

11/11/05 received copy

0074628

May 26, 2005

Natural Resource Trustee Council
Meeting Minutes
February 23-24, 2005
Richland, Washington

Participants:

<u>CTUIR</u>	<u>WDOE</u>
Stuart Harris	Larry Goldstein
Rico Cruz	John Price
Barbara Harper	
<u>NPT</u>	<u>WDFW</u>
Dan Landeen	Lauri Vigue
Gabriel Bohnee	
<u>ODOE</u>	<u>YN</u>
Susan Hughs	Jay McConnaughey
Tom Stoops	Russell Jim
Paul Shaffer	Ray Givens
	Wade Riggsbee
<u>USFWS</u>	
Don Steffeck	<u>USDOE</u>
Lindsey Hayes	Steve Wisness, RL
	Dana Ward, RL
	Jamie Zeisloft, RL
<u>EPA</u>	Kevin Clarke, RL
Larry Gadbois	Ed Hiskes, RL
	Tony Weeks, RL
<u>NOAA</u>	Greg Jones, RL
Mary Baker	John Sands, RL
	John Morse, RL
	Steve Chalk, RL
<u>DOE Contractors</u>	Jim Rasmussen, ORP
Ken Gano, BHI	
Amy Hood, BHI	<u>Others</u>
Roger Dirkes, PNNL	

RECEIVED
DEC 03 2007

EDMC

February 23, 2005

Welcome, Agenda & Previous Meeting Notes:

Don Steffek opened the meeting, welcomed attendees, and initiated introductions. The agenda was modified slightly to allow for scheduling arrangements in the afternoon.

Announcements:

None

Review Action Item List:

Review postponed until later in meeting. See "Action Item Review", which is last topic on February 23, 2005.

Meeting Minutes:

It was pointed out that the meeting minutes were not currently going into the Administrative Record (AR) and questions were raised as to whether or not they should be. It was noted that for EPA to use information for decisions the information must go into the record. Letters, for instance, now go into the AR. It was proposed that the minutes go into the AR, however, further discussions raised concerns that indicated that the Trustees may not want the minutes to go into the AR. Perhaps a summary of the issues and action items would be appropriate for the AR. It was agreed that Steve Wisness, Larry Gadbois, and John Price would look into the AR further, including the process through which material is entered into the AR. In addition, they would evaluate what had been done in the past with the minutes and other NRTC information (ACTION # 34).

September meeting minutes, which were distributed for approval during the December meeting, were discussed briefly. Minimal comments were received on the final draft during the comment period, however, approval was delayed once again. December meeting minutes were also discussed briefly, however, approval was delayed pending resolution of comments received after the review period and redistribution to the Trustees. It was determined that the names of "presenters" would be included in the minutes, however, individuals would not be identified by name during periods of general discussion. An action to redistribute the September and December meeting minutes one last time was established. Final NRTC comments would be due to RL two weeks following the distribution of the final draft meeting minutes. (ACTION # 20/21). In the future, if there are conflicting comments on the meeting minutes that can not easily be resolved, they would be so noted in the draft minutes and the NRTC would resolve.

Attempts to keep meeting minutes "real time" were made during the February meeting with mixed results. The real time concept was a success for the capture of Action Items from each agenda item discussion. However, there was no effort to finalize the minutes

real time as initially intended. Discussions indicated that this may be an unrealistic expectation that may be beyond the need for the minutes and other options for the completion of final meeting minutes should be discussed. Options will be put together for consideration in the April meeting.

- Revise September minutes per trustee comment (ACTION #20)
- Revise December minutes per trustee comment (ACTION #21)
- Provide draft February minutes to Trustees electronically (ACTION #37)
- Develop options for “finalization” of meeting minutes for discussion in May meeting (ACTION #33)

Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) Integration: John Morse

John provided a summary of the ERA Integration Working Group activities. The working group is identifying the ongoing ecological risk assessments and related environmental monitoring and/or characterization activities (approximately 49 total) and providing input for potential areas of integration. A draft is expected to be available for review in the near future and a draft report is anticipated to be completed in May. The draft TPA Milestone M-016-70 requires the three parties to agree on an integration pathway to streamline the process. The current working group document is to provide an integration strategy and identifies process bottlenecks and overlapping schedules. It was suggested that one of the Trustees should be a part of the ERA Integration Working Group and Mary Baker volunteered. RL will consider this suggestion to add Trustee to working group and determine what “draft” of the document will be sent for external review. (ACTION # 35) The Yakama Nation (YN) requested the draft integration report concurrently when it is transmitted to the regulators for review. (ACTION #35) The formal document will go to the AR, which triggers distribution to others as well, including state of Oregon and YN.

