

**Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council  
Lowell, Idaho 2005 Meeting  
Agenda**

**Attendees:** Horace Axtell, Brooklyn Baptiste, Gabe Bohnee, Dan Landeen, Sandra Lilligren, Don Steffek, Paul Shaffer, Susan Hughes, Jay McConnaughey, Barbara Harper, Steve Wisness, Dana Ward, Jim Rasmussen, Roger Dirkes, Jamie Zeisloft, Lauri Vigue, Larry Goldstein, Mary Baker, John Price, Beth Rochette, Larry Gadbois, Dee Willis

**Tentative:** Stuart Harris, Rico Cruz

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
<b>September 7</b>			
8:00-8:30	Welcome	Larry	Business
	Announcements	All	
	Change of Chair	Don	
	May meeting minutes	Dana	Approval
	Action items review	Roger	Update
8:30-9:30	Nez Perce Presentation	Dan, Nez Perce Elders	Tribal history
9:30-9:45	Break		
9:45-10:30	Tri-Party 2006-07 Milestones	John P., Larry Gadbois, Jamie Z.	Information
10:30-12:00	Strategic planning – Council priorities	Larry, Dee All	Decision
12:00-1:15	Lunch		
1:15-3:00	Strategic planning – Council priorities	Dee All	Decision
3:00-4:30	Reference Sites	Paul, Jay Dee	Approve Finding 05-01, Cover letter
Adjourn			
6:00	Dinner		

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 03 2007

**EDMC**

## September 8

8:00-9:30	Working together Continuation of 8/10 discussion What do we want to change?	Larry, Dee	Understanding/ Collaboration
9:30-9:45	Break, check-out	All	
9:45-11:30	Data Gap Analysis Ridolfi Report	Callie All	Next steps
	Chromium plume status	Jamie	Next steps
11:30-11:45	Administrative support	Steve	Information
11:45-12:00	FY '07 Hanford budget	Steve	Information
12:00-12:15	Review new action items Schedule winter meeting	Larry	Agreement

Adjourn

**Natural Resource Trustee Council  
Meeting Summary  
September 7-8, 2005  
Lowell, Idaho**

**Participants:**

<b><u>CTUIR</u></b>	<b><u>WDOE</u></b>
Barbara Harper	Larry Goldstein
Rico Cruz	John Price
	Beth Rochette
<b><u>NPT</u></b>	
Gabriel Bohnee	<b><u>WDFW</u></b>
Dan Landeen	Lauri Vigue
Horace Axtell	
Sandra Lilligren	<b><u>YN</u></b>
	Jay McConnaughey
<b><u>ODOE</u></b>	
Susan Hughs	<b><u>USDOE</u></b>
Paul Shaffer	Steve Wisness, RL
	Dana Ward, RL
<b><u>USFWS</u></b>	Jamie Zeisloft, RL
Don Steffeck	Jim Rasmussen, ORP
Dan Audet	
	<b><u>NOAA</u></b>
<b><u>USEPA</u></b>	Mary Baker
Larry Gadbois	
	<b><u>Others</u></b>
<b><u>DOE Contractors</u></b>	Tom Bowden, Ridolfi, Inc (NOAA )
Tom Marceau, WCH	Dee Willis, Columbia Energy & Env Services (WDOE)
Roger Dirkes, PNNL	

## September 7, 2005

### Welcome, Announcements & Previous Meeting Notes – Larry Goldstein:

Larry Goldstein opened the meeting, welcomed attendees, presented his goals for the year, and initiated introductions. There were no announcements brought to the table.

