

Fax Sheet

0075163



e-mail: j_s_jena_lewinsohn@rl.gov

Fax: 509-376-7818

Phone: 509-373-9628

TO: *Hanford Natural Resource Trustees:*

Chris Burford	541-278-5380
Barbara Harper	509-943-8555
John Carleton	360-902-2938
Susan Coburn Hughs	503-373-7806
Jake Jakabosky	509-536-1275
Dan Landeen	208-843-7378
McConnaughey	509-736-3030
Tom O' Brien	503-231-6223
Geoff Tallent	360-407-7151
Jamie Zeisloft	509-376-7818

cc: Darci Teel, Fred Serier, Larry Gadbois

FROM Jena Lewinsohn

DATE April 3, 1998

SUBJECT Draft meeting minutes from the March NRTC meeting in Richland, March 12-13, 1998.

NO OF PAGES 9

Please review the Draft meeting minutes and provide **comments** to me
by **April 17, 1998**.

RECEIVED
JAN 11 2008**EDMC**

HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

March 12-13, 1998

Location: Atrium, Richland, Washington

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Geoff Tallent opened the March 12, 1998, meeting. Attendees: Chris Burford, John Carleton, Dan Landeen, Jena Lewinsohn, Jay McConnaughey, Tom O'Brien, Melanie Preusser, Geoff Tallent, Darci Teel, and Jamie Zeisloft.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

There were two revisions to the January minutes, which were then approved as revised.

AGENDA ITEMS

Jamie made recommendations to the agenda. A discussion ensued about the necessity of approving the agenda at the beginning of each NRTC meeting. The by-laws state, the chair sets the agenda and approval is a standing agenda item at NRTC meetings.

ACTION ITEM NOTE

Larry stated that there is a functional EPA BTAG (Biological Technical Advisory Group) in Region 10. They generally do not get involved in large Federal projects. However, they can get involved if warranted. Larry will continue to discuss potential involvement at Hanford and will update the Council as new information arises.

NORTH SLOPE DELETION

Dennis Faulk, EPA, updated the Council on the deletion of the North Slope NPL sites and rail station riverland area. Both areas were cleaned up under the 115 removal program. There were 39 100-IU-3 sites that were investigated with 3 sites on the NPL. The 2,4-D burial ground site made the news last year when contamination was found. The 2,4-D site was re-seeded with Hanford-derived native plants. The hope is to complete the deletion process by June of this year. The Council discussed when the statute of limitations starts on the North Slope in light of the fact that the 2,4-D site reopened the remedial process and that the North Slope is still a part of the 100 Area NPL. Jamie had a copy of an EPA memorandum, CERCLA Coordination with Natural Resource Trustees, which specifically addresses closeout reports and statute of limitations. He recommended the Council review the memorandum. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will be conducting a Level 3 Pre-acquisition Survey on the North Slope. Rick Roy has the lead on the Survey. This coming Monday, EPA and USFWS will meet to discuss the deletion process and the Pre-acquisition Survey. Jamie asked Tom why USFWS is conducting a Level 3 Survey on the North Slope when only a Level I Survey was conducted on ALE. Tom said that number of landfills (7) and amount of DDT found in the landfills, warranted the Level 3 survey for the North Slope. In addition, the USFWS did not feel the North Slope sites had been adequately sampled during the remedial investigations.

Barb Harper asked about DOE's plans to excess the North Slope. Jamie stated that due to the location of the reactor buildings and the need for a K basin buffer area, there are no plans to excess in the foreseeable future. John said the tolling agreement needs to be in place before the deletion of the North Slope. Chris suggested that doing a PAS for the

North Slope might be a good approach. John said that, in this case, the better strategy might be to go forward on the tolling agreement. Having a tolling agreement would get the pressure off of writing a PAS in the very near future. If the Council considers doing a PAS on the North Slope due to the original closeout reports starting the statute of limitations, the Council would want to include the Survey results from USFWS. Chris warned not to misconceive the tolling agreement, since there is no way to estimate when it will be finalized. Chris' preference would be to continue work on the tolling agreement, without putting off other projects such as the PAS. The North Slope PAS should be easy to write because USFWS is doing an analysis and it is a distinct area.

