

**HANFORD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEE COUNCIL  
BI-MONTHLY MEETING  
May 18-20, 2010  
CIC Room 120, Richland WA**

**Meeting Summary**

The overall goals of the meeting were to:

- Conduct administrative business
- Receive updates and discuss next steps on procurement, NGO, budgets, and training
- Discuss the Project Coordinator job description
- Update the 2010 and 2011 budgets
- Review and act on TWG issue papers & discuss the next all-TWG meeting
- Discuss ideas for the baseline study
- Brainstorm approaches to better integrate NRDA and Response actions

The final agenda is included as Attachment A. Attendees are listed at end of the meeting summary. The meeting summary below is organized by topic. Action Items are listed as AI followed by a number, and the current Action Item list is included as Attachment B. The current Issue Paper list is included as Attachment C.

**Administrative Business**

- **Introductions.** Don Sampson and Steve Link were introduced by the CTUIR, and will be working with the HNRTC in the TWGs. Don will be focusing on the Aquatic TWG, and Steve will be working on anything related to plants (aquatic or terrestrial) or revegetation.
- **Meeting Summaries.** The March and April meeting summaries were tabled, because the Yakama Nation felt their concerns had not been heard or incorporated into the draft and voted no, but had not commented on the drafts. All trustees are encouraged to comment on these drafts prior to the June conference call.
- **HNRTC History Book.** Dan still needs information from the Trustees to finalize the History Book. Steve, Dana, and Larry will provide this information [REDACTED].

**RECEIVED**  
AUG 26 2010

**EDMC**

## Procurement

- **Phase II IAP.** The HNRTC completed its review in the first week of May, and DOE is conducting reviews of past performance and cost/price evaluations. DOE anticipates an award in the first week of June.
- **Project Coordinator.** The project coordinator job description prepared by USF&W and revised to reflect comments from other trustees was discussed. Yakama Nation noted its opposition to having this position housed at USF&W, and indicated that it would vote no on any candidates proposed through this hiring process. In addition, the YN stated their position that the informal motion at the January meeting did not include hiring a person and cited the January meeting minutes and previous resolutions used to formally commit funds for the facilitator and office space. Other trustees expressed their perspective that the decision to hire and set aside money had already been made through previous HNRTC decisions and budgeting processes, allowing the hiring process to go forward through finalization of the job description and selection of a candidate by majority vote. A resolution was not reached and the topic was tabled for further discussion.
- **USF&W/ NFWF.** Discussions have continued between DOE, USF&W, and NFWF on an agreement for transferring funds to NFWF to manage the HNRTC contracts. Joe and Janis confirmed that there appear to be no obstacles to doing so, and Russ is working with USF&W's NFWF liaison and others to finalize the details of the contracting mechanisms. An MOA or other instrument would still need to be developed to govern how NFWF would interact with the HNRTC in addition to the contractual arrangements. It is not known how long this process will take. It was agreed that at the July meeting the HNRTC should discuss what it would like to include in an MOA with NFWF. Steve sent out examples of some agreements NFWF has entered into in the past, and will resend them.

## HNRTC Budgets

- **Budget Reporting and Updating.** DOE and the Chair prepared estimates of budgets for previous years; however, the two estimates differed in some respects. Janis and Steve were asked to reconcile the differences between the two budget figures for past years [REDACTED] and that USDOE provide budget updates at the bimonthly meetings until a project coordinator was hired. In this way, the budgets can become living documents that are updated as new information about the budget is available and as the HNRTC obligates funds. The source of funds would also be identified on the spreadsheet, along with a line for currently unobligated funds.
- **2010/ 2011 Budget Updates.** Working from spreadsheets similar to those prepared for 2012, the 2010 and 2011 budgets were updated based on current estimates of available funding (final spreadsheets were distributed by Steve after the meeting by e-mail).

Based on the bids submitted for Phase II, and DOE's most current information on the funding available to the HNRTC for 2010 (\$3.015M), the remaining 2010 funds will be sufficient to cover the Phase II low bid, without contingency. The 2010 budget includes \$1.818M previously allocated to the Trustees, \$1.2M for the Phase II contractor, and \$95,000 for the facilitator.

