

Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board Meeting  
Salem, Oregon  
March 29 and 30, 2005

*Board Members:*

Present:

Paige Knight, Chair  
Larry Clucas, Vice-Chair  
Mary Lou Blazek-Smith  
Norma Jean Germond  
Michael Grainey  
Maxine Hines  
Wayne Lei  
Robert A. McFarlane  
Armand Minthorn  
Doug Woodcock

Absent:

Eric Nisley  
Marc Rogelstad  
Dave Van't Hof  
Sen. Margaret Carter  
Sen. Rick Metsger  
Sen. Dave Nelson  
Rep. Linda Flores  
Rep. Bob Jenson  
Rep. Steve March

*Oregon Department of Energy:*

Dirk Dunning  
Deanna Henry  
Lynda Horst  
Susan Coburn Hughs  
Ken Niles  
Paul Shaffer  
Tom Stoops

*U.S. Department of Energy:*

Howard Gnann  
T. Erik Olds

*CH2M Hill:*

Moses Jaraysi  
Bryan Kidder

*Hanford Information Network:*

Doug Riggs  
Matt Wingard

*Western Oregon University:*

Andrew Akerson  
Sara Bell (?)  
Lonnie Guralnick  
Rebecca Irving  
Amanda Kaufman  
Mandy Rebel  
Monica Smith  
Shannon Talbott  
Shannon Wineland

*Willamette University:*

Jordan Rash

**Luncheon Speaker:**

Laura Hicks, Project Manager  
US Army Corps of Engineers

**TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 2005**

Administrative

Chair Paige Knight convened the meeting at 1:25 p.m. on March 29, 2005. Introductions were made around the room. Ms. Knight welcomed students from an Environmental Science Class at Western Oregon University. Ken Niles introduced Paul Shaffer to the Board. Mr. Shaffer is a new member of the ODOE staff and explained his experience and background to the Board. Ms. Knight mentioned that the board has two new senate

members, Senators Margaret Carter and Rick Metsger, who replace Senators Ted Ferrioli and Joan Dukes.

Staff reviewed action items from the October 2004 board meeting and provided additional copies of the correspondence resulting from those action items.

After a brief discussion about the minutes of the last meeting, Mr. Clucas moved to accept the minutes; Ms. Hines seconded the motion.

Those voting in favor: Mr. Clucas, Ms. Blazek-Smith, Ms. Germond, Mr. Niles on behalf of Mr. Grainey, Ms. Hines, Ms. Knight, Dr. McFarlane, Mr. Minthorn, Mr. Woodcock. Those voting against: none. Motion carried.

### Tank Waste Issues

Howard Gnann with the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (ORP) provided an overview of the Hanford tank waste cleanup project. Mr. Gnann reported that Hanford's tank waste cleanup challenge is to remediate 53 million gallons of waste stored in 177 underground storage tanks. The plan is to send 97 percent of the radioactivity and five percent of the waste volume to Yucca Mountain.

Mr. Gnann reported on the progress of building a Vitrification (Vit) Plant and a Pre-Treatment Facility to vitrify (glassify) this waste. He reported on recent issues identified with the construction of the Vit Plant. ORP is investigating a recent discovery that seismic hazards at Hanford are greater than had been realized. In doing a detailed analysis of the Hanford Site and how the basalt and sand beneath the site responds to large earthquakes, ORP discovered that the seismic energy is transmitted differently and more powerfully than they expected. Mr. Gnann said ORP did not halt all construction of the Vit Plant, but has delayed some work that might not be sufficient for the newly recognized risks. As of December 2004, 76 percent of the engineering design and 37 percent of the construction is complete. ORP is continuing to analyze the remainder of the plan design to determine what changes may be required as work proceeds and what additional funding will be needed to make those changes.

Mr. Gnann reported that the Tri-Party Agreement requires ORP to vitrify all tank waste by 2028. In recent years, ORP has pursued several alternative technologies to supplement the vitrification facilities. One of these is a process called bulk vitrification. This process vitrifies waste mixed with Hanford soil in dumpster-size containers. The Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System is now under construction and Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has issued the first permits needed to use the system as a demonstration to vitrify actual waste from one of the Hanford tanks in the 200 West Area. Mr. Gnann estimates that the first container will be treated in December of 2005.

