

**NRTC Meeting  
March 27, 2002  
Toppenish, Washington**

8:00 Administrative Issues

- ~~W~~elcome and Introductions
- ~~A~~pprove Agenda & Previous Meeting Minutes - All
- ~~R~~eview Action Items - All
- ~~A~~nnouncements - All

8:30 CERCLA Cleanup Issues

- ~~8:30~~ 200 Area Risk Framework - John Price
- ~~9:15~~ HAB Exposure Scenario Task Force - Larry Gadbois/Jamie Zeisloft/Tom Zeilman/Jay
- ~~9:45~~ Break
- ~~10:00~~ 100 B/C Area Pilot Risk Assessment - Work Group
- ~~10:30~~ Innovative Treatment & Remediation Demo, 100 N Area - John Sands/John Price
- ~~11:00~~ BRMaP Endorsement For EPA, Letter/Finding - Everyone

~~11:45~~ Lunch

1:00 NRDA & Mitigation Issues

- ~~1:00~~ 100 Area PAS Status - Work Group
- ~~1:45~~ ERDF Mitigation for Cells 1&2 - Heidi Brunkel/Jamie Zeisloft

2:30 **NRTC Adjourns**

2:30 100 Area PAS Work Group Meeting

3:30 **Work Group Adjourns**

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 03 2007  
**EDMC**

Hanford Natural Resources Trustee Council Meeting  
March 27, 2002  
Heritage Inn Restaurant - Toppenish, Washington

*1st Draft rough*

Attendees and Guests:

Thomas Bailor, CTUIR  
Beth Bilson, DOE-RL  
Teri Elzie, BHI  
Larry Gadbois, EPA  
Susan Hughs, State of Oregon  
Dan Landeen, Nez Perce  
Shelby Mendez, UW  
Jay McConnaughey, Yakama Nation  
Tom O'Brien, USFWS

John Price, Ecology  
Ted Repasky, CTUIR  
Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation  
Darci Teel, BHI  
Lauri Vigue, WDFW  
Steve Wisness, DOE-RL  
Tom Zeilman, Yakama Nation  
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL

Welcome and Introductions:

Tom Zeilman filled in for Larry Goldstein and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The meeting was called to order and introductions were made.

Approve Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes:

The agenda was approved as drafted.

Jay McConnaughey stated that the meeting minutes from the last meeting (January 31 – February 1, 2002) did not reflect what he said. Jay's comments will be provided to Teri by end of next week, and then she will re-issue them for full Council review.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for June 19-20, 2002, at the Federal Building (Room 142) in Richland, Washington.

There was a discussion concerning future meetings, the schedule of meetings, and location options. At the last meeting, it was decided (without a vote) that full Council meetings would be held quarterly and would be held in Richland. At the same time it was decided that the work groups would meet more frequently and at different locations. Tom O'Brien voiced a concern said this would cut into the USFWS travel budget, which would then limit the amount of money that can be spent on projects. Tom said that if it is appropriate to be in Richland, then let's meet in Richland, otherwise, the meetings should be moved around.

Larry Gadbois provided input on why the decision was made to meet quarterly in Richland. He said the quarterly meetings were going to be a summary of the work group meetings, and would also provide an opportunity for the project people to come in and status the Council.

Susan stated that she supported this idea.

Tom Zeilman stated that he would like to see the September meeting in Idaho remain unchanged. Several members of the Council agreed and said it is a nice retreat, and that a lot of work usually gets done during the September meeting. Tom Zeilman asked if anyone had "big" objections to meeting in Lowell in September. Dan Landeen will check on the available dates and get back to us.

**Action: Dan Landeen – Check available dates for the Three Rivers Resort in Lowell.**

**Action: Teri Elzie – Agenda item for next meeting: Discussion on meeting locations/schedule, etc.**

Steve Wiseness suggested video teleconferencing. Jamie said this may work best in the work group meetings, smaller number of people and shorter amount of time. Jamie reiterated the struggle to put together an agenda, possibly meeting too often, and again suggested more work group meetings.

Tom Zeilman asked if someone would put together some ideas for everyone to look at.

Review Action Items:

The action item list was reviewed and updated.

Discussion on I&I language – Connie – said there is not a lot of information on it. Larry Gadbois – ERDF and BRMaP – 2 examples of how DOE uses I&I; Connie said she wants to discuss it when it is specifically requested on a certain document (?).

Draft WMEIS – is it in there? (Beth) Connie said yes. Supporting earlier I&I statements made; not Connie's project, so she doesn't know for sure.

