

DRAFT AGENDA

HNRTC Meeting
March 15-16, 1999 – BLM Office
Spokane, Washington

RECEIVED
 DEC 03 2007

EDMC

Monday, March 15, 1999:

- ~~10:00~~ Welcome and Introductions
- ~~10:00~~ ✓ Approve Agenda & Previous Meeting Minutes
- ~~10:00~~ ✓ Review Action Items
- ~~10:15~~ Announcements (All)
- ~~10:30~~ ✓ Resolution 99-01 Status/ 100 Area Assessment Plan Public Meeting
 (decision needed on format, date, member participation) –
 (Jay McConnaughey/Doug Mosich/Bob Speed)
- ~~11:15~~ ✓ L&H Native Seed Contract Discussion – (Darci Teel)
- ~~11:45~~ ✓ LUNCH BREAK
- ~~1:15~~ ✓ USDOE's Analysis of the North Slope/ALE DDT Issue/Alternative Study
 Proposal – (Steve Weiss)
- ~~2:15~~ ✓ Outcome of the HNRTC/Tri-Party Meeting/ Finding 99-01 and Suggested
 Study Proposal (Recommendation/Clarification Needed) – (All in
 attendance at the February, 10, 1999, Meeting)
- ~~2:00~~ ✓ BREAK
- ~~3:10~~ ✓ Continuation of 2:15 Agenda Item
- ~~4:25~~ ? Tolling Agreement Status – (Doug Mosich/Jamie Zeisloft)
- ~~4:45~~ ✓ ADJOURN

Tuesday, March 16, 1999:

- ~~8:30~~ ✓ Location of May Council Meeting (Decision) – (All)
- ~~8:40~~ ✓ Chromium Study Update – (Dan Audet/Dan Woodward)
- ~~9:40~~ ✓ BREAK
- ~~9:50~~ ✓ DDT Study Proposal/Discussion of USFWS Role at the Hanford Site –
 (Dan Audet)
- ~~10:50~~ ✓ Geologic Source Site Update – (Jay McConnaughey)
- 11:10 Standing Agenda Items
 - Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project – (Barbara Harper/Jamie Zeisloft)
 - Web Site (Posting of 100 Area Assessment Plan) – (Web Site Comm.)
- 11:40 LUNCH BREAK
- 1:00 Council Round Table Discussion – (All)
 - Direction of Council
 - CERCLA Studies needed
 - Council Policy
 - Others
- 3:00 ADJOURN

may meeting - vice chair nominations/election

HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

March 15-16, 1999

BLM Office – Spokane, Washington

Attendees:

Dan Audet	Jay McConnaughey
Julie Campbell	Doug Mosich
John Carleton	Tom O'Brien
Teri Elzie	Preston Sleeper (Not Present)
Larry Gadbois	Darci Teel
Wendell Hannigan (Not Present)	Steve Weiss
Susan Hughs (Not Present)	JR Wilkinson (Not Present)
Nick Iadanza (Not Present)	Dan Woodward
Jake Jakabosky	Jamie Zeisloft
Dan Landeen	
Jenifer Linville	

Welcome and Introductions

Jay McConnaughey welcomed everyone to Spokane and thanked Jake Jakabosky for hosting the meeting.

Approval of Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

The agenda was approved after two items were switched due to the availability of presenters. The meeting minutes from the previous NRTC meeting were approved with the revised changes.

Review of Action Item List

The action item list was reviewed and updated.

Announcements

- National Marine Fisheries Service would be announcing the listing of six more species on the Endangered Species List, including the Upper Columbia River Chinook Salmon.
- Watchable Wildflowers Handbook, available from the BLM, Cost \$4.00.
- Jamie brought up Doc Hastings latest bill.

Geologic Source Site Update – Jay McConnaughey

Jay updated the Council on the Geologic Source Site letter and said that he had met with Paul Dunigan to discuss the draft letter. Jay said the letter currently focuses more on the needs for the 100 Area because they are more immediate than those in the 200 Area. He said there was some discussion of the pits being pre-Hanford and pre-NEPA and asked if there is a need to look at the pits in the 100 Area where backfill soil was obtained. Jay thought that an environmental assessment might be appropriate for the 100 Area sites. Paul said that a letter would help keep the item on the table. There was discussion on rewriting the letter with the focus being on the 100 Area for now, and the 200 Areas down the road. Barbara said there are many decisions that could be made now that effect current RI/FS projects and putting it off would not help. John suggested the letter be written to include the entire site, but the immediate emphasis could be on the 100 Area. Barbara said that it could reference that there is not currently enough fill available from existing borrow areas. Jamie said additional borrow area restoration costs may need to be built into the cost estimation models.

