

START

7613425.0655

0043778

029895

2/2

**Meeting Minutes Transmittal/Approval
Unit Manager's Meeting: 200 Area Remedial Action
200 Area Remedial Action Strategy Work Shop
3350 George Washington Way, Room 1B03, Richland, Washington
March 20 - 22, 1996**

FROM/APPROVAL: *Bryan Foley* Date 4/17/96
Bryan Foley, 200 Area Unit Manager, RL (H0-12)

APPROVAL: *[Signature]* Date 4/18/96
Jack Donnelly, 200 Area Unit Manager, Ecology (B5-18)

APPROVAL: *Paul Beaver* Date 4/18/96
Paul Beaver, 200 Aggregate Area Unit Manager, EPA (B5-01)

Meeting Minutes are attached. Minutes are comprised of the following:

- Attachment #1 - Agenda
- Attachment #2 - Attendance Sheet
- Attachment #3 - Meeting Summary/Summary of Commitments and Agreements



Prepared by: *Dave Erb* Date 4/17/96
Dave Erb, ERC (H9-12)

Concured by: *Greg Eidam/Joan Woolard* Date 4/17/96
Greg Eidam/Joan Woolard, BHI Remedial Action Projects (H0-17)

029895

**200 REMEDIAL ACTION STRATEGY
WORKSHOP/MEETING : MARCH 20-22, 1996**

DAY 1

Introductions and Check-in

Partnering philosophy, assumptions and goals

Ground Rules for Meeting

Consensus Guidelines

Agenda Review

Interview Feedback

Break

Assumptions

Constraints

Lunch

Review of Background Information

Review Rules of Brainstorming

Grouping Options

Break

Evaluation Criteria

Use of Day 2 and Agenda

Close-out

**200 REMEDIAL ACTION STRATEGY
WORKSHOP/MEETING : MARCH 20-22, 1996**

DAY 2:

Check-in

Continuation of :

Assumptions

Constraints

Break

Values

Evaluation Criteria for Grouping (if not complete)

Interview Feedback

Lunch

Continuation of pre-lunch activity, discussion of issues (parking lot)

Break

Stages of Team Development

Other Team Activities

Close-out

**200 REMEDIAL ACTION STRATEGY
WORKSHOP/MEETING : MARCH 20-22, 1996**

DAY 3:

Review Contractor's Grouping of Sites or Continue whole Group's work on same task

Break

Implementation and Streamlining

Lunch

Priorities

Near-Term Work

Break

Continue with any unfinished items

Schedule Next Meeting

Prepare Agenda for Next Meeting

Close-out and Evaluation

200 Area Remedial Action Unit Manager's Meeting
Attendance Record
March 20-22, 1996

PRINTED NAME	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE
Bryan Foley	RL	
Jim Hanson	RL	
Donna Wanek	RL	
Beth Ward	RL	
Paul Beaver	EPA	
Dennis Faulk	EPA	
Joan Bartz	Ecology	
Suzanne Dahl	Ecology	
Jack Donnelly	Ecology	
Alisa Huckaby	Ecology	
Moses Jarysi	Ecology	
Dave Lundstrom	Ecology	
Shri Mohan	Ecology	
Laura Russell	Ecology	
Greg Eidam	ERC	
Karl Fecht	ERC	
Linda Mihalik	ERC	
Greg Mitchem	ERC	
Joan Woolard	ERC	
Michael Galgoul	ERC	

**200 Area Source Operable Units Strategy Workshop
Meeting Notes
Table of Contents**

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
2.0	VISION STATEMENT (Consensus Item)	2
3.0	ASSUMPTIONS (Consensus Item)	2
4.0	CONSTRAINTS (Consensus Item)	3
5.0	VALUES	3
6.0	STRATEGY OUTLINE (Consensus Item)	4
7.0	STRATEGY FLOWCHART (Consensus Item)	4
8.0	EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR WASTE SITE GROUPINGS (Consensus Item)	4
9.0	WASTE SITE GROUPING CRITERIA (Consensus Item)	8
10.0	FINAL WASTES SITE GROUPING CRITERIA STATEMENTS (Consensus Item) .	11
11.0	WORKSHOP GROUND RULES (Consensus Item)	12
12.0	PARKING LOT	12
13.0	AGENDA ITEMS	13
14.0	ACTION ITEMS	13
15.0	DISCUSSION POINTS	14
16.0	STILL TO WORK ON	14
17.0	WORKSHOP CONDUCT/FUNCTION EVALUATION	14
18.0	INTERVIEW RESPONSES	15