### Change of HNRTC Chair - All

The anticipated transfer of HNRTC Chair responsibilities from Don Steffek to Larry Goldstein was not approved. An 'objection' vote was submitted by the YN that, due to the consensus requirement in the by-laws, effectively stopped the transfer of responsibilities. The YN expressed concerns with the state of Washington having served in the chair capacity too often relative to other entities represented on the council and a desire to see the other Tribes take the role of council chair. Representatives for the Nez Perce Tribe and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation expressed an interest in taking on this responsibility in the future, however, present commitments did not allow them to take this role at this time, and they respectfully declined. The YN representative expressed a need to continue discussions with the prospective tribal representatives and identified another possible candidate (Dirk Dunning from Oregon) that may be acceptable to the YN but with whom he had not had a chance to talk to. The state of Oregon representative indicated that this was not likely to be a viable option. In order to proceed with the meeting, it was moved and seconded to move forward with Larry Goldstein as temporary chair, continue to work this issue, and set up a conference call to discuss further and vote. Motion carried. (ACTION # 82)

### Nez Perce Elder Presentation – Dan Landeen, Gabe Bohnee, and Horace Axtell

The floor was yielded to Horace Axtell, spiritual leader of the Nez Perce Tribe, who reflected on past life experiences ranging from a young boy growing up, to service in the Army and experiencing Hiroshima and Nagasaki, reuniting with his father, to the present and challenges that lay ahead with respect to Hanford issues and the Nez Perce Tribe. Of particular note was the impact of Hurricane Katrina, which reminded him of the devastation he witnessed in Japan, and the heartfelt sorrow he was feeling for the people suffering such great losses.

### May Meeting Summary - All

The meeting summary for the May 2005 HNRTC meeting was approved with 2 revisions noted that will be incorporated into the final document. June meeting summary was discussed briefly and comments requested for incorporation into the revision to be discussed in the November meeting.

### Review Action Item List – Roger Dirkes

Open action items, as described in the June 2005 meeting minutes, were reviewed and closed as warranted. Those items remaining open, as well as new actions items established during this meeting, are listed at the end of these minutes. DOE-RL reported that they were successful in obtaining a person to fulfill the HNRTC funding for the administrative support role, up to 0.25 FTE. Janine McKeever will be on board this month to provide support on HNRTC activities.

### Tri-Party 2006-2007 Milestones – Larry Gadbois, John Price, Jamie Zeisloft

A summary list of the FY 2006 and 2007 Tri-Party Agreement Milestones and Targets was provided to the Council. Larry Gadbois highlighted those that he felt were important for the Council to be aware of and likely opportunities for input by the Council into the process. In general, items including feasibility studies and remedial investigation reports were identified to be of interest to the HNRTC. It was determined that the list would be useful in prioritizing HNRTC concerns and in developing priorities. Milestones provided in the handout are also available on the Web. During discussions, it was suggested that EPA provide a brief status of the 200 Area Operable Units and ongoing activities at the next meeting. (ACTION # 67)

Jamie Zeisloft provided 2 handouts regarding Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) 1) their 'new' plan for work beginning in FY 2006, and 2) plans for work that was not included in the original contract. CERCLA Closure is included in the WCH contract. WCH invites the HNRTC to be a part of the closure process; Tom Marceau is point of contact, although inquiries are generally to be initiated through DOE. WCH is not lead for site risk integration activity, which is currently under the Configuration Management Group made up of representatives from DOE-RL, ORP, and HQ. Two action items were identified for the next HNRTC meeting, scheduled for November:

- WCH provide brief of current plans (ACTION # 68)
- Tri-Party discussion of CERCLA closure guidance document (ACTION # 69)

CERCLA 5-Year reviews are coming up, final due April, 2006. John Price indicated that EPA and Ecology are more focused on clean-up to finish, while DOE focus is aligned with final RODs, closure, and NPL delisting of sites. A commitment was made to get copies of the 5-Year Review schedule and the last 5-Year review document, which covers all RODs currently in place. (ACTION # 70) The first review was not thought of highly by some trustees since the review is not based on sampling or confirmatory monitoring data. The 5-Year reviews are not a decision document but they do evaluate adequacy of clean-up and if different decision is needed, then it would go through the CERCLA process to change clean-up alternative.

