

HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCES TRUSTEE COUNCIL

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

May 19 – 21, 2009

Consisting of 26 pages,
including this coversheet

RECEIVED
FEB 17 2010

EDMC

**HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL
BI-MONTHLY MEETING
May 19-21, 2009
WSU CIC, Richland WA**

Meeting Summary

Introduction

The overall goals of the meeting were to:

- Conduct administrative business
- Receive an update on the current approach and schedule for Hanford cleanup
- Continue development of the Hanford NRDA scope, schedule, and budget, with a particular focus on the FY 2010 and 2011 budgets
- Review and approve the statements of work for the Project Coordinator and Phase II contracts
- Review near term CERCLA response activities of interest to the Trustees
- Receive an overview of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) Impact Directed Environmental Account

The agenda for the meeting was based on an agenda planning conference call among the trustees held on May 4, 2009. The final agenda for the meeting is included as Attachment A. Attendees are listed in Attachment B. The meeting summary below is organized by topic. Action Items are listed as AI followed by a number, and the current Action Item list is included as Attachment C. Powerpoint presentations given at the meeting have been sent out separately and are not attached.

Administrative Business

- **Introductions and Staffing Updates.** Introductions were made around the table. Staffing updates were provided by the USFWS, NOAA, and CTUIR. FWS has made a hire for their GS-12 position; their new person comes from Ohio EPA and has NRDA experience at Fernald; he will join FWS in July. Dana Ward will be leading the Source/Pathway TWG and Dale Engstrom will lead the Groundwater TWG. Mike Grainey will be stepping down as the Director of the Oregon Department of Energy; Mark Long will be Acting Director for an undetermined period of time. Matthew Duchesne is now the designated NRDA lead/point of contact for DOE-HQ.
- **Procurement Integrity Briefing.** DOE attorney Joe Schroeder provided an overview of the Procurement Integrity Act requirements that apply to Trustees involved in Federal Procurements. A non-disclosure form was handed out for the Trustees to sign. YN staff

signed with the condition that a decision to determine who should issue the RFP for the Phase II work remains before the council.

- **Chair Announcements.** Paul provided the following updates:
 - Copies of the DOE letter from Frank Marcinowski, DOE Environmental Management Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory Compliance regarding the 2010 budget request are available to those who want one.
 - Finding 09-01 still requires a signature/approval from the YN; this was provided at the meeting.
 - The Hanford Land Management flowchart was handed out for information.
 - Trustees were reminded of the June 2-3 meeting with Stratus on the CSM.
 - Paul pointed out that lodging is getting scarce in the Tri Cities and arrangements should be made as early as possible for those traveling from out of town to Trustee meetings.
 - Paul discussed the need for better interface with the HAB regarding Trustee interests. He is requesting time for a presentation to the HAB on Trustee background and issues.
 - Paul recommended that the Trustees take a tour of Hanford in the near future to see the cleanup status and progress.

- **Meeting Minutes.** The March bi-monthly meeting minutes were reviewed and a minor correction was made. Larry moved and Toni seconded that the minutes be approved as revised. The motion passed unanimously. Paul moved and Larry seconded that the minutes from the April 15, 2009 Senior Trustee conference call and the April 2 and 10, 2009 Trustee conference calls be approved; the motion passed unanimously.

- **Agenda.** The agenda was approved. As prelude to the NRDA planning, Teresa asked each of the Trustees to state their goals for the next few days and reminded everyone to be creative, open minded, forthright, polite, and respectful. Key goals identified by Trustees included the following:
 - Develop a process and understanding that would allow the HNRTC to disagree and still move forward
 - Define a systematic process to establish the scope, cost, and schedule for a Hanford NRDA baseline using a collaborative approach
 - Take advantage of the fact that there is now dedicated funding for Hanford NRDA activities
 - Move away from unilateral decision-making toward a collaborative process; clear up miscommunications that have been occurring

- Develop the NRDA schedule based on reasonable budget assumptions and consideration of ongoing cleanup activities/schedules
- Use best available science in the decision-making process, and determine the focus as a group
- Take the time up front to define the role of the TWGs, and determine the tasks of the HNRTC and the TWGs before getting started on it
- Do the scope first, then the schedule, then the budget – in that order, so that the budget is based on tasks and realistic schedules
- Approve the SOWs for the Project Coordinator and Phase II work

NRDA Scope, Schedule, and Budget

- **Mission, Objectives, and Tasks.** To stimulate the Hanford NRDA planning process, an outline of a strategic plan was handed out and discussed. The first step in the process was to develop a mission statement, with the Council agreeing to:

Identify and restore natural resources injured by hazardous releases from Hanford and compensate for lost uses.