April 11, 1996

1.0 INTRODUCTION

These meeting minutes summarize the activities performed during a 3-day workshop to develop a strategy for the 200 Area source operable units assessment and remediation. The consensus items are those to which the group agreed to during the workshop. The remaining items represent important points for which agreement needs to be reached, items valuable to further discussions, and topics deemed worth keeping for future consideration. The order differs from the meeting organization, but is intended to highlight statements and points of agreement.

2.0 VISION STATEMENT (Consensus Item)

The 200 Area strategy is a streamlined process of getting to and performing cleanup that is technically sound, protective of human health and the environment, and publicly acceptable.

3.0 ASSUMPTIONS (Consensus Item)

Modified from Workbook

Near term IRM focus is on worker protection and no spread of contamination and long term risk reduction/remedial action when appropriate. (A-2)

A new way of grouping sites for characterization may be needed. This grouping may or may not be the same for remediation. (A-11)

Applicable presumptive remedies, analogous sites, and observational approach can be used, provided characterization (which includes, but is not limited to, historical data) information support it. (A-8)

The Hanford Past Practice Strategy, integrated with RCRA closure requirements, will provide process steps to be used in this strategy. (A-13)

Waste or contaminated media, including TRU constituents and pre-1970 TRU waste may be left in place as long as the risk associated with this in-place remediation is acceptable. Alternative technologies will continue to be assessed. (A-7)

DOE shall insure that Surveillance and Maintenance is adequate for addressing surface contamination migration. (A-3)

The Tri-Party Agreement and Long Range Plan schedule dates may need to be reconciled. It is assumed that this is possible and the strategy will be the basis for these changes. (A-9)

April 11, 1996

New Assumptions

200 Areas Strategy will be developed within the intent of the Environmental Laws.

Decay may be a viable remediation option for short-lived (half-life of approximately 30 years or less, Cs-137, Sr-90, Co-60) radionuclides.

Integration with other projects/programs will occur.

4.0 CONSTRAINTS (Consensus Item)

Funding is a constraint to developing schedules, not strategy. The 100 and 300 Areas priority is recognized.

5.0 VALUES (Unprioritize brainstorming of established values)

The following are some of the public value statements that were discussed within the group. Other values contained in TWRS, ERDF, FSUWG, and 200-BP-11 documents were also discussed.

- Do not activate or contaminate groundwater areas. Limit actions that would derive contaminants from vadose zone to groundwater.
- Work geographically from the outside in (i.e. remediation to work from the periphery toward the center).
- Do not destroy undisturbed areas.
- Use existing facilities where possible.
- If waste can be cleaned up and gotten rid of, don't leave it behind.
- Implement real remediation; use existing technology.
- Keep public involved.
- No acceptance of offsite waste (but does this apply to 200 Areas strategy???) {Parking Lot Item???

Public values statements available in TWRS, ERDF, FSUWG, BP-11 documents.

April 11, 1996

6.0 STRATEGY OBJECTIVE/OUTLINE (Consensus Item)

Bryan Foley's strawman to consist of five key items

- Assumptions and Constraints
- Vision
- Waste Site Grouping Options and Evaluation Criteria
- Implementation and Streamlining
- Priorities

Jack Donnelly's Proposed Outline

- Assumptions
- Waste Site Groupings
 - Criteria/Process
 - List of Groupings
- Characterization
 - Historical Data
 - Priority for Characterization
 - Implementation
- Decision Documentation
- Remediation
 - Criteria
 - Priority for Cleanup
 - Implementation

7.0 STRATEGY FLOWCHART (Consensus Item)

See attached sheet

8.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR WASTE SITE GROUPINGS (Consensus Item)


What are the evaluation criteria for rating waste site strategy groupings?

