

**HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL  
BI-MONTHLY MEETING  
March 23–25, 2010  
HAMMER Facility, Richland WA**

**Meeting Summary**

**Introduction**

The overall goals of the meeting were to:

- Conduct administrative business
- Receive updates and discuss next steps on procurement and NGO
- Determine the roles and responsibilities of the Chair and Facilitator
- Discuss data access and a data management system
- Discuss approaches to budgeting and finalize a 2012 budget
- Review the previous all-TWG meeting and plan the next one
- Better define and discuss next steps on potential 2011 studies
- Review CERCLA response activities and receive updates on the HNRTC History Book and path forward for NRDAR Training

The final agenda is included as Attachment A. Attendees are listed at end of the meeting summary. The meeting summary below is organized by topic. Action Items are listed as AI followed by a number, and the current Action Item list is included as Attachment B.

**Administrative Business**

- **Introductions.** John Carleton with WDFW, Jack Bell with the Nez Perce Tribe, and Pat Spurgin, counsel for the Yakama Nation, introduced themselves and their backgrounds. John Carleton will be the non-voting Trustee representative for WDFW and Jack Bell will be the voting HNRTC representative for the Nez Perce Tribe (pending formal notification).
- **Meeting Summaries.** No further comments were provided on the December 2009 conference call summary. Dana moved that the conference call summary be approved, and Dan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Minor editorial comments were provided on the January 2010 meeting summary. Dana moved that the meeting summary be approved as amended, and Dan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**RECEIVED**  
AUG 26 2010  
EDMC

- **Resolution 10-01.** The Chair reported that this resolution to procure office space failed.
- **Roles and Responsibilities of the Chair and Facilitator.** The HNRTC agreed that agendas would be developed as follows: 1) Agenda items carried over from previous meetings would be listed as standing agenda items at the end of meeting summaries, 2) the HNRTC would identify additional agenda items during the monthly conference call between meetings, 3) the facilitator would develop a draft agenda based on the conference call, 4) the facilitator would obtain the Chair's input on the draft agenda, 5) the facilitator would distribute a revised agenda to the HNRTC. Additional changes can be made with concurrence by the HNRTC if the need arises.

The HNRTC also expressed support for active facilitation during meetings, to provide a neutral and efficient forum for discussion and to allow the Chair to participate as a Trustee.

- **HNRTC History Book.** Dan has updated the HNRTC History to include the recent NRDAR activities, and requests comment on the updates prior to integrating in photographs and printing copies. Comments are due to Dan by the April conference call [REDACTED].

## Procurement

- **Phase II.** DOE passed out a tentative schedule for the Phase II procurement effort. One contractor had requested an extension of the RFP Closure Date from April 9 to April 28, 2010. Several members of the HNRTC had a conflict for the proposed RFP review dates; therefore it was agreed to allow an extension of the RFP closure date until April 21, 2010, close of business Pacific Time. HNRTC review of the RFPs was re-scheduled to begin at 1 pm May 3, and continue until the review was completed (2-3 days). A revised procurement schedule taking into account these changes was later distributed, with final award of the contract likely at the end of May 2010. Evaluation criteria for the RFP review will be further discussed at the April conference call.
- **Project Coordinator.** Russ circulated a USF&W position description for the Project Coordinator and explained how it was developed. He asked for input on various aspects, including the location of the position, supervisor for the employee, whether moving costs should be allowed, and GS grade and classification. Comments are due to Russ by April 6 so that he can address them and recirculate the position description prior to the April conference call [REDACTED].
- **USF&W/NFWF.** As noted in the Senior Trustee call, discussions are underway between DOE and USF&W on an agreement for transferring the funds to manage the HNRTC contracts. There is nothing new to report at this time. *[DOE reported after the meeting that the correct term for this agreement is an Economy Act transaction.]*

### Data Access and Information Management Systems

- **Hanford Collaboration Zone.** Benjamin Ellison of DOE gave a presentation on the Hanford Collaboration Zone DOE hopes to establish to bring all the non-sensitive environmental data, as well as data held by other organizations, into a declassified, single format that all signatories to the agreement could access. This is expected to require several years to accomplish, including development of the hardware/software system itself and review, declassification, and formatting of the data. More information was requested from DOE on how their IT staff arrived at a \$1.0 million estimate for an information management system.
- In the meantime, DOE will provide terminals that can be used to access its databases, but it will be in a secure location and governed by access and data release agreements. Concern was expressed over potential limited access to only two points of contact per Trustee, since staff and contractors may need access to the system given the range of data housed in it. DOE supported hiring a data manager who would be able to learn and interface successfully with both systems.