The council then developed process objectives and task-oriented objectives to support the mission statement. A task list was developed for each of the task-oriented objectives through the end of the NRDA process (Attachment D). The task lists provide a basis for developing a schedule and a budget, and for reviewing progress each year at the annual planning meeting.

It is recognized that it may also be appropriate to develop tasks for the process objectives, but this was not addressed further at the meeting, although some related tasks are underway (e.g., by-laws revisions).

- **Technical Work Groups.** The Trustees also discussed the role of the TWGs and their relationship with the Council, and developed task lists for the TWGs (Attachment E). These task lists are considered a subset of the overall task list that the Council will carry out. Participation in the TWGs and the tasks that the TWGs will accomplish are considered key aspects of determining the staffing and FTE needs of the Council, as it is expected that the TWGs will conduct a substantial amount of the technical work required to accomplish the mission and objectives of the NRDA, in addition to contractors.
- **FTE Needs based on the Tasks.** The Council then worked to determine near-term staffing needs to carry out the objectives and tasks in Attachments D and E. The Council reviewed and discussed the tasks that will need to be conducted, both in the full Council and in the TWGs, to support Phase II and the early implementation of studies. Council

members with experience with other NRDA processes having a similar Council/TWG structure shared their experiences to help the council estimate the time commitments required to participate in the TWGs and Council meetings, and to carry out technical work between the meetings. The following basis for FTE requirements was developed (note that an FTE in this context could be a staff person or a contractor acting as staff):

- Based on each Trustee's stated interest in how many of the TWGs they intend to participate in (2 to 6), it was determined that the TWGs are likely to have 6 members on average, and there are currently 6 TWGs. This is also believed to be an appropriate and manageable size for a TWG.
- TWGs are expected to meet as often as twice a month and will conduct substantial work in between meetings, particularly while Phase II IAP, study design, and study implementation activities are occurring. This is in line with previous NRDA processes. Based on previous experience, the Trustees estimated that participation in a TWG will require 1/3 FTE. Therefore, 12 FTEs will be needed among all the Trustees to participate in the TWGs and conduct associated technical work.
- 3-day Council meetings will continue to occur on a bimonthly basis, and the Council will begin having monthly conference calls between regular meetings. In addition, there are both technical and administrative work products to develop and review between meetings. Based on past experience, the Trustees estimated one FTE per trustee for Council participation, which may be divided among more than one person, for a total of 8 FTEs among all the Trustees.
- Combining the above, trustees estimated that $12 + 8 = 20$ FTEs are required for Council work in 2010 and 2011. However, it was noted that DOE's FTEs are not included in the council budget, so the FTEs requiring funding can be reduced to 16. In addition, it is likely that 2010 will not ramp up to this level immediately; therefore, the FTE estimate for 2010 was estimated at 12 and for 2011 was estimated at 16.
- The trustees were polled and an average FTE is approximately \$135K/yr. Therefore, the best estimate of 2010 budget needs for staff would be \$1620K and the 2011 need is estimated at \$2160K to accomplish the tasks identified by the Council. It is important to note that this FTE estimate is based strictly on an estimated Council work load, rather than being a compilation of staffing requests from individual trust organizations (the approach used for past budgets).

In addition, it is important to recognize that the majority of FTEs, and the budget to support them for 2010 and 2011, will be dedicated to technical work (mostly through TWGs) contributing to development and review of the Phase II Injury Assessment Plan and planning for injury studies. Only about 4 of the FTEs (1/2 FTE per trust

organization) will be associated with Council oversight and administrative tasks in 2010 and 2011, though that percentage was likely higher in 2008 and 2009 as the process was being initiated. The balance (0.5 FTE per trust organization for Council work and all of the TWG FTEs) is associated with technical work needed to meet the NRDA objectives and mission.

- **2010 Budget/Scope.** The Council then worked to establish overall priorities for 2010/2011 given the current 2010 budget guidance and potential carryover from 2009, as well as the task list and FTE needs identified above. Paul provided a 2009/2010 budget status and budget options for discussion purposes, based on the assumption that our 2010 budget will be limited to the \$2320 K identified in the President's budget request to Congress, plus carryover from 2009 (Attachment F).

It was first noted that there were a few errors in the 2009 carryover portion of the budget options page; there was a transcription error in the amount of the 2009 carryover (\$20K); more importantly, 2009 funding for US FWS is not coming from the Council budget, so their 2009 budget request for Council funds was actually zero. For these minutes, values have been corrected and appear in red. The revisions result in a larger carry-over than originally expected, and the budget options initially provided do not reflect these corrected totals.