(number of votes received), {Code for application to rating characterization and remediation criteria in Section 9.0, pg. 8}

April 11, 1996

STRATEGY FLOWCHART

Moses Jaraysi's Logic Chart



4990 5241/94

April 11, 1996

Only the first eight items were used to evaluate groupings.

- Promotes prioritization based on high risk; easier to prioritize. (11), {E}
- Technically and legally defensible. (9), {B}
- Get to real cleanup quicker and cheaper. (9), {A}
- Promotes success toward RCRA and CERCLA integration. (6), {F}
- Better integration with other programs. (6), {D}
- Promotes early start of characterization. (6), {C}
- Groundwater and source cleanup are linked. (4), {H}
- Public and stakeholder acceptance and understanding and common sense. (4), {G}

-----Cutoff Point-----

- Promotes innovative technology application and testing in the next 4 to 6 years using EM-50 support. (2)
- Achievable. (2)
- Balances resources and investment toward high risk. (2)
- Efficiency of scale. (1)
- Decision-making process is defined (measurable). (1)
- Works toward final remedy selection. (1)

-----No Votes-----

- Aligns with assumptions.
- Does not lose focus of path.
- Easy scheduling/supports/friendly.

April 11, 1996

- Allows low risk areas to be completed faster (whole cycle) and optimizes whole cycle time.
- More efficient/streamlined application of remedy.
- Less paperwork.
- Accommodate early action for reuse of land.
- Maximize land area cleanup.
- Does not allow pieces to fall through cracks.
- Supports implementation.
- Easier to choose remedies.

Other Statements (eliminated/combined due to repetition or inclusion with above criteria statements).

- Adequately addresses technical and regulatory requirements.
- Meets closure (RCRA) requirements.
- Use/sounds like common sense.
- Integrated risk between programs.
- Promotes progress toward getting finished cleanup.
- Concentrates on technologies for the next 4-6 years.
- Supports mortgage reduction.
- Bias for action.
- Saves dollars.
- Accommodates early action for high risk.
- Scheduling coincides with other programs (TWRS).
- Lends itself toward documentation (work plan, assessments) measurable.
- Buy-off from stakeholders.
- Less emphasis on administrative stuff.
- Builds confidence in results.
- Defensible basis/foundation.
- Promotes early remediation.
- Early visible (real) remediation.

April 11, 1996

9.0 WASTE SITE GROUPINGS (Consensus Item)

What are the criteria for grouping waste sites for characterization and remediation purposes?

Ranking of all characterization/remediation grouping criteria.

Voting on importance to: (Characterization/Remediation; 1st Round)
{Characterization/Remediation; 2nd Round}

- Types of contamination (Rad versus Dangerous versus Mixed, Sanitary versus Nonsimilar, similar concentrations, low- versus high-mobility contamination, liquid versus solid) - (13/10), {10/1}
 - High volume/low concentrations versus low volume/high concentration waste streams - (9/5), {1/1}
 - Geographic - Inside versus outside the fenceline - (9/3), {2/8}
 - Discharge process types (Tank Wastes Process Condensates, Steam Condensates) - (8/0), {12/0}
 - Zone of Contamination (i.e., surface, near surface, at depth in vadose zone) - (7/5), {0/2}
 - Waste site type (cribs, ponds, ditches, etc.) - (6/7), {7/6}
 - Short-lived versus long-lived radiological contaminants - (5/6), {1/8}
 - Continuing source versus noncontinuing source - (5/3), {2/0}
 - Proximity to potential driving sources (i.e., septic tanks, raw water lines, condensate discharges, low topography) - (3/4), {2/1}
 - Specific geologic/hydrogeologic characteristics - (4/2), {2/4}
 - Proximity to Permanent/Other Facilities - (0/5), {0/8}
- Cutoff Point for Second Round Voting-----
- TSD versus non-TSD - (1/3)
 - Site size - Big versus little - (1/1)
 - Use characterized sites as a basis for grouping - (1/1)