Action: Teri (Larry) – Have Tom Post on the next agenda to discuss implementation plans (??).

Action: Jamie/Darci – Get a map of all the borrow sites on the Site.

L&H Native Seed Contract Discussion – Darci Teel

Darci briefed the Council on the status of the subcontract with L&H Seed, Inc. She said the original subcontract asked for three acres of Sandberg's Bluegrass, one acre of Indian Rice Grass, and one acre of Needle and Thread. We are currently at a point where we have enough Sandberg's Bluegrass to support all of the ERC revegetation needs through 2001. Darci asked for input from the Council on where to go from here with the contract. Dan Landeen said there are a lot of places on the Hanford Site to use this seed, such as borrow sites, old disturbed sites, etc, and asked if ERDF is included in the revegetation plans through 2001. Darci said no, because ERDF will not even be ready for revegetation by then. Everyone agrees that we should keep the contract going and not let it go. Jamie said that we could pass the contract on to the PHMC or PNL, USFWS, and then in a couple of years they could pass it back; keep the contract going. Larry asked if the contract could be passed on to DOE, but Jamie said no. Jamie said that from a DOE perspective, they (DOE) would like a little contingency seed. It was asked how long the seed can be stored and will it still be good by 2001. Darci said that it would cost us more to have L&H store the seed for that length of time, and she does not want Bechtel to have to store the seed. Darci will proceed forward and look at options and update the Council at the next meeting.

Location of May Council Meeting – All

Due to overlapping meetings being held in Pendleton at the same time as the May Council meeting, it was decided to move the May meeting to the Tri-Cities. It will be

held at the Bechtel Building and will also include a tour of some of the revegetation sites. The meeting will be held all day on Thursday, May 13, 1999, and the tour will be ½ day Friday, May 14, 1999.

Action Item: Teri – Check on badges (renewing) for John Carleton and Tom O’Brien; schedule a conference room for the meeting, and schedule a van for the tour.

DOE’s Analysis of the North Slope/ALE DDT Issue/Alternative Study Proposal – Steve Weiss

Jamie provided some background information that led to the presentation given by Steve Weiss on DOE’s analysis of the DDT/DDE issue. Following the Tri-Party Meeting that was held on February 10, 1999, Jamie asked ERC to take a look at the DDT/DDE issue from DOE’s perspective. Steve’s presentation went over the initial sampling and the results presented in the August 1998 USFWS report, and the calculation method used. Barbara had some concern with the NRDA regulations, and when sampling, do you look at individuals or populations. Jamie said that NRDA says populations. There was discussion on the size of the feeding territories versus the “contaminated” areas. Steve said the contaminated area is equivalent or smaller than the areas that would be needed to feed the birds and they would run out of food and be expanding their feeding territories. Jamie said that one thing that needs to be done is to get out and look at the entire Horseshoe Landfill, not just the portion that has been remediated. Steve’s presentation ended with comparing the cost of the study vs. the potential for injury. Jamie said DOE’s position is that Horseshoe Landfill is not that big of a threat/problem because of the size of the site (0.4 ha). Dan Audet discussed the purpose of Rick Roy’s report and said that it was not done as a “risk assessment,” but for USFWS to decide if in the future they are asked to manage these sites, do they want to, knowing these problems exist.

Outcome of NRTC/Tri-Party Meeting/Finding 99-01 – All

Larry Gadbois discussed the February 10 meeting that was held in response to the Council's letter, specifically calling for three items to go forward with. Larry said the meeting came down to the first bullet in the letter, doing additional work. He said that it became clear that the issue was not whether they met the cleanup, but injury as a result of residual amounts of DDT/DDE. In summarizing the meeting, Jay said, the big issue was “to determine what it would take to reach closure on the issue.” The conclusion was to put out nest boxes and do a Starling bioassay, because a Starling will feed very close to its nest. Larry said you can actually track exactly what they are eating by putting on a constriction around the nestlings neck that causes the food to get stuck and then you can identify and measure what the nestlings are eating or being fed. Tom said that USFWS was asked by DOE if they would be interested in doing this work, and they said yes. Dan Audet said that the issues discussed at the meeting did not include participation from all

