

DRAFT AGENDA
HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL
JUNE 8, 1995

- 8:30 - 9:00 Refreshments and Welcome -- (refreshments at Jennifer's Bakery
-- everyone on their own)
- 9:00 - 9:15 Funding Issues and HQ Complex Report, Paul Kube, Discussion
- 9:15 - 9:30 Tolling Agreement, Chris Burford, Paul Kube, Discussion
- 9:30 - 10:00 Congressional Update, Chris Burford, Discussion
- 10:00 - 10:30 Pump and Treat Letter, Chris Burford, Action
- 10:30 - 10:45 Break
- 10:45 - 11:00 Outcome of St. Louis Meeting, Paul Kube, Discussion
- 11:00 - 11:45 MOA, Geoff Tallent, Discussion/Action
- 11:45 - 1:00 Lunch
- 1:00 - 3:00 Committee Reports
- River Committee
 - 100 Area Briefing, Greg Eidam
 - Upland Committee
 - ALE Project, Janelle Downs, Discussion
 - Administrative Committee
 - Site-Wide Committee
 - Regulatory/Legal Committee
 - Core Values Committee
- 3:00 - 3:15 Break
- 3:15 - 3:30 1100 Area Delisting, Larry Gadbois, Discussion
- 3:15 - 4:15 Committees Meet
- 4:15 - 4:30 Agenda Items, Wrap Up

RECEIVED
NOV 27 2007
EDMC

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council Meeting
June 8, 1995
Richland, Washington

Attendees

Mike Bauer, Yakama Indian Nation
Deborah Borrero, Yakama Indian Nation
Liz Block, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department
Janelle Downs, Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Janet Ebaugh, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Greg Eidam, Environmental Restoration Contract/Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
Larry Gadbois, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Linda Goodey, Dames & Moore
Susan Coburn Hughs, State of Oregon Department of Energy
John Hall, ASCI, Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Jake Jakabosky, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Paul Kube, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Kathy Leonard, Environmental Restoration Contract/Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
Jay McConnaughey, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife Service
Callie Ridolfi, Ridolfi Engineers and Associates, Inc.
Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce Tribe
Geoff Tallent, Washington State Department of Ecology
K. Michael Thompson, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Jamie Zeisloft, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Mr. Paul Kube welcomed the Hanford Natural Resource Trustees and visitors.

FUNDING ISSUES AND DOE HEADQUARTERS COMPLEX REPORT, Paul Kube

Funding issues were discussed. It was noted that most trustee funding comes from the Environmental Restoration budget. The Administration Committee is looking at funding options. A Trustee recommended coordinating with other sites/Trustee organizations to understand how their funding processes have worked.

TOLLING AGREEMENT, Paul Kube

A Tolling Agreement will be drafted prior to the next meeting and presented to the Council in July.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, Geoff Tallent

A final draft of the MOA was distributed by Mr. Tallent. He pointed out the minor differences from the last draft. He recommended all organizations take the MOA to their constituencies for signature. All signature pages are to be sent to Mr. Tallent prior to the July meeting. In July, the final, signed MOA will be ready to send to all organizations as part of the formalization process for the Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council.

NORTH SLOPE, Liz Block

The salvaged bunchgrasses and sagebrush tubelings are thriving on two of the three revegetated sites on the North Slope. The plants on PSN 12/14, however, may not be doing very well due to cricket infestation. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has bait available for free to treat the infestation. To date, nothing has been done about the cricket problem because of conflicting opinions about the necessity of stopping the infestation as opposed to allowing nature manage the problem. Mr. Paul Kube will investigate and report on activities relating to this issue at the July NRTC meeting.

OUTCOME OF ST. LOUIS MEETING, Mike Thompson

A meeting was held in St. Louis in May between Ecology, EPA, and DOE. The agencies informally agreed to change the way business is conducted at Hanford. One of the concepts which will be implemented is "projectization." Under the projectized format, specific endpoints will be defined and a baseline established to reach those endpoints. The designated baseline will include estimated costs, defined outcomes, and defined actions. Project managers will participate in the planning, commitment, and work processes, so there is an informed person who will be responsible for the success of each project. The projectized format will assist DOE in reducing costs, staying in compliance with required regulations, and getting the necessary work done.