ORP is still hopeful that it will be able to dispose of some tank waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico. ORP has been working with the State of New Mexico and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to demonstrate that waste in at least eight of Hanford's tanks is actually transuranic waste, rather than high-level waste.

Mr. Gnann reported that the Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is now scheduled for release in Spring 2006 with the record of decision (ROD) anticipated to be issued in December 2006. In response to questions about the delay in issuing the EIS, Mr. Gnann said the main reason for the delay is that the waste impact analysis disagreed with an analysis of similar waste in the Hanford solid waste EIS. DOE is revisiting these differences and trying to make the results of the two EISs more consistent.

### Groundwater Updates

Tom Stoops began his presentation with some background on the groundwater problems existing at Hanford. There are currently 80 square miles of groundwater contaminated above drinking water standards, and radioactive material is entering the Columbia River.

He explained that groundwater cleanup and remediation efforts have been going on since the mid 1990s. Mr. Stoops discussed the status of efforts in the 100, 200, and 300 areas of the site.

DOE has discovered a technetium-99 (Tc-99) plume in groundwater north of the T-TX-TY tank farms in the 200 area. A monitoring well is currently being constructed to provide additional data on this plume. Sampling done on this newly discovered plume indicates limits far in excess of the drinking water standard. It is not yet known how large of an area this plume covers. The Tri-Parties (DOE, Ecology and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) are negotiating the next steps, which should include additional characterization.

There is a dispute about additional work that may be needed on the uranium transport conceptual model for the B-BX-BY tank farms. In the BC cribs area, DOE has admitted that significantly more contaminants were discharged to the subsurface than originally thought.

DOE had developed a Groundwater Strategy to focus on a variety of areas, including decommissioning high risk wells, reducing natural and artificial recharge, implementing final groundwater remedies, operation of the waste sites, removing, immobilizing and shrinking contaminant sources and managing emerging issues. There is concern now that budget cuts will affect implementation of the groundwater strategy.

The next board meeting will focus heavily on groundwater issues, so that the board can get a better understanding of the problems and concerns.

### K-Basin Cleanup (Sludge Removal)

Mr. Dunning explained that there is not much in the way of news since information was sent to the board in the pre-meeting packet. The spent nuclear fuel is out of the basins, but the sludge removal process has been difficult. Because the timetable was based on overly optimistic estimates, the work currently is behind schedule and will continue behind schedule for a while. During work in the K-east basin, the level of airborne contamination increased and has reached 12 times the allowed limit.

Mr. Dunning discussed DOE's proposal to introduce grout into the sludge with plans to ship it to WIPP for disposal. There is disagreement about whether the introduction of grout to the sludge will allow it to meet the criteria for WIPP disposal. There is also discussion about sending the waste to Yucca Mountain, but it will be quite a while before any decisions are made.

The concrete in the basin has become contaminated with Tc-99 and DOE would like to place that rubble into the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF). Mr. Dunning expressed concerns that the Tc-99 would freely move out of the concrete rubble. This translates into a waste management issue, since there is the potential for the Tc-99 to leach out of ERDF. There is also the possibility that the quantity of Tc-99 could overwhelm the capacity of ERDF.

### Ecological Risk Assessment

Mr. Shaffer presented a discussion about the process of ecological risk assessment (ERA), including its purpose, how it is done, and how ERA relates to natural resource damage assessments. ERAs are required under certain federal regulations, including CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act), commonly known as Superfund.

The goal is to be thorough, consistent, provide quantitative and qualitative data, and provide data that are adequate for making defensible decisions. The process includes remedial investigations and feasibility studies, an engineering analysis along with the human health and ecological risk assessment. The ecological risk assessment focuses on populations, not individual organisms unless they are threatened or endangered, or specifically protected by treaty. Remediation is meant to be protective, not return the site to the baseline.

