

DRAFT AGENDA

HNRTC Meeting
September 8-9, 1999 – Three Rivers Resort
Lowell, Idaho

Wednesday, September 8, 1999:

- ✓~~9:00~~ Welcome and Introductions
- ✓~~9:00~~ Approve Agenda & Previous Meeting Minutes
- ✓~~9:00~~ Review Action Items
- ✓~~9:15~~ Announcements (All)
- ✓~~9:45~~ 100 Area Assessment Plan Update (Jamie Zeisloft)
- ✓~~10:15~~ Groundwater/Vadose Zone Update (Barbara Harper)
- ✓~~10:45~~ BREAK
- ✓~~11:00~~ Project W-519 Update/Status (Jamie Zeisloft)
- ✓~~11:30~~ LUNCH
- ✓~~1:00~~ Draft DDT/DDE Report (Jamie Zeisloft/Ken Gano)
- ✓~~2:00~~ Finalization of the 1100 Area PAS (Jamie Zeisloft)
- ✓~~2:30~~ BREAK
- ✓~~2:45~~ Tolling Agreement (Doug Mosich)
- ✓~~3:00~~ Annual Revegetation Report (Jamie Zeisloft/Ken Gano)
- ✓~~3:30~~ Occurrence Reporting Process (Ken Gano)
- ✓~~4:00~~ ADJOURN

Thursday, September 9, 1999:

- ✓~~8:45~~ Chromium Study Update (Jamie Zeisloft/Dan Audet)
- ✓~~9:45~~ Discussion on 100 Area Burial Ground FFS (Tom O'Brien)
- ✓~~10:15~~ BREAK
- ✓~~10:30~~ 200 Area Recommendations (200 Area Work Group)
- ✓~~11:00~~ BRMaP Update (Dan Landeen)
- 11:15 HAB/Council Visibility (All)
- ✓~~11:45~~ Schedule Future Meetings (All)
- 12:00 ADJOURN

RECEIVED
DEC 03 2007
EDMC

HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL
Meeting Minutes
September 8-9, 1999
Three Rivers Resort – Lowell, Idaho

Council Attendees:

John Carleton	Jenifer Linville
Teri Elzie	Jay McConnaughey
Larry Gadbois	Doug Mosich
Wendell Hannigan (Not Present)	Tom O'Brien
Barbara Harper	Preston Sleeper (Not Present)
Susan Hughs	Darci Teel
Nick Iadanza (Not Present)	JR Wilkinson (Not Present)
Jake Jakobosky	Jamie Zeisloft
Dan Landeen	

Presenters & Guests:

Dan Audet, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Ken Gano, Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
Lee Hoppis, Yakama Indian Nation
Bob Martin, Skyrunner's Corporation

Welcome and Introductions:

Susan welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made. Susan also thanked Dan Landeen for setting up the meeting and making the arrangements with the Three Rivers Resort.

Approval of Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes:

The current agenda was discussed and approved; the meeting minutes from the July meeting were approved as revised.

The action item list was reviewed and updated.

Announcements:

- Health of the Hanford Site Conference, November 2-3, 1999, in the Tri-Cities
- Wetlands and Remediation Conference, November 16-17, 1999, Salt Lake City, UT
- Jamie discussed the Memorandum of Agreement with DOE and the Office of River Protection and provided everyone with a handout.
- Jamie discussed the reorganization of DOE-RL and provided a draft organization chart to everyone.

- John Carleton announced that this would be his last Council meeting due to reorganization within his department. His position on the Council should be filled within a month.
- Susan thanked Jay for his time as Chair and presented him with a gift from the Council.

Action: Tom O'Brien – Find out when the next NRDA Training is (schedule and location).

Groundwater/Vadose Zone Update – Barbara Harper

Barbara provided the Council with an update on the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project (GW/VZ). She said that the CRCIA impact people are trying to use as many of the concepts as they can from the CRCIA document, and that it is turning into a composite analysis. Barbara said the conceptual model document (blueprint) will be out this fall, and this will show if the pieces are fitting together or not. Doug asked what the “endpoint” is for this project? Barbara said that that has not been nailed down. What they are going to produce and when, is still being developed. Jay asked if they are working on any potential studies to identify data gaps? Barbara said yes, they are working on identifying the gaps (??).