3-Point Agreement – Funding Proposal: All

The federal Trustee lawyers are discussing the 3-Point Agreement and funding proposal and progress towards coming to an agreement on these issues is being made.

The YN, through Russell Jim, provided a written statement regarding the YN on the 3-Point Agreement, funding issues, and the natural resource trust responsibilities in general (statement provided as attachment to minutes). The YN questions whether or not DOE has adequately addressed injuries to natural resources caused by contaminant releases at Hanford. The statement was read and a motion was made to adopt 3-Point Agreement, Option A to be funded at the levels set out in the Cost Account Plan, Tasks 1 and 2 as provided to DOE. The motion was seconded and much discussion ensued – some on the record, some off.

DOE could not comment on or make a decision (agree or not agree) on the motion at this time per legal direction. The funding proposal was an order of magnitude above what was anticipated. Trustees felt that the DOE Manager had supported Tasks 1 and 2 as proposed

in the December Trustee Council meeting. However, there is some confusion since Tasks 1 and 2 as proposed in December were what is now referred to as Tasks 1a and 1b – not Tasks 1 and 2. Trustees suggest that the 3-Point Agreement and funding proposal need to be on the senior executive trustee meeting agenda. DOE wants input on ERAs and looking hard at technical assistance tasks, but also looking at alternate ways of doing things for the matrix and document database.

Trustees recognized that there was still a motion on the table for the acceptance of Option A for the 3-Point Agreement and funding for Tasks 1 and 2 of the recently submitted proposal. It was decided to draft a finding for this motion, distribute it for comment, and go through the formal approval process as defined in the by-laws (ACTION # 36).

Trustees requested that Russell Jim statement be included in the meeting minutes (ACTION # 37).

Trustees understand the need for, and want to get, something (line item) into the FY07 budget process. FY06 budget was already submitted so FY07 is next opportunity. DOE feels current budget adequate to fulfill responsibility for clean-up under CERCLA and TPA. Some discretionary dollars available that could be used for natural resource issues, in the hundreds of thousands range, not millions as currently proposed. Trustees feel proposal is sound and funding levels are not outrageous. Bottom line answer is that DOE can not speak fully on this issue at this time. Trustees frustrated at this point and have spent existing funds at higher than planned rate to get information to DOE.

Update on Matrix Status

Progress on this activity is tied up in the funding issue to a certain extent. DOE is considering using existing databases for documents and bibliographic information to be used for matrix completion. Similar activities are ongoing in the Columbia River Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment and the Remediation Support Task of the River Protection Project. The intent and ultimate use of the database will drive the decision. The goal of trying to get to something that is useful for multiple audiences, not just Trustee matrix. Range from a simple document title list, to document bibliographical information database, all the way up to a truly interactive, searchable web-based interface that allows access to documents themselves as well as the databases that house the information summarized in the documents. Trustees feel matrix is necessary. Other paradigms are currently in use for the ERAs so progress on filling out the matrix is somewhat stymied until the criteria and use of matrix are further defined. Other options discussed include winnowing the matrix down, which is opposed by some Trustees. An option was proposed to trim down the size of the matrix such that it is something that is more user-friendly and use Site expertise to make progress on filling it out. Trustees don't see anything coming back from their inputs into ERA process which is frustrating. The matrix, if completed, would be useful to show what has been done and what hasn't and help identify what may be appropriate for future studies. However, just because box isn't checked in matrix doesn't equate to a need so is it the most useful tool or necessary? What is the intended use of the data/information – use in risk assessments, identify gaps,

injury assessments? Is the matrix what we really want, what we really get the most useful information from? Others supported that the matrix take a holistic approach, to include the tribal cultures and the health and welfare of the tribal people. Perhaps criteria are needed that define what is most useful.