the Trustees, and before moving ahead, we need to get all the Trustees involved and make sure they are informed. Jay said that the Tri-Parties asked for clarification on the letter. Jamie said that DOE's position is there is a problem, but it has been blown out of proportion. DOE is willing to look at it and obtain more data in order to make clearer decisions, but DOE does not think this is not a problem that warrants a lot of money (\$80K - \$100K). Jamie said that DOE could go out and do this additional work for approximately \$15K. Dan Audet said that he doesn't see any progress being made from the meeting, and that we are moving backwards, going over the same issues. Dan Audet said let's get the sites cleaned up, and Jamie said that DOE doesn't see that these sites need to be cleaned up. Dan Audet said that he doesn't see any wildlife information saying that they don't. It was asked if all DOE would do is to put up the nest boxes, and Jamie said no.

Jamie stated that these sites are too small, and that no agency would file a damage claim. Jamie would like to see that if any additional work/sampling is done, it is done within the existing budget. Jamie said that we realize there are impacts, but those impacts are not significant enough to take funding away from other projects. Barb asked if because the impacts are not significant, is that a good reason to not do good science. Barbara asked if it is an either/or situation, either put up the nest boxes, or do nothing, she would like to see the nest boxes go up.

Dan Audet said that he did not come with a full, detailed proposal because he wanted to get in put from the Council and then decide how detailed the proposal should be. He said the USFWS is not proposing to do studies just to say "there is no problem." Jamie said that we are not very likely to go out and put nesting boxes on a site where there is not enough food/room to support the birds. One option is a reduced number of nest boxes at more sites.

Does the Council want to go ahead and have Dan Audet prepare a proposal or go forward with having ERC (Ken/Steve/Jen) go out and do some work using the existing funding. Jamie said that by going out and looking at some additional nests, and sampling eggs, it could result in additional funding or requesting additional funding if it is proven that we continue to find a DDT/DDE problem in the eggs.

Jay is still interested in seeing a proposal from USFWS. Dan Audet cannot prepare a proposal without knowing how many sites, how big of a study, etc. Tom said that we have to design a study that can address if there is injury or potential for injury at those sites.

DOE would like to collect insects from the contaminated areas and analyze them for DDT/DDE, surveying the present birds. Jamie said they would use ALE as a control site, use the four sites with medium risk, survey birds and eggs, and see how many birds are actually nesting there. Jay thinks that would be re-doing what the first survey did and that it will produce the same results. He said it would not bring us to closure and would only generate another set of data to debate. Jamie said that we need to see how many birds are actually nesting (reproducing) out there. Jay would like to see a proposal from

USFWS and even if it is \$80-\$100K, he feels that it is worth it to get the entire thing closed out. Jamie said the sites are too small to make that decision. Dan Landeen asked if that would be enough for EPA to close it, and Larry said that if the Trustees close it, EPA would close it. Jamie said DOE's position is that this is an unreasonable cost. There are no impacts to population and the feeding range is bigger than the contaminated areas. Jamie said that DOE doesn't feel that we have an injury issue. Jamie said that a proposal would give us an idea of assessment costs, is that appropriate given the potential for injury. Jamie said that if going out and doing this sampling again produces higher numbers, he would have better ammunition to go to DOE and request additional funding. Jamie said that if everyone is concerned about the DOE using funds for unproductive studies, then DOE can stop spending money today. John would like for someone from USFWS to respond to the concerns and perspectives that were raised during the meeting today. Jay would like to see DOE use one of the other sites that is larger, even though it has a medium risk. Jamie said that the Horseshoe Landfill is the biggest site, and where the highest numbers are now. Jay clarified that the biggest site was the H-06-L site and that the 1:1:1 DDT/DDE/DDD ratio at the H-06-LE was of concern since it indicated an unweathered source of DDT exists at that site. Another concern that DOE has is that when Rick Roy surveyed, he only looked at the remediated area within Horseshoe Landfill and DOE would like to go beyond that area.

Tuesday, March 16, 1999

Chromium Study Update – Dan Audet/Dan Woodward

Dan Audet updated the Council on the three stages of the study; fertilization, early life stage, and parr health. The fourth study is the field study which Dan Audet said we need to start planning for very soon.