Mr. Minthorn asked for clarification of those "specifically protected by treaty." Mr. Shaffer responded that the goal is not to assess species by species, but to review populations. However, the exceptions may require evaluation of specific treaties. Mr. Shaffer agreed to research the question and provide more information following the meeting.

There is a multi-step process for developing an ERA, known as ERAGS (Environmental Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund). These steps include screening, problem

formulation, study design, field-sampling design, site investigation, and risk characterization. There are currently 51 ERAs in some stage of planning or implementation at Hanford. Many cleanup actions were taken without knowledge of ecological risk assessment, only human health assessments.

In early 2005, DOE began developing a method to integrate all the ERAs, to look for holes, overlaps, and scheduling misalignments. Staff noted that DOE is moving this project rapidly forward and that only those who are intimately involved can keep up. ODOE staff is trying to get DOE to define how the ERAs will be integrated and DOE has committed to a milestone to define the integration.

Mr. Shaffer discussed the relationship between injury and risk assessment. ERA assessment is to guide remediation that is “protective.” Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) is designed to assess change, or loss of function, from “baseline” conditions. Many of the data needs are similar, but the outcomes are different – protective versus variation from baseline conditions. Risk assessment (ERA) occurs prior to remedial decision making, whereas injury and damage assessment (NRDA) are post-remedial decisions. However, both the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and DOE recommend doing the work simultaneously.

The meeting was adjourned on Tuesday at 4:55 p.m.

### **WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2005**

Chair Paige Knight called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. and announced that some items on the agenda have been rearranged.

#### Trustee Issues

Ms. Hughs provided an update on Natural Resource trustee issues at Hanford. CERCLA designates trustees for natural resources. Trustees have authority and responsibility for protection of natural resources and for restoration, remediation or replacement of natural resources injured by the release of hazardous materials. This injury can include “loss of the services” provided by the natural resource while the injury was occurring. Oregon is a natural resource trustee for some of the natural resources at Hanford.

Last July, Oregon and Washington filed a notice of intent to sue DOE. The states contend that DOE has failed to assess natural resource injury at Hanford, as directed by CERCLA, as well as by DOE’s own internal policy. In September, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) also filed a notice of intent on similar grounds.

Staff reported that since March 2004 the trustees have submitted three formal scope and funding proposals to DOE’s Richland Operations office (DOE-RL). The purpose of all three proposals has been to cause DOE-RL to fund the work of the trustees and integrate the injury assessment with the risk assessment work. The trustees believe that the

outcome of this action will be better cleanup, greater protection for the natural resources at Hanford, and smaller overall cost.

DOE-RL has rejected all three funding proposals. Several factors complicate these negotiations between the trustees and DOE-RL. The notices of intent by the two states and the CTUIR mean that every interaction must be weighed as to how it might affect litigation.

On March 24, 2005, Michael Grainey, Ken Niles, and Susan Coburn Hughs of ODOE, along with the senior executives of the other trustees met with Keith Klein of DOE-RL. The senior executive trustees went into the meeting expecting a substantive discussion on trustee funding. The trustees also wanted a show of good faith from DOE in the form of funding for the immediate work, and a placeholder in the 2007 budget.

The trustees got something less than that. DOE-RL remains adamant that they will not address injury assessment at this time. Mr. Klein agreed to commit limited funding in the current federal budget year to expand the trustee's involvement with the ERA process at Hanford, and to request some funding in the 2007 budget.

#### Hanford Litigation Update

There are several lawsuits pending concerning Hanford cleanup. On July 16, 2004, the state of Washington announced its intent to expand existing litigation in an effort to stop further shipments of waste to Hanford. The original lawsuit, filed in 2003 and joined by four citizen groups, sought to prevent transuranic (TRU) waste from coming to Hanford. Federal District Court Judge Alan McDonald granted a preliminary injunction in May 2003, preventing DOE from making additional TRU waste shipments to Hanford until final resolution of the litigation.

