

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council Meeting
 February 9 and 10, 1995
 DRAFT AGENDA

February 9, 1995

- 8:30 - 9:00 Caffeine and Welcome by Mary Lou Blazek, Manager, Nuclear Waste Program, Oregon Department of Energy
- 9:00 - 9:20 Announcements, Handouts, Council
- 9:20 - 9:40 Discuss ERDF ROD, Paul Kube
- 9:40 - 10:00 Discuss Tolling Agreement language. Chris Burford
- 10:00 - 10:20 Break
- 10:20 - 10:45 Nursery letter status, Chris Burford
- 10:45 - 11:15 What is Baseline? How far do we go back with Restoration?
 Jake Jakabosky
- 11:15 - 12:00 Discuss 1100 Area PAS, Callie Ridolfi
- 12:00 - 1:00 Lunch
- 1:00 - 2:00 Discuss Charter; constituencies changes/acceptance, signature page, Geoff Tallent
- 2:00 - 2:20 Discuss ALE, Seeding Wheat or Rye to prevent weed infestation, Jake Jakabosky
- 2:20 - 2:45 Discuss further action on the 200 Area Plateau Letter, Liz Block
- 2:45 - 3:00 Break
- 3:00 - 4:00 100 Area discussion regarding Vision, decide on further action/policy statement on Vision Statement, Paul Kube, Council
- 4:00 - 4:30 Wrap up

February 10

- 8:30 - 9:00 Caffeine and Welcome
- 9:00 - 9:15 Present Status of technical support, Paul Kube
- 9:15 - 10:00 Subcommittee Updates
- 10:00 - 10:30 North Slope/ERDF Salvage Update, Janet Ebaugh
- 10:30 - 10:45 Break
- 10:45 - 11:00 Chromium in the Groundwater in 100 Area, Larry Gadbois
- 11:00 - 11:20 Risk Assessment Methodology, Larry Gadbois
- 11:20 - 12:00 Discuss what happened to the option of the surrogate site process at ERDF, Liz Block
- 12:00 - 1:00 Lunch
- 1:00 - 3:00 Review letter on BRMiS, funding, Geoff Tallent
- 3:00 - 3:45 Break
- 3:45 - 4:00 Discussion on the follow up on cultural resources plan, what RFP went from BHI, Kathy Leonard
- 4:00 - 4:30 Wrap up

RECEIVED
 NOV 27 2007

EDMC

HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 9-10, 1995
PORTLAND, OREGON

8:30- 9:00 a.m.	Caffeine and Welcome	Mary Lou Blazek, Mgr Nuclear Waste Program Oregon Dept of Energy	
9:00- 9:20 a.m.	ERDF Record of Decision Status	Paul Kuba USDOE Richland	Discussion; Action?
9:20- 9:40 a.m.	Tolling Agreement/MOU at Oak Ridge	Larry Gadbois EPA	Discussion, Information
10:00-10:20 a.m.	Break		
10:20-10:45 a.m.	Nursery Letter Status of trustee signatures	Chris Burford CTUIR	Action
10:45-11:15 a.m.	What is Baseline? How far back do we go with Restoration?	Jake Jakobosky EIM	Discussion
11:15-12:00 noon	1100 Area PAS	Callie Ridolfi Yakama Nation	Discussion
12:00- 1:00 p.m.	Lunch (on site)		
ETC	Etc	ETC	ETC

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council Meeting
Draft Record of Discussion
February 9, 1995
Portland, Oregon

9502096
mm

Attendees

Mike Bauer, Yakama Indian Nation
Mary Lou Blazek, Oregon Department of Energy
Liz Block, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department
Chris Burford, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
John Carleton, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dave Conrad, Nez Perce Tribe
Rico Cruz, Nez Perce Tribe
Janet Ebaugh, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Larry Gadbois, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
John Hall, ASCI, Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Susan Coburn Hughes, State of Oregon Department of Energy
Jake Jakabosky, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Paul Kube, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
Kathy Leonard, Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
Callie Ridolfi, Ridolfi Engineers and Associates, Inc.
Geoff Tallent, Washington State Department of Ecology
Linda Tunnell, Dames & Moore

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

Mary Lou Blazek, Manager of the Nuclear Waste Program, Oregon Department of Energy, welcomed the Council to Oregon and expressed her appreciation that the Council meeting was in Oregon. The State of Oregon is very concerned about Columbia River issues and also about the transportation of materials through Oregon. She stated that ecological issues are very important and her organization applauds the Council's work on ecological restoration and cleanup. Dirk Dunning has been assigned to work on budget issues related to the Hanford cleanup, and Susan Coburn Hughs has now been assigned to represent Oregon. Dirk will be available as a technical resource to the Council when needed. Mary Lou indicated the Oregon Department of Energy will support the Council any way they can, and encouraged the Council to continue the good work.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND HANDOUTS

Susan Coburn Hughs brought a 30-year report with data gathered by the Oregon Department of Health on sampling of the Columbia River. If anyone wants a copy, please contact Susan.