Suggestion was made to get 15 to 20 experts together and go through matrix, winnow it down in technically defensible manner (not to be confused with eliminating any part of the matrix), and take first cut at filling in the blanks. Some feel the experts could winnow the matrix down by trophic levels, functional areas, taxonomical group, or by guild without compromising matrix and getting to a more manageable task. Others strongly disagreed that this was the way to go. It was agreed to set up a workshop to get some action on the matrix started. Trustees would establish objectives, purpose, criteria, and product of the workshop. Some Trustee representatives feel strongly that the matrix components are there for a reason and they must be accounted for with reason, not simply winnowed out, and therefore feel the experts go through it one box at a time instead of winnowing it down. The need to establish a group was discussed that would define the purpose of the workshop. A Trustee subcommittee was formed consisting of Dan Landeen, Lauri Vigue, Jay McConaughy, Dana Ward, Barbara Harper, Larry Goldstein, and Roger Dirkes. The subcommittee is to define purpose of workshop, criteria for going through matrix, participants, agenda, expected products, and facilitator for the meeting. It was agreed that it will include 15 to 20 participants, over a 2-day time period, and a 2 month lead time would be provided to the participants to allow for scheduling. The subcommittee is to provide information listed above, as well as proposed workshop dates, to the council by March 30, 2005 (ACTION # 38)

Integration of CERCLA remediation and NRDA: Don Steffeck

It was pointed out that EPA has guidance on the web pertaining to ecological risk assessments and coordination with trustees. DOE also has guidance indicating it is good idea to integrate similar assessments and ecological information needs. Risk assessments go to exposure, then if exposure is identified, injury evaluation is warranted. Agreement that data collected for risk assessment may be useful for injury evaluation as well. Also agreement that there may be some savings associated with collecting data for injury evaluation at the same time collecting data for risk assessment. Problem is twofold; funding needed for trustees to identify what "injury" data is needed, and present funding proposal is significantly higher than anticipated by DOE. Schedules driving need for input from trustees, not currently effective. Inputs needed now, next 6 months is critical on some ERAs, need to decide to participate or not otherwise open window may be lost.

Action Item Review

The Action Items list from previous meetings was reviewed and updated per input from the responsible party(ies). It was determined that the Action Items list to be reviewed in

the Trustee Council meetings should be revised to reflect just the open items (ACTION ITEM # 37).

Additional action items were identified as the February meeting progressed. See ACTION ITEMS list at end of these meeting notes for new action items as well as those past action items that remain open.

Administrative Support – Larry Goldstein

Ecology suggested the need to look at administrative support and what should be done to assure things were not falling between the cracks. Trustees noted that some things were not getting done that used to be done by administrative staff. Setting up the meeting locations, setting the final agenda, preparing and providing information packets for the Trustees, and bringing minutes from previous meetings are examples of things that used to be done consistently. DOE has lost secretarial and administrative support staff so those capabilities not available. It was suggested that Trustees bring their own hard copies of information known to be on the agenda for use in the meetings. Agreement was reached that DOE would provide for the agenda preparation, coordinating meeting arrangements, provide draft and final meeting minutes to Trustees via e:mail, and Trustees would be responsible to bring their own copies of material needed for the next meeting based on agenda items. (ACTION # 39) Issue of Administrative Records was discussed once again and referred back to previous action item to check into process and need for it. (ACTION # 34)

February 25, 2005

Update and Discussion on ERDF Mitigation Action Plan: Ken Gano

The draft Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) is currently being prepared and plans call for the update of the mitigation plan, which hasn't been revisited for some time. The draft MAP is anticipated to be out for review in April. (ACTION #7) The mitigation area for the overburden was burned during the 2000 wildfire, however, it is recovering quite well and is a level 2 with grasses, forbes, and a few shrubs. Mitigation is at a 1:1 ratio now due to the fire lowering the shrub habitat classification from a 3 to a 2. Some felt the ratio should remain 3:1 since it was once level 3 habitat and that the habitat lost due to the fire should be replaced anyway. The current plan, however, calls for mitigation to the level that exists in the BRMaP. Trustees suggested that this may be an opportunity to revisit the BRMaP since the quantity of high quality habitat has been decreased as a result of the fire, and therefore the remaining habitat is more critical and the ranking perhaps should be higher. A Trustee letter of recommendation is to be drafted to DOE to reevaluate the classification of site sage brush habitat in view of the loss of so much of it during the fire. (ACTION # 40). Trustees were concerned over the Vit Plant and whether or not BRMaP was being applied for mitigation at this site. (ACTION #7) It was also determined that the Trustees should engage ORP and request a briefing by ORP on their activities and review