ACTION: Chris, Geoff, Jamie, and Tom form a work group to look at the North Slope schedule and issues for the Council.

216-A-25 SAGEBRUSH PLANTING

Chris Kemp, BHI, discussed the Radiation Area Remedial Action (RARA) program's sagebrush planting on the emergency overflow of 216-A-25. RARA is within the S&M (surveillance and maintenance) projects, and is involved with remediating and maintaining a small portion of the S&M sites. 216-A-25 is just north of 200 East near Gable Mt. It was designed with overflow and emergency overflow areas to take clean water. Intermittent large amounts of water flowed into 216-A-25 in the 60s. Most of 216-A-25 consisted of cheatgrass; however, sagebrush had recolonized 1/3 hectare on the emergency overflow area. The latest radiation survey fly-over detected an anomaly at 216-A-25. The investigation found subsurface contamination of strontium and cesium. The decision was to leave the contamination in place for the interim while stabilizing the site with 1' rock and 1' sand. Tribal members requested that sagebrush be planted as not to impair the view from Gable Mt. The stabilized area was re-seeded with Sandberg's bluegrass and 1,000 sagebrush tublings were planted across 5,000 ha. Planting with Sandberg's is a new practice on interim stabilization sites. The typical practice would have been to re-seed with crested wheatgrass, but now there is a supply of native Sandberg's bluegrass. The bluegrass was planted at the end of September 1997, with the tublings planted in mid-February, 1998.

Jamie stated that RARA is a DOE self-directed program. Larry said that this is a CERCLA past practice site. However, since no CERCLA decision documents have been written, this site is not within the CERCLA process. Jamie said that this is an interim action but it could become final, with no additional disturbance. Chris asked if RARA received any follow up letters from the Tribes. Geoff thought the Trustees should express their gratitude for the project. John said that the Tribes might want to check to make sure the people who requested the revegetation are happy with the results.

ACTION: Chris - draft a letter of commendation for 216-A-25 revegetation efforts.

N-AREA DECISION PACKAGE & COMMENT PERIOD

David Olson, DOE, Phil Staats, Ecology, and Basu Mukherjee, BHI, introduced the five N-Area decision documents sent to each voting representative on the Council. Dave reviewed the schedule and the list of alternatives for decision in the handout packet. He stated DOE's desire to look at the shoreline as a separate waste site. Dave stated that N-springs is under CERCLA documentation. There will be 3 separate decisions, each having a corresponding CERCLA and RCRA counterpart. All N-Area sites are RCRA past practice sites; however, these were integrated with CERCLA because of the

radionuclides involved and the need to dispose of the waste in ERDF. The Corrective Measures Study (CMS) incorporates the I&I impacts for each alternative. Phil said that the RODs will be interim because a baseline risk assessment has not been done which is required before a ROD can be finalized. The existing pump and treat will be maintained for the next five years. During that time, technologies will be reviewed for a final remedy. Groundwater monitoring will continue under CERCLA and RCRA. Dave pointed out the TSD locations and the preferred alternatives for highly contaminated areas. The preferred alternatives are consistent with the other 100 Area RODs with a complete removal of structures and then cleanup. The proposed start date for cleanup is July of 2000. Initially, S&M will be performed on the 52 facilities until D&D is executed. The debris from D&D will be disposed on at ERDF.

Chris asked if N-Area will remain off limits. David stated that DOE was not looking at any long-term controls. The residential scenario will drive cleanup. The only decision to be made is what will happen along the River. Larry said there will probably be some restrictions to drilling. Jamie asked if Dave expects to see improvement in groundwater quality. David stated that it depends upon how much contamination remains at the excavation limit. David said DOE has invited the Tribes and different state agencies to participate in a workshop to establish what should be done with the groundwater.

ACTION: Schedule a conference call in 1 month to share ideas and comments that are appropriate for the NRTC.

100 AREA WORKGROUP REPORT

The Council discussed Resolution 97-02 and reached agreement on the changes. Geoff wants to make sure people do not have a problem with the planning of the injury studies. No study will be developed that DOE cannot afford to implement. This approach is procedurally different than before since it is not a formal damage assessment. There is no reference to a PAS in the resolution.