The Trustees are encouraged to maintain contact with the regulators and DOE to make sure the NRTC's goals and values are incorporated into the endpoints and baseline.

CHROMIUM UPDATE, Mike Thompson

DOE is evaluating the water quality of the Columbia River and groundwater in the 100 Areas. A program to remove chromium in the groundwater at 100 Area through the pump and treatment process will be started within the next few months through an interim response Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD is expected to contain a five-year review cycle. The pump and treatment process is intended to intercept chromium before it enters the Columbia River.

PUMP AND TREAT LETTER, Chris Burford

The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation wrote a letter to DOE regarding the advisability of using the pump and treatment process. The CTUIR letter urged that a holistic plan be written and implemented as soon as possible. The letter contained specific recommendations on how treatment could be done, and proposed a program for chromium management.

Mr. Burford was pleased that DOE decided to begin the pump and treatment process for chromium and emphasized that the CTUIR will be closely monitoring the progress.

CONGRESSIONAL UPDATE, Chris Burford

Mr. Chris Burford handed out copies of the testimonies provided at the May 11, 1995, hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on the Environment regarding the Superfund reauthorization. It appears that CERCLA may not be reauthorized this year. This will probably result in a one year extension of CERCLA without any changes to the existing statute.

Mr. Burford distributed a copy of Merkowski's bill and amendment. Mr. Burford stated that, in essence, Merkowski proposes excluding Hanford from all environmental laws. Instead, the Secretary of Energy will prepare a plan concerning the cleanup of Hanford. Mr. Burford also mentioned that on May 25, Mr. Merkowski stated that Hanford could be designated as a national repository for spent nuclear fuel.

Copies of these documents can be obtained from Linda Goodey, 509-946-3684.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

100 AREA BRIEFING, Greg Eidam

Mr. Eidam presented a discussion on the proposed plans for remediation of radioactive liquid waste high priority sites within the BC-1, DR-1, and HR-1 Operable Units. The goals for the preferred plan are: (1) remediation goals will comply with the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Level B (residential level); (2) radiological goal of 15 mrem above background per year; (3) protection of groundwater such that contaminants remaining in the soil after remediation do not result in an impact to groundwater that could exceed Maximum Contaminant Levels under the Safe Drinking Water Act (this applies to waste sites where groundwater has not been impacted); and (4) protection of the Columbia River such that contaminants remaining in the soil after remediation do not result in an impact to groundwater and, therefore, the Columbia River that could exceed the Ambient Water Quality Criteria under the Clean Water Act for protection of fish (protective of salmon spawning grounds).

The preferred alternative is remove, treat (as appropriate or required) and dispose of the contaminated soil and associated structures.

There will be a pilot project with three demonstration sites in the 100-BC area: B-4, B-5, and C-1. These sites will provide cost information, contaminant information, and information regarding appropriate methodology for restoration and remediation. It will probably be a year before this pilot project is complete. Site restoration will be addressed during remedial design; however, the concepts of avoiding and minimizing damage to natural resources are written in the proposed plan.

ARID LANDS ECOLOGY PROJECT, Janelle Downs

Variation in *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies: Responses to Nutrient and Drought Stress

"Big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) is a dominant shrub species occurring in semi-arid, cold desert, shrub-steppe ecosystems across the intermountain west. *A. tridentata* subsp. *wyomingensis* and *A. tridentata* subsp. *tridentata* are sympatric subspecies of big sagebrush that grow in habitats differing in soils and elevation and thus are adapted to different environmental conditions of nutrient and water availability. My dissertation research involves comparing the biochemical and physiological mechanisms that operate in sagebrush under drought and nitrogen stress in relation to the geographical and environmental distribution of the subspecies. In addition to evaluating the physiological responses of sagebrush populations, I am also assessing the genetic structure of those populations from differing habitat types to aid in understanding the

distribution of genetic diversity across the range, and the ability of different genotypes to adjust in response to stress.