The 2011 budget was updated to reflect the current estimate of \$4.586M in DOE's budget request to Congress. The actual amount that will be received is unknown. The 2011 budget developed during the meeting includes \$133,000 Phase II contingency, \$1.3M in study costs, \$50,000 for restoration planning, \$240,000 for a project coordinator, \$30,000 for data management costs, \$95,000 for a facilitator, and approximately \$2.738M for the Trustees, for a total of \$4.586M. ***[2011 and 2012 budget spreadsheets showing further details were distributed after the meeting by Steve Wisness.]***

- **2012 Budget.** The 2012 budget of \$6M has been sent to HQ and is now subject to embargo. The Trustees discussed the 2012 budgeting process, the meaning of collaboration and consensus, and alternatives for resolving the budget impasse in the future; however, none of the identified alternatives received a consensus.

### **NRDAR Activities**

- **TWG Issue Papers.** Each of the TWG issue papers was reviewed and acted on. A summary of the actions is included as attachment C, and each of the revised papers indicating the resolution or response will be distributed after the meeting and placed on the Google site.
  - **AT10-01. Approach to resolution of issues raised by technical work groups.** The proposed approach was modified to ensure an opportunity for all TWG members to review and comment on draft issue papers in a timely manner, and for the Chair and Vice-Chair to receive copies of issue papers at the same time they are sent the facilitator. The revised approach was approved with 5 in favor and Yakama Nation and DOE abstaining. Yakama Nation preferred a more structured process before issue papers are forwarded to the HNRTC, and DOE preferred a more informal process.
  - **RS10-01. Incorporate primary restoration into remedial (revegetation) activities.** Various Trustees were concerned about linking primary restoration with revegetation activities, were not sure about the term "as appropriate and practicable," thought that these activities may be conducted too early, and/or felt that the Trustees should first review the criteria for selecting early restoration actions. Therefore, the first requested action was sent back to the TWG for redrafting. The request for the Restoration TWG to coordinate with the work on the Hanford Revegetation Manual was approved with 6 in favor and

Yakama Nation abstaining. The third request for a letter to Dave Brockman was dropped due to the concerns over the wording of the first action request.

- **GW10-01. Establishing the threshold of injury for groundwater resources.** The first sentence of the requested action was unanimously approved, with the addition that the Groundwater TWG should equally evaluate a variety of different potential thresholds, and that the evaluation should include a temporal component. The second sentence of the requested action was not considered timely, as the evaluation is not yet before the HNRTC.
- **GW10-02. Technical working groups overlap.** Jay pointed out that more detailed versions of the divisions of responsibility described here exist in other memos, at least for GW/SW. That memo will be appended to this one for further clarification. The issue paper was approved with 6 in favor and Yakama Nation abstaining.
- **GW10-03. Access to GIS and environmental data.** This paper requested that the HNRTC identify a means of gaining access to HES for the Groundwater TWG. The HNRTC developed a response based on existing coordination efforts with DOE and approved it, with 6 in favor and Yakama Nation abstaining due to concerns over lack of appropriate consultation by DOE with the Tribes and how many people will be allowed access to the data.
- **GW10-04. Need for a stand-alone computer with a large hard drive.** The HNRTC developed a response to this request based on existing contracts and budgets and it was approved unanimously.
- **SP10-01. Access to DOE data for contaminant source inventory for the Hanford Site.** The HNRTC approved the two requests unanimously, with the addition that the Source/Pathway group should include the vadose zone in its source inventory.
- **SP10-02. Selection of 100-B/ C as the preferred location for pilot data-mining activities.** The HNRTC had concerns with this proposal, due to the potential restrictions it might place on other HNRTC activities, including work by the Phase II contractor and field studies. The requested actions were not approved, with 5 voting no and 2 (DOE and WA) abstaining. TWGs were encouraged, however, to work together and coordinate activities in selected locations to make work more efficient.
- **TWG Chair Meeting.** Teresa reported on the TWG Chair meeting that was held May 11, 2010. Meeting minutes were distributed Monday, May 17. One topic of discussion at the TWG Chair meeting was the administrative record, and the HNRTC decided that

three TWG products would be included in the administrative record: 1) final issue papers, 2) TWG monthly reports, and 3) final work products.

**All-TWG Meeting.** The next All-TWG Meeting has been set for August 11-12 in Richland, when the TWGs would otherwise have been meeting there. Draft topics for the agenda include:

- Introductions and agenda
- Update on HNRTC activities and timelines, contracting
- Overview of Phase II SOW and points of interaction with HNRTC/TWGs
- Communication between HNRTC, TWGs, and Phase II contractor
- Substantive division of work between HNRTC, TWGs, and Phase II contractor
- Update on TWG activities in 2010 (focusing on those with relevance to other TWGs and Phase II)
- TWG Action Plans and priorities for 2011 – check for consistency, agree on priorities, and adjust based on Phase II discussions earlier in the day

Additional work on the agenda in early June will determine whether one or two days are necessary. In addition, it became apparent that a subsequent in-depth data meeting is needed, to be scheduled once the Phase II contractor is on board. Draft agenda items for that meeting are also listed in the TWG Chair meeting summary.

- **Baseline Study.** Callie presented a more detailed outline of the topics that could be covered in a study of baseline conditions, and the HNRTC spent some time discussing each element and what types of data may be available to include in the study. Using this information, she will meet with the other members of the baseline study workgroup and develop a more detailed scope of work and budget for the study [REDACTED].
- **NRDAR Training.** NRDAR training has been set up for the week of June 21. Janis will determine the final dates based on the schedules of the DOE staff that should attend [REDACTED]. Trustees who wish to attend should also send their schedules to Janis.

### Response Integration

- **Brainstorming.** Steve presented the look-ahead schedule, including a number of high-priority areas that may need to be discussed during the next few HNRTC meetings. However, the HNRTC is interested in finding ways to conduct these meetings that better integrate NRDA objectives with response actions. Ideas discussed included:
  - Getting more specific about exactly how incorporating NRDA into cleanups will save DOE money and time on the cleanups, as well as getting resources restored earlier

- Develop a number of specific examples from actual sites, both on and off-site, to get site managers thinking about it. Incorporate them into the NRDAR training.
  - Integration may provide a range of benefits, including reduced cleanup costs, earlier or more complete restoration to reduce NRDA liability, and/or avoidance of injuries that could have resulted from certain cleanup alternatives
  - Do a couple of pilot projects at Hanford to demonstrate how integration can work and prove that it does not have to slow down projects or increase costs
  - Get a draft of the restoration plan completed and through HNRTC review, so that the criteria and other ideas are available for use on projects
  - Work with site managers on data collection and proposed plans while ideas are still in the working stage, rather than in a review mode
  - Educate site managers on how service losses and other injuries are associated with institutional controls and other less complete cleanup alternatives
  - Work with DOE to better incorporate complete life-cycle costs into alternatives evaluations – not only NRDA liabilities but also maintenance and monitoring costs
  - Need a long-term vision that goes into some kind of document, like a comprehensive conservation plan, and is carried forward into other Hanford planning documents
  - Involve EPA and Ecology (as regulators), along with DOE, in these integration discussions
- **Working Meetings.** In the near-term, specific ideas for more productive working meetings were discussed. For July, the HNRTC would like to meet with Jim Hansen and Nick Ceto to map out the upcoming activities and identify the points in the process where working meetings with site managers would be most useful in conducting NRDAR/Response integration. Questions to focus on would be circulated to site managers in advance, the Trustees would work up some ideas in advance, and the meetings would be more like working meetings than briefings or Q&A sessions. Two types of meetings at different points in the process were identified, along with some draft questions to focus on:

#### **R/FS Work Plan**

- 1) What are the ecological resources in this area of the site?
- 2) Which of these ecological resources may have been injured and how?
- 3) What are the human uses and service losses that have occurred at this site?
- 4) What data are needed to answer these questions? What data already exist?
- 5) Which of these data are already planned to be part of the R/FS investigation?
- 6) Which of the remaining data needs can be integrated into the R data collection efforts in a cost-effective manner? Which data needs may need to be fulfilled separately?

#### **Feasibility Study/ Proposed Plan**

- 1) How are natural resource injuries, human services, and restoration considered in development and evaluation of the alternatives?