Jamie stated that he visited the lab in Jackson, WY. Dan Audet will be there next week to discuss with Dan Woodward what synergistic effects might arise from other contaminants on chromium toxicity, as well as avoidance, habitat assessment and food chain studies.

The last 100 Area work group meeting took place on March 3. USFWS toured the site. Primary and secondary goals of the study were established and discussed. Jamie said that the QA/QC USFWS follows, meets what is stated in section 11.31 of the regulations. Larry said that the standards are actually more stringent than the ones Hanford follows.

The first study plan, the HR-3 KR-4 study plan (chromium study), is due for NRTC review on June 11. The timeline for review of both the Assessment Plan and the first study plan was discussed. It was decided that the Council would benefit by reviewing both documents at once, while providing members more time for review. Comments on the study plan need to have a quick turnaround so work can commence as planned. The next 100 Area work group meeting is in Spokane, March 31, where USFWS will discuss the conceptual design for the study plan. It will be important to get concurrence on the design from the work group.

Jamie stated that John Stang, Tri-City Herald, has requested an interview with him on the NRTC river study. Chris asked if someone else could attend since the Herald has a strong editorial standpoint. The interview will probably be sometime next week.

ACTION: Geoff will finalize Resolution 97-02 and send it to Trustees.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Darci discussed the issue of NRTC administrative support that needs to be compatible with the by-laws. Melanie is scheduled for 40 hours per month to work on trustee issues, but is spending closer to 80 hours per month on NRTC secretarial duties. Council members are asking for more of Melanie's time than necessary. Everyone needs to improve when it comes to requesting information, scheduling meetings, sending out faxes, etc. Priorities will now be reviewed with Darci to decide how to remain within the budgeted 40 hours per month. In regard to workgroup meetings and additional travel, the Council needs to review alternate ways to take minutes. Jamie stated that there are decisions being made in workgroup meetings that need to be recorded. The bottom line is not to exceed the forty hours per month. Chris asked if he could see the Administrative Record information and how it is put together. That would be a good agenda item for next meeting. Geoff said that everyone should be sensitive to time usage. He feels that making the meetings happen is the most important role of the administrative secretary.

ACTION: Geoff - add administrative record database to the May agenda.

BRMaP/BRMiS COMMENT LETTER

Jay focused on the BRMaP/BRMiS comment letter he drafted on behalf of the work group. Jay would like to try to establish some ongoing meetings between the work group and Dana Ward. During a series of conference calls, the work group discussed the documents and put together a list of 12 items of concern. One key issue is the comment period and finalization of the documents. Trustees were allowed to comment on the 1994 draft document; however, no official notice was sent out stating a request for comments on the latest working drafts. Jay requested that DOE send an official letter requesting comments on the plan. Dana said that he still has not been able to get that mechanism (public review and comment incorporation) funded. Dana would like comments to come in; then if funding was established comments could be incorporated.

Chris said that the CTUIR met with Wagoner, DOE, and Hatch, FDNW, and discussed BRMaP. On both occasions, CTUIR representatives called out problems and kudos for the two documents. The problem is that it is still in draft form. These documents need to be finalized and funding established for their implementation. Chris suggested that two letters be written, one to Wagoner that requested finalization of BRMaP/BRMiS, and the other with comments on how to improve the documents. The completion of these documents is becoming essential to the completion of the HRA-EIS. Jay feels that politics have entered into this document as well, i.e., writing off areas for mitigation because of economic development. Dana said the ideal is to make BRMAP a policy document rather than a guidance document. But, he had enough trouble getting the document out as guidance. Jamie said DOE's primary mission is waste management and cleanup, and that DOE will not be able to get a policy document that interferes with that primary mission. Tom said that does not alleviate the responsibility to mitigate. Jamie said that RL's budget is insufficient to meet regulatory compliance. If BRMaP becomes

policy, it would be even more difficult to meet regulatory requirements. Jay stated that the work group would like to meet with Dana to resolve some of the issues.

ACTION - Chris and Jay draft a letter to John Wagoner expressing the need to fund completion of BRMaP and BRMiS.

TWRS PROJECT 519 STATUS

Bob Lober, DOE, discussed the path forward for mitigation. When he last met with the NRTC, Bob had presented the Council with a list of mitigation alternatives. Since then, he has worked with the Upland Committee to finalize the particular approach. Bob brought copies of the draft Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) for the Upland Committee to review. He would like comments by March 20, 1998.