processes to ensure trust responsibilities are being met. (ACTION # 44). A Nature Conservancy Report documenting the fire response and revegetation activities and replanting treatments that experienced various levels of success is now available and should be used as reference for future revegetation efforts. The email address for the report and an electronic version of the executive summary will be distributed to the trustees as appropriate. (ACTION # 41)

Horseshoe Landfill Status: Jamie Zeisloft

A fact sheet was provided with a map regarding basic information on the status of the activities at Horseshoe Landfill. DOE was not at liberty to discuss the activities in detail in light of ongoing legal considerations. The site had been cleaned up under CERCLA and closed out, however, follow-up monitoring had detected some elevated levels that are now being cleaned up by DOE outside of the CERCLA domain and transported to Arlington, Oregon for disposal. EPA and Ecology are not requiring any action at this time. Nez Perce have reviewed the current plan and are pleased that the elevated levels are being cleaned up. The YN reported that they were not consulted on this matter. After the excavation of the contaminated area, biological monitoring will resume. In addition, it was noted that there is a 5-year review per CERCLA, during which the Trustees can look into the actions at the Horseshoe Landfill further.

Executive Trustee Meeting Plans: Trustees

It was agreed that the morning of the meeting, the executives would be taken on a Site tour. An information package, to be prepared by DOE, would be provided to each participant prior to the meeting. (ACTION # 42) Topics of discussion during the tour to include the nature and extent of contamination, the impacted versus non-impacted areas of the site, clean-up activities, groundwater contamination, natural resources, and ecological risk assessments. It was hoped that a representative of ORP could be available to summarize ORP activities onsite as well. (ACTION # 42)

While it was reiterated that DOE hoped for the executive meeting to be relatively unstructured, potential agenda items were identified including an internal report card, reaffirmation of each agency's commitment to trustee process, RL clean-up priorities, memorandum of agreement and by-laws, technical assistance, funding proposal, 3-point agreement, communications, and issue resolution. The pros and cons of having agency attorneys in attendance at the executive trustee meeting were discussed. It was agreed that the trustees should assure their respective executives and legal staff were on the same page outside of the meeting.

It was determined that EPA was not a participant in the executive meeting since they are not technically a trustee. An issue was raised about DOE being the PRP in addition to a trustee and that dual roles are sometimes confusing. DOE legal pointed out that DOE is not PRP, the United States would be legally defined to be the PRP and Department of

Justice would defend. This would change the operating protocols significantly and would not be to benefit of HNRTC. The trustees have worked towards the protection of Hanford's natural resources for 10 years and it would be a shame to lose that momentum. We all are saying a preassessment screen will be performed, but there is disagreement as to when this will be done and what data is needed in order for it to be completed. Important that HNRTC continue working together to avoid Department of Justice involvement and change in operating paradigm. DOE, as agency responsible for clean-up under CERCLA, can fund for technical expertise. However, funding process is ongoing and input for FY07 is being worked on now for submittal in mid-April. The Trustee funding proposal came well after FY06 budget submittal was submitted to headquarters and funding levels established. Therefore, dollars for HNRTC support would have to come at expense of other, approved activities. There is a funding mechanism in place, but it comes with long lead times and it is important for HNRTC to get a placeholder in now through DOE for outyear funding needs. Need to determine whether DOE is going to initiate some effort to obtain data for injury assessment now, or wait until after preassessment screen is completed. A FY07 budget submittal item for injury assessment would show a good faith effort on DOE's part.

Discussion turned back onto senior executive meeting agenda and the following items were suggested from which the senior executives could conduct the meeting.