Jamie – everyone prepare our own explanation of what I&I means and how it is applied, put it on the table and discuss it.

Connie – index to CLUP; explains DOE's position.

**Action: Teri Elzie – Agenda item – Discussion on I&I language; everyone prepare their own agency's position (provide a write-up).**

The November 2001 meeting minutes were approved as revised.

Jay – appropriate for PNNL scientists to give their interpretation of category 1 and 2 habitat (for mitigation?) Jamie said DOE has received 2 letters, so there will have to be a response from DOE on their position (?).

DQO – Bechtel and DOE are meeting today to decide the list (?). They will follow the procedure. Mixture of individual interviews and group.

## 200 Area Risk Framework – John Price

John Price distributed a handout and discussed the risk framework process. Background, goals, assumptions. Typical activities for those land uses. Determined that it would be best to have consistent assumptions between the central plateau and ????. Open process involving the public. Timing was driven by the 200 Area, moving from planning phase to feasibility studies; actually making decisions. John emphasized that risk assessments are not 'decision' they are just a tool for assisting with making 'decisions.' A starting place to make consistent decisions. Not sure what type of document will be generated – agreement in principle or possible a guidance document. John said this presentation is a work in progress; incorporating feedback they have received and revising. Workshop in May (tentative) – groundwater. Susan asked – how does it relate to exposure scenario task force? John – this was put together to culminate with the task force. Public forum to explain this risk assessment framework. The task force was our goal audience. Beth – purpose of meeting with that audience was to input values? John said yes.

3 Areas to come to agreement: geographic zones, time periods, and what type of activities do we assume are taking place (slide 5).

John discussed the schedule of the plan (strawman scheduled) – Slide 6.

Waste sites outside core zone – “buffer zone” – (B Pond and Gable Mountain Pond) remediation activities would go on in the core zone (through 2050).

Tom Z. – can you show progression of groundwater plumes over time? John said they are working on that (modeling) - - working with Moses Jarayssi –

Action: Jamie – Agenda item (groundwater project – video/presentation on groundwater plume movement). John Morse willing to come in June.

Wade asked about surface contamination – John Price said that when remediation is done, that would take care of surface contamination (?).

Jamie asked if that is because of concentrations (Wade's concerns) - - Wade said you need to look at risk that's contained and risk that isn't contained when doing risk framework. Jay said lack of characterization; buffer zone was moved because – “what is adequate characterization.” 2002 – 2008 time period that was listed in task force. John Price – said that there hasn't been time to update the presentation based on the comments received for the new time period (2002 – 2010).

2050-2150 timeframe – Postclosure institutional control: remediation and closure has been completed.

Commercial low-level ?? – control taken over by DOE.

Possible groundwater remediation – “could be” long-term groundwater treatment; could still be contamination that has an active remedy; Jamie – clarified that there is groundwater remediation going on right now, and it will continue. Not to mean that it will “start” at that point.

Beth – letter of intent (2025) vs. this schedule/slide (2050) – John said if the letter of intent proceeds along and the letter of intent, these assumptions can be modified. John said these are only “starting assumptions” to do analysis.

John Price said we really need some starting points for this in order to do the assumptions; risk results should be interactive with assumptions. (??)

John went through the handout (slides).

Wade asked if carbon tetrachloride will be tracked. John said go forward with RI/FS, something aggressive with carbon tet, assumption is plume will be contained within core zone. Larry Gadbois – intent is to go after the core part; probably the same with uranium. John – use the buffer zone assumption to calculate the risks of carbon tet plumes (?).

John – after 2150, although there may be deed restrictions, barriers, signs – people will probably ignore; no active monitoring will be done.

John Price – all assumptions are based on current groundwater remedial technologies.

Action: John Price – E-mail presentation to the Teri to forward to the Trustees.

Copy of handout is filed with meeting information.

#### HAB Exposure Scenario Task Force – Gadbois/Zeisloft/Zeilman/McConnaughey

1 workshop has been held; HAB sponsored task force; workshop was to get involved and interested parties to provide input to the work group – intent being that input would go on to the tri-parties; nothing has been generated in writing as a result of that workshop; there is a timeline for all task force activities; as soon as that is available, Jamie will get it out to everyone. The next workshop is scheduled for May to focus on 200 Area. Jamie said he was disappointed that the facilitator did not breakup the dynamics of the group; and instead ran the workshop much like a HAB meeting.