The project has been successful in keeping impacts inside the fence. Rectification for the transmission line corridor will consist of seeding Sandberg's bluegrass and sagebrush. The compensatory mitigation ratio is higher than 1 to 1, and the planting density is higher than the BRMiS guidance. There is still room to consider a somewhat lower density for planting to gain more acreage. Bob also realizes that planting only sagebrush may not accomplish habitat goals. Lessons need to be learned from research with habitat quality in mind. Parameters for a study fit in with ALE's mission. Additionally, ALE is less expensive to mitigate due to labor issues. Bob cannot afford to do as much mitigation on Site. Tom was concerned that we are concentrating our mitigation areas on ALE to save money and avoiding the central plateau. Tom cautioned against ALE being an easy mitigation area. Projects on the central plateau need to be mitigated on the central plateau. Jay's theory is that projects should mitigate close to the impact area so the animals have a place to go. Geoff moved that everyone accept the ALE concept and that they keep open the opportunity to get information together on how to lower costs at Hanford.

W-112 PROJECT MITIGATION

Richard Roos presented the results of the mitigation project, which planted sagebrush tublings. Tublings can be planted at about 100 to 1 and need only about 3 to 5 years to achieve mature sagebrush. If put in a good location, they do well with uniform height reached in five to eight years. They start to assume the role of mature sagebrush in the first three to five years. Since extreme cold and drought slows down physiology of sagebrush, the project chose to plant in late summer/early fall. Sagebrush, given adequate moisture, will grow vigorously during the heat of the summer and roots grow down with the soil moisture profile. Finding 98-02, which recognizes the contractor and Waste Management for their efforts, was approved.

ERDF UPDATE

Darci said that on January 26, grubbing started for sites cells 3 and 4. The digging will commence at the end of the summer or early fall. Jay wanted to have a meeting with DOE prior to grubbing the site to document the habitat. Since the walkthrough did not occur that opportunity has now been lost. Darci stated that there are currently two other outstanding issues. There was some media coverage on a notice of violation from unlabeled IDW waste drums found in the area. That issue is being negotiated. Another issue is that a leak was found in the liner. Regulatory personnel and DOE are working to fix this problem. The Upland Committee needs to start the site selection process for the ERDF mitigation within the next month or so.

ACTION - Jamie start the process to involve Upland Committee on ERDF mitigation site selection.

1100 AREA UPDATE

The work group is reviewing the information document. Jena will incorporate the comments and then send it for full Council review. Comments on the information documents are due from the work group by March 20, 1998. The next work group meeting for the PAS is on March 23, 1998.

BY-LAWS MODIFICATION

Resolution 98-01 allows for modification of the by-laws. The proposed changes (1) extend the term of the chair and vice-chair for 1 year, (2) establish the vote for the vice-chair at the meeting prior to the expiration of the current chair's term, and (3) establishes a minimum number of votes for a quorum. By creating a minimum number of votes, this would force trustees to take action and not rely on the no-show abstention. A vote from at least four of the trustee organization is required for a majority with no more than 3 abstentions. The NRTC can take no formal action if there are any objections, or if more than half of the Trustees abstain. The fourth amendment changes the term working group to work group.

GENERAL UPDATES

Geoff asked if people want to schedule any meetings past May at this time. Jamie suggested we should look at the draft schedule for the assessment plan to schedule future meetings. Jamie suggested August in Portland was a good meeting time/location.

PR Status – Geoff updated the Council on PR issues. Geoff spoke with Guy Shine of DOE External Affairs on PR ideas for the Council. Guy suggested that to attract attention, the Council should create an event or present an award. The other idea was to apply for an Al Gore Hammer Award for process improvements within DOE. The Council discussed putting an article in the Hanford Reach. Jamie said there is an opportunity to work with a national student council group in early October. He has recommended that the student council group help with the revegetation effort up on ALE. It would also be an opportunity to educate the students and the media that there is a lot more to Hanford than tanks and waste issues.

ACTION: Jamie will pursue the student council involvement for ALE. Check out revegetation and weed control as possible involvement activities.