Action – Jamie: Find out about the SAC Habitats Document.

Occurrence Reporting Process – Ken Gano

Ken Gano gave a presentation to the Council on the process for reporting occurrences and provided handouts for everyone. He said there are 4 difference types of notification categories: emergencies, unusual occurrences, off-normal occurrence, and not-classified events. The last classification is a category specific to Hanford and was created in response to the PFP incident. Each classification has a timeline associated with it and a specific list of who gets notified and for what reason. Ken stated that there are many different categories, but that his presentation is focused on the environmental categories: radioactive releases, hazardous substances, and impacts to ecological resources. Ken provided a flow-chart showing the path to follow in reporting an occurrence. (Copies of the handout are filed with the meeting information).

Action: Tom O'Brien – See about putting Jeff Haas/Heidi Brunkal on an upcoming NRTC agenda to discuss weed management on ALE.

100 Area Assessment Plan – Jamie Zeisloft

Jamie discussed the two letters that were drafted to respond to the comments received on the 100 Area Assessment Plan during the public comment period. Copies of the draft letters, along with the comment responses were provided to the Council for review and comment. Tom O'Brien said that the Spokane USFWS office would like to have the final review of the document in order to update the endangered species information.

Suggested changes to the comment responses were provided to Jamie so that he can revise the responses before sending on to the commenters.

Project W-519 Update/Status – Jamie Zeisloft

Jamie provided an update on the W-519 Project. Jamie and the project went back out and looked at the sites that were discussed at the last meeting and made some adjustments. The Cold Creek sites were left as is; a few changes were made to the Gate 111 sites: some were shifted slightly and ~~a couple were added to the lower end of the site~~ one site was reduced in size; and in the burn area, one site was reduced and everything else was redirected to the alternate site.

Draft DDT/DDE Report – Jamie Zeisloft/Ken Gano

Ken Gano gave a presentation on DOE's results of the DDE issue on the North Slope. Copies of the draft report were handed out to the Council for review. Ken said that the numbers didn't change much from last year. One Meadowlark nest was found on the Horseshoe Landfill. The Control Site was estimated to be Horned lark territory, but nests were not detected. A Starling nest, a Magpie nest, a Kestrel nest, and an Owl's nest were found at the PSN-90 site, but no Meadowlark, Horned Lark, or Sagesparrow nests were found to sample. At the PSN-01 Site and the H-06-LE Site, there weren't as many insects available, so some traps were composited to provide adequate sample weights.

In conclusion, concentration numbers in insects were similar to the 1998 values; concentrations in bird eggs were lower than in 1998; no adverse effects on reproduction in passerine bird eggs (based on published date); and maximum number of affected birds can only be 1 to 2 pairs at any of the waste sites, therefore population level effects are not possible. Tom O'Brien said that it was just a repeat of the previous tests; and what we need to do is decide if we have a "trust" issue or not.

Dan Landeen stated that the Nez Perce have been working with BHI and DOE to go out to the North Slope and gather 20-25 additional samples in native vegetation. The Nez Perce will fund the analysis of the samples, and BHI will provide support and storage of the samples.

Action: Tom O'Brien – Have the two reports reviewed by experts (???), and see what their recommendations are based on the numbers.

Tolling Agreement – Doug Mosich

Doug said that the State of Washington has decided not to pursue a tolling agreement for the North Slope, and that the state would like to see a 'biological' response from USFWS. John Carleton said that he would like to see the USFWS come up with what they think are 'potential' impacts or injuries and can they justify the numbers focusing on injury, and do we need to follow up for NRDA.