### Announcement – Tom Marceau

Tom Marceau announced a meeting on the Columbia River Component of the Baseline Risk Assessment, on September 20, 2005 at the Clarion Inn, Richland. The data collection phase would be summarized and that phase of the project closed out.

Strategic Planning – Larry Goldstein, Dee Willis – September 7 & 8

This session was facilitated by Dee Willis. Notes were provided by Dee and are included at the end of these minutes to document this session. Action items identified during this session are included in the revised ACTION ITEMS list also included at the end of these minutes.

**September 8, 2005**

NPT Involvement – Dan Landeen

Dan provided a brief statement regarding past NPT involvement in the HNRTC itself and activities performed outside of HNRTC that were important to the council and the protection of the Site's natural resources. In response to YN's concerns that the NPT and CTUIR have not stepped to the plate and taken a role as Chair or Vice-Chair in the HNRTC, it was pointed out that the NPT led a number of HNRTC activities, such as the data gap workshop effort that helped get the 'matrix' off the ground, and were instrumental in the finalization of BRMaP. However, present circumstances preclude the NPT to take the chair position at this time.

FWS – Coeur d'Alene – Dan Audet

Dan presented a brief status of recent Coeur d'Alene NRDA actions and approach. The approach included remedial actions combined with restoration plans. EPA clean-up actions were okay, but may need to go further. There was also a reversal of a judgment on trusteeship that now specifies that the award is to be considered as a whole, not to specific trustees. The next step is the damage determination trial scheduled for January 2006. Dan offered to provide a brief to the HNRTC at the next council meeting. (ACTION# 83)

Reference Sites – Paul Shaffer, Jay McConnaughey

A brief status of Finding 05-01, Reference Sites, was provided. A few comments have been received and DOE comments will be distributed to the council electronically. (ACTION # 76) In addition, a conference call was scheduled for Monday, September 19, at 2:00pm to discuss rewording options in the finding as well as criteria to define the sites.

Data Matrix Analysis Update – Tom Bowden

Ridolfi staff continue to tabulate existing studies. To date, approximately 350 documents have been reviewed, with about 150 more identified for review. Emphasis has been placed on those documents pertaining to the river corridor and biological resources that may be pertinent to exposure assessments. There has been a number of documents of

interest identified that have yet to be located. A request has been provided to DOE for assistance in locating these documents. The reviews include compiling bibliographic information into spreadsheets that then will be transferred to the matrix. Tom Bowden will send out lists of documents that have been located, documents reviewed, documents to be reviewed, and bibliographic material. (ACTION # 77) The Data Matrix workshop will convene conference call to discuss information analysis and provide alternative alternatives on how council can proceed in data analysis and identifying data gaps from the information pulled together thus far. (ACTION # 77) Tom Marceau indicated that the CRBRA database will be put on the website, which has changed due to contract change. Tom will provide new web address to HNRTC. (ACTION # 78)

#### November HNRTC Meeting – All

It was suggested that there should be a one-day Trustee workshop prior to the November 16-17, 2005 meeting. November meetings will include Matrix Workshop on November 15, Chromium Issue information update the morning of November 16, and the HNRTC meeting the afternoon of November 16 thru the afternoon of November 17, 2005. (ACTION # 75) Steve Wisness and Dana Ward committed to provide address and phone number of Janine McKeever, new HNRTC administrative support person, to the council members. (ACTION # 79) Paul Shaffer requested work plans with schedules for the Central Plateau and the GW Protection activities. (ACTION # 80)

#### Chromium Plume Status – Jamie Zeisloft, John Price

An unknown chromium source has resulted in the observation of chromium levels in an aquifer tube located in the river near 100D at 100 ppb. This is of concern since the cleanup level is 10ppb. There are concerns that there may be problems in which 'purging' due to fluctuating river levels may be leaching chromium from the vadose zone, indicating the cleanup may need to go deeper. A 1/2 day workshop is planned for the November HNRTC meeting.