John Price said more attention will be paid to the dynamics next time (break out groups, seating arrangements, etc.). Beth – not a DOE, EPA, or State driven activity.

Susan asked what is the produce “outcome” of this workshop and how will it work back in to everyone and the Council? John said the tri-parties are looking for using the information from the workshop and plugging it into the guidance document for risk assessment -

Tom Z. – so we aren’t really sure how valuable this information will be?

Larry Gadbois voiced the thoughts of EPA – we know we are going to be doing ecological risk assessments; want to do them in the way of what peoples anticipation of uses are; what value should we be watching out for when we plan our cleanup method; information useful for the tri-parties to use in developing cleanup methods (?). John – the workshops have already been valuable; forced us (tri-parties?) to be painfully clear about groundwater.

Wade had a lot of concerns about pathways, conceptual models, institutional controls (??)

Jamie tried to explain what was accomplished at the first workshop, or the way he interpreted it. Some concerns were voiced – don't want to get cancer, don't want the 200 Area to become a "deposit" zone for waste - -

Beth – this workshop does not satisfy any of the requirements for the tri-parties to go out and complete what they are required to do (meet with the trustees, etc.) this does not replace the public participation process that is required.

John Price – did not want to get way down the road and be completely off the mark, hoping this task force will help when they go out for public comment.

#### Innovative Treatment & Remediation Demo, 100 N Area – John Sands/John Price

Group from Sandia National Laboratory – handout. John went through the presentation objectives; follow-up to the report that went out in January. Summarize that report and give a status of the technology evaluation. 100-NR-2 ROD objectives (1999) – 4 years of information. Pump and Treat is also listed in the ROD. This project evaluates the technologies for Strontium-90 removal. Problem statement – strontium 90 was released from n reactor; huge driving force to get strontium down to the groundwater and discharged to the river; it's in the cribs, in the groundwater, and reaching towards the river. (?)

Jamie – 2 cribs are being remediated; plan is that both cribs will be removed down to 15 feet (John) – starting with the one closest to the river; Jamie – is that source removal expected to reduce the impacts to groundwater in any way? Beth said the length of the impact would be reduced, but not the amount (?). According to the models, most of what is in the vadose zone will not get into the river (John).

Jamie – briefing a couple of years ago in Spokane; decisions on near-shore environment (what to do with it) were deferred. Now are being looked at again (?) John said the contamination is still there and we need to determine what to do with the shoreline.

John summarized the presentation and said the more "detail" can be found in the report.

April 24 – workshop to closeout this process (?). John Sands encouraged anyone interested in this project to attend.

Cost data to implement the technologies – found within handout.

John Price said the pump and treat has been relatively 'ineffective' in comparison to 'natural attenuation (?)' of the waste.

Bank Stability – since most of the strontium is in the soil, will we push more into the river during construction? Negligible amount.

Jamie asked about the cost (55m) – natural attenuation – didn't expect it to be that high? Doesn't look like it is based on 300 years. Jamie asked if the assumption is 300 years for natural attenuation (monitoring). John said he wasn't sure, but he thought that was correct. John said the total costs need to be looked at further.

Susan – if we already know that the sheet pile wall failed, why is an option here? John – impermeable barrier (slide) – combination of both a sheet pile wall and cryogenic (ground freezing) barrier to form an impermeable barrier. Would have to be monitored for a long time because it has to be kept frozen.

Tom Z – how long would the lyp.... Take; John said 7-8 years, that is what the cost estimate was based on.

Tom Z asked about planting? John said yes, planting. More studies need to be done.

ITRD did not come up with a final recommendation, instead listed 5 different ones to be discussed. (Last slide). A range of different technologies and combinations.

John – here today to peak the interest of the council, to assist with what to do at n springs (later on). Assist with input into the process.

Wade – diesel plume and co-mingling with this (?) - - potential problem. Told it can't be removed, but if you can remove strontium, then you should be able to remove diesel. John said the ROD addresses that; need to decide what to do with that by 2003.

A copy of John's handout is filed with the meeting information.

#### BRMaP Endorsement for EPA – Letter/Finding – Everyone

The status of the BRMaP letter that Larry Goldstein sent out for review was discussed. Tom Zeilman and Lauri Vigue both said their agencies have concerns with BRMaP the way it is currently written. Tom O'Brien said the concern the USFWS has is that BRMaP doesn't provide mitigation for Level I or II habitat. (Lauri agreed). Tom said this fell through the cracks with the USFWS not providing comments at the right time (?);

Tom Z – at the last meeting discussed having a letter sent out from the Council, recognizing BRMaP, glad it was out, helpful, a couple of agencies had some concerns.

