

0085159

HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCES TRUSTEE COUNCIL

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

(Typed and Handwritten)

November 17 – 19, 2009

Consisting of 28 pages,  
including this coversheet

**RECEIVED**  
FEB 17 2010

**EDMC**

**HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL  
BI-MONTHLY MEETING  
November 17-19, 2009  
Port of Benton Offices, Richland WA**

**Meeting Summary**

**Introduction**

The overall goals of the meeting were to:

- Conduct administrative business
- Receive and discuss procurement updates
- Discuss NRDA process, structure, and issues
- Discuss and plan TWG goals, activities, and meetings
- Receive updates on CERCLA response activities and sampling activities

The final agenda is included as Attachment A. Attendees are listed at end of the meeting summary. 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 B.

**Administrative Business**

- **Introductions and Staffing Updates.** Introductions were made around the table. Matthew Duchesne and Douglas Gray were visiting from DOE-EM to observe and provide their perspective on NRDA at DOE facilities. Russ MacRae joined the HNRTC as the USF&W voting representative and HNRTC Vice-Chair, replacing Toni Davidson. Jeff Skriletz was introduced as the WA F&W representative, replacing Mark Hunter.
- **Site Tour.** Dana is planning a site tour for new members and anyone else that wants to come for sometime in Jan/Feb. Contact him if you wish to attend.
- **Office Space.** On Tuesday morning prior to the HNRTC meeting, members toured several available office spaces in downtown Richland. Those on the tour reported their impressions during the meeting and agreed unanimously that one of the spaces was superior to the others. Janis will look into DOE leasing of the space [AI311]. While most of the HNRTC was in favor of leasing the space, a vote was delayed until the December meeting to obtain information on leasing options and for members to check with their Senior Trustees as needed.
- **FY2012 Budget.** It will soon be time to begin planning the FY2012 budget, and it has been suggested that the HNRTC begin the baselining process in conjunction with

developing this budget. A budget workgroup was formed, consisting of Janis, Jay, Paul, Steve, Callie, Barb, and the Project Coordinator (once hired). Steve and Callie will coordinate the group, with the goal of having budget alternatives available for HNRTC discussion at the January meeting [AI312].

- **Role of Non-Voting Trustees and Other Organizations or Individuals.** A discussion was held of the role of non-voting trustees on the HNRTC. Trustees were distinguished from non-trustees, in the sense that they have both rights and responsibilities to participate in the process as defined by the NRDAR regulations. No specific distinctions were recommended between voting and non-voting trustees. A potential finding was discussed, but consensus was not reached on the need for one.

Non-trustees must request or be invited to attend the meetings, as they are not considered open meetings. Should a non-trustee request time on the agenda, the Chair was encouraged to consult with the HNRTC to determine whether that entity should be accommodated.

- **Conference Call Minutes.** Dana made a motion to approve the minutes of the Oct 19 conference call, Dan seconded the motion, and the HNRTC approved the minutes unanimously.

### **FY2010 Contracting**

- **Project Coordinator.** Linda Jarnagan was present for a discussion of the two applicants for the Project Coordinator position. The HNRTC discussed the resumes, and declined to hire either of them as they did not meet the required qualifications. Linda will notify the contractor that neither applicant is being accepted. Options for further search and hiring were discussed. Russ will look into hosting either a term position or contractor through USF&W [AI307]. Meanwhile, the position is still open through DOE's contractors.
- **Phase II Contracting.** Jennifer Knittel presented the results of the request for a letter of interest for the Phase II IAP. Three contractors responded who are all considered qualified, indicating that there is sufficient interest to proceed with the GSA contracting process. In addition, USDOE is waiting for a FBO (federal business opportunity) announcement to close on Nov. 30<sup>th</sup>. The RFP is expected to go out around mid-December and submittals will be due by the end of January. Jennifer is working on resolving conflict of interest issues with legal before the RFP goes out. Janis will report on this at the December call [AI313].