There was considerable discussion of the overall priorities and approach that should be taken in 2010/2011, given the President's budget for 2010. The Trustees discussed the timing of hiring a project coordinator, extending the scope of Phase II into 2011, the potential need for an overall NRDA management contractor and/or data management contractor, and minimum funding needs for the Council and individual Trustees to carry out their NRDA mission and task lists. The following considerations were noted:

- The Phase I NRDA contract required additional funding and schedule to complete; it may be necessary to anticipate the same for Phase II
- The actual budget needed for the Phase II contract is unknown at this time, but we may have better information once Stratus submits its take on the Phase II scope and budget (i.e., by the July meeting)
- Nearly all of the Trustees expressed the priority of doing Phase II well and completely rather than moving as quickly as possible
- There are substantial and difficult discussions and tasks ahead of the Trustees to meaningfully participate in Phase II (i.e., working on TWGs), and regardless of the budget, this may itself require the Council and its contractor to spend more than a year preparing Phase II
- Regardless of the pace of NRDA, the Trustees need to build into the process a way to look for and respond to opportunities to impact cleanup, especially in the River Corridor

- The Trustees need to make the best use of available funding for 2010, and this will require some trade-offs among the items originally budgeted for 2010
- Data management was not adequately built into the 2010 budget and needs to be added (app. \$300K). Trustees were in consensus on this addition, although there was debate over whether this should be part of work scope for the Phase II contractor or funded separately.
- Regarding support staff, the Trustees were in agreement that facilitation should be retained. Most preferred putting off hiring a Project Coordinator to put more funds toward the Phase II contract and the Trustee FTEs, though two of the trustees strongly advocated hiring the Project Coordinator now
- Concern was raised that the 2010 budget may not come in on time, as has been the case for at least the last 8 years. In this situation, because in this first year with specific Council funding, we will not receive any funding under a Continuing Resolution, monies for the Phase II contract may not be available until well into the fiscal year. This possibility cannot be predicted in advance, but may require an extension of the Phase II contract into 2011.

In summary, the path forward agreed to by the majority of the trustees was to fund trustee FTEs based on the staffing needs developed above, as well as a facilitator, then put the remaining balance toward the Phase II contract, extending it into 2011 as needed. A project coordinator would be delayed until 2011.

Jay proposed a budget alternative for 2010, to include:

- \$1670K for Trustee FTEs
- \$1760K for Phase II Contractor (includes 300K for data management)
- \$100K for facilitation

for a total of \$3530K. Jay stated that this is the minimum amount necessary to continue making progress on critical Phase II work (injury assessment plan) to be issued under one RFP, and keeps existing support staff, the facilitator, already put in place. This amount is \$500K more than is currently expected to be available, and he requested that DOE find the difference to fully fund the Trustees and Phase II work in 2010. [Note: it has been determined that US F&W will also need support in 2010, so that amount would need to be increased.]

The alternative budget assumes that the Phase II draft IAP can be completed within FY 2010. However, the expectation of most trustees was that extending the Phase II IAP into FY 2011 would most likely be needed, to reflect both the budget situation and the need for the Trustees to be fully involved in completing the necessary tasks associated with the

IAP. Al and Connie were tasked with identifying mechanisms for extending a contract over more than one year, with the understanding that another Trustee or the NFWF could also conduct the procurement (AI284).

- **2011 Budget.** Based on the technical tasks identified in the Trustee work scope, and recognizing budget limitations for 2010, the Council developed a 2011 budget that was supported by the majority of the Council. An alternative budget for 2011 was also proposed by Jay. Both are discussed below.

Alternative A: Based on the mission, objectives, and task lists; the FTE needs developed by a majority of the Council, the existing 2009 carry-over and 2010 President's budget, and an assumption that Phase II will begin in 2010 and extend into 2011, the following budget was developed:

Contracting (Phase II, injury studies):	\$3,200,000
FTE Needs:	\$2,160,000
Data Management:	\$300,000
Project Coordinator:	\$210,000
Facilitation/Public Inv.:	\$150,000
TOTAL:	\$6,020,000

In this budget, the funds for Contracting include Phase II contract needs unmet by the 2010 budget, potential extensions of the Phase II contract into 2011 and a contingency fund for overruns, as well as study contracts for the first few studies that may be carried out in 2011. It is unknown the extent to which Phase II will actually extend into 2011; it depends on when the 2010 funds become available, what the bids for Phase II actually are, when the contract can be put in place, and how fast both the Council and the Phase II contractor can complete the required tasks. Many of these things cannot be predicted in advance. However, if Phase II can be completed more quickly, then more of this money will be available to conduct studies, and the converse is also true.