#### FY 07 Hanford Budget – Steve Wisness

As previously discussed the RL budget submittal to HQ included \$1.7M (in over target category) for trustee council support. The overall DOE budget submittal will go from the DOE controller to the OMB in the next few weeks and back to DOE during the November time frame. We should know final numbers for FY07 President's budget request sometime this spring. FY 2006, currently at about \$877M, is shaping up to be a tough year, given likely cuts to account for Hurricane Katrina and the war in Iraq. It is almost assured that FY06 will begin under a continuing resolution. RL has identified \$250K in 2006 for the HNRTC.

#### Meeting Wrap-up – Larry Goldstein

Emphasis was placed on making progress on the 5 action plans from each of the subcommittees identified during the strategy sessions. A target date for draft action plans

to the council members for review was set for October 14, 2005 with the desire to have revised drafts ready for discussion during the November meeting. Dee Willis will get his typed notes to Larry Goldstein by COB September 13, 2005. (ACTION # 81) While there was much accomplished, it is anticipated that the following items will be completed during this annual strategy development meeting. Larry Goldstein will lead a session that will highlight the following items:

**ACTION ITEMS FROM 9/7-8/05 HNRTC  
MEETING**

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
2	a) Update general information on... b) Review update, comment to... c) General Review by Trustees, comment to DWard d) Add ERA participation and link to BIII ERA website – J. Zeisloft ACTION: HNRTC - All	5/25/05 5/25/05 9/7/05	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"> <li>• Mailing list provided to Trustees 12/1/04</li> <li>• Mary Baker (NOAA) added</li> <li>• Update information due to D.Ward ASAP</li> <li>• Addition of Paul Shaffer</li> <li>• Provide copies at next HNRTC meeting</li> <li>• NOAA support print file – continue status</li> <li>• Email list to members</li> <li>• Routine update at HNRTC meetings</li> </ul> ACTION: Dana Ward	9/8/04  12/1/04 12/1/04 12/1/04 2/23/05 2/23/05 5/25/05 9/7/05 9/7/05	Ongoing  Done done Updated Done Done Done
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"> <li>• Discussed in 12/1/04 meeting; attorneys should work together to review/rework MOA</li> <li>• Legal working – D. Steffek get status from FWS legal</li> <li>• Status at HNRTC meetings</li> </ul>	9/8/04  12/1/04, 2/23/05  5/25/05 9/7/05	Ongoing
30.	Provide Ray (Austin) Johnson biological database electronically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm completion</li> <li>• Confirm completion – D. Ward</li> <li>• Obtain CD of last update</li> </ul> ACTION: D. Ward	12/2/04  2/23/05 5/25/05 9/7/05	Ongoing
50.	300 Area End State a) 300FF5 review schedule requested – electronically to Trustees, hard copy to YN b) RL plans to discus (consult) separately with YN ACTION: S. Wisness, J. Sands	5/25/05, 9/7/05  5/25/05	Ongoing  Done
52.	Forward May 26, 2005 ERWG meeting summary notes ACTION: D.Steffek	5/25/05, 9/7/05	Ongoing
61.	Provide 300FF1 Remedial Action Report to HNRTC Action: J. Zeisloft	6/30/05, 9/7/05	Ongoing