### **NRDAR Process and Issues**

- **NRDAR Structure.** The HNRTC held a thoughtful discussion of the structure and flow of the NRDAR process, focusing on the interplay between assessing injury and restoration activities, including restoration planning and early restoration. Matthew Duchesne presented his view of how the current DOE funding source can be applied, which does not depend on the stage of the restoration process, but rather whether it can be tied to response activities. He clarified that planning that supported both restoration and response activities would qualify, and that both primary and compensatory issues could be addressed. He also recognized the need to pursue alternative sources or structures of funding to allow NRDAR activities that might not directly support response activities to take place, and anticipated that this would be addressed in the next year or two.

Members of the HNRTC expressed a variety of viewpoints on restoration planning and early restoration activities and their place in the process. Most supported a strong focus on restoration planning to allow opportunities for early restoration in conjunction with response activities to take place, recognizing that there will need to be carefully thought out criteria in place with which to evaluate such proposals. Others were concerned that restoration planning not get ahead of the injury assessment process and that early restoration projects might not ultimately be consistent with the final restoration plan. Concern was also expressed about the limited time and funding that the HNRTC has, and which tasks have priority for these resources.

As a way of resolving these issues, the following general principles were discussed. A distinction was drawn between general restoration planning (e.g., development of criteria by which to judge projects, delineation of habitats and goals for restoration), which could begin now, and completion of the final restoration plan, which would best be done once the information from the Injury Assessment is available. Early restoration and/or proposed mitigation projects would be judged individually according to criteria developed in advance, and implementation of any such projects should not draw from the same sources of funding being used to complete the Injury Assessment process.

The HNRTC chose not to work further on the structural diagram, but will work with both structure and timing further as part of the upcoming baselining process.

- **NRDAR/CERCLA Integration.** Paul raised the issue of how to better ensure consideration of NRDAR issues when site managers are in the FS phase of selecting a remedy. He suggested that it might be time to develop a white paper laying out the HNRTC's expectations with respect to integration of life-cycle costs into the FS and other NRDAR considerations during remedy selection. Paul, Barb, Larry, Callie, and Brian volunteered to assist with developing this white paper [AI314].

Later in the meeting, it was also suggested that NRDAR training for DOE site managers, as well as potentially their counterparts at Ecology and EPA, would be helpful in orienting them to the issues they should be considering. Russ has been involved in conducting this training through USF&W, and is available for further information and/or coordination of an on-site training. Janis and Matthew will look into this possibility further [A1315].

- **Unresolved Phase I Injury Assessment Issues.** The HNRTC brainstormed a list of unresolved issues from Phase I that will need to be addressed as part of Phase II, as well as the proposed forum/manner in which to work on these issues, as follows:
  - Geographic and temporal scope of the IA (all-TWG meeting)
  - More detail in the food web diagrams (individual TWGs)
  - Selection criteria for species and contaminants of concern (Aquatic and Terrestrial TWGs take first cut, followed by all-TWG discussion)
  - Integrating services and habitat into the IAP, key principles and concepts (Human Uses TWG)
  - Use and definition of the term “stressors” and better definitions of injury (Phase II IAP)
  - Interaction between TWGs and Phase II contractor (all-TWG meeting)
  - Access to data, data and document management (Phase II contractor + potential early interaction between TWGs and Hanford contractors)

See TWG Activities below for further discussion of TWG issues and the All-TWG meeting.

### **TWG Activities**

- **TWG Reports.** Each TWG chair gave a report of its activities and any issues that have arisen:
  - **Terrestrial:** The TWG has been identifying disturbed habitat to begin looking at the scale of potential injuries. It has also been working on species selection criteria. One issue is the need to access Hanford subcontractors for mapping activities, and their need for a charge code for more than simple requests.
  - **Aquatic:** The TWG has been working on criteria for selecting species and resources to study, injury definitions, and natural history summaries. This TWG also has a need to obtain data layers from existing databases.
  - **Source/Pathway:** The TWG has been identifying documents with useful information, and summarized some of those in the meeting.