- Performance report card
- Priorities
- Communications
- Trustee responsibilities and roles
- Budget and funding needs
- Strategy and timing of NRDA

FY 2006 Budget: Greg Jones

DOE went through the FY06 budget submittal and identified where decreases were recommended due to completion of accelerated cleanup elements. Schedules were presented which made it clear that we are now in FY07 budget preparation and submittal process and it is imperative that if HNRTC is to have something in 2007 budget submittal, it must be completed and provided for input early in April. The short turn-around on this submittal places increased emphasis on the status of the funding proposal and the need to have it addressed at the senior executive trustee meeting. A conference call was tentatively set for March 16, 2005 between 2:00 and 4:00 pm. The purpose of the call is to get feedback from DOE on the funding proposal, tasks 1a and 1b, and identify where the scope looks good, where differences exist, and where the proposal could move forward. (ACTION # 43) YN staff inquired as to when consultation on the DOE budget submittal would begin with the YN, through the YN ERWM program manager. While outside the responsibility of the DOE staff present, it was agreed that they would check into it.

Future Meetings

It was agreed that the next meeting would be a special council meeting to be held April 7-8, 2005 in Portland. This change was deemed imperative in light of the mid-April deadline for submittal of a FY07 budget package and to act on progress made during the senior executive trustee meeting held in late-March. The next regular council meeting will be in Richland on May, 24-25, 2005 as originally planned.

Final Discussion

DOE legal has commitment to report back to the Department of Justice (DJ) as to the progress, or lack thereof, being made with the HNRTC. The intent is to pass on to the DJ that the council continues to work the issues and has agreed to meet in the next couple months to continue discussions. There has been agreement that there is a need to integrate efforts, task 1a and 1b and to focus the ERAs, provide technical assistance, work on the matrix, and further define alternatives to the matrix and document bibliographic database.

**ACTION ITEMS FROM 2/23&24/05 NRTC
QUARTERLY MEETING
(3/30/05)**

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
1.	a) Provide a list to Ecological Resources Working Group of existing and upcoming land disturbance projects b) Mail out quarterly update of land disturbing activities ACTION: Dana Ward	6/11/03 12/1/04, 2/23/05	Ongoing
2.	a) Update general information on Web page – D.Ward b) Review update, comment to D.Ward ASAP ACTION: HNRTC - All	9/11/03 12/1/04	4 th Qtr 04
3.	Set up a conference call with trustees to move forward on the USGS proposal integrating Sculpin studies into the DQO process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • informal discussion 04 SETAC Mtg • conference call planned in January • conference call planned in near future ACTION: Don Steffeck	7/13/04 12/1/04 2/23/05	Delayed
7.	IDF and Bulk Vitrification construction projects underway which may have land disturbance impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews underway • Propose laydown yard to less sensitive area • Resolve next month or so • Review status • Draft Mitigation Action Plan to Trustees ACTION: ORP (Jim Rasmussen with Dana Ward)	9/8/04 12/1/04 2/23/05 2/24/05	Ongoing
9.	Provide Dana Ward updates to mailing list, especially individuals that need to be copied on information. Dana keep the e-mail list and mailing list current. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mailing list provided to Trustees 12/1/04 • Mary Baker (NOAA) added • Update information due to D.Ward ASAP • Addition of Paul Shaffer • Provide copies at next HNRTC meeting ACTION: Dana Ward	9/8/94 12/1/04 2/23/05 2/23/05	Ongoing
10.	Attorneys to work together to review MOA and develop language that allows unencumbered technical discussions to continue. Ray Givens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed in 12/1/04 meeting; attorneys should work together to review/rework MOA 	9/8/04 12/1/04, 2/23/05	Ongoing
16.	Shirley check on status of HAB/RAP request for technical assistance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassigned to S. Wisness 12/1/04 • Continued 	 12/1/04 2/23/05	Ongoing