Specific information on differences in abilities of subspecies and/or genotypes to regulate water use through the growing season in response to drought and nutrient stress will also be helpful in developing selection criteria in shrub restoration efforts. Results indicating that subspecies vary physiologically in the amount and timing of stomatal control in response to drought stress are also of interest to plant breeding programs attempting to develop improved genotypes for resistance to environmental stress.

Working cooperatively with Dr. Pam Soltis at Washington State University and Dr. Durant McArthur at the Shrub Sciences Laboratory in Provo, Utah, we are using starch gel electrophoresis to assay isozymes within and among sagebrush populations from different habitat types. These studies will give estimates of levels and distribution of genetic variation that can be compared directly between populations or species. These studies are being conducted with plants originating from eastern Washington and the Great Basin, which are being grown in Washington State University greenhouses in Pullman.

To determine the relationships between drought tolerance and nitrogen nutrition and whether population responses differ across an elevational gradient, experiments are being conducted using (1) field-grown plants in a common garden receiving varying levels of water and nitrogen and (2) plants grown in greenhouses at Washington State University, Pullman. Plants being used in these studies were grown from seeds collected during the 1993-1994 winter from populations at locations from low elevations along the Columbia River plain on the Hanford Site to the foothills of the Cascade Mountains between Yakima and Ellensburg (along Umtanum Ridge and Yakima Ridge). Plants grown from these seed collections were planted in a common garden along the northeast side of the Horseshoe Landfill on the Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve on the U. S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site in November of 1994. All of the plants transplanted to the common garden originated from eastern Washington seed sources. A block design containing nine eastern Washington populations and the following four treatments was replicated five times: (1) ambient conditions, (2) additional nutrients, (3) additional water, (4) additional water and nutrients (total of 180 plants in experimental design). Additional plants were randomly planted around the edges of the treatment blocks.

Measurements of soil water availability and plant water relations parameters through a growing season under control and added nitrogen will aid in understanding shrub population response and growth patterns. Experimental work will be conducted at the common garden site during the summer months of 1995 and from January through September of 1996. A 0.5 m radius around each planted shrub will be cleared of all other plants to minimize plant competition and subsequent differences in water and nutrient availability. Each shrub is marked to identify origin. Collection of data for this experiment will be completed before shrubs reach reproductive maturity."

Ms. Downs can be reached through the Botany Department at Pullman, Washington, on 509-335-3066.

COLUMBIA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (CRCIA)

Mr. Larry Gadbois indicated the CRCIA workshop scheduled for June 14 has been postponed due to contracting problems. The Technical Peer Review Team has been selected, and the list is now subject to final review by regulators. Tribal representatives have not submitted their candidate for the Technical Peer Review Team, but are currently coordinating their efforts.

RIVER COMMITTEE

Ms. Susan Coburn Hughs distributed the River Committee draft of five priorities:

1. To gather information on contamination and biological effects, including:
 - identify contaminants in the river and their biological effects.
 - identify what contaminants came from Hanford and what came from industrial activities
 - address cumulative impacts
2. To gather information on contaminant entry and dispersal in the river, effects, including:
 - identify food webs and trophic dynamics, historical and future patterns
 - conduct basic surveys of fish and other organisms to identify if/what effect contaminants have had on the biological components of the individual organism or population
3. Participate fully in the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment
4. Develop strategies for mitigation of impacts on the river, including:
 - become proactive by defining and sharing the Trustee vision of strategies for mitigation
 - identify ways to work within the system DOE has established
 - identify mitigation needs and strategies; define what is appropriate under what conditions
5. Get involved in formal DOE 100 Area cleanup processes, including:
 - identify schedule of current 100 Area activities. Establish priorities for Trustee involvement. Chromium and contamination deep in river sediment are near-term activities. 100 Area groundwater remediation is a concern

Tasks will be assigned to member of the River Committee, and a status will be provided at the next NRTC meeting.

UPLAND COMMITTEE

The purpose of the Upland Committee is: To track terrestrial biological and habitat-level impacts on the Hanford Site and make recommendations, and to establish NRTC protocol in order to provide guidance to DOE regarding ways to address those impacts.

The Upland Committee identified projects and assigned a point of contact to provide a status for each project at the next NRTC meeting.

