

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 03 2007

**EDMC**

0074616

NRTC  
Draft Agenda  
March 20 & 22, 2007  
Richland, Washington

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
<b><u>March 20, Tuesday, Ecology Office</u></b>			
8:00 – 9:00	Welcome Announcements December Meeting Summary Action items review Calendar Task	Barbara all Dana/Roger Dana/Roger Barbara	Business approval update
9:00 – 9:15	300FF5 status	Mike Th.	Presentation
9:15 – 9:45	WCH Surface Soil Survey MARRSIM	Jeff L Wayne G.	Presentation Answer Q. Discussion
9:45 – 10:00	Columbia River Component Status	John S.	Presentation
10:00 – 10:15	Break		
10:15 – 11:30	Demonstration on Reference Database	Ridolfi	Presentation Interaction
11:30 – 1:00	Lunch		
1:00 – 1:30	Discussion of Relation of 100/300 Area RA to TC – EIS	Woody	Information Discussion
1:30 – 2:00	Status of Reference Sites Review	John P	Information
2:00 – 2:30	Status of Integration Concerns Integration Definition	Joe Paul	Information Information
2:30 – 2:45	Break		
2:45 – 3:00	100/300 Site Listing	Donna	Information

3:00 – 4:00	Preparation for 3-21 Workshop	Barbara	Discussion
4:00 – 4:15	Revegetation Work by WCH	Ken G.	Information

**March 21, Wednesday, Workshop, Ecology Office 8:00 to 4:00**

- Evaluation of detection limits versus SAP PQLs (Section 2)
- Consistency of detection across sample media
- Correlation of concentrations for 'paired samples'
- Comparison of 100 Area/300 Area RCBRA to previous investigations
- Spatial trends in contaminant concentrations versus river mile
- Time series plots of groundwater concentrations
- Status of Inter Areas assessment
- Status of Columbia River Component

**March 22, Thursday**

8:30 – 9:00	“Joseph” Priorities Senior Meeting impact to those Priorities	Barbara	Discussion
9:00 – 9:20	Accomplishments Review	Barb/Larry	Briefing
9:20 – 10:20	Administrative Process for an Injury Assessment Plan	Callie	Information
10:20 -11:00	Existing Data for Injury Assessment Plan (IA)	Callie	Review Discussions
11:00 – 11:30	IA Plan options for levels, Data Completeness & Uncertainty	Charlene A.	Briefing
11:30 – 12:00	DOE, Path Forward	Joe F.	Briefing
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch		
1:00 - 1:30	PNSO, Overview of PNNL, Capability Replacement Laboratory Project for the “triangle”	Julie	Presentation

1:30 – 2:30	Perspective on Path to Closure - Scale, Protective & Data Criteria	John P. Larry G. John S. Jamie Z.	Information Discussion
2:30 – 3:30	Administration Review action items Improvements in Council meetings Next meeting	Barbara	Action

**Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council  
March 20 & 22, 2007 Meeting**

**Meeting Summary**

**Participants:**

<b><u>CTUIR</u></b>	<b><u>WDOE</u></b>
Barbara Harper	Beth Rochette
Rico Cruz	John Price
<b><u>NPT</u></b>	<b><u>WDFW</u></b>
Dan Landeen	Charlene Andrade
Gabriel Bohnee	
	<b><u>YN</u></b>
<b><u>ODOE</u></b>	Jay McConnaughey
Paul Shaffer	Ray Givens (phone)
Donna Morgans	Brian Barry (phone)
	Russell Jim (phone)
<b><u>USDOJ</u></b>	
Mike Zevenbergen (phone)	<b><u>NOAA</u></b>
	Rebecca Arenson
<b><u>USFWS</u></b>	
Don Steffeck	<b><u>USDOE</u></b>
Rich Torquemada	Joe Franco, RL
Jim Hansen	Dana Ward, RL
	Woody Russell, ORP
<b><u>USEPA</u></b>	John Sands, RL
Larry Gadbois	Jamie Zeisloft, RL
	Wayne Glines, RL
	Mike Thompson, RL
<b><u>Bureau of Indian Affairs</u></b>	Connie Smith, RL (phone)
Q. Brown	Julie Erickson, SC
Dan Noble	Mike Talbot, SC
<b><u>Contractors</u></b>	<b><u>USDOJ</u></b>
Roger Dirkes, PNNL	Jean Rice (phone)
Callie Ridolfi, Ridolfi	
Larry Hulstrom, WCH	<b><u>HAB</u></b>
Jeff Lerch, WCH	Susan Leckband
Darci Teel, WCH	Jerry Peltier
	Pam Larson