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
62.	Integration Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft position paper on how council members will represent HNRTC in working group</li> </ul> ACTION: D. Steffeck	9/20/05 9/7/05	On going
67.	200 Area OU brief and status at November HNRTC Mtg ACTION: L. Gadbois	9/7/05	
68.	WCH brief on strategy/plans at November HNRTC Mtg ACTION: J. Zeisloft	9/7/05	
69.	Provide CERCLA closure guidance document and brief at November HNRTC Mtg ACTION: J. Zeisloft	9/7/05	
70.	CERCLA 5-year reviews a) Provide current 5-yr review document, w/schedule to members b) Provide CD of last 5-yr review to members ACTION: S. Wisness	9/7/05 9/7/05	
71.	HNRTC Strategic Planning Action Plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How we govern ourselves: S. Hughs, B. Harper, D. Ward</li> <li>Timeliness, effective, having an impact: P. Shaffer, M. Baker, S. Wisness (RL support)</li> <li>Budget/Resources: L. Goldstein, D. Steffeck, J. Price, S. Wisness</li> <li>Strategy and Priorities: P. Shaffer, L. Gadbois</li> <li>NRDA and Integration: D. Landeen, J. McConnaughey, L. Vigue, B. Harper, D. Steffeck</li> </ul> a) Conference call September 29 @ 10:00am b) Draft Action Plans for November Mtg to council members for review by October 14 ACTION: a) S. Hughs b) Team Leads	9/7/05 9/7/05	
72.	Governor's Conf call questionnaire – provide 17 questions w/answers to members ACTION: S. Wisness, L. Goldstein	9/7/05	
73.	Provide DOE guide on what to look for in 5-yr review to members ACTION: S. Wisness	9/8/05	
74.	Provide DOE Institutional Control (IC) plan to members ACTION: S. Wisness	9/8/05	
75.	Workshop on state of Cr in the environment tied in with November HNRTC meeting (November 16 am) ACTION: J. Zeisloft	9/8/05	
76.	Reference Site Finding a) final comments to P. Shaffer b) DOE comments to trustees electronically	9/8/05 9/8/05	

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	c) Conference call, September 19 @ 2:00 pm ACTION: a) HNRTC; b) S. Wisness; C) P. Shaffer	9/8/05	
77	Data Gap Database: a) document lists of all documents in database, those reviewed to date, and those to be reviewed to be provided to HNRTC members b) data gap work group to provide recommendations on alternatives for data analysis (workshop, etc) c) Workshop prior to November Meeting (Nov 15) ACTIONS: a) T. Bowden; b) D. Landeen; c) HNRTC	9/8/05 9/8/05 9/8/05	
78.	New WCH web site for River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessments to be provided to HNRTC ACTION: T. Marceau	9/8/05	
79.	Provide phone number and email address for Janine McKeever (admin support) to members ACTION: S. Wisness	9/8/05	
80.	Provide work plan schedules for CP and GW Remediation to trustees ACTION: S. Wisness	9/8/05	
81.	Strategic planning work notes to L. Goldstein and onto council members week of 9/12-16/05, to be included in meeting minutes ACTION: D. Willis	9/8/05	
82.	Conference call to discuss and resolve issues on transfer of chair responsibilities. ACTION: J. McConnaughey, S. Wisness	9/7/05	
83.	Status of Coeur d'Alene NRDA/Trustee Actions – Brief at November HNRTC meeting ACTION: Dan Audet	9/8/05	

I. NRTC Challenges In Next 12-18 Months (First Day) – Dee Willis

• **Step 1: Brainstormed suggestions:**

- Financial support for the NRTC
- **Integration of risk assessments**
- Workload planning and priorities
- Become more effective among ourselves
- Focus (on specific tasks) or do everything
- Develop a strategy for NRDA (do we accept DOE's approach?)
- Timely decisions vs. consensus (consensus undermines timeliness)
- Incorporate injury assessments into risk assessments (timeframe is an issue)
- Participate in cleanup decision document reviews
- How do we participate in the ecological risk assessment process?
- Restoration of injured resources
- Getting our recommendations integrated into ongoing DOE work
- Better understanding of the DOE portion of CERCLA and site contracting
- Having our comments and letters taken seriously
- Achieve a better understanding of data already generated and available
- Get DOE to more effectively make "space" for the NRTC to contribute (NRTC needs to be proactively involved)
- We need to change the status quo which has us coming in too late with comments; we need more integrity in our role
- Work with DOE early on the FY '08 budget
- Show the trustees accurately the impacts they are having; we need to recognize our successes and create incentives for improvement
- Create opportunities to revisit DOE decisions
- Need to move forward despite lawsuits
- Stay positive and develop trust
- Bring closure to technical issues
- Know what's coming and schedule for it
- Get senior managements involved in NRTC issues