As discussed above, the bulk of FTE funds requested for trust organizations will be used for technical work to support Phase II (through TWGs) and planning/design for injury studies. Only about 3.5 (of 16) FTEs supported by this budget are expected to be used to provide administration and oversight through the Council. Overall, this results in a proposed budget in which more than 80% of funds will directly support technical work (contracting, TWGs, Council interaction with the Phase II contractor), with the balance supporting overhead and administrative functions, and infrastructure.

Alternative B: This alternative differs in several important ways from Alternative A. First, FTE were determined as they have been in the past, recognizing and respecting the sovereignty of each party, by summing the requests from each individual Trustee for their anticipated needs to participate effectively on the Council. Second, this budget assumes that Phase II will be completely funded with 2010 funds, including carryover 2009 monies, \$2320K as included in the President's 2010 budget request, plus the additional \$500K the YN has requested USDOE to provide in FY2010. In addition, this alternative assumes that at least 4 studies will be initiated in 2011.

Contracts (4 injury studies):	\$3,200,000
FTE Needs:	\$2,487,000
Data Management:	\$300,000
Project Coordinator:	\$210,000
Facilitation/Public Inv.:	\$150,000
TOTAL:	\$6,347,000

This alternative assumes the Phase II contract will be in place by Oct 1, 2009 and that FY 2010 funds will be sufficient to cover the full costs of the Phase II plan, including any work that carries into FY 2011. The YN representative stated that the YN expects to be fully funded based on its own analysis of what it takes to be fully engaged in the process, and that this option ensures the full participation of each trustee. YN also stated that they believed that Alternative A underestimates staffing needs to support TWGs, because the assumed time commitment (1/3 FTE per trust organization) is too low. CTUIR expressed an interest in increasing its budget request under this alternative to better reflect their preferred level of staffing. Teresa will check with CTUIR after the meeting. ***[CTUIR did increase its staffing request after the meeting; also it was determined that US F&W would require funding in 2011 that was not originally taken into account. Therefore, the final FTE Needs value of Alternative B was increased to \$2997K and the Total was increased to \$6857K.]***

- **Next Steps.** The 2011 budget alternatives will be written up as revised budget documentation and submitted for consideration to the Trustees and Senior Trustees (revised AI280). A Senior Trustee conference call will be scheduled for early June to determine a final 2011 budget (AI285). Additional items for the Senior Trustee agenda include: 1) obtaining their support for a baselining process to occur concurrently with development of the Phase II IAP, and 2) discussion of in-target vs. over-target expectations.

CERCLA Response Activities

- **Hanford Cleanup Activities.** Nick Ceto of DOE provided an overview of ongoing Hanford cleanup activities, revised schedules, and opportunities for the Trustee Council to get involved. The slide presentations have been distributed separately.
- **CERCLA Response Update.** Steve provided a list of upcoming Hanford cleanup documents of interest to the Trustees (Attachment G). The list will be expanded and updated on a more frequent basis and sent to the Trustees electronically. The website link for Hanford public involvement activities will be added to the list. The Trustees expressed a need to have more timely and meaningful involvement in the cleanup and other decision-making process/documents including NEPA, Biological Resource Management Plan, Tank Farm activities, and the Ecological Working Group.

Phase I NRDA

- **Phase I Status.** The Council discussed their initial impressions of the Phase I deliverables from Stratus, and Paul requested input for the June 2-3 meeting. The Council was fairly happy with these reports, although there may be some data gaps. The data report appears to be in good shape. It was suggested that Stratus consolidate their recommendations and add an executive summary to the report. TWG members need to be on the distribution list and review the deliverables. Stratus should provide a recommendation on when to establish an NRDA "baseline" for Hanford and how the TWGs should be utilized. Any other suggestions for the June 2-3 meeting should be forwarded to Paul and he will communicate the Council questions/suggestions to Stratus.