### HNRTC Budget

- **Budget Development Process.** A discussion was held regarding how the HNRTC should finalize its 2012 budget and develop its budgets in future years. Several parties expressed interest in moving toward a majority decision-making process. Some parties reaffirmed their commitment to a consensus-based process, with several noting that the past budget approach of developing two or more alternatives was not succeeding in producing consensus. As an alternative approach, the Trustees built a single budget in which every budget line item was discussed, and only those items or levels of funding that received a consensus were included in the budget. In all HNRTC decision processes, the importance of abstaining if possible, while still voicing contrasting viewpoints for the record, was emphasized rather than voting no, to maintain forward progress.

The HNRTC also discussed how best to achieve transparency and accountability in the budget, so that the Senior Trustees can determine how the money is being spent, and to coordinate tasks to ensure collaborative and non-duplicative products. Each year, we are making progress toward that goal. This year, given the short time remaining, it was decided to further divide up the Trustee FTEs among technical and management tasks. A majority of Trustees reiterated their preference for a fully task-based budget that is coordinated and integrated among the trustees.

The trustees discussed the possibility of leveraging CERCLA RI/FS and ecological risk assessment activities to obtain some of the data needed for the injury assessment. This would help reduce the overall NRDAR budget.

- **2012 Budget.** Option 2 (\$7,272,118) for the 2012 budget was used as the basis from which to work, as only the YN expressed support for Option 1 (\$13,935,372). Charlene presented a workload analysis that indicated that about 1 FTE would be needed just to respond to Phase II deliverables in 2011 and in 2012. Therefore, even though the contractor for Phase II will have been fully funded prior to 2012, some of the Trustee FTEs previously listed on the TWG line should be allocated for Phase II in 2012. The HNRTC worked through each line; consensus on most items was confirmed, and areas where further work is needed were highlighted. Each Trustee, including DOE, was requested to provide their FTE breakdowns among tasks by Friday, April 2 to Teresa, who will add them to the master spreadsheet [REDACTED].

\$10,000 was added to the budget to purchase hardware and software needed for data management, participation in the Hanford Collaboration Zone, and GIS analysis and plotting.

Seven Trustees expressed their belief that the amount requested by the Yakama Nation for FTEs was too high and had not been justified. They stated that they could not support this amount, and requested that the Yakama Nation reduce it to a level commensurate with the other Trustees, while affirming their appreciation and desire for the Yakama Nation's continued participation. The Yakama Nation was requested to consider whether they could accept these changes and begin using the budget approach described above [REDACTED].

YN staff stated that a consensus could not be reached during this meeting and provided a contrasting view that included support for each party's participation cost based on each party's own internal needs, analysis and assumptions, such as the number of studies that can be conducted per year, since each party is a sovereign and has responsibilities to its constituents. YN also expressed concern over unilateral decision-making by DOE thwarting consensus on budget matters in past years. DOE stated that it is following the federal budget process.

Other Trustees stated their belief that sovereign nations can participate in developing an integrated and consensus-based project budget, and that DOE has provided a level of funding commensurate with the pace at which the HNRTC has been able to make use of the funding, and consistent with Congressional funding limitations.

Once all the revisions to the budget have been received, Teresa will send out a single budget for review by each Trustee with their Senior Trustees April 5-9, with the goal of approval by April 10.

#### **NRDAR Activities**

- **All-TWG Meetings.** A retrospective of the all-TWG meeting held in February was conducted, including accomplishments, lessons learned, and topics for the next meeting, as follows:

#### ***Accomplishments***

TWG Chairs and members got to know each other and were able to coordinate  
Potential studies and activities for 2011 were identified and prioritized  
An initial discussion of data needs and data mining was held  
Mission statements were presented and discussed  
TWG participants became familiar with council processes through the schedule, organization, and work breakdown structure

#### ***Lessons Learned***

Have more time spent on introductions at the beginning  
Define acronyms that all may not be familiar with  
Provide more context for some of the discussions  
Have a more structured agenda and more active facilitation  
Take and distribute minutes  
Keep council business and TWG activities separate

#### ***Upcoming Topics***

Communication – inter-TWG, with HNRTC, with contractors  
Develop definitions and working assumptions  
Further develop TWG scopes and action plans  
Further discussion of data needs and data mining approaches  
Develop selection criteria  
Report on dry run efforts

The TWG Chairs will determine a date and location for the next all-TWG meeting at the next TWG Chair meeting on May 11 [REDACTED].