## March 20, 2007

Welcome B. Harper

The meeting was brought to order by Barbara Harper, Council Chair, and introductions ensued. Jim Hansen, USFWS, was introduced and will be taking on a larger role out of the Spokane office. Several HAB representatives were in attendance primarily as observers but also attempting to learn more about the Council and its role at Hanford. HAB representatives included Susan Leckband, Jerry Peltier, and Pam Larsen. D. Steffek provided a brief overview of the HNRTC and its purpose and roles (technical assistance and trustee) on the clean-up side as well as on the natural resource side. Questions remained as to who the HNRTC works for/with and how the Council interacts. Since the HNRTC and HAB have similar interests, it is in the best interest of both groups to better understand and support each other as appropriate.

Announcements All

There is a Science and Technology (S&T) workshop planned for March 27 to discuss needs to enhance research on groundwater issues. HAB is creating a groundwater flowchart of closure activities related to groundwater. There is a need to evaluate technology as it is developed and utilize as appropriate to minimize exposure of public from contaminated groundwater. The HNRTC has questions as to how they should engage and track groundwater issues, where to track as a Council or rely on the HAB, or weigh in as individual trustees. One option is for the HNRTC Chair to submit a letter to DOE-RL to show council participation and concerns.

Meeting summaries D. Ward, R. Dirkes

The meeting summaries from the past two HNRTC meetings (October and December 2006) were discussed and both were approved with minor revisions. Since the Yakama Nation (YN) representative was not able to attend the October meeting, The YN abstained on the October Meeting Summary vote.

Action items review D. Ward, R. Dirkes

Open action items, as described in the December 2006 meeting summary, were reviewed and closed or cancelled as warranted. Those items remaining open, as well as new action items established during this meeting, are listed at the end of this summary.

Calendar Update B. Harper

B. Harper handed out a listing of upcoming meetings/workshops of potential interest to the Council. There is no single place to obtain such a list and it is difficult to capture and track all the upcoming activities. Suggestions to streamline or assist in putting this list together are welcome.

The demonstration of the reference document database was postponed until the June meeting in Portland. Also, the presentation scheduled for Thursday, March 22 from 11:00 to 11:30 on the Injury Assessment Plan and discussion of data completeness and uncertainty was postponed until the June meeting. Preparation for the Senior Trustee Meeting was added to the agenda at 10:15 on March 20.

300FF5 status

K.M. Thompson

300FF5 includes the groundwater beneath the 300 Area as well as below the 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds north of the 300 Area. Past 5-year reviews recognized that attenuation of the uranium plume is not occurring at the rate expected. There appears to be sufficient uranium in the aquifer matrix and deep vadose zone that is mobilized when the soil is wetted from high river water levels. There is, however, no apparent downward migration of uranium in the soil column. As a result, a new remedial technology using polyphosphate is being evaluated with hopes that it will create a sequestration barrier to stop the movement of uranium into the river.

TCE was found at elevated levels in deep wells drilled to determine the extent of downward migration of uranium. The TCE appears to be in the sands between the Hanford and Ringold formations. Four boreholes are planned to further investigate the TCE plume, only one of which is funded in FY 2007. Additional groundwater funding may provide more latitude for additional work.

Elevated gross alpha levels in groundwater beneath the 618-2 burial ground were observed. Three wells were drilled near the site, purged and sampled as a result of the discovery. The pH in water at the bottom of the burial ground was low but went back up in the deeper zone, rendering the plutonium immobile away from the immediate area. Plutonium concentrations in all three wells were below the detection level confirmed the lack of migration of plutonium away from the burial ground.

