th, 1999 date marking the end of the no-Ecology-penalties period, should be February 8th, 2000). A change was made to the original document and agreed to, and initialed, by the signing parties. The letter was signed without further discussion.

## Approval of 224-T TRUSAF Negotiations AIP Extension
### (P. Knollmeyer, M. Wilson, R. Stanley)

An agreement letter (Attachment 3) was signed to provide more time for DOE and Ecology to continue 224-T Facility negotiations. The due date for 224-T Phase I, and associated negotiations, was suspended indefinitely until the parties mutually agree to resume.

## Additional Item Noted for the Record
### (P. Knollmeyer)

Mr. P. Knollmeyer made note that his term as the RL IAMIT Representative had ended and that Mr. W. Ballard would be taking over the duties of DOE-RL IAMIT Representative starting with the November meeting.

ATTACHMENT 1

| Change Number | Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order<br>Change Control Form<br>Do not use blue ink. Type or print using black ink | Date |
|---|---|---|
| M-13-99-01 | | October 3, 1999 |

**Originator**
DOE

**Phone**

**Class of Change**
[ ] I – Signatories [X] II – Executive Manager [ ] III – Project Manager

**Change Title**
Modification of Interim Milestones M-13-23 and M-13-24 and Establishment of New Interim Milestones to Support 200 Area Operable Unit Work Plans

**Description/Justification of Change**

Introduction:

The U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Restoration (ER) Program has begun assessing (characterizing and evaluating) contamination at approximately 700 waste sites located in the 200 East and 200 West Areas of the Hanford Site. The sites typically consist of units such as cribs, ponds, ditches, and unplanned releases to soil. They do not include the large underground single-shell tanks (SSTs) and double-shell tanks (DSTs). For purposes of assessment, the sites are grouped into 23 operable units (OUs) based on similarity of waste received and type of waste unit. The DOE ER Program, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency worked together to prioritize the assessment of the OUs based on criteria such as potential threats to health and the environment. The initial prioritization is reflected in a series of milestones that were approved in 1998. These milestones establish dates for developing assessment work plans, performing characterization, and evaluating cleanup alternatives. The parties agreed to review the prioritization as worked progressed to determine if there were any necessary changes to the criteria and/or ranking process. Preparation of the assessment work plans for the first three OUs began in 1999.

In a separate activity, the DOE Office of River Protection (ORP) and Ecology recently concluded negotiations related to interim corrective action at Hanford's SSTs. The 149 SSTs are grouped into waste management areas (WMAs) for purposes of *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act* (RCRA) groundwater monitoring. Past releases of dangerous waste and dangerous waste constituents from some of the SSTs have resulted in groundwater contamination at four of the WMAs, which has triggered corrective action under RCRA. Several milestones have been established for assessing the contaminant releases at the four WMAs. Under these milestones, a WMA-specific assessment work plan would be submitted for the S-SX WMA in October 1999 (Milestone M-45-52), followed by the B-BX-BY WMA in May 2000 (Milestone M-45-53) and the T and TX-TY WMAs in December 2000 (Milestone M-45-54). One of the issues identified in developing the SST corrective action program and implementing assessment activities is the proximity of several ER Program waste sites to the SST farms.

In July 1999, the DOE ER Program, Ecology, and EPA met to reassess OU prioritization needs. Several new criteria were proposed for consideration in establishing OU priorities. These new criteria include the following:

- Resolution/refinement of the source of existing contaminant plumes (e.g., distinguishing whether the principal contributor to a groundwater contaminant plume is an ER Program crib or the adjacent SST farm)

**Impact of Change.**
Modification of Agreement interim milestones related to preparing work plans and characterizing contamination at the 200-TW-1, 200-TW-2, 200-PW-2, and 200-PW-4 OUs.

**Affected Documents**
The Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, as amended, and Hanford site internal planning and budget documents (e.g., Detailed Work Plans).

**Approvals**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Julie E. Bilson<br>DOE | 10/25/99<br>Date | X Approved | ____ Disapproved |
| Douglas R. Sherwood<br>EPA | 10/25/99<br>Date | X Approved | ____ Disapproved |
| [illegible]<br>Ecology | 10/25/99<br>Date | X Approved | ____ Disapproved |

**Description/Justification of Change (continued)**

- The efficiency gained from integrating data needs and characterization efforts between two DOE programs (e.g., using ER program characterization activities to provide information for development of the System Assessment Capability)

- Technical coordination (e.g., alignment of assessment schedules to produce data of sufficient quality to make sound technical decisions for programs in addition to the ER Program)

- Regulatory integration (e.g., Agreement milestones for a particular program).