The ERDF Mitigation Action Plan is available. For copies, call Larry Gadbois.

Copies of the ERDF ROD are available from Larry Gadbois.

For a copy of the Executive Memorandum (and associated federal register notice) urging the use of native plants, call Jake Jakabosky.

Rico and Mrs. Cruz had a baby boy three weeks ago, Rico Sterling Cruz.

ERDF ROD, Paul Kube

ERDF Mitigation Action Plan (ERDF MAP) is complete and is available for Trustees to review. Comments need to be completed as soon as possible.

The ERDF salvaging efforts have begun and plants are being put in pots to be transported to the North Slope. There was a discussion on the budget process, and the cost of salvaging. A request was made for the Council to get together via telephone conference call and discuss specifics of the budget with Glenn Goldberg. There was also a question regarding the how appropriate it was to cut salvaging efforts from 5 days to 3 days, who made that decision, and why. Since three sites had been identified, with the reduced salvage material, there may be enough plants to restore only 2 sites. What will happen to the other 15+ acres which have been identified for restoration?

Since the salvaging is going on this week, with the bulldozers going out next week, the Council may not be able to affect a change on this project. Perhaps by discussing "lessons learned," the Council can create a more beneficial situation next time.

DRAFT TOLLING AGREEMENT, Chris Burford

Chris has been researching the legal issues surrounding a tolling agreement. Mike Bauer, Paul Kube and Chris will get together this month and prepare a draft tolling agreement for review at the next Council meeting.

Other comments and questions during the discussion included:

- There are so many questions about when the clock starts running, a tolling agreement may assist DOE to focus on cleanup and not spend resources on litigation.
- DOE is not the only PRP onsite. Since there has been a ROD at 1100 Area, and some groundwater contamination may have come from Siemens, the clock may be ticking, even if the Trustees sign a tolling agreement with DOE.
- The Council should move as quickly as possible to resolve this issue.

NURSERY LETTER STATUS, Chris Burford

Chris indicated that his manager, J.R. Wilkinson, was having a problem with the current version of the Nursery Letter and with the NRTC recommending DOE fund a nursery and native seed bank in light of recent budget concerns and cuts. The concern is that DOE will dismiss the idea now and kill the possibility at a future time. Suggesting the native nursery now may make the Council look demanding and insensitive to DOE's shrinking budget. An alternative approach might be to send a letter endorsing the use of native species during restoration, and incorporate the use of native species in the restoration, planning, and mitigation processes.

Comments and questions during the discussion included:

- This approach seems weak.
- By making the recommendation now for a nursery and native seed bank, it could be considered in future budgets of 1996, 1997, 1998.
- If the recommendation isn't made now, how can it be part of future restoration projects?
- The Council has done a lot of talking and planning, a nursery project is a concrete recommendation that would greatly assist restoration and mitigation.
- Davenport Seed has said they would be willing to collect seed locally, collect plants locally, grow seed and have it be available for restoration projects. This could be done as a business risk rather than a contract.

- Using a company such as this or another company, does not limit diversity and can be used to meet DOE's needs and NRTC's recommendations.
- Should the NRTC offer its expertise to identify seed species?
- Perhaps the letter should be kept more general at the moment.
- Retreating from recommending a nursery and native seed bank may be a mistake at this time.
- CERCLA says the site will be restored, and part of restoration is revegetation.
- Although CERCLA is not specific, replacing the services of lost resources can't really be done without using native species.
- If restoration is done with the right species, it would probably save money because the job wouldn't have to be done over.
- Having the EMSL team get the job to create a nursery should be discussed outside this forum to avoid conflict of interest issues.

It was agreed to work on the letter and discuss it the following day.

WHAT IS BASELINE? Jake Jakobosky

When the NRTC was discussing the 100 Area, a question came up concerning "what is baseline." In doing some research, baseline conditions are defined as conditions that would have existed at an assessment area had the release of the hazardous substance under investigation not occurred. Baseline is the day or hour before release.

