DRAFT
MEETING SUMMARY
FERNALD NATURAL RESOURCE TRUSTEES
EM CONFERENCE ROOM
NOVEMBER 1, 2000

Attendees: Joe Bartoszek (OEPA)
Donna Bohannon (OEPA)
Tom Crawford (Fluor Fernald)
John Homer (Fluor Fernald)
Bill Kurey (FWS)
Lisa Ludwick (Fluor Fernald)
Tom Schneider (OEPA)
Eric Woods (Fluor Fernald)
Pete Yerace (DOE)

Conceptual Design for the Southern Waste Units

John Homer presented a summary of the conceptual design for the Southern Waste Units (SWU). Key components of the restoration design include the following:

1. Expansion of floodplain and possible re-channelization of Paddys Run
2. Revegetation options within floodplain areas
3. Addition of amendments to existing sub-soils in order to facilitate revegetation
4. Stabilization of slopes to prevent erosion
5. Revegetation of slopes and upland areas to an oak-hickory, oak-maple forest mosaic

Once the components of the design were presented, Fluor Fernald discussed the uncertainties associated with working around Paddys Run. Tom Crawford presented the remediation activities outstanding in the SWU and a rough schedule of implementation. Several areas of flyash, primarily associated with the historic running track and the riprap berm along Paddys Run, still need to be excavated. In addition, some additional excavation is required in the vicinity of the deep excavation within the Inactive Flyash Pile. Support features such as Basin 1 and the turnaround area also need to be removed. Tom estimated that work should be completed by next summer.

Ohio EPA commented that certain features within the SWU, such as perched water seeps and the excavated octagon area, should be utilized to create microhabitats. Otherwise, the approach for revegetation of the slopes and upland areas was acceptable. The approach for the lower-elevation potential floodplain area is uncertain, since the extent of additional excavation and the technical feasibility of integrating Paddys Run still need to be determined. Fluor Fernald summarized the 10/31/00 site visit by Randy Hoover of ODNR. In general, Randy concurred that the Paddys Run floodplain should be maximized. Randy indicated that his office would probably be able to provide technical support for the SWU design. The NRTs agreed that Fluor Fernald should seek technical support for the SWU design either through ODNR or through a subcontractor. Because of the dynamic nature of Paddys Run, it was also suggested that once remediation is complete, the lower portion of the SWU could be seeded and left alone for a year in order to see where plantings would best be utilized.

The SWU discussion led to a discussion regarding the entire onsite reach of Paddys Run. Several man-made (i.e. channelization) and natural (i.e. local geology) factors have contributed over the years to constrict the floodplain of Paddys Run, thus accelerating bank and streambed erosion. Randy Hoover proposed that floodplain needed to be increased by reversing the incising nature of Paddys Run. This could be accomplished by either lowering adjacent land elevations or by raising the streambed elevation

through grade control structures. The NRTs proposed that an ideal approach be developed for managing the onsite reach of Paddys Run.

Action Items:
1. DOE develop a conceptual post-excavation topography drawing for the SWU
2. DOE determine how outside technical support for the SWU design will be obtained
3. DOE develop an ideal plan figure for managing Paddys Run through some combination of floodplain re-establishment and grade control structures

Memorandum of Understanding

DOE is reviewing the latest revision of the MOU. DOE is also reviewing the latest groundwater proposal from OEPA?. FWS has recently undergone reorganization, and Bill Kurey does not know who legal counsel is. OEPA stated that dates for restoration design submittals need to be established before the NRRP and settlement can be finalized. The NRTs agreed to attempt to finalize the MOU by the next NRT meeting in December 2000.

Action Items:
1. FWS determine legal counsel and submit MOU for review
2. DOE review and comment on groundwater settlement proposal
3. DOE establish restoration design submittal dates

Northern Pine Plantation

The conceptual restoration design for the Northern Pine Plantation was discussed. OEPA provided the following comments with respect to clearing. First, it was pointed out that there was a difference in the percentage of pines that would be cleared (40% in summary bullets vs. 60% in the conceptual design). Second, OEPA suggested that the clearing design be opened up by removing the ends of the Austrian pine rows and creating more "islands" of white pines. It was also suggested to focus on shrub plantings on the edges of existing stands in order to prevent invasion by amur honeysuckle.