Tom Zeilman asked what is the purpose of the letter. Jamie said to respond to EPA's request. Jay said, "shouldn't EPA be referring to USFWS guidance for mitigation?" Jamie said we either respond to EPA stating that we endorse the document (BRMaP) or we don't say anything at all. Can the Council endorse the document as a valuable tool? DOE thought that Dan's letter was a good approach. Jamie said that DOE supports Dan's version of the letter and the benefit it adds. Understand that there are particular issues with BRMaP - - have to decide if there is benefit added by having EPA write this document into CERCLA decision documents? Jay said why do we need to write a letter? When is EPA or DOE going to establish this work group that was identified in the

work group to resolve concerns that are already known. The point has already been made, don't see the need for a letter.

Steve Wisness said the BRMaP is more Hanford specific, where the USFWS mitigation policy is not. Tom O'Brien said it is specific to Federal sites.

Susan – guidance document for discussion and decision, we want to participate in the work group that is defined from the document. Tom O. – 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the letter, stating some agencies need improvements and list them; want to see that in a letter. Susan asked, “would you then buy in to sending a letter?” They all 3 said yes. (Tom Zeilman, Tom O'Brien, and Lauri Vigue).

Dan Landeen said that was not the purpose of the letter. The work group is where those concerns should be brought up. Jamie offered some wording that could be put in the letter, and said those concerns could be addressed when the work group is established.

Tom Z – suggested combining the information from the two letters and getting something put together that everyone can agree on.

Jamie read Dan Landeen's letter to refresh everyone's memory as to what it says.

Jamie asked Tom O'Brien if the USFWS think the BRMaP is a valuable tool. Tom said yes. Jay said, however, that it does not meet the spirit of NEPA. The document met environmental laws and treaties...

Beth – why don't you make a general statement that a number of agencies have concerns that need to be addressed within the work group. Steve – other federal/state/tribal policies also need to be followed (suggestion).

Jamie – wording in the letter should be revised to state the EPA and the referencing of the document for use as guidance. Jay – also ask that they reference other environmental laws, policies, etc. Jamie said we won't get concurrence then on the letter.

Dan L/Tom Z/Jamie – drafted language to address the concerns with the BRMaP letter:

2<sup>ND</sup> PARAGRAPH: “some of the trustees still have concerns, issues with BRMaP – in file

**Action: Tom Zeilman – Draft a Finding to go out with the BRMaP letter.**

**Action: Jamie Zeisloft/Teri Elzie – Put the BRMaP authors on the agenda for the next meeting.**

**Action: Teri Elzie – Agenda item for June meeting (Chair/Co-Chair Nominations).**

Tolling Agreement Update – Jamie

Jamie said there are 2 activities they are working on with regard to the 1100 Area – the Horseshoe Landfill and the Horn Rapids Landfill. Jamie has an internal draft of the Horseshoe Landfill Report, which was called for in the Tolling Agreement. Jamie also said that DOE-RL has responded to the comments they received. A meeting will be scheduled on TCE/groundwater issue. Also need to go out and sample plants. Pending deadline with the tolling agreement. Would like to do the sampling soon. Mice were sampled and results are back - - low levels, but all the data is in the report.

Conference call or meeting to address spring sampling at horseshoe landfill. The time is now.

**Action: Jamie Zeisloft – Call and set-up sampling and a meeting. (Horseshoe Landfill – Dan Landeen, Jay McConnaughey, and Tom Zeilman); (TCE – Wade Riggsbee). (Monday, 4/1/02, 1:00 p.m.)**

#### 100 Area PAS Status – Work Group

The work group will look at the north slope and the riverlands; those were deleted in 1996 (?); beginning of process for during the 100 Area PAS. Because the sites are not as complex as the 100 area, starting with these 2 areas. 1 conference call has been held to discuss the reference documents. Jamie – extensive search of any documents that would pertain to natural resources or contaminant sources; extensive list of documents; decided to go through the list and divide into 3 groups: CERCLA contaminant releases, biological resources, and miscellaneous contaminant issues. Jamie sorted these chronologically. Now have copies of these documents and made sure they did include the deleted portions of the 100 Area; following this meeting the work group will go through the documents, check which ones they don't want to see; once everyone is in agreement as to what documents to review, copies will be made and mailed out.

Dan L. – have we determined when the statute of limitations is up. Tom Z said he thinks July of next year.