- **Groundwater:** This TWG has identified three issues for discussion: 1) the need to obtain data for groundwater and the vadose zone, and for waste sites (e.g., HEIS, WIDS databases), 2) overlaps with the Aquatic TWG in upwelling areas and with the Terrestrial TWG where groundwater connects with surface water, and 3) the threshold of injury for groundwater. On issue 2, the Groundwater TWG will address pathways and chemical issues and the Aquatic TWG will address impacts to biota in the interface between soil and groundwater. The Groundwater TWG will address surface water, since it is likely connected to groundwater. The TWG plans to assemble possible groundwater criteria from various sources, assemble the data, and develop contours for each of the sets of criteria to determine where there are meaningful differences in the results.
- **Human Uses:** The human uses TWG is focusing on identifying services that flow from baseline conditions of the resources at Hanford to people (especially tribal services at first). The second step is to identify criteria for injury and thresholds of concentrations or other parameters for use by other TWGs. Later we will identify cultural keystone species and other issues. One issue is how to address cultural resources that may be sensitive information, and one option is to protect entire habitats or use surrogate species.
- **Restoration:** The TWG has been focusing on identifying ecological zones at the site and developing criteria for early, primary, and compensatory restoration.

One issue common to several of the TWGs was obtaining access to existing data through Hanford contractors, who need a charge code. Janis confirmed that the unallocated HNRTC funds at DOE do have a charge code that could be used if the HNRTC chose to set aside some of its funding for that purpose. Paul will develop and circulate a resolution on data access and the issue will be discussed further at the December conference call [AI316].

- **All-TWG Meeting.** An All-TWG meeting was scheduled for February 11, all day in Richland, location TBD. Dana will looking into a meeting location big enough for all the TWG participants [AI317]. Agenda items were identified as follows:
  - Updates on TWG activities and a discussion of whether, as a whole, the activities of the TWGs are meeting the needs of the HNRTC prior to Phase II starting
  - Scope issues – geographic, temporal, conceptual
  - Consistent criteria for selection of CoCs, species, habitats to focus on
  - Funding issues for TWGs (if not yet resolved)
  - Interaction with the Phase II contractor

A planning committee has not yet been identified.

## Presentations

- **Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS.** Prior to this presentation, the HNRTC discussed whether, in general, it should have presentations or concern itself with NEPA actions or documents. There was a general feeling that the HNRTC should focus primarily on CERCLA/NRDAR activities, but that there were occasional NEPA actions that were significant enough that the HNRTC should stay updated on them and have time for discussion. One example is this EIS, and Mary Beth Burandt gave an overview of the alternatives considered, the selected alternative, and importantly, what assumptions are being made about CERCLA response actions as part of the EIS.
- **100/300 Area Integrated RI/FS Work Plan.** Laura Beulow and Larry Gadbois of EPA and Mandy Jones of Ecology were on hand to answer questions about these documents and their status. They explained some of the agency comments that had gone to DOE and the changes that had been made in response to those comments, which are not yet public.
- **ERDF Mitigation.** Cole Lindsay gave a presentation on ERDF mitigation plans for this year and requested the HNRTC's input on the best location for additional plantings.
- **Hanford Site Completion Framework.** The HNRTC held a discussion of this document, which is not a decision document, but an attempt to provide an overview of cleanup activities at Hanford to the public in a unified manner. Paula Call was available to answer questions about the document and discuss comments by the HNRTC. Many trustees felt that it was too general to be useful for their purposes, but might have served its purpose as an overall educational document for the public. A number of other comments were provided, including significant issues in how the cleanup alternatives are being presented and how tribal involvement is reflected.
- **Central Plateau Cleanup Strategy.** Briant Charboneau described this document, which describes the long-term strategy and rationale for cleaning up the central plateau. The concepts of shrinking the footprint and retaining a central core for industrial activities are key to the plan. There was significant discussion about the merits of capping vs. more complete removal, especially in areas with deep vadose zone contamination. The manner in which NRDAR had been taken into account was also questioned and discussed.
- **Central Plateau Eco-Risk Assessment.** Jim Hansen presented an overview of all of the risk assessment documents and how they will influence the RODs at the site. The first document will be a data compilation and methods report, but will not include actual risk levels. He and John Sands have been working to ensure that consistent methods are used

between the various risk assessment documents at the site. This report will be followed up by a series of risk assessment reports for major areas of the site, which will each have subsequent RODs. They are also working on an interactive comprehensive risk assessment tool, which is currently planned to be available after the RODs are complete. The HNRTC questioned why this was not being done prior to the RODs, to assess the cumulative risks at the site. Workload and data management issues make this difficult.