Modification of ER Program Schedules

These new criteria were applied to the current OU assessment schedule in light of the recently-developed SST corrective action program and opportunities were identified to coordinate ER Program and ORP activities. There are two OUs that comprise sites that received waste associated with the tank systems, the 200-TW-1 Scavenged Waste Group OU and the 200-TW-2 Tank Waste Group OU. These two OUs contain waste sites that are located near the B-BX-BY WMA and the T and TX-TY WMA. These two OUs were not scheduled for assessment work plans until after fiscal year 2000 based on the original prioritization scheme. Increasing the priority of these two OUs and advancing the assessment schedule would allow for integration with assessment activities for the SST WMAs. Integration efforts could include conducting joint data quality objective workshops, coordinating sampling activities and analytical requirements, and ensuring that all data are available in a form usable to both programs. Integration would be facilitated by preparing a single work plan to address the 200-TW-1 and 200-TW-2 OUs.

The budget to implement ER Program assessment activities is fixed. Accelerating 200-TW-1 and 200-TW-2 OU assessment activities into fiscal year 2000 requires delaying assessment activities at other OUs. The OUs identified for delay are the 200-PW-2 Uranium-Rich Process Waste Group and the 200-PW-4 General Process Waste Group Operable Units.

To implement this reprioritization, the existing TPA milestones would be changed as follows:

- Interim Milestone M-13-23 (4/30/00) would be reassigned from the Uranium-Rich Process Group (200-PW-2) to 200-TW-1. The milestone date would be changed to 8/31/00.
- inteirm Milestone M-13-24 (8/31/00) would be reassigned from the General Process Waste Group (200-PW-4) to 200-TW-2 with no change to the milestone date.
- A new interim milestone would be established to require submittal of the work plan for 200-PW-2 OU by 12/31/00. Submitting the work plan required by this new interim milestone would satisfy major milestone M-13-00K, which requires submittal of one 200 Area work plan by 12/31/00.
- A new interim milestone would be established to require submittal of the work plan for 200-PW-4 OU by 6/30/01. Submitting the work plan required by this new milestone would satisfy in part major milestone M-13-00L, which requires submittal of an additional three 200 Area work plans by 12/31/01.

The slip of four months associated with Milestone M-13-23 is recommended to integrate the 200-TW-1 and 200-TW-2 OUs and is offset by submitting the 200 PW-4 work plan by 6/30/01, six months earlier than would otherwise be reuqired.

The waste sites in the 200-PW-2 and 200-PW-4 OUs include RCRA treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD) units. In accordance with the 200 Area waste site remediation strategy, the RCRA closure plans/postclosure plans for the TSD units will be submitted in conjunction with the OU assessment documentation. Separate Agreement milestones address submittal of the closure plans/postclosure plans as follows:

- Milestone M-20-33, Submit 216-A-10 & 216-A-36B Cribs Closure/Postclosure Plans to Ecology in coordination with 200-PW-2 (10/31/03)
- Milestone M-20-52, Submit 216-A-37-1 Crib Closure/Postclosure Plan to Ecology in coordination with 200-PW-4 (12/31/03)
- M-20-53, Submit 207-A Retention Basin Closure/Postclosure Plans to Ecology in coordination with 200-PW-4 (12/31/03).

## Description/Justification of Change (continued)

These closure plan/postclosure plan milestones will not be affected by the delay in the 200-PW-2 and 200-PW-4 assessment work plan milestones. The draft 200-PW-2 and 200-PW-4 Operable Unit Feasibility Study Reports for these units with the RCRA TSD closure plans/postclosure plans will still be completed before the M-20 milestones above.

One challenge will be ensuring that changes in the ORP schedules do not adversely impact the ER Program schedules. This will be accomplished through close and continuous communication and by budgeting the ER Program activities at a level that ensures that the ER activities can proceed independently in the event that ORP schedules are delayed.

The new criteria are also being evaluated with consideration to the Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project. At this time, no necessary modification of the OU schedule has been identified to support the GW/VZ Integration Project. However, DOE is committed to coordinating the ER Program and the GW/VZ integration Project to identify data needs, particularly in the areas of science and technology, development of waste inventories and contaminant distribution models, development of the System Assessment Capability models, and refinement of groundwater monitoring. DOE will actively seek opportunities to satisfy those needs through ER Program assessment activities.

## Interim Milestones Modified/Established by Approval of This Change Request

Modifications to existing milestones

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M-13-23 | Submit 200-TW-1 work plan. | 8/31/2000 |
| M-13-24 | Submit 200-TW-2 work plan. | 8/31/2000 |

New milestones

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| M-13-25 | Submit uranium rich process waste group (200-PW-2) work plan. | 12/31/2000 |
| | Submitting this work plan will satisfy major milestone M-13-00K, which requires submittal of one 200 Area work plan by 12/31/00. | |
| M-13-26 | Submit general process waste group (200-PW-4) work plan. | 6/30/2001 |
| | Submitting this work plan will satisfy in part major milestone M-13-00L, which requires submittal three 200 Area work plans by 12/31/01. | |

ATTACHMENT 2

Tri-Party Agreement

Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement or TPA)