Dan Woodward briefed the Council on the status of the Chromium Study to date. He discussed the problems they encountered with the fertilization study and said they will re-run this stage in the spring (April, May, early June). Dan Woodward said they will go step-by-step and re-evaluate the steps that could have been the problem with the first fertilization study. He said that if they encounter the problems again with the sodium chloride and physiological saline, Hanford water could be used, but that would drop the baseline. Jamie asked if there is any usable results from the fertilization tests. Dan Woodward said there is nothing reportable, and the data is not something you would want to make any decisions on. Dan Woodward said the sodium chloride was tying up the chromium and that could be part of the problem. Larry asked if they have a variety of analytical tools to analyze the data. Dan Woodward said that there is the possibility of going to a different technique. Jamie said that our concern is that we will have data on the Rainbow Trout and the Cutthroat Trout, but nothing on the Chinook Salmon. Dan Woodward said that maybe it is not even a fish problem, but an analytical problem. They need to figure out what the problems were last year and get started with a new protocol this year. Jamie said that under this existing contract, we will not be able to do fertilization using Chinook Salmon, we will get a re-do of the test using disease-free Cutthroat Trout this spring. Jay asked if modifying the contract is a possibility in order to

re-run the tests this fall using Chinook Salmon. Jamie said there would be a funding problem. Dan Woodward thinks that it makes sense to go back and run the tests again using Chinook Salmon.

Dan Woodward said they looked at mortality during the various stages; and also looked at percent hatched, behavioral abnormalities, length and weight, and will look at a 30-day post-swimup measurement, but are not to that point yet. Dan Woodward said they have not seen any observed effects on anything, but the data is preliminary. There were signs of reduced length at 11, 24, 54, and 120 during swim-up. The fish with concentrations of 0 and 5 appeared to be larger than anything with a concentration level of 11 and above. Dan Woodward said the residue analysis and physiology tests still need to be done. Jamie asked about the schedule, and if we will have results prior to the next phase. Dan Woodward said that some of the results could be available, but you really want to wait until you have a quality assurance plan to go along with the results. Jamie said that if we are planning something for this fall, we need to get started soon, and that the funding needs to be allocated this fiscal year. Dan Woodward said the parr health test is being done at Jackson, as will the fertilization tests. Dan Audet said that they (himself, Dan Woodward and company) will get together and prepare something for the May Council meeting. It was asked if the parr health stage shows no impacts, would the third phase (field work) still be necessary. Dan Woodward said that yes, you would still want to do the field phase because the lab was only testing with chromium, and the actual field could have things other than chromium. Larry said that the reason we are doing the lab tests is so that we can be smarter in doing the field tests. Dan Woodward said that we are pretty much on schedule with where we need to be and that by June, we need to have a good idea of what we want to do in the fall, where our priorities are, and we will have some preliminary data (results) to help make those decisions. Then by August/September there could be a plan in place and begin the field tests in the fall. Larry said that until we use our species (the Chinook Salmon) and our water (Hanford Site/Columbia Reach), we will not reach closure.

There was a discussion that if there is no impact at concentration levels of 24 and 54, Dan Woodward would have approval to increase the concentration levels without having to contact the Council.

Action Item: Teri – Put Dan Audet on the agenda for the May Meeting in the Tri-Cities, to provide an update on the Chromium Study (provide a proposal for the field work).

Resolution 99-01 Status/100 Area Assessment Plan Public Meeting – All

Jay passed out copies of a draft schedule prepared by Ecology for the public comment period and public meeting concerning the 100 Area Assessment Plan. The 100 Area Assessment Plan has been placed out on the web site. The fact sheet will also be put out on the web page and it will convey where comments should be sent and to whom. It was suggested that the notifications go into the Tri-City Herald, the web site, the Hanford Update, and the various Hanford notifications. The document will also go out to the

various mailing lists that have expressed an interest in Hanford. The Ecology office will also make sure the document is sent to the information repositories. There was discussion on the format of the public meeting. Jamie suggested a question and answer type meeting, but Jay thinks there should be some sort of presentation on the document. Jamie said that USFWS has not been contracted to give a presentation, just to attend the public meeting, so Jay will give an opening presentation at the meeting. Julie Campbell and Toni Davidson will be present to represent USFWS. The meeting will be hosted by Ecology, and will be held from 6:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Open house will be from 6:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. and the presentation will be at 7:00 followed by questions and answers. Tentative date – end of April.