April 11, 1996

- Existing operable unit - (1/0)
- Release - Vadose zone known release versus potential release - (1/0)
- Potential reuse area (large disturbed areas {B-Pond} versus long-term institutional control areas {highly contaminated areas or candidate areas that will decay}) - (0/2)
- Remediation technology - (0/2)
- 200 East Area versus 200 West Area - (0/1)
- Discharge volume - (0/1)
- Group by Program Compatibility (by facility deactivation) - (0/1)

-----No Votes-----

- Level of risk
- Physical maintenance to unit required ASAP
- Easier versus More-difficult site to remediate
- AAMSR grouping
- Characterization technology - intrusive versus nonintrusive
- Cost
- Aggregate area
- RCRA corrective action versus CERCLA
- Work plans versus those that do not need work plans

Other statements (eliminated/combined due to repetition or inclusion with above criteria).

- High risk versus low risk.
- Release (detection monitoring storage versus disposal).
- Remediation technology-techniques in use for this type (i.e., carbon Tet remediation).

April 11, 1996

- Facility footprint/shadow - (waste site near facility, so group in remediation for plant.)
- Group by need or timing.
- Discharge process type (Pu versus U versus Organic versus Sr/Cr).

Results of the second round of voting produced a general agreement that the criteria listed below would be judged by the workshop participants against the evaluation criteria.

Top Characterization Grouping Criteria

1. Discharge Process type
2. Types of contamination
3. Waste site type.

Top Remediation Grouping Criteria

1. Geographic - Inside versus outside the fenceline
2. Proximity to permanent/other facilities
3. Short- versus long-lived rad constituents
4. Waste Site Type.

RATING CHARACTERIZATION AND REMEDIATION GROUPING

These top groupings were evaluated against the evaluation criteria identified in Section 8.0, Page 4 for waste sites presented in Section 7. The top characterization and remediation criteria were consolidated into an overall grouping category. Each workshop member voted on whether the grouping met the top eight evaluation criteria. Voting was either for (Y), against (N), neutral (0) or not applicable (NA). The A through H designators refers to specific evaluation criteria identified in Section 8.0 Page 4. The results are as follows:

Characterization Grouping

Discharge Process Types/Type of Contamination

Evaluation Criteria	-	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Group Voting	-	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0

i.e. 6 yeas and 2 neutrals.

April 11, 1996

Waste Site Type

Evaluation Criteria	-	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Group Voting	-	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	0	0

i.e. - 2 yeas, 2 neutral and 4 nays

Remediation GroupingProximity

Evaluation Criteria	-	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Group Voting	-	0	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N

i.e. 4 yeas, 3 nays and 1 neutral

Geographical

Evaluation Criteria	-	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Group Voting	-	0	0	NA	0	N	Y	Y	N

i.e. 2 yeas, 2 nays, 3 neutral and 1 NA

Short-Lived versus Long-Lived Radionuclides

Evaluation Criteria	-	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Group Voting	-	0	0	NA	N	0	Y	Y	N

i.e. 2 yeas, 2 nays, 3 neutral and 1 NA

Waste Site Type

Evaluation Criteria	-	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Group Voting	-	N	Y	NA	N	0	Y	Y	0

i.e. 3 yeas, 2 nays, 2 neutrals and 1 NA

10.0 FINAL GROUPING CRITERIA STATEMENTS (Consensus Item)

- CHARACTERIZATION grouping to be determined primarily by the discharge type and type of contamination with a secondary factor of the waste site type.

* See Section 15.0 for additional factors.

April 11, 1996

- **REMEDATION** grouping based on waste site type generally staying away from sites in close proximity of major facilities and starting from the outside and working inward.
* See Section 15.0 for additional factors.

11.0 **WORKSHOP GROUND RULES** (Consensus Item)

- Respect others.
- One speaker at a time.
- Listen and stay open to all points of view.
- No interruptions.
- No side conversations.
- Leave positions and agendas at the door.
- Stay focused.
- Call time out when needed.
- Focus on solutions and stay positive.
- Stay aware of time and help team use it well.
- Stay for the hard parts.
- Participate fully.
- Be on time.