Contracting/Project Management

- **Project Coordinator SOW.** Al made a motion and Larry seconded to approve the text of the Project Coordinator SOW. The motion passed unanimously. The council agreed to not proceed with the procurement of a project coordinator at this time, and it was agreed that the date of award and contract period would be left TBD until budget questions are resolved and it is decided to proceed with the contract. There was a discussion about whether to have a project coordinator if the Council were to hire a general NRDA management contractor, but no decision was made.
- **Phase II SOW.** Approval of the Phase II SOW was deferred. The SOW will be revisited in July after incorporation of information management system (IMS) scope and a review of Stratus recommendations for Phase II.
- **National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), Impact Directed Environmental Account (IDEA).** An overview of the NFWF IDEA program was presented by Rachel

Jacobsen, Director of the IDEA program (Powerpoint presentation distributed separately). Rachel discussed an overview of the Foundation, how the Idea program works, how it is funded, and provided examples of projects funded from the program. There was considerable interest in procurement/contract administration capabilities, interactions with other trustee councils, and how DOE would actually provide funding to the Foundation if the Council decided to use them for Phase II. Further discussions will be arranged between DOE and NFWF administrative and legal staff to explore funding mechanisms and constraints (AI286).

Wrap-Up

- **Decisions.** The following decisions were made:
 - March meeting and conference call minutes were approved
 - Project Coordinator Scope of Work was approved

- **Accomplishments.** The following additional activities were accomplished:
 - An NRDA mission, objectives, and Council tasks for the entire NRDA process were developed
 - TWGs were better defined and a task list was developed
 - An FTE analysis for 2010 and 2011 was performed
 - The 2010 budget was revisited with new information and a path forward identified
 - Two 2011 budget alternatives were developed, based on the above information
 - A better understanding of the current cleanup timelines and status at Hanford was obtained
 - Draft Phase I Stratus deliverables were discussed, and topics for the Stratus workshop on June 2-3 were identified.
 - Information was obtained on the NFWF IDEA program, questions answered, and further steps for exploring this possibility identified.

It was noted that the Council will likely need conference calls in the months between meetings to address all of the tasks being conducted, especially focused on completing administrative tasks so that in-person council meetings can focus on larger issues. Teresa will work on scheduling a Council conference call in June (AI287).

ATTACHMENT A
Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council
Draft Meeting Agenda: Tuesday, May 19
 WSU, Richland, WA – 2710 University Dr., CIC Bldg, Rm 120/120A

Time	Topic – Focus: Issue Identification – NRDA Scope, Schedule, and Budget	Lead
1:00 pm	Approval: Meeting minutes, action items, agenda Bring: Meeting minutes (all), action item updates (as assigned)	Shaffer/Michelsen
1:20 pm	Update: 2010 budget news and 2011 budget guidance	Ward/Hawkins
1:40 pm	Brainstorm: Meeting goals – clear intentions for what to accomplish by Thurs. Issues and challenges around scope, schedule, and budget for discussion*	Michelsen
2:30 pm	Break	
2:50 pm	Prioritize: Identify the order in which issues need to be discussed and their relative priorities for this meeting. Revise Wed agenda if needed	Michelsen
3:30 pm	Discuss: Begin overall scope discussion	Michelsen

*** Issues identified during agenda call:**

- Overall scope (costs) of the injury assessment effort
- Overall desired timeline
- Annual level of effort (budget, FTEs, studies) needed to support these goals
- Ability of the trustees to sustain that level of effort OR alternative pace
- Based on the above, specific 2011 FTEs, studies, and budget recommendation
- Integration with CERCLA response activities (including study designs that facilitate that)
- Whether early restoration is in/out of scope
- Role of the Technical Working Groups
- Role of contractors vs. in-house studies
- Working as a unit vs. independent trustee entities
- Value of a steering committee
- Trustee time allocation (need for additional meetings/net-meetings/conference calls)

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council

Meeting Agenda: Wednesday, May 20

Time	Topic – Focus: NRDA Scope, Schedule, and Budget (Long-term & 2011)	Lead
9:00 am	Discuss/Reach Consensus: Long-term scope and schedule goals	Michelsen
10:15 am	Break	
10:40 am	Discuss/Reach Consensus: Annual pace that is sustainable	Michelsen
11:30 pm	Lunch	
12:30 pm	Discuss/Reach Consensus: 2010 activities and FTEs to support (potentially based on updated budget information)	Michelsen
2:00 pm	Break	
2:20 pm	Discuss/Reach Consensus: 2011 activities, FTEs, and studies needed to support	Michelsen
4:00 pm	Discuss/Reach Consensus: Final budget recommendation for 2011 and action items for all topics above (documentation, conference call scheduling, senior trustee approval, etc.)	Michelsen

Note: These are general topic areas that may include a number of the issues identified on the previous page. Wednesday's agenda is subject to modification based on Tuesday's discussion and is purposely somewhat general.