An all day workshop is scheduled for March 27, 2007 to discuss funding and potential remediation S&T efforts. M. Thompson provided a handout providing a brief description of the workshop, agenda, and a brief needs statement. Potential activities have been prioritized into categories. Specific activities within each category are also prioritized to facilitate discussions. New ideas are welcome and suggestions are encouraged. Needs that have been identified include science as well as clean-up work that needs to get done. It might be beneficial to differentiate between data needs and technology needs or characterization versus remediation needs. Mark Gilbertson from DOE-HQ will be at the workshop. M. Thompson will send handout electronically to D. Ward for distribution to trustees. (ACTION # 155)

There is an update to a 10 year old baseline ecological risk assessment nearing completion. The initial assessment was to provide snapshot in time and the update was intended to bring that snapshot up to today's conditions and does not look into the future. As a result there are some inconsistencies between this update and the ongoing 100/300 Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment. These inconsistencies will need to be addressed through the ongoing assessment processes, similar to other past assessments.

Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) is initiating plans to develop and test area based radiological surveys following completion of the 100 Areas. Guidance provided in MARRSIM is being considered in the design of the surveys. MARRSIM describes a process to conduct surveys to establish that clean-up levels, or other criteria, have been met. This is being considered as a way to evaluate the inter area and it is not being used to closeout any remediation area. A graded approach is being considered to address remediated waste sites (high), roads or areas where wastes were transported (medium), and areas adjacent to cleanup activities (low). They are currently looking at approach and design of the surveys, which they expect to be completed over the next several months. This will be followed by conducting the surveys, interpreting data, evaluating effectiveness of the method, and then presenting results for stakeholder input. It was emphasized that this is not part of the formal closure, other surveys and sampling will do that. Trustees express interest in being involved in development of this effort or development of a sampling and analysis plan. It was stressed that this is not sampling, which is not planned for several years, and that this is to provide current status of radiological levels at this point in time. This is to provide information immediately following completion of clean-up and consists of only surface radiological surveys.

A handout describing DOE's land release process as described in DOE Order 5400.5 was provided. A brief discussion followed and it was agreed that this topic would be postponed to a future meeting. Since the next meeting is in Portland, followed by the annual planning meeting in Joseph, Oregon, it may be December before we get people back together on this topic.

Columbia River Component RCBRA

J. Sands, L. Hulstrom

It was announced that the Columbia River Component of the RCBRA would be a model for trustee involvement by DOE at the Senior Trustee Meeting. However, it appears that the assessment is moving forward without input from the trustees and WCH plans for involvement are the same as for earlier risk assessments. Data gathering and potential data gap analysis was completed and summarized last June/July (WCH-91). WCH is now charged with the development of a work plan for the actual assessment, which includes additional gap analyses. The Trustees inquired about a point of contact or a way to get information on what is going on. Right now there are internal meetings and Tri Party involvement. The development of a Sampling and Analyses Plan is some time out. It is anticipated that data compilation and gap analysis will be completed and then, when appropriate, schedule a workshop and initiate discussions that launch a DQO process to determine what is needed to fill the gaps. WCH indicated geographic coverage would be from Priest Rapids Dam to McNary Dam. Trustees feel it is premature to define study area and pointed out this is an example of moving forward without trustee involvement. "True" early involvement was identified as a potential topic for upcoming Senior Trustee Meeting. State of Oregon has written two letters to DOE emphasizing trustee involvement. D. Morgans will take lead in developing summary of early involvement concern to share with trustees for possible council action and input to senior meeting. (ACTION # 156)

Senior Meeting Agenda Items

All

The date for the Senior Trustee Meeting has not yet been finalized and is currently between April 12 and April 17. The main topic (possibly entire meeting) will likely be the new approach to move forward on NRDA to be presented by DOE. As such, there will not be much time for other items so it would be best to limit number of items and prioritize so time is used on most important issues. It was agreed that the PAS would dominate the meeting. Integration of assessments, including NRDA, was considered the next priority. Early effective involvement of trustees in assessment process (ie., River Component RCBRA, Inter Area Soil Survey, etc.) was also identified as a continuing issue.

#### WCH Revegetation D. Teel

The window for successful revegetation is October through February at Hanford. As such, revegetation activities have just been completed for this year and plans for next year are ongoing. All WCH projects are being evaluated and estimates of how much seed will be needed are being prepared. Revegetation activities are documented in an annual report put out in September. The CTUIR native seed nursery is producing seeds for several species successfully and these are being used to revegetate disturbed areas. WCH process includes planting, monitoring of progress every year for 5 years. If it is successful then monitoring is performed less frequently. If unsuccessful the site generally is reseeded and monitoring continues. The trustees asked if revegetation activities are coordinated onsite. We have some revegetation performed for NEPA mitigation, stabilization of waste sites, and restoration or remediation of waste sites. Are the processes used by all the same across the board? This is a possible topic for discussion at an ERWG meeting, which will be scheduled to coincide with a HAB or ecological risk meeting/workshop this year. This may also have some connection to the reference site concept and perhaps a standard 'mix' of species would be appropriate.