Webpage – The NRTC homepage is now linked to the Hanford Homepage. Geoff asked that if anyone is aware of possible links to other NRTC homepages, please let him know. Also, the feature section of the webpage needs to be updated. There has been a cut in Ecology's computer support to maintain the NRTC homepage. Jamie stated that if Geoff has a problem managing the homepage, it could always be turned over to DOE to maintain. Approval would still be through the Council; technical implementation is all the DOE people would do. Jamie said that a committee should sit down every six months and review the webpage status.

Native Seed Contracts - Darci stated that BHI has two subcontracts, one with the Nez Perce and one with CTUIR. BHI is trying to create additional resources and options for

native seed. The Nez Perce contract includes oral histories of native plants from the elders. When they reviewed the revegetation manual, the Nez Perce identified this as a data gap. The CTUIR contract is being finalized, and will get them up and running to grow a diversity of native seed. This effort should benefit all of the contractors at Hanford. The CTUIR is also contracted to grow 10,000 sagebrush for the ERDF mitigation. Larry asked if it was an 88 contract. If so, the federal government would come in and help set up the infrastructure. Jamie stated that he had heard from the Indian Nations program within DOE that the 88 status was not agreeable to the Tribes. Chris thought the hold up was over the sovereignty issue.

Tolling Agreement - A lot of work has been done on the tolling agreement. Chris wrote a lengthy memo to other trustee attorneys, aside from DOE, to get input. When that is done, Chris will bring DOE in.

Congressional Record Correction - Chris said that it is too late to do anything about this issue since the report was submitted in February of last year. In the future, the Council should send a letter immediately. Jamie stated that the bigger issue is the misconception of how things are. Geoff said he still wants to have a meeting of the trustee representatives from across the country. Chris asked if the DOE meeting each year could send one non-DOE representative. Jamie will try to get a better read at the meeting at Fernald this year. Jamie liked the idea of bringing along another trustee representative.

Moniz Visit - Geoff told the Council that he was not able to speak with Undersecretary Moniz during his visit to Hanford.

Finding 98-03 - Geoff passed out Finding 98-03 on the Alm policy. Geoff will set up a conference call in two week to take any comments on the finding.

100 AREA AQUIFER SAMPLING RESULTS

Arlene Tortoso, DOE, and Bob Peterson, CH2M Hill, presented the results of the aquifer tube sampling effort completed last fall. The project did not complete all the tubes they set out to install. The report that summarizes the results was sent to all of the 100 Area work group members and Arlene passed out extra copies. Bob emphasized the usefulness of the sampling tubes for other project efforts. Results from this project gave them a better idea of the unconfined aquifer in the sampling areas.

GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT UPDATE

Rich Holten, DOE, and Steve Foelber, BHI, presented an update on the groundwater/vadose zone integration project. BHI has submitted a rough draft plan for the plan which RL and HQ are reviewing. Although HQ has requested the plan not be released at this time, Rich offered to review the plan with any interested trustee. The plan deals with the project management and is not really technical. BHI was selected as the integrating contractor because they have good project management skills and experience. In the near term, a team is being put together that includes DOE, TWRS, BHI, PHMC, and PNNL. BHI has been interviewing interested stakeholders, regulators, and Tribal Nations to see how they want to be involved. The plan is looking at a two-phased approach. The first phase is to list the existing projects and put on paper what projects are doing to-date. The team will then develop a list of issues and data gaps. This first phase should be completed by June. The second phase will be to bring in experts that will work on a groundwater model. Doug Hildebrand is the contact on that if you are interested. Rich

stated that the team is looking at integrating these activities with projects that have TPA milestones. It is an approach that might assure funding.

COMPOSITE ANALYSIS

This analysis is driven by DOE order 5280. The analysis is a human health risk assessment of low-level waste in the 200 area. The starting point is the year 2050, modeling out from that point. Larry said the analysis makes several assumptions including that the tanks are pumped out and only 1 % is left. The analysis does not include the canyon buildings, high-level waste, or chemicals. It is really a sketch of what is expected and is very limited. Jay asked if a Phase II of the analysis is expected.

ACTION: Jamie will find out if there is a Phase II planned for the Composite Analysis.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting is scheduled in Spokane for May 21st and 22nd.

ACTION: Melanie schedule room for next meeting.