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council

Meeting Agenda: Thursday, May 21

Time	Topic – Focus: Financial Management and Contracting	Lead
8:30 am	Update: CERCLA response activities Distribute at meeting: CERCLA response update (Wisness)	Wisness
9:00 am	Review/Approval: Project coordinator SOW and contracting Bring: Draft Final Project Coordinator SOW	Michelsen
9:30 am	Review/Approval: Phase II SOW Update: Phase I Stratus timeline and activities Bring: Draft Final Phase II SOW	Wisness/Shaffer
10:00 am	Break	
10:30 am	Presentation: IDEA Program	NFWF
11:40 am	Wrap-Up: Action items, accomplishments, scheduling	Michelsen

ATTACHMENT B
Meeting Attendees

CTUIR

Barb Harper

Nez Perce Tribe

Johnathan Matthews

Yakama Nation

Jay McConnaughey

Russell Jim

Wade Riggsbee

Ray Givens

Callie Ridolfi

OR Dept. of Energy

Paul Shaffer

WA Dept. of Ecology

Larry Goldstein

WA Fish & Wildlife

Charlene Andrade¹

NOAA

Nick Iadanza

US Dept. of Energy

Al Hawkins

Steve Wisness

Nick Ceto²

Matthew Duchesne^{1,2}

US Fish & Wildlife Service

Kate Benkert

Toni Davidson

National Fish & Wildlife Foundation

Rachel Jacobson²

Facilitator

Teresa Michelsen

¹By telephone

²For presentation only

ATTACHMENT C

ACTION ITEMS

Note: Yellow indicates changes to previously existing action items, including completion dates, updates, and changes in responsibility. Items with yellow completion dates (or otherwise closed) will not be included on subsequent action item lists. Blue action item numbers indicate new items since the most recent update.

	Assignee/Action	Date Assigned	Date Completed
271	Develop calendar of events accessible online. <i>ACTION: Steve</i>	3/17/09	
272	Update and distribute electronically revised contact list. <i>ACTION: Teresa</i>	3/17/09	
273	Review and revise by-laws and distribute for Council review. <i>ACTION: Teresa</i>	3/17/09	
274	Review and revise letter process and distribute for Council review. <i>ACTION: Teresa</i>	3/18/09	
280	Prepare revised 2011 budget support document supporting FTE requests on the basis of 2011 scope and activities. <i>ACTION: Teresa, all</i>	5/21/09	
281	Schedule time for review of Stratus deliverables. <i>ACTION: Paul, Stratus</i> <i>Update: June 2-3, 2009</i>	3/18/09	5/11/09
282	Identify Chairs of the source/pathway and groundwater TWGs <i>ACTION: DOE, Council (respectively)</i> <i>Update: Dale Engstrom of OR DOE has volunteered to chair the GW TWG, and Dana will chair the S/P TWG.</i>	3/18/09	4/27/09
283	Write a letter to the sturgeon workgroup requesting samples for NRDA injury assessment. <i>ACTION: Toni</i>	3/19/09	
284	Determine whether/how DOE contracts can be extend over more than one year. <i>ACTION: Al, Connie</i>	5/20/09	
285	Set up Senior Trustee conference call re: 2011 budget <i>ACTION: Paul</i>	5/21/09	
286	Discuss contracting mechanisms, flexibility, and constraints for DOE transmittal of funds to NFWF. <i>ACTION: DOE, NFWF</i>	5/21/09	
287	Schedule Council conference call for June. <i>ACTION: Teresa</i>	5/21/09	

ATTACHMENT D

NRDA Mission, Objectives, and Tasks

Mission Statement:

Identify and restore natural resources injured by hazardous releases from Hanford and compensate for lost uses.

Process Objectives:

1. Work collaboratively and cooperatively.
2. Make timely decisions.
3. Use an effective, transparent process to secure funding in a stable, predictable manner.
4. Integrate NRDA and CERCLA Response actions to the maximum extent practicable.
5. Conduct injury and damage assessment in a comprehensive, thorough, and cost-effective manner.
6. Identify/implement technical support for the HNTRC (TWGs/administrative/technical).

Task-Oriented Objectives and Related Tasks:

The tasks under each objective have been listed roughly in order that they will need to be carried out. However, some tasks are ongoing throughout the process and others will be completed concurrently, or the order may vary from that listed below. Similarly, the Objectives are listed roughly in order of completion, but may be carried out concurrently to some extent.