• **Step 2: Grouping the brainstormed suggestions into "issues"**

1. Creating feedback loops, revisiting decisions, showing trustees their effectiveness
2. Moving forward recognizing the reality of lawsuits
3. How we govern ourselves
4. Earlier and proactive involvement, timely decisions, closure on issues (senior management involvement)
5. Integration of risk, injury, and restoration; develop an approach to NRDA strategy
6. Resources and budget for the NRTC
7. Information management
8. Setting NRTC strategies and priorities (focus or stay broad?) and council effectiveness

• **Step 3: Prioritizing "issues" for action planning:**

**(in order of priority by votes of workshop participants)**

- ✓ How we govern ourselves
- ✓ Earlier and proactive involvement, timely decisions, closure on issues (15 votes combined)
- ✓ Resources and budget for the NRTC (7 votes)
- ✓ Setting NRTC strategies and priorities (focus or stay broad?) and council effectiveness (7 votes)
- ✓ Integration of risk, injury, and restoration; develop an approach to NRDA strategy (6 votes)

NOTE: The Yakama Nation representative raised an issue of process (i.e., parity) and used an example of the state of Washington casting 3 votes to the YN's one vote.

- **Step 4: Action plan guidance**

How we govern ourselves

- Define institutional strategies and goals
- Review the by-laws and the MOA
  - Identify the issues in the by-laws
  - De-link the MOA and the by-laws
  - Recommend changes
- Recommend and reach agreement on a decision making process
  - Consider a less formal process
  - Simplify it
  - Define what decision closure is and stick with it
  - Make it a "graded" approach
- Define the decision latitude of members
- Consider differing responsibilities and "areas of interest"
- Consider what kind of training is required (team training or institutional collaboration)
  - consider an interest-based collaborative process
- Define "signature authorities"; what officers can decide
- Define "trust" as it relates to the NRTC
- Define what makes the NRTC effective

(action plan writers: Dana, Susan [chair], Barb, Lauri)

Integration of risk, injury, and restoration; develop an approach to NRDA strategy

- Address possible responses:
  - Sitewide risk
  - Integration of injury with risk
  - NRDA strategy (define it now or wait?, wrestle with pieces of it or the whole thing, focus on restoration or NRDA process?)
  - Need for a site wide tolling agreement

- Define “integration” and “cumulative”
- Define a strategy for CERCLA closure at Hanford plus a statute of limitations
- Check on whether we need to cooperate with other sites’ trustees: can we learn from other sites?
- Get DOE’s draft answers to the “17 questions”  
(action plan writers: Jay, Dan Landeen [chair], Barb, Lauri, Don)

#### Strategy and Priorities

- Poll the council members and find out their “end state” goals
- What is the role of the NRTC?
- Focus on strategy first, and then priorities
- Prepare a strategic plan
  - What do we expect out of cleanup?
  - What’s the common ground among us?
  - Identifies alternative strategies and their pro’s and con’s
  - How do we establish and rank priorities?
- Ask the Tri-Parties what their cleanup strategies are: focus on their big picture(s): How protective of the environment do they intend to be? Are they just going to meet regulations and allow more residual contamination? (a series of conversations)
- What do your constituencies and governing statutes trust you to do?  
(action plan writers: Larry [chair] and Paul)

#### **D. Earlier and proactive involvement, timely decisions, closure on issues**

- Educate DOE and contractors’ project managers on need for collaboration with trustees
- Educate trustees on what project managers need so they can make focused comments: what is achievable?
- Investigate “what works” (rely on Nez Perce staff for help on this)
- Include all projects and programs in this approach (ORP)
- Include awareness of River Corridor Closure contractor incentives (20%)
- Find ways to take into account work schedules, deadlines, and milestones
- Consider ways to get trustees to participate in accelerate decision and cleanup processes
- Rule of thumb: six months lead time on documents  
(action plan writers: Mary, Paul [chair], Steve)