#### Reference Site Evaluation J. Price

The final report documenting the review of reference sites at Hanford is not yet complete. However, J. Price offered the following summary:

- Need for a better up front job of reference site selection documentation. The evaluation didn't turn up anything particularly wrong, but documentation and buy in up front is lacking.
- DOE/contractors (everyone) need to use common definition of reference site or at least be very clear of how it is being defined for the specific study.
- There may be a need to augment reference sites in existence now (ie., more sites).

Trustees identified some issues that need to be covered including airborne deposition and how to account for it in assessments and definition of 'background' since this impacts the clean-up level. Recommendations regarding reference sites from Ecology, which is coming out in the near future, may impact cleanup schedules.

Related to reference sites is the concept of restoration to 'background'. Final restoration levels must be defined and methods to determine whether or not restoration is 'done' are needed. In addition, baseline conditions for NRDA should be developed. A workgroup was established

(Hanford Baseline Workgroup) to develop scope of this task. Workgroup members include P. Shaffer – lead, D. Steffek, D. Ward, B. Harper, D. Landeen, and J. Zeisloft. (ACTION # 157)

Tank Closure – Environmental Impact Statement (TC-EIS)

W. Russell

The TC-EIS will include a cumulative analysis but it is not a sitewide risk assessment. Decision to do sitewide risk assessment has not been made and will be the responsibility of J. Franco and M. McCormick. The composite analysis, required by DOE Order 435.1, more closely mimics a sitewide assessment. The next composite analysis will follow the completion of the TC-EIS and will incorporate the cumulative analysis. Some trustees feel the risk assessment should be done before the composite (sitewide) analysis. Relative to TC-EIS, RL feels NEPA requirements are being fulfilled. NEPA allows for some flexibility in that minimal data can be overcome by accounting for the uncertainty associated with small data sets. The EIS will also be worst case as the benefits of pump and treat will not be included for in the assessment. The EIS is scheduled for completion in January of 2009, with the composite analysis following shortly thereafter. It is believed by RL that there is sufficient information in the EIS to make necessary decision. As always there is a risk that not everyone will be convinced. EPA noted that the groundwater model currently being used is one-dimensional and inadequate. DOE recommended the trustees weigh in during the review process and provide comments on the draft or send to Mary Beth Burandt. (ACTION # 158) W. Russell will be point of contact on the composite analysis and link back to DOE.

Integration Concerns

J. Franco

P. Shaffer provided a handout, which will be included in summary, and led discussion on integration, including a definition. (ACTION # 159) Key components for successful integration include:

- Physical environment
- Regulating framework
- Structural units
- Management
- Fiscal system

Management consistency is very important and there may be some issues with Office of Science position on BRMaP that may warrant HQ attention. The possibility of Hanford becoming a player with the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership may also shift management outlook.

Second handout is from D. Dunning, state of Oregon, and provides a conceptual model showing elements of RI/FS and NRDA assessments. Dunning's approach demonstrates several similarities between the two but the timing is out of synch.

If we don't integrate there could be duplication of efforts, inefficiencies, and the path to closure will be disjointed. Oregon is going to work this issue further and will present next version at the next HNRTC meeting. The thought is that integration with the clean-up activities will facilitate reaching agreeable restoration.

A handout, which was prepared for the HAB, was provided to the trustees by D. Morgans who also led a discussion on a review of the WCH integration strategy. The report was organized by Operable Units in the 100 Area by milestone dates. Interim remedial action (bias for action) completion dates are provided. Those needing institutional control are identified and will be included in risk assessment. Tribal scenario may trigger more sites needing institutional control. It was intended to tell whether or not cleanup levels and closure methods are or are not adequate. It is also useful for data gap analysis. While tons of material have been moved to ERDF (2/3rds by volume), the number of curies moved is small since most activity is found in the burial grounds as opposed to these waste sites. Mass that is left and could leach to the groundwater will be picked up in the groundwater assessment. It doesn't appear that there are significant gaps. Everything that was remediated is included in the assessment. Orphan sites and new discoveries will be added to totals and the MARRSIM survey will help fill other gaps. Thus far, small stuff, in terms of curies and volume, are being found. 'Legends' are being investigated.