Comments and questions during the discussion included:

- The baseline might be cheat grass if that's how the land was before DOE got it.
- There has to be some common sense and logic involved, cheat grass isn't going to be gathered and planted.
- The questions should be: what resources were on the site, what services did they supply, and in a separate issue, would restoration be scaled to the scale of injury?
- There are 2 kinds of liability that apply: restore resources and repay for services lost by restoring resources; ie., you have a cheat grass field where geese eat the grass and because the grass is contaminated, the geese are harmed; DOE would have to do something equivalent to bring the number of geese above baseline.
- How do you convince DOE to do something that will be along the compensatory damages element since DOE doesn't recognize that.
- It would be beneficial if there was some sort of accounting system to balance restoration projects.
- In a damage assessment, an economic measure is used, using discount rates, cost/benefit analysis; but because some of the numbers which need to be plugged into this system are inaccessible to us because all the value impacted would need to be looked at, we may need to use a non-economic accounting system.

ACTION: John Carleton will give a presentation on how to create an accounting system for natural resource injuries.

1100 AREA PILOT PREASSESSMENT SCREEN, Callie Ridolfi

Callie did a brainstorming session to identify what services may have been impacted in the 1100 Area.

GROUNDWATER

- drinking water
- recharge to surface water
- provision for aquatic habitat
- irrigation/stock: agri-use
- bequest
- existence
- aesthetic
- restricting development potential

SURFACE WATER:

- subsistence fishing
- recreational fishing
- off-site commercial
- waterfowl
- plant gathering
- spiritual or ceremonial uses of surface water
 - inhalation of water in a sweat house
 - ceremonial use of salmon
 - drinking
- drinking water
- recreation/water sports
- existence
- bequest
- irrigation/agricultural
- stock water

SOILS

- provision for terrestrial habitat
- medium for vegetative growth
 - gardening
 - gathering
 - agriculture
 - wildlife habitat
- burrowing animals
- rangeland
- land use
- materials source
- habitat for soil biota
- nutrient recycling

AIR:

- recreation
- traditional Native American uses
- wildlife

BIOLOGICAL

Comments and questions during this discussion included:

- There may be a double accounting problem with this in regard to the 300 Area.
- Access or no access to the groundwater could affect the ability to develop economically in the region or could restrict use.
- Is the groundwater ever going to get to the surface.
- Studies say no, but there may need to be an independent evaluation done.
- Damages can't be assessed on theoretical injuries.
- Groundwater reaching surface water may need to be characterized as slim possibility; but if it does happen, it could be devastating.
- The idea is there are impacts to natural resources that reduce services.
- There may be lost income to the community in recreational dollars.
- The next step is to quantify loss of services.
- Restoration would look at how to restore those services that have been reduced.
- The most basic PAS must answer 5 questions, the first 3 are relatively easy; the last 2 are more difficult to answer.
- The idea of the assessment would be to look at how to bring back the services that were lost.
- The question is whether lost services or injuries can be assessed cost-effectively compared to what the cost of restoration would be.
- The assumption is that there's been a potential injury because there has been a release.
- For groundwater, there has been an injury, for soil, there has been an injury; since there has been an injury, the question is how to quantify it, what should restoration look like, what will it cost for that restoration.
- Is there sufficient data available, or can data be acquired to proceed?
- At the next meeting, perhaps we could have something to look at regarding answering cost/benefit analysis.
- The site may need a specific restriction because of the asbestos in the landfill.

ACTION: Callie will do a cost/benefit analysis for the 1100 Area.

CHARTER, Geoff Tallent

Geoff had a couple of changes recommended by Ecology's legal department. Paul Kube brought a draft with changes recommended by DOE's legal department. The item was tabled until the following day to give the Council a chance to review the recommendations.

ALE/NORTH SLOPE SEEDING, Jake Jakobosky

Since nothing is going to be seeded until next fall at some of the disturbed sites on ALE and the North Slope, it might be a good idea to put in a sterile annual which will die out next fall. Currently there is no ground cover. By fall the weeds will likely be dropping seeds in the disturbed sites. There are several ways to prevent weed infestation:

- Herbicides
- Till the ground and bury the seed in the fall

- Plastic tarp to cover the ground
- Drill sterile annuals by Mid-March

Comments and questions during this discussion included:

- Sterile wheat or rye might be used and is the preferred alternative for BLM.
- Native shrubs can be transplanted into seeded ground, if needed.
- There may be difficulty buying seed, obtaining a tractor to drill the seed, and placing the tractor into the area without causing additional damage to the vegetation.
- It is not clear if the Army Corps of Engineers has adequately assessed the impact or determined a clear solution.
- Since ALE is a Research Natural Area, herbicides and equipment to drill annuals may not be allowed.