- **Remedial Investigation Work Plan for Hanford Site Releases to the Columbia River.** John Sands and Larry Hulstrom presented an update on the River Component RI, including data collection and groundwater upwelling results from Phase 2b.

### Meeting Attendees

**CTUIR:** Barb Harper, Rico Cruz

**Nez Perce Tribe:** Dan Landeen

**Oregon:** Paul Shaffer

**WA Dept. of Ecology:** Larry Goldstein

**WA Fish & Wildlife:** Jeff Skriletz

**NOAA:** Charlene Andrade<sup>1</sup>

**Yakama Nation:** Jay McConnaughey, Brian Barry, Callie Ridolfi, Russell Jim<sup>3</sup>, Ray Givens<sup>2</sup>, Tom Bowden

**US Fish & Wildlife Service:** Toni Davidson, Joe Bartoszek, Russ MacRae

**US Dept. of Energy:** Dana Ward, Janis Ward, Steve Wisness, Connie Smith, Matthew Duchesne, Douglas Gray

**Facilitator:** Teresa Michelsen

### Guests and Presenters

**Ecology:** Mandy Jones<sup>4</sup>, John Price<sup>4</sup>

**EPA:** Larry Gadbois, Laura Beulow<sup>4</sup>

**USF&W:** Greg Hughes<sup>4</sup>

**DOE:** Mary Beth Burandt<sup>3</sup>, Paula Call<sup>4</sup>, Jim Hansen<sup>4</sup>, Briant Charboneau<sup>4</sup>, Margo Voogd<sup>4</sup>, John Sands<sup>4</sup>, Linda Jarnagan<sup>3</sup>, Jennifer Knittel<sup>4</sup>

**WCH:** Michael Peloquin<sup>4</sup>, Cole Lindsay<sup>4</sup>, Jon Fletcher<sup>4</sup>, Larry Hulstrom<sup>4</sup>

**PNNL:** Mark Triplett<sup>4</sup>

**EAS:** Brett Tiller<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Present Tuesday

<sup>2</sup> Present Tuesday and Wednesday

<sup>3</sup> Present Wednesday

<sup>4</sup> Present Thursday

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council**  
**Meeting Agenda: November 17-19**  
Port of Benton, 3100 George Washington Way, Richland, WA

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic – Focus: Contracting, NRDA and TWGs</b>	<b>Lead</b>
10:00 am	<b>Tour:</b> Available office space and present analysis along the way <b>Purpose:</b> to evaluate potential meeting/office space options and including cost and suitability to meet Trustee needs <b>Meet:</b> At Federal Bldg Lobby, bring enough cars for everyone	Wisness
12:00 noon	<b>Lunch</b>	
1:00 pm	<b>Administrative Business: approve</b> Agenda	McConnaughey
1:15 pm	<b>Round Table:</b> NRDA process and structure <b>Purpose:</b> work toward understanding and common agreement on a proper and effective nrda process for the Hanford facility <b>Bring:</b> Regs and structure diagram from Sept. meeting (10/22/09 revision), be prepared to discuss your trustee's position on the issues raised	All
3:15 pm	<b>Break</b>	
3:30 pm	Id. Issues from TWGs (e.g. unresolvable issues and coordination) Purpose: Air issues and identify path forward to resolution	All
4:30 pm	<b>NOAAs role as a non-member trustee</b> <b>Purpose:</b> discuss how signatories/non-signatories of the council's MOA and Bylaws should be treated	McConnaughey
5:00 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council**  
**Meeting Agenda: November 17-19**  
Port of Benton, 3100 George Washington Way, Richland, WA

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic – Focus: NRDA, NEPA, and Procurement</b>	<b>Lead</b>
9:00 am	<b>Round Table:</b> NRDA process, structure, TWG issues continued <b>Purpose:</b> work toward understanding and common agreement on a proper and effective nrda process	All
10:30 am	<b>Break</b>	
10:45 am	<b>Tank Closure and Waste Management</b> Environmental Impact Statement <b>Purpose:</b> Presentation of alternatives for informational purposes and allow questions and answers if time allows. Comment deadline is March 19, 2010	Burandt
12:00 pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
1:00 pm	<b>Round Table:</b> Unresolved injury assessment issues (Id. from Phase I work) <b>Purpose:</b> identify issues, common understanding, and path toward resolution <b>Homework:</b> Review Phase I product and bring to meeting your list of Stratus' identified outstanding issues as they relate to development of the injury assessment	All
2:30 pm	<b>Project Coordinator:</b> Procurement <b>Purpose:</b> Discuss options and path forward to fill position	McConnaughey
3:30 pm	<b>Planning:</b> Combined TWG meeting – date/location/agenda	Michelsen
4:00 pm	<b>Admin.</b> Approval of conference call minutes, administrative record, Russ MacRae background	Michelsen
5:00 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council**  
**Meeting Agenda: November 17-19**  
Port of Benton, 3100 George Washington Way, Richland, WA