Preparation for 3/21/06 Workshop B. Harper

Questions, issues, and/or concerns on the 100/300 RCBRA for the workshop include:

- What is in?
- What is out?
- What is being done beyond SAP that isn't being included?
- What data issues have been identified?
- Chromium in horizontal aquifer tubes.
- Have we done any continuous monitoring of conductivity to determine the time receptors are being exposed?

Close for the day.

### March 22, Thursday

Senior Trustee Items – 'Joseph' Priorities All

The top 5 priorities as determined at Joseph planning meeting were:

- Sitewide PAS
- Integration
- TC - EIS
- Action Plans
- Long Term Stewardship

Items identified during the Senior Trustee Meeting as those activities the Council should focus on were:

- Planning for ecological risk assessments
- River Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment

- TC – EIS

The Council discussed several options for how best to stay engaged with the growing number of activities of interest. Most trust organizations are involved with the EIS within their existing frameworks. As such, an option to weigh in as issues of interest come up and maintain general periodic overviews at council meetings may suffice. All trustees most likely need to look at some part, if not all, of the impact analysis and cumulative assessment. It was agreed that we need an overview of the EIS status at the next HNRTC meeting with technical folks available to provide input as needed via phone. (ACTION # 158)

P. Shaffer will enhance the front end of Oregon's definition of integration. A better definition is needed so everyone is on the same page and it can be communicated to other groups. A similar effort is warranted on 'cumulative risk'.

Trustee involvement continues to be an issue. River Component of the RCBRA was to address concerns, but now the project has already moved forward without involvement. Upper level DOE offered to engage trustees early, yet it hasn't happened. Where the breakdown is occurring needs to be identified so it can be addressed. J. Sands indicated trustees would be involved early, however, WCH is moving forward to complete DQO and SAP to allow for sampling this summer/fall. The schedule is driving action and there is no indication of involving the trustees nor is there an acknowledgement of the usefulness and value of trustee involvement. A concise definition of involvement, specifically early involvement, may be needed. It was pointed out that project manager conference calls include discussions of schedule and concerns which may be a useful venue for trustees. It hasn't been effective to date for those that have called in. Oregon reminded the group that the schedule for the River Component was provided last December and Oregon responded with concerns but they weren't aware that any other trustee responded to it and now we're weighing in. Council could express agreement with Oregon input or wait for Senior Trustees to address issue. Additional discussion followed on limiting the geographic area of the assessment and how the decision was made, with more questions being raised. It was agreed to curtail discussion for now in order to move on with meeting agenda items. B. Harper will draft letter from the council chair, send to trustees for review and transmit to DOE. J. Franco offered to receive concerns from group and pass them on and try to identify the breakdown. (ACTION # 160)

Injury Assessment Plan Administrative Process      R. Givens, C. Ridolfi

C. Ridolfi provided handout providing background for scoping an assessment plan and laying foundation to kick off the next step. The need for a briefing on how to use the document database to get to the data was acknowledged and identified as an action item. (ACTION # 161)

The discussion led to how the process works at mega-mining sites and the working relations between the response owner and the trustees. Coeur D'Alene and the silver valley were used as an example of how they worked together and how they learned and adjusted as they went. It is feasible that there should be a phased approach with the first phase being a sitewide injury assessment, followed by injury quantification. The Yakama Nations (YN) Preliminary Assessment Screen (PAS) and options to move forward were discussed. Options ranged from

rewriting PAS as a council, to suggesting changes to YN PAS, to moving on without changing the PAS. Federal trustees are still working the issue and will provide feedback soon. Senior trustees advised to work on trusteeship language and revise the YN PAS. Similarly, the CTUIR has direction to modify the trusteeship language. There is general agreement to try to resolve issues and not have multiple PASs on the table. The decision to stop the RCBRA at McNary Dam was brought up as an example that would have been done differently at Coeur D'Alene. Both sides worked together and came to agreement on how to proceed, either through response side or resource side, but the communications allowed for upfront input and decision-making as well as assuring priority issues are covered by someone. Current Hanford Trustee products (PAS and Data Compilation) may be useful on the response side, however, it was pointed out that documents included to date cover historical conditions and not applicable to risk assessment of current conditions.