The Upland Committee made the following recommendation: The Upland Committee should define an overall NRTC policy regarding restoration and mitigation options for terrestrial habitat, and after full NRTC approval, submit the policy to DOE. This policy would include the NRTC's vision of mitigation, restoration, and implementation, and a definition of coordination: how and where the NRTC would like to be brought into the DOE processes.

REGULATORY/LEGAL COMMITTEE

The purpose of the Regulatory/Legal Committee is to provide legal guidance to the Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council on an as-needed basis.

The Committee identified 4 tasks:

1. Identify the most effective and efficient steps in the CERCLA process for the NRTC to become involved, Larry Gadbois
2. Draft Tolling Agreement, Chris Burford and Paul Kube
3. Legal drivers for site-wide planning, Mike Bauer
4. Identify appropriate ways for the NRTC to participate in land-use planning discussions, tabled

CORE VALUES

Mr. Geoff Tallent gave the following presentation:

The purpose of a core value is to clearly communicate the NRTC Core Values, interests and concerns. Also to educate the Hanford community about our mandate, purpose, and role. A core value is a common principal or interest held by all members of the council from which we derive our specific positions, statements, or recommendations.

Attributes of a core value:

- All participating organizations and individuals hold in common
- Applicable site-wide
- Fundamental (serve as a foundation)
- Brief
- General

The Core Values Committee defined a recommended format and values: who we are, what are natural resources, why a council, how our interests are satisfied. The intent was to stay away from specifics and legal drivers.

The following is a draft of the Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council Core Values:

Who we are:

We are governments entrusted by our constituencies with the stewardship of certain natural resources. We have legal obligations to manage the resources responsibly. From government to government, our jurisdiction varies as do our other interests and responsibilities. Together, however, we have responsibility for the entire panoply of natural resources at Hanford.

What are natural resources:

Natural resources are the elements of the environment of use, importance, or value to our constituencies. Examples of natural resources are: land, fish, wildlife, biota, air, surface water, and ground water. Natural resources provide physical and biological services to both humans and the ecosystem as a whole. Natural resources may have value derived from their use, potential use, or by virtue of their existence.

Why a council:

Because natural resources and their services are interconnected parts of a larger system, they are better addressed holistically. Cooperation among our

governments, with our diversity of expertise and resources, is the best way to be holistic.

How are our interests satisfied:

Understanding the present and future nature, extent, and value of the natural resources of the Hanford site; both locally and regionally.

Understanding and approaching natural resource management holistically.

Efficiently integrating natural resource management into Hanford planning and cleanup.

Responsibly managing the natural resources of the Hanford site.

Avoiding and minimizing the degradation or destruction of natural resources and their services.

Replacing valuable lost natural resources and services quickly.

Using identical or similar replacement for valuable lost natural resources or services.

Recognizing the connection between natural resources, the services they provide, and the health and quality of life of our constituencies.

ACTION: Comments on the Core Values are to be sent to Geoff Tallent by June 23, 1995. The Core Values Committee will present a revised Core Values document at the July NRTC meeting.

1100 AREA DELISTING, Larry Gadbois

Mr. Larry Gadbois provided the following points in a document he distributed at the NRTC meeting regarding the fate of the 1100 Area relative to National Priorities Listing (NPL) delisting and land transfer and revegetation. If anyone has questions, Mr. Gadbois can be reached on 509-376-9884.

- ▶ Land listed on the NPL can be transferred/sold. The CERCLA statute does not prohibit land transfer. However the CERCLA NPL stigma may deter some potential recipients.
- ▶ EPA does not delist portions of NPL sites.
- ▶ If a remedial action is selected that results in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, the lead agency shall determine that a review shall be initiated no less often than every five years after implementation of this selected remedial action.
- ▶ In October 1989, EPA established policy to require conduct of at least one five-year review prior to delisting a site from the NPL. In December 1991, EPA reversed this policy. Thus, the two processes are now independent.
- ▶ Confirmation of revegetation: If the purpose is part of the contaminant remedial action (stabilization of a cap, enhancement of in-situ biodegradation processes, etc.) it is evaluated differently than if the purpose is habitat restoration relative to natural resource services. It

also makes a difference if the revegetation/restoration is specified in the Record of Decision versus an activity introduced during Remedial Design.