#### Resources and budget for the NRTC

- Find out what DOE expects of the trustees in an acceleration environment?
- How can we be sure that our views and comments will be taken seriously?
- Our work has to be something that can be supported
- Identify alternatives to adequate funding for the NRTC
- Ask DOE to us advice on funding alternatives: what will sell?
- Goal for FY ’08: get the NRTC funding request within the target level  
(action plan writers: Larry [chair], Don, Steve)

## II. Setting Priorities For Responding To Upcoming Hanford Work (Second Day)

### Step 1: Identify key TPA milestones and other relevant projects

- M-091-40L-012: burial ground sample results
- M-015-44B: 200-MW-1 OU feasibility study
- M-015-48B: 200-ZP-1 feasibility study
- M-016-72: 100/300 baseline risk assessment report
- M-045-58: corrective measures study
- M-45-60: RFI/CMS work plan for all SST WMA's
- M-016-70: sampling in 100/300 areas
- M-16-63: milestones for 300-FF-2
- M-15-043-C: 200-PW-2 OU feasibility study
- M-15-44A: 200-MW-1 remedial investigation report
- M-020-33: 216-A-10, etc., crib closure plans
- M-015-48A: 200-ZP-1 remedial investigation report
- 200-PO-1 work plan
- River Corridor Work Plan For A CERCLA Baseline Risk Assessment
- Five-Year Review (comment only)
- Composite Analysis (risk assessment)
- Tank Closure EIS
- Chromium (and other contaminants) plumes
- Columbia River Component Risk Assessment
- Other ongoing risk assessments
  - 100-B/C
  - 100/300 Areas
  - 100-NR-2
  - 300-FF-5
  - 200-Area Ecological Risk Assessment

### Step 2: DOE/Ecology/EPA representatives describe step 1 milestones and projects

- **M-15-44B:** (Product date: 10/06)
  - Whatever remedy is chosen, it may have long-term leachability consequences
  - Trustees need to get their concerns built into the feasibility study
  - The study will raise the question of restoration potential
  - Trustees need to get executive briefing from the project managers, but this will be relatively late in the process
- **M-091-40L-012:** (Product date: 9/06)
  - 200-area retrieval and treatment of LLW in burial grounds
  - involves carbon tet (not a priority)

- the wastes will be picked up and treated in any event
- **M-45-60:** (Product date: 9/07)
  - This is a *big thing*
  - This is about SST piping, foundations, etc.
  - About leachable contaminants
  - 5-15 year horizon for this work
  - Planning for this is going on right now
  - Trustees have never gotten involved much in this work
- **Ground Water Operable Units:** (Product date: 4/06)
  - Big Thing
  - Nez Perce will take the initiative
- **Composite Analysis:** (Product date: ongoing)
  - Covers the entire inventory of contaminants at Hanford
  - Includes fate and transport analysis with and without remedies
  - (It presupposes and models potential remedies.)
  - It is basically a modeling effort and incredibly complex
  - Not for “dabbling”
  - It will go on for years; it’s schedule is not reliable
- **Tank Closure EIS:** (Product date: 6/06)
  - Will be comprehensive
  - Will include a quantitative cum analysis
  - Has some overlap with the Composite Analysis
  - Will be more comprehensive than the Composite Analysis
  - Will include a mass balance
  - It will be a decision document and is important for the trustees
  - The precursor document for closure plans
  - Will include gamut of alternatives from clean closure to leaving the wastes in place
  - Will have an ecological component
- **M-016-72:** (Product date: 6/07)
  - There may be subsequent phases of sampling after the report
  - It is important because it will form the main part of the 100/300 area final ROD
  - The Data Summary Report will be prior to the final risk assessment report
  - The trustees could use their action on this report to be a “pilot” for “being more effective”
  - Incorporate: M-016-070
- **Five-Year Review:** (Product date: 1/06)
  - Really important
  - Reviews all cleanup levels and options
  - Addresses the fundamental question: are we being protective?
  - Will include lots of information