#### PNSO, PNNL, & CRL Overview J. Erickson, M. Talbot

There are 3 DOE entities at Richland, 2, RL and ORP, are part of DOE-EM and the latest, Pacific Northwest Site Office (PNSO), is part of DOE-Science (SC). PNSO was established initially for research at Hanford. A unique arrangement (use agreement) was included in the contract that allowed for the use of PNNL for private research and the work now conducted by PNNL is diversified. The contract to manage PNNL will be put out for competitive bid in the near future.

Initial plans called for the replacement of all needed 300 Area facilities as a result of DOE-EM's clean-up plans. However, costs exceeded those anticipated significantly and currently plans call for retaining the 325, 350, 318, and 331 facilities in the 300 Area. The Capability Replacement Laboratory is scheduled to be built in the "triangle" just north of the Battelle complex, the administrative jurisdiction of which was recently transferred from EM to Science.

Concerns have been raised by the trustees due to the lack of consultation on the EA and the apparent determination that BRMaP is not applicable for PNSO since they are not part of "Hanford". This seems inconsistent with the original intent for BRMaP and confusing since it is all DOE. There is also confusion as to when the trustees should be consulted in that some feel they are involved only in CERCLA clean-up activities. There appeared to be some inconsistency in that apparently the Hanford Cultural Resource Management Plan, which is comparable to BRMaP, is being followed. There was some discussion about the adequacy of the EA as well. The issue was left with DOE to clarify the applicability of the Hanford management plans and legal requirements for the Office of Science. (ACTION # 162)

#### Accomplishments All

A handout was provided that took initial input by L. Goldstein a step further to showcase the Council's accomplishments and demonstrate the impacts the Council has on activities at Hanford. The goal is to document what has been done, what was influenced, and its significance. P. Shaffer will provide copy of similar document put together by the state of Oregon as an example. A working group was established (Accomplishments) including B.

Harper, D. Landeen, and S. Hughs. The group will work on a draft for review and further development. (ACTION # 163)

#### Path to Closure - Scale, Protective & Data Criteria J. Sands, L. Gadbois

John Sands led discussion of the work group established between the Tri-Parties that is continuing to discuss the river corridor in a holistic manner and an integration strategy for closure. We need to go through final actions and a Record of Decision (ROD). They have started putting a list together of the requirements needed for completion which includes what RODs are needed and options to move forward, including lumping source operable units with groundwater operable units. ROD groupings also need to be determined. A fact sheet listing requirements and options is anticipated that will be distributed to trustees and others for input. The intent is to define alternatives and look at pros and cons of each, select favorable options, and move forward.

Larry Gadbois provided his perspective of CERCLA path to closure. Interim action ROD can take place any time before final. A full RI/FS may not be necessary for interim RODs. Interim action RODs must be followed by a final ROD and they can't simply be re-categorized. Deletion from the NPL follows the final ROD and confirms that ROD is completed and remediation processes are established. Deletion, which is an EPA action, does not have to be for the entire site. "No Action" RODs still must have a plan and include public comments but ARARs are not invoked. Institutional control is an action, therefore by applying this standard there is not likely to ever be a no action ROD at Hanford. Other standards, such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act apply if no CERCLA response action is underway. At Hanford, a decision was made to use interim RODs providing more risk assessments to support the final ROD. Most of the clean-up work will be done at the time the final ROD is issued and the remaining work will be done under a final ROD. Final RODs must address all risk elements of the project. Assessments under interim RODs can be partial. Final RODs certify compliance with ARARs. EPA determines risk threshold for clean-up, generally defined by ARARs, and residual risk may exist. Residual risk may result in risk/injury as defined by other entities. All the 100 Area RODs are interim with the exception of the North Slope and Riverlands. The 300 Area source operable unit is a final ROD, while others in 300 Area are interim. All RODs are listed in the 5-year review and this is a good reference to better understand them.