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic – Focus: Response Activities</b>	<b>Lead</b>
8:00 am	<b>Perspective:</b> 100/300 Integrated RI/FS Work Plan <b>Purpose:</b> To hear EPA's regulatory perspective	Laura Buelow
8:45 am	<b>Round Table:</b> Discussion on Hanford Site Completion Framework <b>Purpose:</b> Opportunity to share insight into framework and determine whether trustees want to take any action as a council. Deadline is November 30th	All
9:50 am	<b>Break</b>	
10:00 am	<b>Presentation:</b> Central Plateau Cleanup Completion Strategy <b>Purpose:</b> Receive information from USDOE and to ask questions and determine whether to formulate a response as a council, or as individual parties	Matt McCormick or Briant Charboneau
10:45 am	<b>Presentation:</b> Central Plateau Eco-risk Assessment <b>Purpose:</b> receive an update on this assessment and its current path forward	Jim Hansen
11:15 am	<b>Presentation:</b> River Corridor Risk Assessment <b>Purpose:</b> receive an update and hear about its current path forward	John Sands
12:10 pm	<b>Update:</b> Phase II Interest Announcement Status <b>Purpose:</b> receive and update and status on announcement of interest and next steps including timeframes of steps and when trustees will need to review proposals	Jennifer Knittel
12:30 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

## ATTACHMENT B

### 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
283	Write a letter to the sturgeon workgroup requesting samples for NRDA injury assessment. <b>Update: DOE is keeping samples until RI is completed</b> <i>ACTION: Toni</i>	3/19/09	<b>No longer applicable</b>
291	Revise contact list <i>ACTION: Dana, Steve</i>	7/21/09	<b>11/23/09</b>
307	Check with USF&W about hosting Project Coordinator <i>ACTION: Russ, Toni, Kate</i>	9/15/09	
309	Ensure FY2009 funds are re-obligated and disburse FY2010 funds <i>ACTION: Janis</i>	9/16/09	<b>11/18/09</b>
310	Begin procurement process for Phase II Contractor <i>ACTION: Janis, Jennifer</i>	9/17/09	<b>10/15/09</b>
<b>311</b>	Looking into leasing options for office space <i>ACTION: Janis</i>	11/18/09	
<b>312</b>	Develop budget options for 2012 by Jan mtg <i>ACTION: Budget Workgroup (Steve/Callie)</i>	11/18/09	
<b>313</b>	Report on Phase II contracting conflict of interest issues <i>ACTION: Janis</i>	11/19/09	
<b>314</b>	Develop white paper on integrating NRDAR into CERCLA response <i>ACTION: Paul et al.</i>	11/17/09	
<b>315</b>	Look into NRDAR training for site managers <i>ACTION: Janis, Matthew</i>	11/19/09	
<b>316</b>	Develop and circulate resolution on data access <i>ACTION: Paul</i>	11/17/09	<b>11/30/09</b>
<b>317</b>	Find and schedule meeting room for all-TWG meeting <i>ACTION: Dana</i>	11/18/09	<b>12/1/09</b>

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

11-17-09

①

1pm

- Introductions completed
- agenda reviewed and approved
- NRDA process & structure

### Restoration

Joe B USFWS Talks on early restoration and how he favors early restoration and why it is important and not in conflict. Pot of \$ used for early restoration should not impact funds.

Do not want to miss opportunities

Russ M. Regs are guidance that do not have to be followed.

Limit remediation to the remedial site is not necessary.

Is ~~partial~~ Damages part of restoration.

Discussion by Ray Givens, Matthew D and others on restoration and examples.