Finalization of the 1100 Area PAS – Jamie Zeisloft

Jamie said that DOE, as a Trustee, is not comfortable with not fulfilling the responsibility to finish the 1100 Area Pre-Assessment Screen, and has made the determination not to do a damage assessment. The determination is based on: 1) the concentrations of DDE in the Horseshoe Landfill samples are low; 2) Horseshoe Landfill is small in size; and 3) the number of migratory birds potentially using the landfill site for nesting would be very small, maybe 2-3 pairs maximum. The determination is also based on the reasonable cost aspect of NRDA (i.e. the cost of the assessment would exceed to cost of the damages). Jamie said that it is time to make a determination and move forward with a damage assessment or put this item to bed, and DOE feels that it is time to put it to bed. ~~Jamie said that DOE is making the determination that there is not enough information to move forward with a damage assessment, and would like to put an end to this.~~ Tom O'Brien said that even though other agencies may not agree, is Jamie planning to do this anyway? Jamie said that he is speaking for DOE only. The other agencies are welcome to make their own determination. Jamie said that DOE will wait on the 100 Area to see what happens with the next round of sampling, but that a decision needs to be made on the 1100 Area because the Statute of Limitations has run out for some trustees and is running out for the tribes.

Tom O'Brien asked for a written announcement from DOE stating their position about not pursuing a damage assessment. Jamie stated that he would take that request under consideration. Barbara Harper agreed with Tom. Jay said that he finds it very disappointing on the part of the DOE to make this decision to go by themselves, and not help resolve this issue. Susan said that it could effect the trust the Trustees have in DOE since they are the agency that has the resources to continue the plans, etc. Tom said that DOE owes the Council an announcement, in writing, stating their place. ~~Jamie asked for a time limit, and~~ Jay asked why the 'urgency' after we (the Council) sat and waited for DOE to go and re-do the tests that USFWS had already done. DOE's analysis is that USFWS has blown the DDE issue way out of proportion.

Barbara Harper said that she would like to see the following: the Nez Perce results, an expert review of the data from Tom's contacts; a literature survey for new effects; and to give USFWS a chance to look at both reports (1998/1999) and review.

Doug would like to have the injury question answered, then he can decide whether or not to move forward. Jamie said that DOE agrees there could be injury, but not enough to justify doing a damage assessment.

Jamie said that it is not DOE's preference to operate as one Trustee and do this on their own, but they will if needed. They will do it at a slower, giving everyone a chance to gather more information, and decide whether or not their agency would continue with a damage assessment. The other trust agencies also have the option of making that determination and then coming to DOE for financial assistance. ~~Until that determination is made, DOE does not feel that there is enough information to go forward with a damage~~

~~assessment.~~ Tom reiterated his request to have that in writing from DOE. Jamie said they (DOE) is doing what a Trustee should do, we have a regulatory responsibility ~~and to~~ make a determination. Jamie said that it is not just an issue of can DDE cause injury, but can DDE cause injury at the Horseshoe landfill on the Hanford Site. He said that DOE will wait one month, because he would like to work with the other Trust organizations.

Action: Jamie – Set up a conference call with the Council to discuss finalization of the 1100 Area PAS.

Annual Revegetation Report – Jamie Zeisloft/Ken Gano

Ken Gano gave a presentation on the 1999 ERC Revegetation Monitoring. Ken said this is the 4th year that we have been monitoring revegetation success on the Hanford Site. Ken said cheatgrass does extremely well; it may or may not effect the native seed, but it will always be there. The sagebrush survival was really good at the ALE revegetation sites; 73,000 sagebrush seedlings (bareroot and tublings).

Bridge Overlook and PSN 72/82 sites are continuing to develop. PSN 12/14 bunchgrass recruitment is high but sagebrush has declined. North Slope Cheatgrass Area – sagebrush survival still high at 77%. 300 Area sagebrush survival 54%.

Ken said that on the Horn Rapids Landfill, from 1996 to 1999, wheatgrasses and cheatgrass have increased, but the russian thistle has declined. During the same three years at the Horseshoe Landfill, cheatgrass, sagebrush, and bunchgrass percentages are going up, while the russian thistle remains unchanged. Ken said the russian thistle didn't grow because everything else was coming in so well.