12.0 **PARKING LOT** (items requiring further discussion)

- 100 mrem/yr basis - April 10th?
- Presumptive remedies
- Land use (industrial standard?) - April 10th?
 - Does characterization drive land use or does land use drive characterization?
 - Does characterization drive remedial decisions or does remedial decision drive characterization?
- Groundwater versus source correlations?
- Consider waste site deletion candidates (Do we know enough about some sites now to drop from further consideration?)
- Put remedial alternatives section in strategy document?
- Possible addition to assumptions list (from Suzanne Dahl)
 - Strategy actions must be considered against sitewide cumulative risk.
- Waste disposal for the 200-Areas? - April 10th

April 11, 1996

13.0 AGENDA ITEMS (for April 10, 1996 meeting)

- Discuss field trip (1/2 hr)
- Discuss meeting minutes from 3/20-22/96 workshop (1/2 hr)
- Status of characterization groupings, using Karl Fecht's list. Paul Beaver and Suzanne Dahl to support ERC Team in conducting group evaluation. (1 hr)
- Strategy outline (1/2 hr)
- Action items
- Parking lot items
- Streamlining - process/priorities

14.0 ACTION ITEMS

- Public involvement before finalizing the 200 Area strategy will occur.
- Any items in the workshop sourcebook that the team feels are a candidate for inclusion in the strategy should be highlighted for future consideration (have ready for field trip).
- Field trip, April 9, 1996 - RL to coordinate with Paul Beaver and Jack Donnelly. Anyone who can brief on a particular waste site/aggregate area will inform their agency's contact person. Bring lunch and sourcebook.
- Next meeting - April 10, 1996.
- Calculations for buffering capacity of soils (in liquid waste study). This was handed out by Karl Fecht on March 22, 1996.
- Collect public values.
- Read AAMSR before field trip.

April 11, 1996

15.0 CROSS CUTTING FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN GROUPING AND PRIORITIZATION

- Other factors to be considered in grouping/prioritization are as follows:
 - Potential driving forces and continuing sources
 - Hydrologic conditions.

16.0 STILL TO WORK ON - Elements of Priority

- Philosophy statement
- Establish (research) public values.
- Criteria for prioritization
- Prioritization of 200 Area source OU assessment and remediation activities.

17.0 WORKSHOP CONDUCT**What Worked**

- Voting/consensus
- Asking questions
- Ground rules
- Room/refreshments
- People coming with a commitment
- Sourcebook
- Having expertise available
- Good planning
- Willingness to listen
- Willingness to participate
- "Parking Lot"
- Facilitator.

What Needs Work

- Trying to give each other what we need to get consensus
- Continuing to use "Parking Lot" to help stay on track
- Paying attention to time
- Everyone sharing information
- Doing homework
- Point/counterpoint rather than listening and clarifying
- Need to realize the strategy will not be a perfect product.

April 11, 1996

18.0 INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Before the workshop began, a series of questions were sent out to the participants and responses were solicited via telephone interviews. The responses are listed below.

1. What obstacles do you see interfering with this team's ability to succeed?

- RCRA/CERCLA differences - need to compromise
- RCRA/CERCLA integration
- RCRA/CERCLA differences and differences in knowledge about other programs.
- RCRA/CERCLA differences may be an issue.
- This will be the first time people of different backgrounds (RCRA/CERCLA) have come together to discuss and come to agreement.
- This process may not happen overnight. We may have the draft by May. It will take until summer to get something we all can agree to. Partnering takes time.
- Directives from upper management. If outcome is determined before we start.
 - Size of group (too large).
 - None - there is nothing they cannot handle.
- Getting and keeping people focused on the strategy itself and not getting bogged down in details. There is a short period of time to accomplish the strategy goals.
- Preconceived notions or hidden agendas.
- Any hidden agendas.
- Other issues might be important, but it would be best to address them in other meetings. Need to make sure we capture the other issues.
- Need to make sure we come to consensus on components of strategy.
- People not being willing to listen.
- Any one person's perspective, issues, concerns could become an obstacle.
- The time constraint (must have a draft in place by May).