7. Complete analysis of injured natural resources and services provided
 - Data management (ongoing)
 - Identify the temporal scope of injury (pre-1980, etc.)
 - Identify the geographic scope of injury
 - Agree on the definition of injury (resource-specific) and associated data requirements
 - Develop criteria for:
 - Identifying and prioritizing stressors (substances and activities)
 - Identifying and prioritizing fate and transport pathways
 - Identifying and prioritizing resources of concern
 - Distinguish between exposure and injury
 - Identify data gaps
 - Complete Phase II Injury Assessment Plan
 - Plan injury assessment studies
 - Peer review of study plans and results

- Conduct injury assessment studies and review data
- Identify condition of injured resources but for releases from Hanford (define baseline)
- Complete final injury determination
- Determine whether an injury can be restored
- Determine whether an injury can be quantified
- Define injury quantification metric
- Conduct injury quantification

8. Complete analysis of interim and permanent lost uses

- Identify past and future lost uses
- Identify restoration needs that cannot be carried out
- Quantify lost uses

9. Complete quantification of damages

- Quantify damages associated with injured resources
- Quantify damages associated with lost uses

10. Conduct restoration of injured resources

- Identify restoration needs
- Identify restoration opportunities
- Develop criteria for selection and prioritization of restoration projects
- Identify opportunities for early restoration
- Complete restoration plan
- Oversee restoration activities
- Ensure long-term protection and stewardship of restoration projects
- Complete final restoration report

ATTACHMENT E

Role and Tasks of the Technical Work Groups

Technical Work Groups

TWGs are considered subsets of the staff provided by the trustees and may include Council members, other staff, and/or contractors acting as staff

TWGs have no decision authority; they will work through technical issues, develop recommendations, and report to the council for decision/action

A recommendation/reporting process needs to be developed for the TWGs

Current TWGs and Chairs:

- **Source/Pathway** – Dana Ward
- **Groundwater** – Dale Engstrom
- **Terrestrial Resources** – Dan Landeen
- **Aquatic Resources** – Nick Iadanza
- **Human Uses** – Barb Harper
- **Restoration** – Charlene Andrade
- **(Legal)** – has been suggested but is not yet implemented

Major activities/tasks

Some technical tasks must be conducted by the Council as a whole. The following tasks were identified as ones that would most appropriately be carried out by the each of the first five TWGs listed above for its specific resource area. The following list includes injury assessment tasks; quantification and final restoration tasks will be determined once injury assessment is complete.

- Identify opportunities for integration with CERCLA response activities
- Review/update CSM
- Develop definition of resource-specific injury
- Identify metrics and methods for quantifying injury
- Review data for quality and relevance
- Data analysis and summary
- Work closely with NRDA contractors
- Prioritize studies to be conducted
- Develop plans for injury assessment studies (QA/data management)
- Organize peer reviews
- Oversee/carry out/review injury assessment studies

The Restoration TWG has developed its own list of tasks, as follows:

Priority

- Finalize project selection criteria for early restoration projects
- Evaluate natural resources and resource management actions at Hanford
- Initiate and maintain a proposed restoration project list

Additional future tasks and proposals

- Develop a prospectus or template for proposing projects to the TWG
- Develop an understanding of Hanford resources and resource management and conservation plans
- Develop a pilot project to use for example restoration
- Identify environmental conditions and opportunities for restoration
- Establish template / criteria for establishing advanced restoration projects and opportunities

ATTACHMENT F
Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council

2009/10 NRDA budget status (in thousands)

May 14, 2009

Total Funds Available (2009 + 2010)

- 2009 carryover 710
- 2010 RL-100 (proposed) 2320

Total **3030**

2010 budget options (brief explanation of Options A – C below)

	4/08 proposal	A	B	C
• Project coordinator	200	200	200	200
• Facilitator*	100	100	100	100
• Trust organizations	1670	1670	1020	820
• Contracts				
○ Phase II	1460	810	1460	1460
○ Other (e.g. injury study planning)	800	0	0	200
Total	4230	2780	2780	2780

* Funds listed for a facilitator were listed in the 2010 request as being for administrative support

Option A

- Preserves full funding for staff and trust organizations.
- Reduces funding for Phase II contractor; likely delays completion of injury assessment plan.
- No funding for planning studies or other extramural work.