Thursday, September 9, 1999

Chromium Study Update – Dan Audet

Dan Audet of the USFWS provided everyone with an update on the Chromium Study. He said that during the Early Life Stage, swim-up started 30 days after exposure, and that exposure continued for 84 additional days. Once the exposure was discontinued, the fish continued to be monitored up to day 114. Dan said the analytical data came out very nice; egg hatchability 90-93.8%, and no chromium or high levels of chromium exposure. He said deformities were seen, but that it does not seem to correlate with exposure. Dan said it is too early to say whether or not chromium is or is not a problem, and it would be irresponsible to make that determination at this point. The big issues that still need to be addressed are weight and length. The people at the Columbia Lab are looking at the videotapes of the behavior. Dan said quantitative analysis is being done, but is not yet complete.

Dan said that during the Parr Health Study the exposure limits were 24 ppb and 54 ppb for 104 days. Limited signs of toxicology were seen at those exposures and no major effects, but they are still waiting for some of the chromium data to come back. Dan said after 104 days the 24 ppb treatment group was increased to 120 ppb and the 54 ppb was increased to 266 ppb for 29 days. This was done to validate chromium effects and to better interpret the on-site study since those are the numbers being used for the onsite study. Dan said the preliminary results of the 120 ppb and 266 ppb suggest mortality and gross pathology exist, but the full analysis is not complete.

So what does all this mean? Dan stated that nothing is conclusive right now. The exposure rate 120 ppb shows that there are problems, but we have yet to conduct the most sensitive chromium test – avoidance. However, it is also indicating that 120 ppb is a concentration that exists and is available to the Chinook, which can cause injury. Barbara asked if they would be running the whole concentration range? Dan Audet said the labs (Columbia and PNNL) are still discussing that. The avoidance testing will begin in 2000 and is the most sensitive test. Dan Audet said the avoidance testing was postponed until 2000 so that they (USFWS) don't have to rush. They want to make sure and use the correct fish (size, weight, etc.) and make sure it is done right. Ken Gano asked how the avoidance testing will be done? It will be done using a plume, forcing the fish to choose one side or the other, and based on concentration levels, will they make a choice. The avoidance work will be done at Columbia Lab, but the eggs will come from McNenny. Jamie said there will be two protocols for the Council to review: the Early Life Stage (Hanford) and the Avoidance (Columbia). The draft protocol for the Early Life Stage will be given to the Council on September 17, 1999, for review. Dan Audet said, the Avoidance protocol will not even be given to the Council until the Early Life Stage gets well underway. Jamie asked when the Council will see the Protocol for the Avoidance. Dan said sometime during the December/January timeframe.

Barbara asked how much we have spent and how much we have yet to spend? Dan said, to finish the fertilization would cost approximately, \$22.5K; avoidance \$121K; early life stage \$50K for (USGS/USFWS); and \$4K for modification to the Quality Assurance Plan. The onsite early life stage, total - \$196.5K plus PNNL costs for onsite early life stage. Jamie said the grand total for the Interagency Agreement is \$643K, and that you can add about \$150K for PNNL's work. Dan said for the November meeting, he will have the investigators come and give a full presentation to the Council. He will check possible dates with the others involved and get back to Teri to inform the Council.

The preliminary results are not complete, but what's being discussed as a cleanup level seems to be working. However, we have not yet done the avoidance work. By the end of the year we should have a good handle on Chromium effects on salmon in the Columbia River. Jamie asked if the results from the lab early life study will be available before we begin the Hanford early life study, and if they were still planning to use disease free eggs from Priest Rapids for early life stage. Dan said yes.

~~Jamie will send USFWS the file, in Word format, for them to do their final review, make any necessary changes, and then get the document issued.~~

Jamie asked about the NRDA training that is put on by the USFWS, and Dan said there isn't any NRDA training scheduled at this time. The basic NRDA course will probably be taught in the near future and he will let us know when/where. Dan said that the USFWS could put on a 'mini' damage assessment course specifically for the Council if there is enough interest. Everyone showed an interest in attending this type of course.