April 11, 1996

- Eight different aggregate areas within the 200 Areas, each with a project manager; concerned that they may not be able to step back and make decisions for the 200 Areas as a whole. Will their desire to get work done in their own areas interfere?
 - Can they all put the 200 Areas in perspective with the 100 and 300 Areas.
 - Style here is to come in with your position and negotiate from that. It will be hard to drop that style and come in open.
 - People not really "being there."
 - Keeping an open mind. Not letting predetermined notions rule.
 - Some may not see a need for a 200 Area Strategy or may not have buy-in on the need to create this together. There are enough people in all organizations who agree on its importance. Focus has always been on 100 and 300 Areas.
 - May have a hard time coming to consensus unless each entity has only one spokesperson.
 - DOE seems to think that this can be done quickly. They seem to want it done in May to contribute to the Long Range Plan schedule. Shouldn't rush and produce an inferior product.
 - Presumptive barrier remedy - everyone may not have bought in. Barrier testing in 200 Areas has been shelved for awhile. Tribes have problems with it the treatability barrier. Political issues. Coming out with strategy before barrier tests results are in.
 - People who come need to have full authority.
- 2. What expectations do you have for this partnering meeting?**
- See who will be there.
 - Everyone starts to get comfortable with each other.
 - Prefer to spend more time on Team Building and relationship building. But focus must be on developing the Strategy.
 - That everyone keep an open mind and not develop a position.
 - Get common understanding of what you are trying to accomplish.

April 11, 1996

- Come out with new approach to the 200 Areas Remediation and Characterization Strategy. Use lessons learned from 100 Area and improve on it.
- At end of it, we come up with a majority agreement on schedules, scope of work and commitments. May need a day meeting a few weeks after this initial one to come up with these. Hard to do all of this in 3 days. Better spend that time crunching data.
- Discuss the notebook.
- Not spending an excessive amount of time on "Team Building."
- Roles and Responsibilities.
- Set ground rules early.
- A closer working relationship.
- We let go of the old way of doing business and get to new ideas, create synergy.
- We will get through everything in the workbook.
- Work through assumptions that may be all you can get done.
- Values (values of Tribes and special interest groups, too).
- We come out with enhanced working relationships; people are willing to work together, work as a team.
- People move away from posturing.
- Should determine how 200 Areas is perceived. DOE has said they want to be able to walk away when closure and final cleanup occurs.
- Understanding of priorities/prioritization.
- Get ideas of information to be gathered.
- May take 4 to 6 months.
- Foundation is laid for creating solutions together.

April 11, 1996

3. What issues/concerns do you have about "baggage" in this group?

- Perception that DOE is "trying to get out of work."
- The usual organizational baggage - low trust, frustration between organizations.
- Lack of willingness to accept change, to look for new ways to "skin the cat."
- Organizational baggage - EPA does not trust DOE. DOE thinks their contractors are right and EPA is wrong. Ecology is very conservative.
- Some only care about their own area; need to focus on the big picture, what is best of all. An enforcement style may create defensiveness.
- RCRA/CERCLA folks are annoyed to be negotiating milestones again rather than enforcing the ones they have. Standard regulator/regulated relationship, delays in completion, violating the Tri-Party Agreement agreement re: 2008.
- Tough to say. Everybody's worked together in the past.
- One individual in the past has had a working style of holding DOE hostage.
- No personal baggage.
- Do not think there is a lot of baggage. Some individuals do not get along too well though.
- Everybody may bring in some baggage.
- Mixed feelings about DOE's plan.

4. How would you define success for this team? (NOT DISCUSSED AT WORKSHOP)

- Everyone is still there at the end! (2)
- We have managed to rough out key components. Have come to consensus on these key components.
- Come up with some common understanding about groupings and priorities we can stand behind.
- Have captured all the issues.
- Trust.