- A shortcoming of the review is that it covers work that is still in process; no data has been collected for a long time on some projects
- This offers a prime opportunity to insert trustees' views
- This is a DOE effort and the regulators reserve the right to disagree with it
- Trustee comments can impact:
  - 300area (clean up to industrial standards?)
  - groundwater treatment
  - 100-B groundwater
  - additional site characterization
- The review probably will consider confirmatory monitoring
  
- **M-15-043-C:** (Product date: 4/06)
  - This feasibility study includes lots of waste sites (40-50 out of about 1,000 in the 200-area)
  - It comes earlier than other feasibility studies
  - Trustees need to get a briefing early on
  - Incorporate: M-020-33 and M-15-44A
  
- **River Corridor Work Plan for CERCLA Baseline Risk Assessment:** (Product date: 9/06)
  - Purpose is to find a way to roll up existing risk assessments to include groundwater plumes at the river's edge, source areas, etc.
  - Overall integration of existing risk assessments along the river
  - WCH is setting up a separate team
  - This effort is undefined; trustees need to get involved early, ask for a workshop
  - Clarification: this is a small sub set of overall risk assessment integration work
  
- **Chromium (and other contaminant) plumes that have reached the river:** (Product date: ongoing)
  - This is important
  - One possibility is to look at specific COPCs on a river corridor-wide basis
  - This needs a separate workshop presentation
  - We need to lay it all out in order to make decisions on how to move forward
  - Do a "data dump" first
  - Tie this work to trustees' previous comments on 100/300 areas SAP
  
- **M-045-58:** (Product date: 6/07)
  - Some of the work in this corrective measures study may already be "trumped"
  - Relatively lower priority
  
- **M-16-63:** (Product date: no date as yet)
  - Low priority
  - This is really about internal Tri-Party discussions
  - Procedural in nature; field work scheduling
  - This could become important if cleanup levels change

- **M-015-48B:** (Product date: 5/07)
  - This is the first feasibility study for groundwater
  - Involves a large plume of carbon tet; possible high concentrations at the river
  - Tri-Parties may not agree on this
  - Issue: how ambitious should this project be?
  - (Groundwater is a big integrator for all the risk assessments)
  - Issue: what are the other remedies besides pump-and-treat? What's our band-for-the-buck for pump-and-treat?
  - This will be an important document; there will be three more after this
  - Incorporate: M-015-48A (Product date: 5/06)

**Step 3: Criteria for Prioritizing Milestones and Projects**

1. Work already begun by the trustees has higher priority (example: 100/300 SAP)
2. Impact on available trustee resources
3. Can the work be folded into other work?
4. Potential magnitude of the (environmental) impact of the project/milestone
5. Can the work be undertaken and addressed effectively by individual trustees?
6. How well would the new work fit with, be consistent with, ongoing work?
7. Can the new work be completed with minimum effort?

**Step 4: Deciding What Milestones/Projects Should Get Priority Attention From the Trustees (assumption: ongoing work or work already begun by the NRTC will continue to completion)**

NOTE: The Oregon representative asked that each trustee confer within it's participants and cast only one vote per organization to obtain equality amongst members.

NOTE: The Yakama Nation representative informed the assembly that it refrained from voting since all the milestones listed were of importance to the tribe and that they all had the potential to impact the health and welfare of the Yakama people and treaty resources.

<u>Milestone/Project</u>	<u>Value Assigned By All Workshop Participants</u>	<u>Value Assigned By Voting Trustees</u>
<b>M-16-72 - 100/300 Areas Risk Assessment</b>	23	9
<b>Chromium (and other contaminant) plumes</b>	20	12
<b>River Corridor Work Plan for CERCLA Baseline Risk Assessment</b>	12	7
<b>Five-Year Review</b>	10	5

**M-015-48B – 200-ZP-1  
Feasibility Study**

**4**

**3**

**Tank Closure EIS**

**2**

**0**