100 Area Burial Ground Focused Feasibility Study – Tom O'Brien

Tom said that he received the 100 Area Burial Ground Focused Feasibility Study from Preston, but was unable to comment during the time allotted. However, he would still like to have his comments documented. Tom said he thinks the document was picked up off the shelf in 1994 and reissued without being updated, and said it is the worst document he has ever reviewed. The information is inaccurate and outdated. Barbara said that she spoke to Dennis Faulk and he said "DOE has seen the light and the appropriate changes will be made." Larry said that if comments are received in the next three weeks, it would be considered 'very timely input.' The Tri-Party Agreement milestone is December 1999.

Larry said that EPA is cleaning up in the best possible way, exhuming the entire burial site, and they will exhume until they find 'clean'. The cleanup levels used could be a Trustee issue if the Council feels that the cleanup levels are not appropriate for the environment. Larry said the sites will then be revegetated. Jamie said the habitat was cleared out because of construction, and that DOE's position is that the loss of habitat is not because of a release so they do not need to compensate for that loss. If any additional habitat is lost because of cleanup, then they will compensate for those losses. Larry said the piece of the battle that EPA is fighting on this issue is for total exhuming of the burial grounds to MTCA cleanup levels. Jamie asked if EPA is considering containment at all? Larry said that EPA acknowledges that capping is a legitimate alternative for DOE to evaluate, but after a proper analysis, capping would not be appropriate for the preferred alternative.

Jamie said that because of the significant cost difference, DOE has opted to use both the remove, treat, and dispose (RTD) alternative and the containment alternative. If they find during initial RTD activities that containment would work, ~~then they would go that direction, but it will be based on what they find~~. DOE will then have the option of going to containment if it appears that containment might be adequate. Larry said there is no reasonable way to characterize a landfill without digging it up.

Action: Teri – Put this topic (100 Area Burial Ground FFS) on the November agenda.

BRMaP Update – Dan Landeen

Dan said he has been working with Dana Ward (DOE-RL) and some PNNL employees to get the BRMaP rewritten. A lot of changes have been made to the document, but most of them are minor. The biggest changes will be in the information based on the biological surveys the Nature Conservancy did over the past few years. The plan is to issue a cover letter and an attachment showing the updated maps and a summary of the changes made to the document. Dan said he will give review copies to the Council and whoever else would like one. It will be much less expensive to do it this way rather than issue a whole new document for review. The invitation will be made in the cover letter, 2-3 weeks will be allowed to review the changes, then a BRMaP workshop will be held to resolve any comments received. Following the workshop it will be given to DOE-RL for their review process and to become final. Dan said a rough draft should be ready by the middle of October.

Hanford Advisory Board/Council Visibility – All

Doug said that he thinks the Council needs more visibility with the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) but is not sure how to go about doing it. The suggestion was made to possibly having someone from the Council sit in on the HAB-ER committee, representing the NRTC. It was also suggested to make it a regular agenda item on the HAB-ER Committee agenda; and vice-versa for the Council meetings. Jamie agreed with getting someone on the HAB so that our voice will be heard, but also said it is a big commitment. Jamie said that the HAB drives policy at Hanford, and that cleanup standards at Hanford are based on human health, not the environment. Our concern is the environment. Dan Landeen suggested having an article in the Reach that identifies what exactly the Council is, who we are, what we do, etc. Doug said that whether or not we are on the committee, we should be on the agenda each month letting them know what it is we want.

This will be put on the agenda to discuss at a future meeting.

200 Area Recommendations – 200 Area Work Group

Jay said the 200 Area Work Group was formed after Tom Post visited the Council in March. The work group had a few conference calls and came up with five recommendations for ecological exposure/effects assessment of the 200 Area, which Jay provided to everyone in a letter. The work group consists of Jay, Dan, and Tom. Doug said that this would be a good way to discuss the biological issue and get it more prominently featured in the cleanup process. Revisions to the letter were provided to Jay, and he will revise the letter and get it back out to the work group. Larry said the big issue to communicate to EPA is cleanup levels. Larry said that this letter would help when developing cleanup levels, if it is not helping to develop cleanup levels, then it is not helpful to the EPA. Jamie asked if the cleanup standards for human health are enough for the environment.

Schedule Future Meetings:

The next meeting will be held December 1-2, 1999, at the Bureau of Land Management Office in Spokane, Washington.