# Mutual Agreement and Extension
Regarding
Milestone M-26-01, Submit an Annual Hanford Land Disposal Restriction (LDR) Report
October 26, 1999

Currently two disputes [(1)] [(2)] are pending at the IAMIT Level, which relate to Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (also referred to herein as the Tri-Party Agreement or TPA) Milestone M-26-01, "Submit an Annual Hanford Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Report." The purposes of this Mutual Agreement and Extension are fourfold: 1) to combine the resolution of the two LDR disputes, 2) to extend their determination date at the IAMIT Level until the IAMIT Meeting of January 25, 2000, 3) to extend until February 8, 2000, the due date of the Corrective Measures Report for alleged violation #4 [(3)] and 4) to agree that during this period of additional consideration by the Parties, Ecology will not issue any orders or penalties for the alleged violations [(3)].

To date, six meetings have been held (July 14, 1999 through September 23, 1999) with appropriate Ecology and RL technical and management staff. These meetings have allowed the parties to gain a common understanding of the issues, provide technical clarifications, and discuss the directed changes in the Ecology LDR Notice of Correction (NOC) to the current method of complying with the governing 1990 Hanford LDR Plan Requirements (4-pages in length). Additional meetings between Ecology and RL are needed to complete these discussions. Further, the LDR Report for 2000 is due April 30, 2000, the call for information goes out November 15, 1999, and the format of the report depends on the outcome of these discussions. Unless a clear understanding of the report format and contents is determined, this next report will contain the same disputed issues as the 1999 LDR Report. The parties wish to avoid further misunderstandings. For these reasons, it is logical to combine the two disputes and extend the timeframe for their resolution at the IAMIT level, particularly since the points of contention in both disputes are similar and interrelated. Furthermore, to avoid producing a 2000 LDR Report that is not satisfactory to both parties, by this agreement, the due date for the 2000 LDR Report is extended to July 31, 2000. The time extensions are also warranted to accommodate the work priorities, existing commitments and schedules of key Ecology and RL personnel and to allow resolving the issues in unison, both efficiently and expediently.

This agreement in no way affects the rights under the Tri-Party Agreement and/or other regulatory right of either Ecology or RL.

The agreements are as follows:

- Relative to RL's ongoing disputes at the IAMIT Level, the deadline to elevate these two disputes to the Director of Ecology's level is extended until January 31, 2000.

- The clarification letter from Ecology pertaining to alleged violation #4, specified in the Ecology June 3, 1999 NOC [3] is due on or before December 13, 1999.

- The December 8, 1999 deadline for completion and certification of the Corrective Measures Report on alleged violation #4, specified in the Ecology June 3, 1999 NOC [3] is extended until February 8, 2000.

- The due date of the 2000 LDR Report (TPA Milestone M-26-01J) is extended to July 31, 2000.

- Ecology agrees not to issue any orders or penalties for violations described in its June 3, 1999 NOC [3] prior to February 8, ~~1999~~. 2000

The undersigned hereby mutually agree to abide by the terms stipulated in this Extension.

Agreed to this 26th day of October 1999.

Michael A. Wilson, Program Manager
Nuclear Waste Program
State of Washington
Department of Ecology

Peter M. Knollmeyer, Assistant Manager
for Nuclear Materials and Facility
Stabilization
U.S. Department of Energy

REFERENCES

[1] Letter, G. H Sanders, RL, to M. A. Wilson, Ecology, "Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement) M-26-01H "Transmittal of the Statement of Dispute for the 1998 Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Compliance Inspection, Notice of Correction (NOC) at Hanford," dated August 13, 1999.

[2] Letter, G. H Sanders, RL, to M. A. Wilson, Ecology, "Transmittal of the Statement of Dispute for the 1999 Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Report [Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement) M-26-01I], dated October 18, 1999. **Note:** Ecology also initiated dispute via Letter, L. Ruud, Ecology to G.H. Sanders, RL, {untitled} dated September 17, 1999.

[3] Letter, L. Ruud, Ecology, to P. Kruger, RL, et al., RL, "Notice of Correction Resulting from the 1998 Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Compliance Inspection at Hanford (TPA Milestone M-26-01H)," dated June 3, 1999.

ATTACHMENT 3

Tri-Party Agreement

# 224-T PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS RESCHEDULE

The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (RL) and the State of Washington Department of Ecology had previously agreed in the June 22, 1999, 224-T Facility Agreement-in-Principle (AIP) to perform Phase I negotiations. The parties have been unable to address the 224-T Facility negotiation activities.

In light of the above, it is proposed that the Phase I due date and associated negotiations for 224-T be suspended indefinitely until the parties mutually agree to resume.

Michael A. Wilson, Program Manager
Nuclear Waste Program
State of Washington
Department of Ecology

10/26/99
Peter M. Knollmeyer, Assistant Manager
for Nuclear Materials and Facility
Stabilization
U.S. Department of Energy

Douglas R. Sherwood
Hanford Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency