

*"DRAFT AGENDA"*

**NRTC Meeting  
July 13-14, 2000  
BLM Office – Spokane, Washington**

**Thursday, July 13, 2000:**

- 8:30 Welcome and Introductions  
Approve Agenda & Previous Meeting Minutes  
Review Action Items
- 9:00 Announcements – All
- 9:30 Finalize Council 1100 Area PAS – All
- 10:15 BREAK
- 10:30 Continue 1100 Area PAS Discussion – All
- 11:45 LUNCH BREAK
- 1:15 Chromium Study/Salmon Study Update - USFWS  
(Review of Schedule, Timelines, Deadlines)
- 3:00 BREAK
- 3:15 5-Year Review Update – Larry Gadbois
- 3:30 EPA's BTAG Response Letter: What is our next step? – Larry Gadbois
- 3:45 Significance of National Monument Designation to Work of Trustees – All
- 4:15 Future Meetings/Future Agenda Items
- 4:30 Adjourn

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

"DRAFT AGENDA"

**NRTC Meeting  
July 13-14, 2000  
BLM Office – Spokane, Washington**

**Thursday, July 13, 2000:**

- ~~8:30~~ Welcome and Introductions
- ~~✓~~ Approve Agenda & Previous Meeting Minutes
- ~~✓~~ Review Action Items
- 9:00 ~~✓~~ Announcements – All
- 9:30 ~~✓~~ Finalize Council 1100 Area PAS – All
- 10:15 ~~✓~~ BREAK
- 10:30 ~~✓~~ Continue 1100 Area PAS Discussion – All
- 11:45 ~~✓~~ LUNCH BREAK
- 1:15 ~~✓~~ Chromium Study/Salmon Study Update - USFWS  
(Review of Schedule, Timelines, Deadlines)
- 3:00 ~~✓~~ BREAK
- 3:15 ~~✓~~ 5 Year Review Update – Larry Gadbois
- 3:30 ~~✓~~ EPA's BTAG Response Letter: What is our next step? – Larry Gadbois
- 3:45 Significance of National Monument Designation to Work of Trustees – All
- 4:15 Future Meetings/Future Agenda Items
- 4:30 Adjourn

*✓ Fire Discussion - sometime in the pm*

*\* BTAG Discussion by Ron S. @ next mtg*

# HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

July 13, 2000

BLM Office – Spokane, Washington

## Council Attendees:

Teri Elzie  
Larry Gadbois  
Larry Goldstein  
Lee Hoppis (Not Present)  
Susan Hughs  
Nick Iadanza (Not Present)  
Jake Jakabosky

Dan Landeen  
Jay McConnaughey (Not Present)  
Tom O'Brien (Not Present)  
Preston Sleeper (Not Present)  
Darci Teel  
Lauri Vigue  
JR Wilkinson  
Jamie Zeisloft

## Presenters & Guests:

Dan Audet, USFWS  
Brad Frazier, USFWS  
Stacy Jones, BHI  
Greg Patton, PNNL

Don Steffek, USFWS  
Ivana Witt, YN  
Tom Zeilman, YN

## Welcome & Introductions:

Susan welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made. Darci introduced Stacy Jones, a summer intern for Bechtel Hanford, Inc., and Ivana Witt was introduced as representing the Yakama Nation for this council meeting. Don Steffek and Dan Audet were both introduced for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Susan thanked Jake for hosting the meeting.

## Approved Agenda & Previous Meeting Minutes:

The agenda was discussed, and it was decided to make time for a discussion on the fire. JR said that he was able to fly over the site and would be able to provide some information as to what was going on in the background during the fire; Larry Goldstein said that he had brought copies of articles that ran in the Tri-City Herald; and Jamie said that he had a copy of the BAER (Burn Area Emergency Rehabilitation) Report that everyone could look at.

**Action: Susan Hughs – Contact Carroll Palmer/Russell Jim to see about a voting representative for the Yakama Nation, so that we can update the phone/address list accordingly.**

### Announcements:

- Tom Zeilman said that he had several documents that had been collected by Barbara Harper and wasn't sure what to do with them. Susan said that she would look at them and see if they need to be in our files.
- Don Steffeck provided an update on Tom O'Brien.
- Larry Goldstein said that the State would not be replacing Doug Mosich, and that he will be the permanent replacement on the Council; an official letter is forthcoming.
- Jamie said he had extra copies of a document entitled, "Legend and Legacy: Fifty Years of Defense Production at the Hanford Site," for anyone that wanted one.

### Finalize Council PAS – All

Jamie provided an update of what the 1100 Area Work Group has been doing, and said they are currently on draft 11. Jamie said the work group has done all that they can do, and it needs to come to the council to resolve the outstanding issues (Section 4). Jamie said that we have an opportunity to finalize this document if we can finalize the issues associated with section 4, but he is afraid to open it up to everyone, and have it be "word smithed" - - or we will be on draft 12, 13, 14. If we can finalize Section 4, and do a little finetuning, we can wrap up this report. Susan said that is the purpose of the meeting - - to get this document done so that it can go to each agency for signature. It's a significant act that the council has not ever taken before. The discussion seems to center around how to characterize, what we saw - - we will not proceed with a damage assessment, but we want the findings and concerns to be documented. Larry Goldstein said that focusing on Section 4 would be the best approach, and not focus specifically on Jay's comments. He and Lauri have gone through it, discussed it with Jay, and they can present the State's position. Jamie went through Section 4 – and the 5 criteria that are used in determining whether to move forward with a damage assessment or not (out of NRDA). The council as a whole has decided not to move forward with a damage assessment, and what the work group tried to do with Section 4 was say that there is injury but not enough to move forward with a damage assessment. The information on the DDT was added, stating that DDT is in the soil, in the food chain, that numerous studies were done, etc., but not getting specific on the contaminants. The 5 criteria which have to be met to move into a damage assessment were discussed at length. They are:

- 1) *A release of hazardous substance or substances has occurred within the 1100 Area operable unit waste sites.* Yes; Larry Goldstein said that he would like to add "that release continues to occur;" Jamie said yes, that's fine because the data indicates that is true. Larry Gadbois stated that "releases" are not continuing, the release was done. Larry Goldstein said that it is important for the trustees to document that there is release. Jamie said there is no new contaminants being released, it's all been released. Susan suggested using "residual release" - - Don Steffeck did not agree; he

feels that if it is being passed through the food chain, then it continues to be released. Jamie suggested the following wording: “the injury continues because of the release,” and said that if it just says “continues to be released” it is implied that there is still something out there that has not been remediated. “Residual contamination and ongoing injury continues.” Dan Audet said that he feels it continues to be released, at least according to other legal documents/reports. Larry Goldstein said that he hears it both ways, and appreciates the strict interpretation, but feels that the wording “continues to occur,” is accurate. JR said that we need to follow what the Council wants, even if we hit a wall, we need to say that there are trustees who are arguing the point. Jamie said that for now, we will leave it at “continues to occur” but if we aren’t able to get sign-off, we will have to reword it.

- 2) *Natural Resources for which the Nez Perce Tribe, Yakama Indian Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Nation, the United States Department of the Interior, the State of Oregon, and the State of Washington may assert trusteeship under CERCLA have been or are likely to have been adversely affected by the releases.* Yes. Change Yakama Indian Nation to Yakama Nation.

3)

*The quantity and concentration of the released hazardous substances are sufficient to potentially cause injury to identified natural resources.* Yes, quantity and concentrations that are sufficient to cause injury. Larry Goldstein said that he hasn’t seen any data, or thorough discussion in the perceived weakness in the cap design, and his position is as a trustee, the council should have weighed in earlier on this particular issue – ill advised to second guess the Tri-Parties at this time. Jamie said that problems with the cap design, could be addressed by the council during the five year review. Don Steffeck said he feels it is totally appropriate to consider problems with the cap design and work with EPA to collect some additional information on the cap design. Jamie stated that the decision has been made to not move forward with a damage assessment, and said the cap concern can be addressed at a later time. Dan Landeen said you can still document the concerns, we do not need to “water bound” the document just because we are not moving forward with a damage assessment. Jamie said if you insist on cap language in the document, DOE-RL will not sign-off and we will not get concurrence. We can address that issue at another time. Dan Landeen said that we wanted a document that stated our concerns/ issues that ended with we will not move forward with a damage assessment; not a watered down version of the document. Larry Goldstein said that if we focus in on the data at hand, we have a strong case, and also stated that the state has drafted some additional language for Section 5 regarding long term monitoring, etc.

4)

*4) Data sufficient to pursue an assessment are readily available or likely to be obtained at a reasonable cost.* If the decision has been made to not move forward, we have not met all the criteria. There is the reasonable cost issue; we have the release, there is the potential for injury, but “while injury to certain resources has occurred, and injury to”

other resources may have occurred, a damage assessment is not expected to be less than the damages.(???)

5) *Response actions carried out do not sufficiently remedy the injury to natural resources without further action.* Don Steffeck asked what cost structure we would use, to do long-term studies? Jamie said that would be a damage assessment. ~~Jamie said that the information is based on the frequency of the damages/releases, (??).~~ Jamie said that he is speaking from the original work group, and releases to groundwater. It was asked who the “original” work group was, and it was then stated that what they said doesn’t matter anymore. Jamie said it does. Dan Landeen said that we need to go with what the “new” work group has come up with. Dan Landeen asked if you meet all the criteria, do you still have to move forward with a damage assessment, he doesn’t think so. Jamie said if you don’t you are not following through with your trust obligation/responsibility. Susan asked what was our reasoning for not moving forward, if it wasn’t cost? Dan Landeen said the Nez Perce felt that there was damage, but not enough to move forward, both for political reasons and economic reasons. Jamie said the DOE-RL disagrees with that interpretation and does not feel that all the criteria have been met. Dan Landeen referred back to the Starling nest box study, costing approximately \$100K, reasonable cost to get where we want to be. Jamie said we are arguing the same points again, everyone knows DOE-RL’s position with the DDT, what we are trying to do is put together a PAS that we can agree on, and get it signed off. Now, if everyone is saying that we do meet the criteria, then each agency needs to individually move forward with a damage assessment. Susan said that what she is hearing are questions being asked in a discussion. Jamie said it is the same old questions. Tom Zeilman said if you don’t have figures saying here is what it would cost to do an assessment, and an estimate of the damages, it is not a good recommendation. Larry Gadbois said there are some estimates, but they have not been put into a table. Some of the cost information from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and from Bechtel (comparative sort of approaches) is available, and can be put into a table. Don said that there needs to be some documented information about costs, to weigh the balance. Larry Goldstein asked how difficult it would be to recover this information. It is all in the council files. Can it be referenced in Section 4? Jamie said that we are back to a document that we don’t all agree to and said we should write a generic document and let each agency doctor it they way they want, which is fine. Susan asked if we reference the cost information, does that do it and can we move on? Tom Zeilman asked do we know what anticipated damage is? Jamie provided some information (dollars) – the cost of putting together an estimate would be more than the 2 migratory birds. Don said that is not our opinion. Jamie said that it states in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Report, the contamination dissepatates and can no longer be detected once it hits predatory birds, and then can no longer be tracked. Dan Audet and Don Steffeck disagreed with Jamie’s comment. Jamie asked Larry Gadbois, as a Regulator, how do you handle a sample like that. Larry said that you can be divided on criteria 4 and 5, and still come to an agreement (conclusion) on the PAS. Susan said your signatory can agree, and also file a minority report that says I disagree with certain aspects of the report. Jamie again suggested a generic document, and each agency can put in their own

positions/concerns. Jamie asked what the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's position is on this? He felt that at the last meeting Tom O'Brien agreed to not move forward with a damage assessment, but to document our concerns in the PAS. Susan said we have 2 basic paths, do it individually, or we can come to an agreement with a council document that documents our concerns. JR said that we are getting caught up in the end point being a damage assessment; he appreciates DOE's position, but wants to document the Council's concerns so that if funding is needed in the future, the concerns have been documented. Susan said that if we are going to have a council document, it can't be so extreme that one trustee can't/won't sign off on it. Jamie said that if everyone doesn't agree to the concerns, then they can't be put into the document. Larry Goldstein said we would like additional data, but getting that data, would come at a significant cost. Jamie said that DOE-RL values migratory birds, but if you have to put a dollar value on it, the value of resources vs. the value of action, it doesn't compare. Susan asked if there is some way to reword the statement about costs, that would say this issue was unresolved, or can't be resolved without additional cost/studies. Jamie asked if each agency feels that all 5 of the criteria have been met; DOE says no; Dan Landeen said that he supports Susan's suggestion about an unresolved issue, cost – lack of information. Jamie said that DOE-RL won't agree to do any biomonitoring in the 1100 Area, it is not necessary. He said environmental surveillance will continue by PNNL, it is not waste site specific, but general Hanford Site. Don said that he is very disappointed in Jamie's statement of not doing biomonitoring. Jamie said that biomonitoring ~~is needed~~ would be appropriate for the rest of the site, but not the 1100 Area. Don said without data, how can you say that. Jamie said we have data. Jamie asked what the concern is with the TCE? Is it the groundwater? Jamie said it has no uptake, and can't go anywhere. During the five year review, if it is, it will be noted at that time. Jamie asked for wording for Section 4. Don said he is ok with it the way it is, if we add a table showing the costs, then we have some rationale written down as to why we made the decision. ~~Jamie said that if a statement is put in concerning the Horseshoe Landfill (greater than \$100K to do an assessment, less than \$100K in damages).~~ Dan Audet said that those figures encompassed more than just the 1100 Area, including areas in the 100 Area. There are 3 components that make up cost: injury assessment, damages, and restoration. Susan suggested that we finish up #4, leaving it as is, and referring to a cost table to be created. ~~Jamie said it would be cheaper to excavate, bring in clean fill, and cap it – but you guys don't like caps, because then you have to monitor them.~~ The only solution to remedy the DDT problem at the Horseshoe Landfill would probably cost \$250,000, and DOE-RL will not spend that much money to save 2 potentially contaminated birds, it's not good business. JR said it seems reasonable to explore other alternatives, put them out on the table, and just see what they are. Jamie said that it will soon become a mute point, because the statute of limitations is going to run out. DOE-RL's position is that if we spent any money to do an assessment, it's about the need to do restoration, but DOE-RL does not feel that restoration is needed. Jamie said that DOE-RL does not think that spending any more money is reasonable – period. Susan asked how to answer #4 – data to be obtained at a reasonable cost? Jamie said that's ok; we could answer yes to number 4, but then also say yes to number 5 – actions carried out were sufficient to remedy injury. Yes there could be

potential injury, but we have done enough. Susan asked, can we answer yes to all 5 of the criteria and not move forward with a damage assessment. Jamie said we can't do that. Larry Gadbois said we have a lot of data, we could find a waste site, similar in size, and come up with a cost estimate. Jamie said number 5 focuses on the word "sufficiently;" ~~nothing can be done inexpensively (?)~~. Larry Goldstein suggested "available data indicate additional data needs to pursue an assessment are not warranted," – Dan Landeen said we have to make a decision on the data we have now. Jamie discussed the steps/information that lead us to say the remedy is sufficient; basis for making the decision. Larry Goldstein said it would help to have as much information as possible available, including additional references. Larry said there is also a memo from a toxicologist (showing concentrations up to 85.4) that should be documented. Larry Gadbois said the point is that USFWS/BHI have looked at this, Ecology has looked at this, the council has looked at this and wrestled with the issue, been around the block, many, many, many times – yes, we have looked at this, therefore we have a conclusion; not everyone agrees, but we have looked at the information. Jamie said that we have stated earlier that DDT exists above 1ppm, but is close enough – not enough to warrant additional information. Jamie's recommendation is to say "No" to 5 – add a statement that says there is some concern by some trust organizations, with the sufficiency of the remedy of the injury, but it is the consensus of the group that no further action is required. ...." Susan suggested an introductory statement, "while some trustees remain concerned with the sufficiency of the remedy, a full blown damage assessment would be necessary to (??). Jamie said we could say we disagree on the sufficiency of the remedy, but the consensus of the council is that additional actions are not necessary. Susan said if we are going to gather information for a table to answer number 4, then we can't answer that right now. Jamie said "so much for using readily available information." Larry Gadbois said if an estimate of cost is important, we can pull out information and get a cost estimate. Jamie again said that DOE-RL feels the remedy is sufficient, and we will not spend anymore money. Susan said we have to proceed in some fashion, so what's it gonna be? Susan said that we are divided, and maybe we should go back and do something through our own individual agencies, but stressed that something from the Council as a whole, would be so much better/stronger. Dan Landeen said no matter what the answer is to 4 and 5, the conclusion remains the same. Larry Goldstein suggested some word changes to the conclusion; he also added a statement at the end about biomonitoring, some kind of follow-up work to track the contaminants that are associated with this site. One of his primary objectives is to make it clear to DOE and the Regulators that we need to have more biomonitoring overall. Jamie said that DOE would not agree to that in the 1100 Area, it is not a good way to spend tax dollars. Larry said it is a question of whether or not existing monitoring programs are sufficient. Jamie said that DOE-RL feels the 1100 Area is clean, and no biomonitoring is necessary. Dan Landeen said that a little bit of biomonitoring is a great insurance policy. Jamie said that he wants to make it clear that he is pushing for biomonitoring in the 100, 200, and 300 Area, but NOT the 1100 Area. Larry Goldstein said that doesn't wear well with him, he doesn't understand it. Jamie said it is an old issue, but put it in a letter, and we will answer it again. Larry Gadbois, suggested adding a sentence that says, "the Trustees, with the exception of

U.S. DOE, agree residual contamination within the 1100 Area indicates a need for a long-term post cleanup biomonitoring program to ensure natural resources are not adversely affected.” Jamie suggested a broader statement, but everyone wanted it left at only the 1100 Area – Jamie said ok, leave it as is.

Disagreement on the answer for number 5 – Dan Audet said the criteria was met. Jamie said, if we can’t agree, then we need to split and write our own documents. He said that you either have a problem or you don’t; if you have a problem, then you have a trust responsibility to move forward with a damage assessment. Dan Landeen said that you can agree the criteria is met and not move forward, it is not an obligation. Jamie said we disagree, and we will write separate documents, 2 separate opinions ~~that~~ should not be in the same document. Jamie said this is not a funding problem, if we felt we needed to fix something, we would. Larry Goldstein asked, haven’t we been arguing reasonable cost? Jamie said the bottom line is that DOE-RL does not feel the DDE/TCE is an issue, and will not fund further studies. The council continues to identify problems, but then does not provide a fix. Larry Gadbois tried to summarize, that yes, there is injury, but we can live with it; the council is not asking DOE to do more. But Jamie said that if you answer yes to 5, then you have to move forward with a damage assessment. Jamie said this criticism is unfounded, because no one is stepping up. Jamie said that DOE-RL will not answer yes to 5. Susan asked if agreement on an answer for 4 or 5, would that mean a veto, an abstention, or abstention with exception. Jamie said he would veto it, he would have to. He can agree with a yes to 4 but not to 5. Susan asked for options from the council, the trustees that want to say criteria 5 has been met, vote yes with a minority report or would you veto it. Larry Goldstein suggested striking the word “sufficient” in the response – and change it to another word. Jamie suggested moving what’s in the conclusion and moving it up to #5. Jamie said, “The contaminant levels raise some concerns on the sufficiency of the remedy.” Provides a reason for not moving forward. Everyone agreed. In lieu of NRDA, long-term biomonitoring.....”

Larry Gadbois summarized: “However, it is the conclusion of the trustees, that the extent of injuries coupled with the anticipated costs do not warrant proceeding with an NRDA.”

Don’s Steffek added his version: “However, it is the conclusion of the trustees, that a damage assessment is warranted, but precluded at this time, due to cost and time constraints of the trustees.”

Tom Zeilman suggested, “The trustees disagree (differ) on the reasons for not proceeding, among the factors cited by the trustees are: cost, contaminant levels.....” whatever you want to put in there. Individual trustees do not agree on the reasons to not proceed with a damage assessment for various factors (?). Jamie suggested, “It is the conclusion of the trustees that a NRDA action is not warranted;” then adding the biomonitoring sentence. Don had another suggestion: “However, it is the conclusion of the trustees that a damage assessment is precluded at this time, for various factors cited among the trustees.” Susan said she didn’t like “at this time” but she could live with it. She said it sounds like a threat, if we are not going to move forward, then we aren’t.

Jamie objected to the use of the word “precluded,” saying that it was not appropriate for this situation.

The final paragraph, to be included under Criteria #5 is as follows:

However, it is the conclusion of the trustees that a damage assessment will not be carried out for various factors cited amongst the trustees. ( or “However, for various reasons cited amongst the trustees, the trustees have decided not to proceed with a damage assessment.”) The trustees, with the exception of DOE, do find that residual contamination within the 1100 Operable Unit waste sites indicates the need for a long-term, post-cleanup biomonitoring program to ensure natural resources are not adversely affected.

JR quoted the regulations: It is important to distinguish between injuries, which are conditions of harm to the natural resources, and compensation for agencies seeking damages....”

Don said that the USFWS has concerns regarding the injuries, and that it may be appropriate to do a damage assessment; Jamie asked if the possibility exists that they may do a damage assessment in the 1100 Area, Don said no.

Susan suggested tying 4 and 5 together with this final answer (above), and asked do we want to add John Carleton’s information as a reference? Larry Goldstein will look at it and decide. Jamie is ok with tying 4 and 5 together.

Larry Goldstein said that USFWS had a comment on Section 3, “recreation services....” Is an appropriate term. Change to, “recreational opportunities within public rights of way.” Jamie said that we should all be in agreement with the changes here today. The document will be revised and a couple of weeks will be allotted for council review and then it will go out as a finding. The document can be submitted to your legal council/decision maker.

**Action: Jamie – Revise and redistribute the document next week; 2 week review cycle.**

Don asked for clarification on the dates: July 18 - email the revised file; conference call week of July 24; comments due to Susan on August 1.

### **Chromium Study/Salmon Update – USFWS/PNNL**

Greg Patton (PNNL) gave the council an update on what has been going on at the Richland lab with the Hanford Site Early Life Stage Evaluation; (Phase II data/effects to date). He said the objective was to obtain a more complete understanding of chromium contaminated Hanford groundwater/Columbia River water on Chinook salmon. Greg said that a lot of work has been done in 1998 and 1999.

- 1998 - USGS/USFWS simulated Hanford groundwater to conduct a fertilization test, early life stage test, and parr health stage.
- 1999 – avoidance test
- 1999 – PNNL’s test (combined Hanford groundwater/Columbia River water)

Larry Gadbois asked about Hanford site fish, did they come from the Priest Rapids Dam Hatchery? Greg said yes. Greg said there was almost complete survival throughout the entire test, and there was no apparent effect on mortality, even with higher chromium concentrations. The preliminary conclusions were similar to the 1998 Hanford groundwater study; chromium concentrations had no apparent effect on survival at hatch, swimup, and termination. Chromium concentrations had no apparent effect on behavior or growth.

Brad Frazier (USFWS) went over the 3 handouts he provided everyone and gave an update of where we are at with the Salmon Study. Jamie asked if the avoidance study data analysis would be completed in August, and said, if not, we would like notification of that. Jamie said we have a problem, we have a draft report and 2 sets of analysis that were supposed to have been completed in September 1999 (tissue analysis) for the Early Life Stage and December for Parr Health; DNA analysis is not complete, and here it is July, all we know is that it will be complete “sometime this summer.” We have a report to review, yet we don’t have all the data, so Jamie wants everyone to keep in mind that they are reviewing an incomplete report. Brad said, in theory, it should not have much of an impact. The DNA samples taken for Phase I, were not blood samples, they were whole fish samples; Phase 1 Parr Health were blood samples. Blood DNA samples are awaiting to see if they need to be done. Jamie said that from a Project Manager’s standpoint, this is not an acceptable delay, don’t know how long it will be, we were not informed of it, and he is not happy. Larry Gadbois asked about running DNA samples with the local fish (PNNL) in lieu of the ?? – is it too late? Greg said the blood samples are still available. Jamie said if they hadn’t already started Phase I, he would be in favor of it, but since they have started, we need to get the results and get things finalized.

