

Elzie, Teri L

mail
0075319

From: HUGHS Susan C [Susan.C.Hughs@state.or.us]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2000 10:56 AM
To: bharper@nwinfo.net; Brad_Frazier@r1.fws.gov; dan_audet@mail.fws.gov; danl@nezperce.org; dteel@bhi-erc.com; gadbois.larry@epa.gov; james_h_jr_zeisloft@rl.gov; jjakabos@or.blm.gov; jmcc461@ecy.wa.gov; jrwilkinson@ctuir.com; lgol461@ecy.wa.gov; Nick.ladanza@noaa.gov; Preston_Sleeger@ios.doi.gov; tlelzie@bhi-erc.com; tom_obrien@mail.fws.gov; AddressListTooLong-Suppressed
Subject: Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council (agenda items/future issues)

Barb Harper sent me the following information on last week's CRCIA meeting. You'll see they discussed potential Trustee Council involvement. Although we've had no formal contact from CRCIA, this is a heads up for everyone to think about. And note Barb's last comment about a CRESP sponsored eco-risk model show-and-tell. That might be interesting...

>>> bharper@nwinfo.net 04/21/00 09:05AM >>>
Susan, here are my notes from the CRCIA meeting. We talked about ecorisk and the role of the NRTC. Jay was also present.

Meetings/Conferences
a.. Meeting Name: CRCIA meeting
b.. Location: Ecology, Kennewick
c.. Date: April 19, 2000
d.. Attendees: CRCIA Team
e.. Topics:

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2008
EDMC

a.. There was a lengthy discussion of models and information needs. The most pressing needs are better ecological risk assessments, better cumulative evaluations at individual sites, and better multi-site evaluations. While the various models being used for risk evaluation at Hanford all have specific weaknesses, a reasonably good assessment could be done by combining the best of each (this has not been done because no project has been paid to; the Groundwater project chose to go down a non-CRCIA path although we don't know how good or bad it will turn out to be). None of the models integrate ecological risk models. No results will be valid if the source term characterization is not good and if actual environmental data are not used to validate the models.

b.. EPA is doing 5-year reviews of individual areas as well as the whole Site. The N-Area 5-year review is looking at predicted versus actual results, and finding that water applied for dust suppression drove contaminants to the groundwater much faster than predicted.

c.. The Groundwater System Assessment Capability Rev 0 will be a proof of principle using 10 contaminants and an initial river component. It is not intended to produce useful data. The Rev 1 will be a 5-year update of the Composite Analysis using more contaminants. Regulators, Tribes, and Stakeholders have been left out of the GW/VZ planning recently.

d.. There is CRCIA consensus that we need to influence the regulators, who are the entities who will tell DOE what information to produce from GW/VZ. The NRTC is probably the best group to focus on ecological risk, but it does not have the authority to have contractors spend their money to send their ecologists to workshops. DOE can spend money to convene expert panels, but they are not willing to do the same for ecological risk. DOE may envision the GW/VZ project as the avenue for ecorisk improvement (per the BTAG letter), but this has not happened so far.

e.. The basic problem is that DOE can't demonstrate that their decisions are protective of human health and the environment over time, and we can't demonstrate that they're not.

f.. Action items: NRTC will discuss how to interact with regulators to force the ecological risk data at the next Council meeting. CRCIA will draft a letter for consideration by the HAB ER committee about environmental outcomes

and endstates.

CRESP may be willing to host an ecorisk meeting here to which all modelers are invited to test-run their model on B/C contaminants.