April 11, 1996

- Ecology will have a lot of people there, a lot of perspective to offer. But we need one voice as a decision-maker.
- Work together in an efficient manner to come up with 200 Areas Strategy with time lines to complete work that all agencies can support.
- Good and honest exchange of ideas.
- Unified decision that all parties can take to their management (supported individually and as agencies).
- Go through decision elements. Streamline cleanup.
- Some may want all the information, others only the minimum. Establish how much is enough.
- No hitting!
- Strategy/Plan to investigate 200 Area Plateau.
- If we can come to a majority, if not a consensus, on schedules, scope, and milestones.
- Streamlined approach to get to cleanup quicker and cheaper.
- A consensus on 200 Areas Strategy approach to characterization, agreed-upon timetable for that.
- Open mindedness.
- Revisit RI/FS - can we group sites so that we characterize sites only enough to determine remedial action? Put more money into cleanup. Minimal amount of documents. Maximize amount of cleanup.
- Buy-in by Tribes and special interest groups satisfied. Get approval on their methods.
- Integration of cleanup decisions. Integrated strategy.
- 5. **What would help the team achieve success? (NOT DISCUSSED AT WORKSHOP)**
- Need to trust each other.
- Being able to believe that everyone is trying to do the right thing.

April 11, 1996

- Follow-up.
- Get values and expectations from Tribes, stakeholder, HAB, and special interest groups. Recognize them up front.
- Avoid staying with old positions.
- Leave "baggage" at the office.
- Milestones in the Tri-Party Agreement. Fit our plan into it so that it fits timeframe and values.
- Being careful to listen to all points of view.
- Just be professional.
- Facilitation.
- Not getting bogged down in the many issues people may have.
- Present Strategy to Tribes, stakeholder, special interest groups, HAB and get them to help identify possible solutions. May make sense to write letter to them soliciting input early.
- Stay open-minded - look at the data with open minds.
- Quit worrying about milestones of past agreements. Do not let that deter looking at the data and being professional.
- Right people there.
- Staying motivated to accomplish the task.
- Positive attitude.
- Everyone having the right attitude - stepping out of the mold. Stepping out of our "role" and position; letting go of some preferred outcomes.
- Getting common understanding, acceptance and buy-in of the objectives up-front. Need commitment to getting foundation done in 3 days (draft by 5/15).
- All participants to be there without distractions.

April 11, 1996

- Have faith that management has trust in participants to make decisions.
- Laying the foundation for the strategy - something we will be proud of.
- Making sure everyone is heard and understood.
- Need to avoid "drawing a line in the sand."
- Coming to common understanding of what the goal is.
- Accomplishing savings in time and money.
- Look at things from positive sides first, then negative.
- The 200 Areas are going to be there for a long time. It must be a long-range solution.
- We need to be able to say in a Tri-Party Agreement that "We know what we're doing with the 200 Areas. We've thought about it and have made smart decisions."

Distribution
Unit Manager's Meeting: 200 Area Remedial Action
200 Area Remedial Action Strategy Work Shop
March 20-22, 1996

Bryan Foley	DOE-RL (H0-12)
Jim Hanson	DOE-RL (H0-12)
Donna Wanek	DOE-RL (H0-12)
Beth Ward	DOE-RL (H0-12)
Dennis Faulk	EPA (B5-01)
Paul Beaver	EPA (B5-01)
Joan Bartz	WDOE (Kennewick)
Suzanne Dahl	WDOE (Kennewick)
Alisa Huckaby	WDOE (Kennewick)
Moses Jaraysi	WDOE (Kennewick)
Dave Lundstrom	WDOE (Kennewick)
Shri Mohan	WDOE (Kennewick)
Laura Russell	WDOE (Kennewick)
Jack Donnelly	WDOE (Kennewick)
Greg Eidam, BHI	ERC (H0-17)
Karl Fecht	ERC (H0-02)
Linda Mihalik	ERC (H9-12)
Greg Mitchem	ERC (H0-17)
Michael Galgoul	ERC (H9-12)
Joan Woolard	ERC (H0-17)
Administrative Record	(H0-09)

Please inform Tamen Lundquist (372-9562) of BHI
of deletions or additions to the distribution list.