OEPA proposed to accelerate the identification and plugging of agricultural drain tiles within the project area. Once this is accomplished, the area could be observed for a season in order to determine the optimal location for features such as vernal pools and wet prairies. OEPA also proposed to expand the use of these types of water features, as dictated by hydrology. Other comments on the conceptual design included the addition of wildlife structures, a doubling of the shrub planting density, and accelerating pine clearing to this winter if funding is available.

Action Items:
1. DOE accelerate the identification and plugging of agricultural drain tiles to this year
2. DOE develop a topographic map for the project area
3. DOE determine if funding is available to clear the pines in winter 2000/2001

Adaptive Management/Monitoring

DOE provided talking points to the NRTs that called for a recognition of adaptive management principles in future restoration designs and established three categories of success monitoring: compliance, functional, and landscape/social. OEPA proposed that compliance monitoring be changed to implementation monitoring, and that landscape/social issues should be recognized and integrated into designs instead of monitored after the project is complete. Landscape/social issues would be addressed through aesthetics and integration with off-property activities. DOE agreed to both proposals. In

summary, implementation success would be short-term and would determine whether the project was implemented in accordance with the design. Functional success would be more long-term and would determine the extent that the ecological goals and objectives of the restoration project are being met. Functional success monitoring would be viewed in a larger sitewide context instead of project-by-project. Pete Yerace stated that DOE would require a closure date where functional monitoring would cease. The NRTs discussed closing the functional success monitoring period 10 years after the final restoration project is complete.

Bill Kurey pointed out that he needs to show quantitative improvement to his management in order to claim success. The NRTs then discussed a process by which restoration projects would be measured against baseline site information and data collected from reference sites. Baseline information could be project-specific (or habitat-specific in cases where the pre-remediation habitat has been altered or removed), and used to determine what the goals for a particular project should be. Once project goals are established using baseline data, objectives would be pulled from habitat-specific reference site information. References could be established for wetland, forest, prairie, and riparian habitats that provide a desired endpoint for a corresponding restoration project. By using this combination of baseline and reference site data in conjunction with a functional success monitoring program, DOE can demonstrate quantitative improvements over pre-restoration conditions and progress toward the desired endpoints. Throughout the monitoring period, principles of adaptive management would be used to ensure that progress toward goals is being made.

Action Items:

1. DOE will work with OEPA to develop a more detailed adaptive management proposal

Field Tour

The NRTs toured A8PII, the A1PI wetland mitigation project, and the SP3 seeding project after lunch. The NRTs discussed the extent of recent deer damage seen in A8PII and A1PI and agreed that some form of control is required. The installation of protective deer tubes has not eliminated damage from deer rubbing in A8PII. However, the tubes that are now being used are more susceptible to deer damage than black corrugated plastic tubes. [This is not verbatim (can't read writing). It also is not correct – the vast majority of damage is to limbs above tubing] Pete Yerace ~~proposed to develop a plan for controlled hunting at the Fernald site~~. Discussed the option of a "selected harvest" of nuisance deer at Fernald. He also indicated that this would not be a permanent solution. In fact, another buck will take the place of the one that was harvested. However, he agreed to discuss with ODNR possible depredation options. The NRTs discussed the need to present the idea to the FCAB at their November 15, 2000 meeting. OEPA took pictures of the deer damage and stated that they would forward them to DOE.

The deer discussion led to a discussion of research needs in A8PII. The A8PII NRRDP calls for research on deer browsing and volunteer recruitment into areas where no shrubs were planted. Because of the amount of deer damage occurring in A8PII, and because shrubs will be specified at higher densities in future restoration designs, OEPA proposed that no research in A8PII is needed. DOE agreed.

Action Items:

1. OEPA provide photographs of deer damage in A8PII
2. DOE develop presentation to FCAB calling for controlled hunt at the Fernald site

Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m., with an agreement to meet on Tuesday December 5, 2000 at 9:30 a.m. at the Fernald site.