Jamie – notice of intent to delete, that should have triggered the statute of limitations. Tom Z – 1998 notice of partial deletion; May 22, 1998;

Tom Z – this could either be a starting point or something closer to the end; need to decide that as a work group;

Jamie – suggested we meet (work group) on a monthly basis. DOE's approach is to make sure we look at both operable units and all waste sites within those units; complete screen, not just the issues that "float to the top." Realize that time is limited, but want to make sure we capture all potential issues.

PAS was prepared that went out to all trust organizations, did not determine whether one particular agency had run out, assuming we will take that approach here (Jamie) - - not nearly as black and white as it was with the 1100 area.

PAS will be prepared, go to the council, then go out under council letterhead to the 8 trust organizations. However, there is a time constraint.

Jamie – there was a lot of debate and discussion at the end last time, this time there will not be the time for that.

Dan Landeen said he is optimistic that since we have done one before, this one will be easier.

**Action: Jamie Zeisloft – Contact EPA on the 36 sites in the deleted portion of the 100 Area.**

Jamie – need to make sure that when we are saying the statute of limitations

Tom O – said there is a possibility that CERCLA process wasn't followed, but not that these are not CERCLA sites. (EPA doesn't think they should be included in the ROD).

Beth – for the time being, proceed forward

#### ERDF Mitigation for Cells 1 & 2 – Jamie Zeisloft

Jamie – September 2001, conference call that led into the development of the scope of work; then in October 2001, RL sent a letter to the Council stating that rl has opted to provide compensatory mitigation for those impacts; propose to compensate for 170 acres by revegetating 510 acres; asked for council review of the scope of work attached to the letter; revised the initial scope of work and wrote it so that multiple species would be included; contract with USFWS based on that; then requested a proposal from USFWS; met with them, went through contract requirements; Jamie provided background.

Proposal came at the end of January 2002 – reviewed by the council (proposal) – comments were received from doe, bhi, blm, wdfw, nez perce, yakama nation. Discuss comments and finalize the proposal. They need to start the field work. Collecting grass seed –

Susan – if the contract is already done, how can we effect the proposal? Jamie said that's a good question, because this is a different way of doing things. Proposal is not finalized, only the contract specifications are. We can influence the proposal.

Jamie discussed the comments, 1 being that a schedule of the project is needed (several commenters said this). Now in the site selection process. Tour yesterday, 3/26. Have collected some seed (sagebrush and rabbitbrush) need to begin collecting grass seed. Seed selection we are ok; hopefully we are ok with site selection.

Other concerns –

Conference call will be set up to discuss Jake Jakobosky's comments since he is not here.

Tom O – are the herbicides going to be applied by USFWS – yes. Need to have a discussion with Heidi so that we can avoid a “slow down” - - because of the requirements by USFWS to apply herbicides.

Beth agreed – important to stay on top of the schedule and coordinate so that the “\$” goes into the plants.

Action: Jamie – set up a conference call with Heidi and other commenters to discuss.

Action: Ken Gano – provide write-up on monitoring process and contingency plans for ERDF revegetation.

Jamie told Lauri that most of her comments (work requested) will be covered, but not by USFWS.

Beth explained the ending of the Bechtel contract and how the new one will work (driven by cleanup).

Jamie said there will be some contract in place that will cover this scope.

Action: John Sands – follow this issue.

Jamie – other comments: monitoring and contingency plans; following BRMaP and BRMiS and any other applicable documents. Not in the IA with USFWS only because of time constraints.

Jamie went through some of the comments, but said that most of them would have to involve Heidi in order to be resolved.

Discussion on seed collecting and what would be replanted (where would it come from) - - need clarification from Heidi.

Suggestion of putting the contract and the proposal together as 1 document or at least attach them together. Unclear as to what the proposal is for.

DOE is responsible for coordination with other groups.

Objective of treatment A is to address wind erosion; on ALE especially because they are having a lot of erosion problems on ALE.

Jay said he didn't think that came across very clear in the proposal and it doesn't address the expense.

Susan – how many additional acres could we get by dropping treatment A - - Jamie said we need to discuss this with Heidi.

Jamie said these are some experimental treatments as far as the USFWS is concerned; trying some things in smaller areas to see if they may work in larger areas so that they don't have a "large failure."

Rethink on treatment a and clarificatoin on seeds (where/when)

Jamie – check with Heidi for conference call on Monday 4/1.

Information from the conference call will be sent to the full council.