ACTION: Jake will coordinate with Sandy Simmons to tour ALE and North Slope. Rico, Jay, John, Janet, Paul, and Larry would like to go, also. The tour is tentatively scheduled for next Wednesday, February 15. Jake will confirm.

200 AREA PLATEAU LETTER, Liz Block

On August 29, 1994, the 200 Area Plateau Letter was sent. The NRTC has not gotten a response from DOE. Do we want to pursue this matter? Should we request DOE do a habitat evaluation so when they do future actions, it is not done in high priority habitat.

ACTION: Paul will follow up and see where the 200 Area Letter is within DOE.

NORTH SLOPE CLOSE OUT REPORT, Liz Block

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has produced the first draft of the North Slope Close Out Report. USFWS has several concerns regarding this report including:

- Some critical information concerning contaminants and removal processes were only located in the appendices.
- According to the work plan, they were going to sample each geomagnetic anomaly. When they got into the work, they did not sample each anomaly, and they did use an analogous approach. There was no basis for this decision.
- Toward the end of the process fewer and fewer samples were taken.
- Currently the USFWS does not know what contamination is there and whether the area has been cleaned up appropriately.

Comments and questions during this discussion included:

- Some Trustees were concerned about using the analogous approach.
- A deadline was set to complete this project.
- USFWS won't accept liability for this land, DOE will retain liability.
- Characterization in the landfills was probably inadequate.
- Because so much data was placed in the appendices, it looks like someone was trying to cover up something.
- If sampling isn't done soon, it will never be done.
- There was no indication about the volume of contaminated material.
- There is a question about what kind of habitat is there and will the habitat be damaged more if cleanup continues.

Liz is going to draft a letter containing the concerns of USFWS. If other Trustees would like to concur with her letter, let her know.

100 AREA GUIDELINES

There was some discussion on the 100 Area Guidelines. It was decided to let Kathy Leonard work on and the Council will review a draft during the tomorrow's meeting.

Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council Meeting
Draft Record of Discussion
February 10, 1995
Portland, Oregon

Attendees

- Mike Bauer, Yakama Indian Nation
- Liz Block, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department
- Chris Burford, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- John Carleton, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Dave Conrad, Nez Perce Tribe
- Rico Cruz, Nez Perce Tribe
- Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy
- Janet Ebaugh, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservati on
- Larry Gadbois, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- John Hall, ASCI, Pacific Northwest Laboratory
- Susan Coburn Hughes, State of Oregon Department of Energy
- Jake Jakabosky, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
- Paul Kube, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office
- Kathy Leonard, Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
- Callie Ridolfi, Ridolfi Engineers and Associates, Inc.
- Geoff Tallent, Washington State Department of Ecology
- Linda Tunnell, Dames & Moore

BUDGET, Dirk Dunning

At a series of meetings Dirk attended last week, budget cuts were discussed. Dirk gave his impression of the current budget cuts. These impressions included: the possibility of the termination of the pump and treatment of groundwater in the 100 and 300 Areas (except N Springs); privatization of many activities; significant reductions in Environmental Restoration activities; and apparent disregard for commitments made in the TPA.

CHARTER, Paul Kube

The changes presented by Paul yesterday were discussed.

- The Trustees were concerned with the tone of a significant portion of the language changes offered by DOE-RL Office of Chief Counsel. The charter is intended to be a benign document in which no party attempts to add to their legal authorities or to restrict the rights of other Trustees. The Trustees felt the proposed changes went counter to this theme. Additional language changes were discussed that the Trustees felt could capture the concerns of DOE-RL Office of Chief Counsel without unduly undermining the standing of the other Trustees.
- It is to the benefit of all Trustees to have the participation of DOE-RL as part of the Trustee Council; however, a Council can be formed without DOE-RL. The Trustees hope the differences with DOE-RL Office of Chief Counsel can be worked out. Having

a charter would give the Trustees credibility within DOE and with each member's constituency.

- Participation in this Council is voluntary. The Trustees want a disclosure in the Charter which clearly states that they are not conceding the nature or extent of any other Trustee's jurisdictional authority over any particular natural resources. Such an agreement should be beneficial to the working relationship of all concerned.