Option B

- Preserves full funding for support staff
- Preserves full funding for Phase II
- Reduced funding for trust organizations, by about 30%
- No funding for studies or other extramural work

Option C

- Preserves full funding for support staff
- Preserves full funding for Phase II
- Reduces funding for trust organizations, by about 50%
- Provides minimal funding for extramural work (e.g. bring in outside experts for workshops to plan studies or for peer review)

Note – Funding at this level does not support the full funding of the Phase II Injury Assessment Plan and trust organizations (together - \$ 3130 k), even if all other line items are zeroed out

In developing the April 2008 proposed budget for 2010, requests from individual trust organizations were as listed below. To the extent these numbers have changed since 2008, they will need to be accounted in finalizing the 2010 budget. (amounts in thousands):

CTUIR	\$ 500
Nez Perce	\$ 185
Yakama	\$ 500
Washington	\$ 120
Oregon	\$ 150

DOI	\$ 0
NOAA	\$ 150
OR DOE	\$ 70

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council

2009 NRDA budget status (in thousands)
May 14, 2009

Total Funds Available (2008 + 2009) 2700

Committed or planned expenditure of funds

• Trust Organizations		
Washington	120	
Oregon Department of Energy	60	
Dept. Commerce (NOAA)	350	
Dept. Interior (FWS)	0	
CTUIR	400	
Nez Perce	200	
Yakama Nation	400	
	Subtotal	1780
• Injury Assessment Plan (Stratus, Phase I)		
Original contract	385	
Contract modification (March, 2009)	95	
	Subtotal	480
• Facilitator		80
	Total funds committed	1990

Uncommitted Funds 710

ATTACHMENT G

Trustee Items of Interest Look Ahead Schedule

MAY, 2009

River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) Final Report – Final report to be issued in **September** for review. Review and comment process is TBD.

River Component of RCBRA - Up welling studies – Data is being collected and analyzed to determine the location of groundwater upwelling in the Columbia River. Based on this analysis, sampling locations will be identified and sampling is expected to begin in **late summer/early fall**. John Sands would like to brief the Trustees on this effort in June or July, possibly at a TWG meeting, an extension of the Stratus CSM meeting or the next Council meeting.

Central Plateau Ecological Risk Assessment – Rev. 0 is expected to be issued for review in **late summer or early fall**. The new contractor (CH2M Hill) has been reviewing the prior contractor data and products and will be working with DOE to establish a more definitive path forward including a baseline schedule. Review and comment process is TBD.

100 Area RI/FS Work Plan – The general work plan including addendum 1 and 2 for 100 D/H and K areas respectively will be issued for review at the **end of May**. Addendums for B/C/F Areas will be issued in September, 2009. Addendum for the N Area will be issued in December, 2009. Final proposed plans will be issued by the **end of 2011**. Trustees will receive copies for review concurrently with EPA and Ecology.

300 Area RI/FS Work Plan – Scheduled to be issued **October 31, 2009**.

Proposed Amendment of the ERDF Record of Decision - The 30-day public comment period is expected to run **May 4 – June 3**.

The amendment has two purposes. The first is to authorize construction of future disposal cells without having to amend the Record of Decision each time. The second purpose is to authorize construction of future cells using a design based on current technologies.

Purgewater Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA)- The 30 day public comment period will run from **April 29 – May 29**. This EE/CA addresses the management of groundwater withdrawn from wells during well drilling, well development, aquifer testing, groundwater sampling and monitoring, well maintenance and decommissioning. The preferred alternative is to use modular storage units.

Rattlesnake Mountain Environmental Assessment (EA) – The public comment period will run from **May 19 – June 2**. This EA addresses the consolidation of communication equipment and removal of facilities on Rattlesnake Mountain such as the Nike Missile site. Of interest to the Trustees will be how these sites will be restored.

Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS – The 140 day public comment period is expected to run from **June – October**. 1-2 public workshops are anticipated. The EIS will form the basis for making important decisions about Hanford's cleanup, including:

- the final condition of the 177 underground tanks that hold high level nuclear waste
- the final treatment and disposal of those wastes
- the final decommissioning of the FFTF
- on-site disposal alternatives for Hanford's low-level waste (LLW) and mixed low-level waste (MLLW) and LLW and MLLW from other USDOE sites

The EIS will reanalyze groundwater impacts. It will include a cumulative analysis of sitewide environmental impacts. The new EIS will include a reanalysis of onsite disposal alternatives for low-level and mixed low-level radioactive waste from Hanford and other USDOE sites. (Mixed waste contains both radioactive and dangerous waste components.)

200-MG-2 Operable Unit Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) – The public comment period runs from **May 27 – June 26**. This EE/CA addresses 34 of the 69 waste sites in this operable unit. These waste sites received potentially and/or radioactive liquids and are expected to have shallow contamination (less than 15 feet) that could pose a threat to human health and the environment. They include French drains, trenches, cribs ditches and retention basins along with a few sites contaminated from historic leaks or spills. The preferred alternative is removal, treatment and disposal for 18 sites and confirmatory sampling/no further action for 16 sites.

Central Plateau Outer Area Record of Decision – To be issued in approximately 1 year. Interim actions are currently ongoing.

Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Decisions – Expected to be in place in 2-3 years.