There is extensive monitoring and analysis that goes on during clean-up, essentially until a contaminant is not detectable. Then initial sampling is used to determine the variability in concentrations across the study area, which is used in designing the final sampling plan. Final sampling is performed and results are used for closeout and final ROD determination. The final assessment includes total cumulative risk based on current conditions and modeling of future conditions to see if there is a potential problem in the future. Will there be final assessment to roll all these together? Closest thing so far is the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment.

There is much more investigative work to be done before final 300 Area ROD is completed. Changes in regulations, such as MTCA, over time are not always accounted for in ARARs as not all parts of a regulation are identified as ARARs and they are frozen during the process. It

remains unclear how cumulative risk is going to be accounted for at Hanford and how all potential receptors are going to be accounted for. That is, how will we know we covered the most sensitive species?

#### Senior Management Meeting Wrap-up

Three items were identified earlier that trustees would like feedback on from the Senior Trustees:

- Early involvement on Columbia River Component of the RCBRA
- Integration – trustees need to prepare something they could act on. As such, trustees need to complete product upon which the Senior managers can act
- PAS – injury assessment: Need to know federal trustee position and approach.

Three items were discussed that were identified by the Senior Trustees:

- Pilot restoration ideas (ACTION # 165)
- Issues with involvement on River Component of RCBRA
- Resources needed for council to move forward (ACTION # 164)

Meeting Closeout          B. Harper, All

The council members need to be thinking about nominee or volunteer for the Vice Chair position under Gabriel Bohnee next year. J. McConnaughey indicated he would be willing to serve in this capacity. In addition, P. Shaffer indicated he would consider this role and pursue with his management. Others will think about it further. We need to discuss, make formal nomination, and perform formal vote to formalize the action.

The next meeting will be held June 19, 20, and 21 in Portland, Oregon. Topics for the June meeting included:

- Columbia River Component of the RCBRA Needs
- Funding options for HNRTC
- Alternative to move forward on injury assessment (Ridolfi presentation)
- Resolution of PNSO/"triangle" concerns regarding BRMaP and trustee involvement

The September meeting was scheduled for September 18, 19, and 20 in Joseph, Oregon.