- **Potential 2011 Studies.** The three potential 2011 studies/activities that were identified at the February all-TWG meeting were further discussed and refined:
  - **Baseline.** Callie has prepared a draft paragraph describing the scope of this study and has also pulled together information from the regulations defining baseline. She will send this to all the Trustees and TWG Chairs for further review. Callie, Russ, Barb, and Dan will form a group to further refine the approach to determining baseline for the Hanford NRDA.
  - **Contaminant Transport/Upwelling in the Columbia River.** Paul had prepared a description of possible work that could be conducted to further define the influence of upwelling and transport of contaminants in the Columbia River, focused on the 100-B/C Area. There was some discussion of alternative methods that could be used,

as well as refining the goals and approach of this study. The Aquatic TWG (including John Sands) will meet along with some of the GW TWG members to further refine this study. Comments on the proposed approach should be sent to Paul.

- **Data Mining.** It was agreed that this requires a lot of additional discussion and refinement prior to getting started. A coordinated exercise at the next all-TWG meeting may be appropriate to identify and prioritize the various data needs. In addition, a joint meeting with the RI/FS data managers may be appropriate to ensure the most efficient access to the data and to provide them with greater familiarity with our data needs. The HNRTC will need to determine and articulate how our data needs are different from or in addition to RI/FS data needs, and/or where in the Trustees' view, the RI/FS has not collected adequate data for the RI/FS. Either of these could require additional work to be done in the future. TWG chairs were tasked with asking groups to develop list of data mining tasks, and to present and prioritize those tasks at the next all TWG meeting. A resolution or white paper should be developed to determine how to access databases and process should be developed for requesting data and for spending significant amounts of time searching the databases.

Both the Aquatic TWG and the Terrestrial TWG have begun thinking through and working on dry run data mining scenarios. The Aquatic TWG has been considering sculpin and the Terrestrial TWG selected mule deer to conduct data mining research. Both groups have begun collecting data. In both cases, the purpose is to familiarize everyone with the overall data mining process and to identify the types of challenges that come up.

- **Prioritizing Assessment Tasks.** Both the Aquatic TWG and the Terrestrial TWG have begun thinking through how to strategically prioritize injury assessment activities. There are various established methods, recommendations, criteria, and guidance for how groups can prioritize which assessment activities to conduct first. The two TWGs have begun developing specific Hanford assessment planning criteria. The Aquatic TWG has agreed to summarize existing information on the subject, and will present it at an upcoming, joint terrestrial and aquatic TWG meeting. The presenters will then run through the assessment planning criteria using existing information produced on salmon and chromium. The purpose is to familiarize everyone with the overall process and to agree on a process for prioritizing our work.
- **NRDAR Training.** The HNRTC discussed what type of training would be most valuable to have on-site. It was agreed to pursue a 2-day training, with the first day targeted at site managers and heavily focused on how to integrate NRDAR into CERCLA response activities and the second day targeted at HNRTC and TWG members and focused on methods of NRDAR analysis. Russ will work with his co-trainer and Janis to determine dates for this training, likely in late June [REDACTED].

### Response Integration

- **Look-Ahead.** Steve presented the look-ahead schedule, including a number of items that may need to be discussed during the next few HNRTC meetings.

### Standing Agenda Items

- 2012 final budget
- Revisit detailed 2011 budget
- Project Coordinator job description
- Phase II evaluation criteria and procurement update
- Hanford History Book comments/finalization
- Central Plateau Eco-Risk Assessment
- 5-Year review