ACTION: Geoff Tallent will get a clean copy of the Charter with the recommended changes to Linda to distribute to the Trustees on Monday. There will be a conference call on Thursday to discuss the proposed changes.

ERDF, Liz Block

Six months ago, surrogate sites were proposed in order to assess habitat quality, since ERDF habitat will be removed before it has been assessed. At a recent meeting, U.S. Fish and Wildlife was presented with data regarding habitat. Several surrogate sites were chosen to correspond with the habitat subsets that are scheduled to be destroyed next week. A couple of those sites are still in the ERDF footprint, some were just outside ERDF. Fred Roeck sent a letter stating that the surrogate sites will not be developed for three years or until a mitigation action plan is developed and all necessary data is collected. Fred indicated that the letter would serve as an agreement to these terms. He sent Liz a revised letter incorporating some of her comments, and the commitment that surrogate sites will not be developed for three years with additional years designated, if needed, in yearly increments. Since a strawman mitigation plan is already prepared, it is unlikely to take three years.

Liz indicated that it is encouraging that DOE is willing to take steps to support future mitigation. She also stated that she did not know how accurately the surrogate sites correspond to habitat areas on ERDF.

ACTION: Liz Block will fax a copy of the letter to the Trustees.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT DISCUSSION, Paul Kube

Paul discussed DOE's budget to support issues related to the NRTC. Bob Holt and Paul Kube have allocated \$50,000 of the \$100,000 budget to complete the Biological Resource Mitigation Strategy, something the Trustees have indicated they wanted funded.

They also earmarked \$20,000 for a Columbia River Study. Paul Kube provided the following information concerning the study. The USGS/NBS are embarking on a study of the trophic dynamics of selected habitats comprising the Lower Columbia River System (LCRS) in 1995. Trophic dynamics, also known as food web analysis, focuses on the flow of energy through, and the cycling of material within, an ecosystem. The geographic extent of the study encompasses the Columbia from River Mile 400 to the mouth. The objective of this study is to provide a basic understanding of the energy flows through the various trophic systems comprising the LCRS. Virtually nothing is known about how the LCRS functions at the ecosystem level.

A comprehensive understanding of aquatic ecosystem dynamics rests upon the ability to estimate energy flows, as well as material cycling, through the trophic system. The goal of the study is to provide a rudimentary understanding of the structure and dynamics of the trophic system in the various habitat types of the Lower Columbia. An ultimate goal is to delineate the manner in which energy fixed by primary/bacterial producers in each habitat

finds its way to the ultimate consumers in the system. While research regarding system function has been performed in other systems, such efforts have not been attempted in a system of this complexity.

Regarding the Hanford Reach, a match of \$20K will provide us with \$160K worth of research (on the Reach) involving three trophic levels, primary, secondary, and tertiary. The research will provide, on a temporal and spatial basis, the four dominant species within each trophic level and their associated productivities. These data will be available to us as a cooperating agency on a realtime basis.

A potential spinoff to delineating the effects of Hanford impacts on the ecology of the Reach would be to focus the search for impacts on the dominant species. Another important aspect of the study would be the ability to compare the trophic dynamics of the Reach with the rest of the river.

There is \$30,000 remaining for DOE-RL discretionary spending to support their activities as part of the NRTC.

NURSERY LETTER, Chris Burford

John Hall made some changes to the Nursery Letter in an attempt to capture recommendations made during the discussions yesterday. There were a few minor changes and the letter was generally accepted. Chris indicated that if the CTUIR didn't sign it, the Trustees would be justified in sending it without them.

ACTION: John Hall will complete changes and Linda Tunnell will fax a corrected copy of the Nursery Letter to Trustees for discussion during the Conference call on Thursday.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE MITIGATION STRATEGY (BRMiS), Geoff Tallent

Geoff prepared a draft letter from the Council recommending the BRMiS be completed. Currently, it looks like a funding source has been found and the BRMiS is being worked on based on the information from Paul Kube. The connection between BRMiS and mitigation action on the 240 Road was discussed. Geoff stated the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) that resulted from the 240 Road Mitigation indicated that the DOE has committed to preparing a comprehensive mitigation strategy to support other site-wide mitigation needs along with future 240 Road project mitigation. Since the funding for completing the BRMiS may be forthcoming, the Council decided to wait a month before taking any action on the letter.

ACTION: Geoff will discuss BRMiS Letter Status at the next meeting.