- 2) How can the complete lifecycle costs, including maintenance, monitoring, and NRDAR liabilities, be included in the evaluation and selection of a preferred alternative?
- 3) What specific modifications to alternatives or new alternatives could be introduced to better address NRDAR objectives, reduce long-term liabilities, and reduce the costs of cleanup?
- 4) What restoration opportunities could be incorporated into the cleanup alternatives?

It was also suggested that discussing some of these issues during on-site visits would be useful.

### Standing Agenda Items

- Project Coordinator
- NGO agreement
- Response integration planning (DOE/ EPA/ Ecology)
- Central Plateau Eco-Risk Assessment/ cleanup decisions/ RODs
- River Corridor risk assessment/ RI report/ Proposed Plans
- 5-Year review

### Meeting Attendees

**CTUIR:** Barb Harper<sup>1</sup>, Rica Cruz, Don Sampson<sup>2</sup>, Steve Link<sup>3</sup>

**Nez Perce Tribe:** Dan Landeen, Jack Bell

**Oregon:** Paul Shaffer, Ken Niles<sup>2</sup>

**WA Dept. of Ecology:** Larry Goldstein, Jean Hays<sup>4</sup>

**WA Fish & Wildlife:** John Carleton

**NOAA:** Charlene Andrade<sup>5</sup>

**Yakama Nation:** Jay McConnaughey, Brian Barry<sup>6</sup>, Russell Jim<sup>6</sup>, Callie Ridolfi<sup>2</sup>, Pat Spurgin<sup>6</sup>

**US Fish & Wildlife Service:** Joe Bartoszek

**US Dept. of Energy:** Dana Ward, Janis Ward, Steve Wisness, Connie Smith

**Facilitator:** Teresa Michelsen

<sup>1</sup> Present on first and third days

<sup>2</sup> Present on second day

<sup>3</sup> Present on third day

<sup>4</sup> Present on second and third days

<sup>5</sup> Present by phone

<sup>6</sup> Present by phone first and second days

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Tuesday**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Focus: Administrative and Contracting</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1:00 pm	<b>Administrative Business:</b> Approve agenda, March & April meeting minutes	McConnaughey
1:30 pm	<b>Old Business:</b> Phase II contracting, NFWF, 2012 budget update (senior discussions), NRDAR training planning  <b>Purpose:</b> Receive updates and discuss next steps on each	J. Ward, MacRae
3:30 pm	<b>Break</b>	
3:45 pm	<b>Project Coordinator Job Description:</b> Discuss comments and revisions, path forward  <b>Purpose:</b> Finalize job description & agree on next steps	MacRae
5:00 pm	<b>Adjourn</b>	

## Wednesday

Time	Focus: 2011 Budget and TWG Activities	Lead
8:30 am	<p><b>2010/2011 Budget Update</b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Update the 2010 budget and include more detail in the 2011 budget, including accurate Phase II costs and task-based workload estimates. Discuss approach and workgroup assignments to complete.</p>	Michelsen/Wisness
10:30 am	<b>Break</b>	
10:45 am	<b>2011 Budget, cont.</b>	Michelsen
11:30 pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
1:00 pm	<p><b>TWG Issue Papers:</b> Issue papers AT10-01, RS10-01, SP10-01, SP10-02, GW10-01, GW10-02, GW10-03, GW10-04 (attached)</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Review and make decisions on each paper</p>	TWG Chairs
2:45 pm	<b>Break</b>	
3:00 pm	<b>Baseline Study:</b> Continue framing the baseline study	Ridolfi
4:00 pm	<b>All-TWG Meeting &amp; TWG Chair Update</b>	Michelsen/TWG Chairs
5:00 pm	<p><b>Purpose:</b> Discuss issues relevant to all the TWGs and plan the next All-TWG meeting</p> <p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	