### Meeting Attendees

**CTUIR:** Barb Harper<sup>4</sup>, Rica Cruz, Matt Johnson

**Nez Perce Tribe:** Dan Landeen, Gabriel Bohnee<sup>2</sup>, Jack Bell

**Oregon:** Paul Shaffer

**WA Dept. of Ecology:** Jean Hays

**WA Fish & Wildlife:** John Carleton

**NOAA:** Charlene Andrade

**Yakama Nation:** Jay McConnaughey, Brian Barry, Russell Jim, Callie Ridolfi<sup>3</sup>, Pat Spurgin

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

**US Dept. of Energy:** Dana Ward, Janis Ward, Steve Wisness, Benjamin Ellison<sup>1</sup>

**Facilitator:** Teresa Michelsen

**US EPA:** Larry Gadbois<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Present on first day

<sup>2</sup> Present on first and second days

<sup>3</sup> By phone

<sup>4</sup> By phone second day and present first and third days

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Tuesday**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Focus: Administrative and Contract/Procurement</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1:00 pm	<b>Administrative Business:</b> Approve agenda, Dec. & Jan. meeting minutes Introductions – John Carleton, WDFW; Jack Bell, Nez Perce	McConnaughey
1:30 pm	<b>Status Updates:</b> Phase II contracting & next steps, Project Coordinator, NFWF	J. Ward, MacRae
2:15 pm	<b>Roles/Responsibilities:</b> Chair, Facilitator, Project Coordinator <b>Purpose:</b> Better define these respective roles, particularly where they overlap. Check-in on how things are going and how best to meet the Council's needs.  <b>Review:</b> Scopes of work & facilitator/project coordinator roles defined at previous planning meetings, Bylaws, suggestions for Chair/facilitator roles	Michelsen McConnaughey
3:30 pm	<b>Break</b>	
3:45 pm	<b>Data Access and Information Management System</b> <b>Purpose:</b> Brief update on Hanford Collaboration zone. Determine schedule and path forward on developing SOW for data management contractor.	USDOE Michelsen
5:00 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**Wednesday**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Focus: 2012 Budget</b>	<b>Lead</b>
8:00 am	<p><b>2012 Budget</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> Discuss approaches to developing budgets, both conceptual and a detailed process. Use this approach to finalize FY2012 budget.   <b>BRING:</b> Complete budget package from Senior Trustee call</p>	Michelsen
10:00 am	<b>Break</b>	
10:20 am	<b>2012 Budget, cont.</b>	Michelsen
11:30 pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
1:00 pm	<b>2012 Budget, cont.</b>	Michelsen
2:00 pm	<p><b>Budget/Baselining Next Steps</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> 1) Determine agenda/expected outcomes for next Senior Trustee meeting                  2) Identify schedule/assignments/path forward for PEP (time permitting)</p>	Michelsen
2:45 pm	<b>Break</b>	
3:00 pm	<p><b>TWG Topics</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> Discuss outcomes and lessons learned from recent All-TWG meeting. Identify agenda items, support, and schedule for future All-TWG meeting. Discuss how TWG recommendations will be reviewed and decided upon by the Council.</p>	Michelsen
4:30 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**Thursday**

<b>Time</b>		<b>Lead</b>
8:30 am	<p><b>Potential FY2011 Studies</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> Refinement of topics, schedule, path forward</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Baseline</li> <li>2. Contaminant transport/upwelling/mapping in the Columbia River</li> <li>3. Data mining</li> </ol>	TWG/Study leads
10:00 am	<p><b>Dry Run</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> Discuss proposals for evaluating a test case (resource or habitat + contaminant)</p>	TWG Chairs
10:30 am	<b>Break</b>	
10:45 am	<p><b>Miscellaneous</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Look-ahead and important CERCLA updates</li> <li>2) HNRTC History Book status and path forward</li> <li>3) NRDAR Training</li> </ol>	Wisness Landeem MacRae
11:40 am	<p><b>Wrap-Up</b>  <b>Purpose:</b> Review accomplishments and action items</p>	Michelsen
12:00 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

**ATTACHMENT B**

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Note:** Yellow indicates changes to previously existing action items, including completion dates, updates, and changes in responsibility. Items with yellow completion dates (or otherwise closed) will not be included on subsequent action item lists. ■ action item numbers indicate new items since the most recent update.

	<b>Assignee/Action</b>	<b>Date Assigned</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>
314	Develop white paper on integrating NRDAR into CERCLA response <i>ACTION: Paul et al.</i>	11/17/09	
315	Arrange NRDAR training for site managers <i>ACTION: Janis, Russ</i>	3/25/10	
318	Discuss ways to mitigate OCI issue with DOE Procurement/Legal and get back with the Council <i>ACTION: Janis</i>	1/19/10	
319	USFWS to issue an interest announcement for the Project Coordinator position, with HNRTC input on the description <i>ACTION: Russ, All</i>	3/23/10	
320	Determine whether USFWS can establish a contract with NFWF <i>ACTION: Russ</i>	1/19/10	
322	Determine impacts if the Trustees only receive \$4.6M funding in FY2011 <i>ACTION: Budget committee/Steve</i>	1/20/10	
323	Identify detailed FTE Trustee staffing needs/costs to support the NRDAR effort in 2012 <i>ACTION: Trustees</i>	3/24/10	
■	Comment on updates to the Hanford History Book <i>ACTION: Trustees to Dan</i>	3/25/10	
■	Yakama Nation to determine whether to concur with the 2012 budget and budgeting approach <i>ACTION: Yakama Nation</i>	3/24/10	
■	Determine date and location of next all-TWG meeting <i>ACTION: TWG Chairs</i>	3/24/10	