NRDA is the process that informs the response side there wants the AR to be separate.

The restoration plan and action is an important part of the council's activities.

Attendees: Teresa, Dan, Connie, Russ, Toni, Ray G, Brian, Rico, Janis, Matthew Duchesne, Douglas Gray DOE, Jay, Paul, Jeff Skripet, Larry Gold, Barb K, Steve W., Larry Gadhais, Tom Boden

Funds should not be spent on restoration if these funds are better utilized for remediation.

Locke Is, if proceed, the amount of credit could be minimal although this is a good thing.

Case by case, real projects, must be reviewed to see if they are acceptable restoration projects.

Trustees and the laws were formed/in effect to put the resource back to what it was but for the release.

Break

### TWG Reports/Concerns

SW TWG request access to HEIS

How to do this?

Dana suggested a resolution

Paul Shaffer will draft a resolution

2) Discuss boundary between aquatic and GW TWGS.

3) Establishing threshold of injury for GW. what criteria to use.

a. assemble data

b. use various standards/EPA, WA

Terrestrial

Maps

no problems at this time

Aquatic

o looking for biota to study

o Natural History summaries

No problems at this time

SLP

use appendix from TC-WM EIS

\* let Jay/Teresa know about big ticket items concerns from each TWGS.

should have updates of TWGS at each Council meeting.

Affirmative ~~Goal~~ Goal in BRMAP  
Site wide Vision

(4)

Jeff. SKRILETZ @ DFW, WA, GOV  
New member from WDFW To work with  
Larry ~~Gold~~ Goldstein.

Discussions on involvement by NOAA & other non-  
voting members.  
concerns of voting by NOAA at Senior Trustee  
Meetings.

working on a Finding directed at NOAA

Table discussions on NOAA etc participation

11-18-09

Day 2

(5)

NRTC

Baselining would be a good starting point  
to bring in the diagrams from YN, DOE  
Foley

Some concerns with YN flow diagram

WA state flexibility

Russ USFWS felt YN could be split  
into two processes.

would not need to adapt but use  
as a working tool

~~the~~

working group may want to visit

Barb felt it could be part of  
Baselining

Larry Gadhaic talks on Final RODs and how trustee  
concerns/ findings can be incorporate into  
DOE's

DOE can add more response actions into the ROD  
more than is necessary under regulations.

Tom B feels that additional actions can be

taken after the ROD actions are completed. wording could be put into the ROD to assure that restoration meets trustee council goals.

May want to get more stringent cleanup levels into the ROD. If done after the ROD is issued - could be out of luck.

Ray feels that the injury assessment has to be completed prior to restoration.

"NRDA long term cost - "Dark side of reality" Larry Goldstein

Paul S. would like trustees to write a white paper on what needs to be included ~~restoration~~ response side calculations for actions and funding beyond just meeting the work

Teresa M feels that DOE/contractors need to work out what NRDA actions need to be incorporated

Larry Goldstein minimising mineral injury

\* Barb, Paul, Callie, Brian, Larry

New attendees:

Callie, Russel Jim, Jim Hanson

Not present: Steve Winess

will work on a white paper to DOE Project Managers. The purpose is to show DOE that additional work may be necessary to meet NRDA needs beyond meeting response needs.

### NOAA Role

write a "finding" and make it NOAA specific.

\* Larry Goldstein will write the finding.

### NEPA

Appropriate for council to work in the NEPA world.

Some Trustees feel that it is not, while others feel that it is. Many reasons why each way.

### 2012 Budget

- Need to be timely and efficient.
- Do not get left behind.
- Project Coordinator will need to work a budget.
- Needs to be done immediately
- Paul, Jay, Paris is a working group for \*Steve Warner, Barb, & this activity \*Callie. Baselining

\*\* Steve & Callie will set up a meeting

- 2 or 3 budget alternatives.
- Baselineing.

Break

10:45- Tank Closure & Waste Management FIS

Handout by  
Mary Beth Burandt

2003 on tanks, close SST  
at same time solid waste FIS 2004

[www.em.doe.gov](http://www.em.doe.gov)

Notice of Availability Oct 30, 2009

cumulative impacts are in  
Appendix: S, T, U, R

17 alternatives 2 options

Final EIS will state DOE's  
Preferred alternative

GW modeling will be transferred to  
RL - the site ~~that~~ EIC will be  
maintaining the model until transferred

User's Guide can help you find  
things in the EIS.