**Thursday**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Focus: NRDA/Response Integration</b>	<b>Lead</b>
8:30 am	<p><b>Response Integration Strategizing</b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Determine how the HNRTC/DOE can do a better job of accomplishing NRDA/Response integration. Discuss how to adjust briefings and Trustee/DOE interactions.</p>	Michelsen
10:30 am	<p><b>Break</b></p>	
10:45 am	<p><b>Response Integration Priorities</b></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> Identify response integration priorities and plan next steps for more than just project updates.</p>	Michelsen
11:45 am	<p><b>Wrap-Up</b></p>	Michelsen
12:00 pm	<p><b>Purpose:</b> Review accomplishments and action items</p> <p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	

## ATTACHMENT B

## ACTION ITEMS

**Note:** Yellow indicates changes to previously existing action items, including completion dates, updates, and changes in responsibility. Items with yellow completion dates (or otherwise closed) will not be included on subsequent action item lists. ■■■ action item numbers indicate new items since the most recent update.

	Assignee/ Action	Date Assigned	Date Completed
314	Develop white paper on integrating NRDAR into CERCLA response <i>ACTION: Paul et al.</i>	11/17/09	
315	Arrange NRDAR training for site managers <i>ACTION: Janis, Russ</i>	3/25/10	5/18/10
318	Discuss ways to mitigate OQ issue with DOE Procurement/ Legal and get back with the Council <i>ACTION: Janis</i>	1/19/10	5/18/10
319	USFWS to issue an interest announcement for the Project Coordinator position, with HNRTC input on the description <i>ACTION: Russ, All</i>	3/23/10	
320	Determine whether USFWS can establish a contract with NFWF <i>ACTION: Russ</i>	1/19/10	5/18/10
322	Determine impacts if the Trustees only receive \$4.6M funding in FY2011 <i>ACTION: Budget committee/ Steve</i>	1/20/10	5/18/10
324	Comment on updates to the Hanford History Book <i>ACTION: Trustees to Dan</i>	3/25/10	
325	Yakama Nation to determine whether to concur with the 2012 budget and budgeting approach <i>ACTION: Yakama Nation</i>	3/24/10	5/3/10
326	Determine date and location of next all-TWG meeting <i>ACTION: TWG Chairs</i>	3/24/10	5/11/10
327	Find Phase I scoring guidelines and circulate for revision <i>ACTION: Dana, Paul, Larry</i>	4/19/10	5/3/10
■■■	Prepare final budget accounting for 2008 and 2009 <i>ACTION: Janis, Steve</i>	5/19/10	
■■■	Develop scope of work and budget for baseline study <i>ACTION: Baseline study workgroup</i>	5/19/10	
■■■	Final scheduling of NRDAR training <i>ACTION: Janis</i>	5/18/10	

## ATTACHMENT C

## TWG ISSUE PAPERS

**Note:** Yellow indicates updates to issue papers, including decisions or requests for further information. ■■■■■ indicates an issue paper that has had a final decision. Letters indicate the TWG that originated the issue paper: AQ – Aquatic Resources; AT – All-TWG meeting or TWG Chairs; GW – Groundwater; HS – Human Services; RS – Restoration; SP – Source/ Pathway; TR – Terrestrial Resources. The numbers indicate the two-digit year before the dash and the number of the issue paper after the dash. Issue papers can be found on the Google website.

Number	Issue Paper Title	Date Discussed	Status/ Outcome
■■■■■	Approach to Resolution of Issues Raised by Technical Work Groups	5/ 19/ 10	Approved with modifications
AT10-02	HNRTC Technical Work Group Mission Statements	3/ 25/ 10	Returned to TWGs
■■■■■	Establishing the threshold of injury for groundwater resources	5/ 19/ 10	Approved with modifications
■■■■■	Technical working group overlaps	5/ 19/ 10	Approved
■■■■■	Access to GIS and environmental data	5/ 19/ 10	Response provided
■■■■■	Need for a stand-alone computer with large hard drive	5/ 19/ 10	Response provided
RS10-01	Incorporate primary restoration into remedial (revegetation) activities	5/ 19/ 10	1) returned for redrafting, 2) approved, 3) dropped
■■■■■	Access to DOE data for contaminant source inventory for the Hanford Site	5/ 19/ 10	Both 1) and 2) approved with modifications
■■■■■	Selection of 100-B/C as the preferred location for pilot data-mining activities	5/ 19/ 10	Both 1) and 2) not approved