Comments are due August 4, 2000, but since all the data is not yet available, a second review cycle will be required. Jamie thinks that will push the entire schedule back into October. The schedule Brad prepared was discussed, which suggested a schedule change from what’s in the contract. The council approved the document submittal schedule Brad provided during the July 2000 NRTC meeting.

Jamie said that we need to talk to Aida Farag prior to the document being finalized. Brad said that is what the meeting in Lowell is for. The final report is due September 30, 2000.

A copy of Greg’s presentation is filed with the meeting information.

**Action: Brad Frazier – Talk to the people at the lab to see how far they have gone with Phase 1 (cost impacts/schedule completion impacts) – and would it be possible to swap samples?**

## **Hanford Fire Discussion – All**

Everyone watched the video Darci had made of areas of the Hanford Site following the fire.

Jamie said that from a trustee perspective, the BAER is suggesting that we go out and do some revegetation. He said the plots they are looking at revegetating are plots that were burned by back-fire activities, so they are eligible for funding. From what he can tell, those are the sites the council has been involved with. Jamie said our revegetation was wiped out. One option is the W-519 project has 80,000 plants of Hanford origin that can be replanted; Darci and Jamie are looking at using those native plants to replant 45 miles of fire break on central Hanford Site. The ER program has seed, look at how we can best use that seed. There is the possibility of having L&H expand what they are growing/harvesting(?). Looking at funding to come from the BAER (emergency funding), or going back to ERDF to contribute money as compensatory mitigation for initial phase of ERDF Cells 1 and 2. Jamie said that there are a lot of options being looked at and he will keep the council informed and updated.

## **EPA's BTAG Response Letter – Larry Gadbois**

Larry provided everyone with a copy of EPA's response letter concerning a BTAG. The general sense is that EPA can participate in a BTAG if DOE has funding for it, but they have concerns with DOE spending money on a BTAG when DOE has the technical expertise within.

Susan suggested that between now and September, Don Steffeck can better inform us of what a BTAG can do.

## **5-Year Review Update – Larry Gadbois**

~~Larry discussed the handout he provided to everyone and said each area was put together by the individual project managers (?). Susan asked if anyone on the council had responded on the 1100 Area portion, and Larry said no, but he did have responses on the 100 Area.~~

Larry Gadbois provided a handout to everyone that had 3 items in it: (1) an overview of the Hanford 5-year review process, (2) an outline of the 100, 200, 300, and 1100 Area reviews written by the respective authors of those sections, and (3) the current draft of the 1100 Area 5-year review writeup. Larry noted that a draft of the 100 Area 5-year review had been provided to the trustees by e-mail on April 27, 2000. Susan asked if anyone on the council had responded on the 100 Area portion, Larry said no.

## **Significance of National Monument Designation to Work of Trustees – All**

Jamie passed out a "Fact Sheet: Hanford Reach National Monument," and it was discussed, as well as the effects on the council. Jamie said that DOE (?) was directed to discuss adding lands with the Department of Interior, but was not giving the mechanism to do that. The main topics are: Creation, Lands Included, Management, etc., and a copy of the fact sheet is filed with the meeting information.

**Future Meetings/Future Agenda Items:**

- BTAG – Don Steffeck
- Chromium/Salmon Study (1/2 day)
- ERDF Mitigation/Revegetation Seed – Darci Teel
- Timely Involvement in HAB – Larry Goldstein
- Public Outreach – Larry Goldstein
- Administrative Support – Larry Goldstein
- 5-Year Review – Larry Gadbois