DRAFT – April 18, 2007

**ACTION ITEMS  
March 20 & 22, 2007  
HNRTC MEETING**

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
2.	<p>WEB SITE:</p> <p>a) Update general information on Web page – D. Ward</p> <p>b) Review update, comment to D. Ward ASAP</p> <p>c) General Review by Trustees, comment to D. Ward</p> <p>d) Add ERA participation and link to BHI ERA website – J. Zeisloft</p> <p>e) Work Group to Update (SH, LV, BH, DS)</p> <p>f) Put changes into website for review</p> <p>g) Remove phone numbers from website</p> <p>h) Ongoing comments and Accomplishments to D. Ward</p> <p>ACTION: HNRTC, L. Goldstein, D. Ward</p>	<p>9/11/03</p> <p>12/1/04</p> <p>5/25/05</p> <p>5/25/05</p> <p>9/7/05</p> <p>11/16/05</p> <p>3/15/06</p> <p>6/7/06</p> <p>10/3/06,</p> <p>12/12/06, 3/20/07</p>	<p>4<sup>th</sup> Qtr 04</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
80.	<p>Provide work plan schedules for CP and GW Remediation to trustees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- include budgets</li> <li>- more info needed</li> </ul> <p>ACTION: D. Ward</p>	<p>9/8/05, 11/16/05</p> <p>3/15/06, 6/7/06,</p> <p>10/3/06,</p> <p>12/12/06, 3/20/07</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>CP provided</p> <p>Need GW,</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
125.	<p>Work Group (B. Harper – lead, L. Gadbois, L. Goldstein, D. Ward, D. Steffek, J. Concannon)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Calendar of events or matrix of (TPA milestones, OUs, TSDs, etc.)</li> <li>- Legal review/interpretation – tolling agreement?, regulatory clock start?</li> </ul> <p>ACTION: B. Harper, Work Group</p>	<p>10/4/06</p> <p>12/12/06, 3/20/07</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
130.	<p>RCRA – NRDA connection Work Group: D. Steffek - lead, J. Concannon, C. Andrade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- White paper for trustee review</li> <li>- Possible agenda item next HNRTC meeting</li> <li>- Draft for legal review</li> </ul> <p>ACTION: D. Steffek, Work Group</p>	<p>10/4/06</p> <p>12/13/06</p> <p>3/20/07</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
136.	<p>RL plan/vision for 'integration' of risk assessments at Hanford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trustees to provide info on past effort to D. Ward</li> <li>- high level RL presentation at next HNRTC meeting</li> <li>- Sr. Trustee Mtg Agenda topic and March HNRTC meeting agenda topic</li> <li>- 'paragraph' for Sr. Trustee Mtg</li> </ul>	<p>10/4/06</p> <p>10/4/06</p> <p>12/12/06</p> <p>12/13/06</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	- Continue discussions/definition ACTION: Trustees, J. Franco, D. Ward	3/20/07	Open
142.	Potential for Restoration: Now or Later - summarize presentations to date including potential restoration options - HNRTC concerns to M. Baker - Agenda item at next HNRTC meeting and potential for Senior Trustee agenda - Summarize advantages to Trustees, to resources, to DOE ACTION: M. Baker	10/5/06    12/13/06	Done  Done Done  Ongoing
143.	NPL listing clarification of boundaries, trustee versus technical support, closeout strategy, statute of limitation clock, and de-listing ACTION: B. Harper, D. Steffek, L. Gadbois, C. Andrade	12/12/06, 3/20/07	Open Agenda Item
144.	YN PAS: • Options paper • Trustees define path forward ACTION: M. Baker, B. Harper, HNRTC	12/12/06 12/12/06, 3/20/07	Open
146.	Action Plans: • Work groups revise independently • HNRTC Conf Call to discuss as whole • Governance paragraph/sale to Sr Trustees ACTION: Work groups, Trustees, S. Hughs	12/12/06 12/12/06 12/12/06, 3/20/07	On hold
151.	Provide copy of 100N Sr-90 coyote willow greenhouse study report to trustees ACTION: M. Thompson	12/13/06, 3/20/07	Ongoing
153.	Circulate Kathy Higley's (OSU) information package on biological dose assessment ACTION: P. Shaffer	12/14/06, 3/20/07	Ongoing
154.	Present results of CP Phase 3 Sampling at next HNRTC meeting. ACTION: B. Foley	12/13/06, 3/20/07	Ongoing
155.	Ground Water Funding Workshop – Special Studies. Send out invite to March 27 Workshop for \$10-20 Million scope in FY08 ACTION: M. Thompson	3/20/07	
156.	Early 'involvement' in River Component of RCBRA – draft/share Oregon input on Trustee involvement ACTION: D. Morgan	3/20/07	
157.	Hanford Baseline Work Group. (P. Shaffer - lead, M. Baker, D. Steffek, D. Ward, D. Landeen, J. Zeisloft) - Define baseline restoration criteria	3/20/07	

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	ACTION: P. Shaffer, Work Group		
158.	TC EIS – Comments from Trustees welcome, provide feedback to Mary Beth Burandt – W. Russell is point of contact. Also include EIS status on next meeting's agenda ACTION: Trustees, W. Russell	3/20/07	
159.	Handout on Integration from Oregon to be provided electronically to be included in Meeting Summary ACTION: P. Shaffer, D. Ward	3/20/07	
160.	Trustee involvement on River Component of RCBRA. - Letter from Council Chair to RL expressing concerns. - DOE to look into disconnect between mgmt and contractor ACTION: B. Harper, J. Franco	3/22/07	
161.	Brief/Training on Matrix dbase and interactive capability sometime in future. ACTION: C. Ridolfi	3/22/07	
162.	Clarification on legal requirements on Office of Science building in 'triangle'. ACTION: J. Zeisloft, J. Erickson	3/22/07	
163.	Council 'accomplishments' – working group to draft product to demonstrate accomplishments of council ACTION: D. Landeen, S. Hughs, B. Harper	3/22/07	
164.	June HNRTC Meeting prep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- draft key points regarding River Component needs and route to trustees (D. Morgans, R. Arenson)</li> <li>- funding options white paper draft (D.Steffeck, J. Hansen)</li> <li>- One page summary of Ridolfi presentation (J. McConnaughey, C. Ridolfi)</li> <li>- WCG soil survey status (P. Shaffer)</li> <li>- 'Triangle' concerns (J.Zeisloft, J. Erickson)</li> </ul> ACTION: as shown	3/22/07	
165.	Restoration ideas (pilot) to be provided to NOAA ACTION: Trustees	3/22/07	