Lunch

TWG interaction with Contractor  
 Temporal → Dec 3, 1980 ~ 1981  
 Geographic → where contaminants came to be located  
 Species ~~list~~ lists  
 COC list  
 Terminology

Review of stratus final product

services concerns  
 stressors - generic terms

legal issues:

let technical staff frame issues then bring legal in. This also applies to technical issues... then bring in seniors.

TWGs & special costs

should a sum of money be set aside for the TWGs?  
 or  
 should we formulate a written path forward for the TWGs and what they might need.

All TWGs meeting:

Recommend 2nd week of February 2010  
 wed Heb Gw meeting  
 \* Feb 11th full day  
 • downstairs Room CIC  
 • upstairs Room CIC

Two resumes were brought in by NAVARRO  
Karen Crandall  
Keith Anderson

Neither one appears to have the background, experience needed to carry the job. It appears that Karen is a little better <sup>of</sup> "qualified."

Discussions about how to proceed since both candidates are weak.

- Janis write up rejection
- send out sow

may go out with FWS as a request for a coordinator and stay with NAVARRA too.

Break

Russ Talks on his experience

office space:

1. adjacent Fed JIC 24K
2. 1945 Theater renovated 25K
3. Bradley BLUD. 20K

\* Note: Take Russ & Jeff Skriet out on site for tour in early ~~Feb~~ December ~~or~~ or January. Take Larry Goldstein along.

Conference call minutes:  
Admin Record  
Ross MacRae background

Conference call minutes Oct 1980

action: DOE Motion ↑  
NP Second

Approved by consensus.

Russ on minutes

NRD Record  
Response Record

Russ: "makes sense to separate out"

Keep separate record makes sense - one  
lay on NRDA and one on  
response.

Russ will check with solicitor for advice  
on summaries & meeting notes.

\* Teresa: will send out annual Report  
form used at other locations.  
Format.

Concerns of "institutionalizing" the  
Council processes.

Dana needs Resolution Sign off sheets  
for the Admin Record.

other

Sturgeon and samples - disposition  
DOE will keep - YN, CTU/R  
would like samples.

concerns that DOE is not giving up  
sturgeon samples. Saldes  
will be here tomorrow to answer  
questions

11-19-2009

Trustee Council Meeting

Mandy Jones Ecology  
Laura Buelow EPA

Ecology/EPA update on 100/300 areas, POC & RI/FS

Handout by Laura showing Area, DOE POC, Regulations

Cole Lindsey ERDF

Handout

Note: Diversity component as part of BRMop  
as well as acreage

Hampden site completion strategy by Matt McCormick's group

comments due by Nov 30.

Trustee comment "over reliance on the clip"

New attendees:

Laura, Jill, Cole, Paula, Greg Hughes, Mandy Jones Ecology, Mike WCH

Issue is how to clean up the deep vadose zone.

As a 101 primer it seems that well but is lacking.

IGN: cumulative risk assessment for the Hanford site. This is some thing that has been requested over & over - long terms.

Break

Brian Chastoneau

Central Plateau cleanup strategy

Handout

Lower tiered document of The "Framework"

7COC besides Carbon Tet

40-60 feet deep is the usual limit of cleanup. There is contamination deeper but no decision on how to remove.

"Ecological Depth" is an area/document that Central Plateau would want input.

CP ERA

Jim Hansen,

Handouts - Jim reviews handouts

Brad sample (sp) assist CHPRC  
depth of bio intrusion

RC ERA

John Sanders, Larry Hulstrom

\* Need to get Habitat survey letter report from  
Larry Hulstrom.

Cr+6 15 to 112 ppb (10 ppb limit)

Larry reviews handouts to the trustees

Phase 2

Jennifer Knittel

GSA Interest announcement

IEC

JBR Environmental

Status

FBO for additional  
Fed business opportunity

NOV 30 Close

Solicitation out by Christmas

45 day response to solicitation since we have holidays.

Trustee call in Dec 21 could go over any new information from responders.

Boyd IT DOE can lease office space.