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	ACTION: S. Wisness		
18.	Prepare for senior trust leadership meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed in 12/1/04 meeting Engage senior executives/managers prior to senior exec meeting ACTION: HNRTC	12/2/04	Ongoing
19.	Select date for senior trust leadership meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target of mid- to late January S.Wisness to forward Klein open calendar dates by COB 12/6/04 HRNTC respond with exec openings/conflicts by COB 12/10/04 Senior meeting held 3/24/05 ACTION(s): S.Wisness; HRNTC	12/1/04 12/2/04	Ongoing 12/6/04 3/24/05
20.	a) Provide comments on September 8-9, 2004 meeting minutes to D. Ward by December 16, 2004 b) Approve September 8-9, 2004 meeting minutes c) Retransmit revised minutes to HNRTC – D.Ward d) Approve minutes - HNRTC ACTION: Dana Ward, HNRTC	12/1/04 12/1/04 2/23/05 2/23/05	Ongoing
21.	a) Send draft minutes for December 1-2, 2004 HNRTC meeting by 12/10/04, D. Ward b) Provide comments on draft minutes by 12/24/04 c) Retransmit revised minutes to HNRTC – D.Ward d) Approve minutes - HNRTC ACTION(s): D.Ward, HNRTC	12/1/04 12/1/04 2/23/05 2/23/05	Ongoing
24.	a) add NOAA as an HNRTC member b) decision/resolution to make NOAA a voting member c) NOAA to request membership -- M. Baker d) HNRTC to prepare resolution to add NOAA - HNRTC ACTION: HNRTC, Mary Baker	12/1/04 12/10/04 2/23/05 2/23/05	Ongoing
30.	Provide Ray (Austin) Johnson biological database electronically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm completion ACTION: D. Landeen	12/2/04 2/23/05	Ongoing
33.	a) trial run minutes real time/approval at next meeting b) evaluate administrative support for future meetings c) discuss options/process for minutes - HNRTC ACTION: HNRTC	12/1/04 12/9/04 2/23/05	Ongoing
34.	Administrative Records <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate need for Trustee council input into formal Administrative Record Review previous actions towards AR (Terry) 	2/23/05	

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report back next HNRTC meeting ACTION: S. Wisness, L. Goldstein, J. Price		
35.	Site Ecological Risk Assessment Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition of Trustee to working group YN request draft strategy – DOE/RL to determine what “draft” that would be ACTION: John Morse	2/23/05	
36.	Resolution to adopt 3-Point Agreement, Option A, and fund to level defined in CAP, Tasks 1 and 2 ACTION: Jay McConnaughey	2/23/05	
37.	February Meeting Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include YN statement in February Meeting Minute Distribute draft February meeting minutes to HNRTC for comment Action Item List to include only active items ACTION: Dana Ward	2/23/05	3/31/05
38.	Trustee Ecological Study Matrix Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish subcommittee (Dan Landeen – lead, Jay McConnaughey, Lauri Bigue, Larry Goldstein, Dana Ward, Barbara Harper, Roger Dirkes) Organize workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define purpose of workshop, use of matrix Establish criteria upon which to work on matrix Establish agenda for workshop Identify participants and facilitator 2-days, scheduled 2 months in advance draft subcommittee input to HNRTC by 3/30/05 ACTION: SubCommittee	2/23/05	
39.	Administrative Support Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trustees to bring hard copies of materials needed for meetings DOE to provide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> organize/distribute meeting agenda coordinate local meetings maintain and provide updates to trustee council contact list draft and final meeting minutes ACTION: Dana Ward, HNRTC	2/23/05	
40.	Draft letter from HNRTC to DOE regarding potential to	2/24/05	

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	revisit habitat classification for mitigation due to loss of big sage brush habitat from fire ACTION: Lauri Vigue		
41.	Transmit electronic version of The Nature Conservancy report (executive summary) on fire response and revegetation activities and replanting successes ACTION: Lindsey Hayes	2/24/05	
42.	Send Site Senior Executive Tour Information Package to HNRTC, including ORP participation ACTION: Steve Wisness	2/24/05	Completed
43.	Set up conference call of HNRTC on March 16, 2005 from 2:00 to 4:00. Emphasize funding needs ACTION: Don Steffeck	2/24/05	Completed
44.	HNRTC engage ORP and define trustee roles in ORP activities and review processes ACTION: HNRTC	2/24/05	
45.	HNRTC respond to Steve Weiss on availability for tour of 100NR2 sampling locations, including reference sites ACTION: HNRTC	2/24/05	Completed