RISK ASSESSMENT, Larry Gadbois

Larry handed out a document called "Ecological Risk Assessment at Hanford for CERCLA Activities." It called out the HSRAM and RERA. "Hanford Site Risk Assessment Methodology" (HSRAM) has been the foundation of risk assessments for about three years. It is the Hanford site-specific implementation plan for numerous guidance documents. For ecological risk the main EPA guidance document is "Framework for Ecological Risk Assessment." The "Risk Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives" (RERA) document evaluates the risks involved from implementing different remedial actions. A RERA is performed to

ensure that selected alternatives are protective of human health and the environment. Larry indicated that he would be willing to discuss these at a future meeting if there was interest.

CHROMIUM STATUS, Larry Gadbois

The 100 Area has chromium in the groundwater in hexavalent form. This is a very toxic, reactive form which acts as a strong oxidant. Since it oxidizes on contact, wherever it touches tissue, it burns and disrupts tissue. It is an ecological concern before it is a human health concern. Right now there is a pump and treat project going on which is doing a decent job of retracting chromium on a small scale.

BECHTEL RFP, Kathy Leonard

Kathy handed out a copy of the current RFP prepared by Tom Marsau and discussing cultural resources. Paul Kube handed out a copy of Cultural Resource Management at Hanford prepared by the Hanford Cultural Resources Laboratory at PNL.

100 AREA VALUES, Kathy Leonard

The 100 Area Values paper was discussed. Suggested changes were offered and discussed. There will be a conference call on Friday, February 24, 1995, at 11:00 a.m. to discuss the Values further.

Comments and questions included:

- Perhaps the pertinent regulations should be cited.
- When we discuss tradeoffs, we need to indicate we want information.
- The Council should agree with the Future Site Uses Working Group, and Hanford Advisory Board that getting contaminants away from the river should be the highest priority.
- One RAD per day should be critically evaluated for each species, and used only if it can be shown to be protective.
- Will there be land use assumptions in this document?
- Will Native American uses, wildlife scenarios, or recreational uses be addressed in this document?

ACTION: Kathy Leonard and Liz Block will rewrite Values incorporating recommended changes and draft cover letter and fax it to Trustees before the telephone conference call scheduled for Friday, February 24, 1995.

NEXT MEETING

Ecology will host the next meeting in the Kennewick Ecology Office. Proposed Agenda items:

- Technical background for basis for 1 RAD per day, discussion, Paul
- Nursery letter, action, Chris
- Tolling Agreement, action, Chris, Mike, Paul
- BRMiS Letter Update, action, Geoff
- Natural Resource Accounting/Mitigation Banking, discussion, John Carleton
- Salvage Update/North Slope Revegetation, discussion, Janet
- Charter, discussion/action, Liz, Paul
- Next Step on Preliminary Pilot PAS, discussion/action Callie
- MAP Update, discussion

- Ecology Presentation, discussion, Geoff
- Update on ALE, discussion Jake
- 200 Area Plateau Letter, discussion, Liz
- Proposed siting in TWRS EIS Status, discussion, Geoff
- Budget Issues, action, Dirk

The next meeting will be on March 9 and half day March 10, 1995.

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION: John Carleton will give a presentation on how to create an accounting system for natural resource injuries.

ACTION: Callie will do a cost/benefit analysis for the 1100 Area.

ACTION: Jake Jakabosky will coordinate with Sandy Simmons to tour ALE and North Slope. Rico, Jay, John, Janet, Paul, and Larry would like to go, also. The tour is tentatively scheduled for next Wednesday, February 15. Jake will confirm.

ACTION: Paul Kube will follow up and see where the 200 Area Letter is within DOE.

ACTION: Geoff Tallent will get a clean copy of the Charter with the recommended changes to Linda to distribute to the Trustees on Monday. There will be a conference call on Thursday to discuss the proposed changes.

ACTION: Liz Block will fax a copy of the USFWS comment letter on the North Slope Close-Out Report to the Trustees.

ACTION: John Hall will complete changes and Linda Tunnell will fax a corrected copy of the Nursery Letter to Trustees for discussion during the Conference call on Thursday.

ACTION: Geoff Tallent will discuss BRMiS Letter Status at the next meeting.

ACTION: Kathy Leonard and Liz Block will rewrite Values incorporating recommended changes and fax it out, along with a draft cover letter that will be attached when it is sent to the OU Managers, before the telephone conference call scheduled for Friday, February 24, 1995.

ACTION: Council to discuss 100 Area Values, Nursery Letter, and Charter in a conference call scheduled for Thursday at 11:00.