- ▶ The deletion process may begin upon approval of the Close Out Report.
- ▶ A remedy becomes Operational and Functional either one year after construction is complete, or when the remedy is determined concurrently by EPA and the State to be functioning properly and is performing as designed, whichever is earlier. EPA may grant extensions to the one-year period, as appropriate.
- ▶ Close Out Report: Approval of the Close Out Report will signify Superfund site completion. The Close Out Report will be prepared following successful implementation of the final operable unit at the site. All confirmatory sampling and any activities required to ensure the remedy is operational and functional should be completed prior to approval of the Close Out Report. A Remedial Action Report will be prepared by the construction management contractor following each operable unit. This report constitutes the contractor's assurance to the EPA that the work was performed to within desired specifications. It does not, however, constitute site completion. Only the Close Out Report will satisfy completion requirements and only one Close Out Report will be prepared for the entire site, regardless of the number of operable units.

ACTION ITEMS

ACTION: Paul Kube will begin drafting a Tolling Agreement by the next Council meeting. Regulatory/Legal Committee will review it prior to presentation to the full Council.

ACTION: Mr. Paul Kube will talk to Mr. Glenn Goldberg about commitments Mr. Goldberg made to send someone to look at the North Slope cricket situation and to consult with his supervisor about the situation. Mr. Jaime Ziesloft and Ms. Kathy Leonard will assist.

ACTION: NRTC comments on the Core Values are due to Mr. Geoff Tallent by June 23.

ACTION: Core Values Committee will meet and incorporate comments into Core Values document prior to the next meeting.

ACTION: NRTC: get signatures on MOA and return signature pages to Geoff Tallent prior to the next meeting.

ACTION: Upland Committee will get with BHI to understand the ramifications of the Army Corps of Engineers no longer participating on site projects and report at the next meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Paul Kube will get DOE NRDA Green book to Ms. Janet Ebaugh.

ACTION: Administrative Committee will look into the need for a technical person to assist NRTC on economics issues.

ACTION: Mr. Geoff Tallent will send Ms. Kathy Leonard's Core Values comments to the NRTC for review.

ACTION: Mr. Geoff Tallent will send a copy of the Core Values presentation to NRTC.

INCOMPLETE ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

ACTION: Trustees will submit comments to the 100 Area document to Mr. Paul Kube. Ecology will work to finalize their comments before the next meeting.

ACTION: Upland Committee will address the issue of seed collection.

ACTION: Mr. Paul Kube will invite someone to give a presentation on the implementation plan of the HRA EIS.

ACTION: Mr. Paul Kube will confirm with Mr. Glenn Goldberg that the documentation from ACE assures that the landfill is consistently 2 feet deep and report to the NRTC.

AGENDA ITEMS

Native Seed Nursery Update, Upland Committee, Dana Ward

Congressional Update, Chris Burford

Mitigation Banking 101, Liz Block

Mitigation, John Carleton

DOE NRDA Steering Committee Update, Paul Kube

MOA, Geoff Tallent

Status on 100 Area Projects, Greg Eadim

Update on Central Plateau Letter, Paul Kube

Update on North Slope, Paul Kube, Liz Block

Chromium Pump and Treat Update, Mike Thompson

CRCIA Update, Larry Gadbois

Committee Updates

Administration Committee

- Bylaws and Operating Principles, Susan

- Core Values, Geoff Tallent

- Funding and Staffing Needs, Chris and Stan

 - Technical Person for Economics Issues

- Draft Public/Hanford Outreach Strategy, Susan

- Outreach to Other Trustee Organizations, Geoff

Upland Committee

- Status Action Items

River Committee

- Status Action items

Regulatory/Legal Committee

- Trustee integration into CERCLA process, Larry

- Tolling Agreement, Paul, Chris

- Legal Drivers for Site-Wide Planning, Mike

Site Wide Committee

- Status Action Items

100 Area Values Letter, Geoff Tallent

ERDF MAP Update, Kathy Leonard