

FROM: Linda Tunnell, phone 509-946-3684, fax 509-946-3733
DATE: January 26, 1995
TO: Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council & Friends
SUBJECT: **ACTION ITEM ATTACHED FOR THE 100 AREA VISION**
AGENDA FOR NORTH SLOPE MEETING JANUARY 27, 1995
DRAFT MINUTES FOR JANUARY 17, 1995, NORTH SLOPE MEETING

0074935

Mike Bauer, 509-865-4713*
Liz Block, 509-765-9043
Chris Burford, 503-276-0540
John Carleton, 360-664-8693*
Dave Conrad, 208-843-7378
Rico Cruz, 208-843-7378
Dirk Dunning, 503-373-7806
Janet Ebaugh, 503-276-0540
Larry Gadbois, 509-376-2396#
John Hall, 509-376-6968#
Susan Coburn Hughes, 503-373-7806
Jake Jakabosky, 509-536-1275
Paul Kube, 509-376-0306#
Kathy Leonard, 509-372-9447#
Jay McConnaughey, 509-736-3030
Geoff Tallent, 360-407-7151*
RueAnn Thomas, 509-372-9655#

RECEIVED
DEC 20 2007
EDMC

*new numbers
#sent via ccMail

Attached is the agenda for the 1-27-95 North Slope meeting. The meeting will be held in the Atruim Building, 639 Cullum, Richland (the same room we were in for the NRTC Meeting on Friday, January 13) and will be from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Also attached are the draft minutes to the 1-17-95 North Slope meeting.

Attached are the guidelines percolated down from the 100 Area Vision conference call held yesterday. Please review these guidelines with your constituencies and bring your comments and recommendations to the NRTC meeting in February.

The NRTC meeting will be held in the Columbia Room at the Portland Airport Conference facility on February 9 and 10, 1995. Directions and more information will be available soon.

Heads up... the Nursery Letter was finalized yesterday and a formal copy will be sent to all Trustees on Friday for concurrent signature cycle. All signatures will need to be brought to the Council meeting February 9. A copy is attached so you can start the approval cycle, but please tell your people this is a signature review and all Trustees are getting this document at the same time (in other words, it's too late for changes).

If you have any questions, please call me on 946-3684.

Thanks,
Linda

Draft Agenda
North Slope Meeting
Friday, January 27, 1995
Atrium Building
Richland, Washington

9:00 - 9:30 Welcome and Introductions
9:30 - 12:00 Discuss Objectives, Assumptions, and Preferred Plan
12:00 - 1:00 Lunch
1:00 - 2:00 Discuss the Bridge Overlook, PSN 12/14, PSN 72/82
2:00 - 3:00 Discuss boundaries, revegetation options - plants/transplants,
seeds, tubelings, shrubs, and maintenance for each of the
three sites
3:00 - 4:00 Discuss the rest of the site

North Slope Revegetation Meeting
Draft Meeting Minutes
January 17, 1995
Richland, Washington

Attendees
Liz Block
Janet Ebaugh
Glenn Goldberg
John Hall
Paul Kube
Kathy Leonard
Jay McConnaughey
Linda Tunnell
Regan Weeks

There was general discussion on scoping out a framework for the meeting on January 27 and setting an agenda. Some of the discussion points included:

- Salvage bunchgrass and shrubs from ERDF before they start scraping.
- The success rate of planting salvaged shrubs and bunchgrass will probably be greater than planting seeds.
- Some of the complicating factors include:
 - Logistics of salvaging, transporting, and transplanting the salvaged material, in addition to the watering needs and maintenance during the first year.
 - There is little documentation available on the process of salvaging mature sagebrush or on the success rate of such a process.
- There were questions on the \$100,000 budget; who came up with the figure, how was it arrived at, perhaps this is an artificial number and the focus should be on the restoration of the site rather than the budget. There are many indicators that the \$100,000 will be inadequate to complete this restoration project.
- If DOE is using this restoration as a template for future restorations, then the budget is controlling the whole process. It may take two or three attempts to effect a successful restoration.
- There were several areas of concrete and asphalt which were left in place, and many expressed concerns about these areas:
 - Digging up asphalt and concrete may create more disturbance and additional problems.
 - There is a question of whether digging up asphalt and concrete will create habitat value on some of the sites.
 - Concrete pads and asphalt do not create any habitat value if left in place.

- There were a lot of people who did not know that the concrete and asphalt would be left in place.
- There is a question about letting ACOE plan the restoration since they were the ones that went in and created new roads and disturbances during the initial North Slope cleanup.

The group came up with the following objectives, assumptions, and a preferred plan:

Objectives:

- Use native species for restoration
- Create a habitat having wildlife value
- Minimize percent of contribution to herbaceous cover by exotic species
- Conduct soil analysis to determine the need for soil amendments
- Maximize value of restoration by focusing effort on areas surrounded by habitat with wildlife value
- Camouflage newly constructed roads by transplanting mature shrubs
- Thoroughly document details of revegetation to facilitate possible future ability to monitor

Assumptions:

- No grazing
- 'Local source' means Hanford area and within 500 feet elevation difference (defined for NS project only)
- Transplanting will be more successful than seeding
- Monitoring will increase the value of the project by providing information for future restoration projects
- Determine the most successful restoration methods and associated costs first, then work within established budget

Preferred Plan

1. On-site mitigation for the Bridge Overlook, PSN 12/14, PSN 72/82
 - Focus on transplanting bunchgrasses, etc., from ERDF
 - Determine the cost of blocking the PSN 12/14 road - transplant mature (>3 feet) shrubs to block access to the road, consider fencing the area
 - Collect seeds to provide additional diversity and missing species (buckwheat), fall planting, determine cost for local seed collection
 - Eventually use mature shrubs to camouflage the Bridge Overlook road
2. Offsite mitigation for remaining 15.6 acres
 - Determine cost for removing asphalt at H-12L for offsite restoration
 - Determine location of offsite mitigation (options: H-12L, PSN 72/82)
3. With any remaining money, use Steve's sagebrush tubelings
4. Recontour PSN 04 and other sites that have significant tire ruts
5. Road remediation for 2,4-D and cistern sites

The following tentative agenda was set:

- Discuss Objectives, Assumptions, and Preferred Plan
- Discuss the Bridge Overlook, PSN 12/14, PSN 72/82
 - Discuss boundaries, revegetation options - plants/transplants, seeds, tubelings, shrubs, and maintenance for each of the three sites
- Discuss the rest of the site

ACTION: Please review the following document with your constituencies. Define specific and general categories and set a hierarchy. Please get all comments to Kathy Leonard no later than noon February 1 so she can incorporate comments before she leaves February 2. If no comments are received from your organization by February 1, we will assume you concur with this document as it is. The goal is to finalize the document at the February Trustee meeting.

Hanford Natural Resource Trustees
Draft Natural Resource Evaluation Guidelines
100 Area Projects
January 25, 1995

- The Hanford Natural Resource Trustees will not accept "no action" on groundwater. Natural attenuation into the river is not generally acceptable, unless the alternative is ecologically substantially more damaging.
- All waste or contamination which presents a human or ecological risk shall be removed or left in a retrievable state.
- Point of compliance is the near river wells outside of river affected (dilution) zone (50-100 feet from rivers edge) for MCL and criteria for the protection of aquatic life (acute and chronic), unless the source is in or near the river.
- Ecological Risk Assessment
 - It is essential that a comprehensive 100 Area Risk Assessment be done.
 - A risk assessment should be based on multiple terrestrial and aquatic species, using salmon as one endpoint.
 - A risk assessment should be based on multiple exposure pathways.
 - The 1 RAD per day criterion is unacceptable high. A more realistic criterion needs to be developed.
 - A risk assessment must take into account catastrophic flooding.
 - Site specific data should be collected to support species and exposure models.
- Evaluation of tradeoffs:
 - The Hanford Natural Resource Trustees expect to be involved in the development and evaluation of ecological risk assessment. The Trustees recognize that tradeoffs will have to be made in cleanup and expect to be involved in that process. In order to be involved, we expect to be provided with detailed evaluations of the ecological risks from contaminants, the ecological risks from removal and cleanup, human health risks to workers and non-workers, and budget issues.
- Interim actions must be integrated to minimize ecological impacts to natural resources and restored resources. This integration must include an evaluation of what, when, and how to restore without excessive duplication of effort. The Hanford Natural Resource Trustees are concerned about natural resources as they exist on the Site today and during the interim as restoration is done and before it is complete. Mitigation should be developed for all interim actions and applied preferentially to areas that will not have future impacts.
- Treat the riparian corridor (Hanford Reach) as a single ecological unit and apply in-kind mitigation or restoration of lost services wherever it is most advantageous.

(Date)

Mr. John Wagoner, Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Mail Stop A7-50
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352

Subject: REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE IN ESTABLISHING A NATIVE PLANT
NURSERY AND SEED BANK FOR HANFORD

Dear Mr. Wagoner:

The Hanford Site contains a large amount of relatively intact native shrub/steppe habitat. This habitat is being destroyed and degraded region-wide at a rapid rate. At Hanford, activities such as remediation and the construction of new facilities pose a serious threat to this resource.

Protection and restoration of natural resources is a necessary component of successful CERCLA remediation and restoration and is in keeping with the Department of Energy's trust responsibilities. For successful restoration at Hanford, additional information is needed about techniques for gathering, growing, propagating, storing, planting, maintaining and monitoring shrub-steppe plants. For example, the sodium dichromate and riverland sites have been remediated but restoration attempts at these sites have failed. Larger remediation projects, such as the 100 Area cleanup and the ERDF, will require restoration on a much broader scale. In order to meet these future demands, DOE should take steps now to develop the facilities and the techniques which will enable DOE to fulfill its restoration duties efficiently.

An essential component of this effort must be a Hanford-based native plant nursery and seed bank. Locally derived native seed has the best ability to survive, is more beneficial to native wildlife and requires less maintenance. Yet such seed is not currently available from commercial suppliers. To acquire and propagate seed in sufficient quantities to meet Hanford's restoration needs, DOE should establish its own nursery and seed bank facility, or assist the establishment of such a facility. Such a facility is relatively inexpensive, and its operation will greatly reduce DOE's future restoration liability and costs. Moreover, DOE can use this nursery and seed bank to meet its other, non-CERCLA needs.

The NRTC fully supports the development and operation of a native plant nursery and seed bank at Hanford. We formally request that the DOE establish such a facility, or assist the establishment of such a facility. We are available for consultation on this matter, and are willing to contribute our technical expertise to the development of this facility. We request a meeting with your staff to discuss these matters in further detail. Please respond via Paul Kube, DOE, within ten days of the date of this letter, to set a time and place for this meeting.

Sincerely,