The expanded litigation now includes low-level and mixed low-level radioactive waste. Washington's action followed release of the ROD for the final Hanford Solid Waste EIS. Washington contends that DOE has not conducted an adequate environmental analysis of the impacts of disposing of waste at Hanford. Washington state sought an injunction halting further waste shipments to Hanford until DOE adequately addressed the environmental effects of shipping and storing more radioactive waste at Hanford.

The issue was further complicated in November 2004 when Washington voters approved an initiative that blocks shipments of radioactive waste to Hanford until cleanup is completed, among other things. Initiative 297 passed with 69 percent of the vote and was to take effect 30 days after the election.

DOE requested a temporary restraining order to block I-297 from becoming law, claiming that the initiative violates federal laws governing nuclear waste and interstate commerce. A federal judge granted a temporary restraining order and Washington state agreed to allow the injunction to carry over into 2005 while issues of the initiative's constitutionality are resolved in court.

In January 2005, Washington state asked the federal court to refer some questions regarding the implementation of I-297 to the Washington Supreme Court. The questions include the definition of mixed waste under state law and whether the initiative bans movement of waste already at Hanford. As a result, no waste currently is being shipped to Hanford, with a few exceptions such as laboratory wastes or Navy submarine reactor compartments.

Oral arguments on the current injunction and to address issues before the Washington State Supreme Court will be conducted this spring.

### Hanford Budget Update

The board was provided copies of an article from the *Tri-City Herald* about the reduced budget proposed for Hanford for Fiscal Year 2006, and a summary table comparing FY2005 and FY2006 budgets was shown. Staff also noted increased costs in FY2006 for security, and for keeping plutonium at Hanford instead of shipping it to Savannah River, as originally planned.

As mentioned during Howard Gnann's presentation, while some items are targeted for slowdowns (tank farms, groundwater), others will be little affected, and the focus will be on meeting the milestones, or deadlines, in the Tri-Party agreement. Some specific items are noted for slowdown and decreased funding, including the tank farms, B/C cribs, pre-1970 TRU characterization and retrieval, U plant remediation, and the rate of shipments to WIPP because preparation and packaging of waste would be slowed.

Staff noted there will be a number of public hearings in Oregon and Washington about the budget, and a handout with meeting times and locations was provided.

The board discussed the best way to express its concern about the budget. Staff noted that ODOE will work through the Oregon Congressional delegation, and suggested that a letter from the board would be helpful.

It was agreed that the letter should reflect the board's position that Hanford should not take a disproportionate piece of overall DOE cuts. The combined DOE-RL and DOE-ORP budgets represent the largest of the DOE Environmental Management (EM) site allocation, 27 percent, yet 50 percent of the reductions in EM's budget are slated to be borne by Hanford.

Issues of concern to the board include the position that the cleanup budget should not be reduced to provide funds for security, which should be separately funded. Groundwater work should not be deferred and continuing cleanup now is more cost effective than putting it off. The focus of the letter should be the effects on cleanup of reduced funding.

After a lengthy discussion about the tone and contents of a letter from the board, Ms. Hines moved to have the board write a letter to DOE expressing concerns about the budget reductions. Mr. Minthorn seconded.

Those voting in favor: Mr. Clucas, Ms. Blazek-Smith, Ms. Germond, Mr. Niles on behalf of Mr. Grainey, Ms. Hines, Ms. Knight, Mr. Lei, Dr. McFarlane, Mr. Minthorn, Mr. Woodcock. Those voting against: none. Motion carried.

### Public Involvement Update

Staff presented the status of public involvement efforts, noting that the budget meetings will occur due to public interest. Similarly, DOE decided that the state of the site meetings will be changed from the schedule used in prior years. Presently, the state of the site meetings are scheduled to occur in conjunction with Hanford Advisory Board meetings. However, the meetings are spread across the entire year, which will lead to a variable message from and to DOE.

Staff then discussed specific resources available to board members to participate in public involvement, such as overheads, CDs, etc. Many photos are also available. There are power point presentations available for use that contain the basics needed to present to community members. Ms. Hines and former board member Shelley Cimon will give a presentation at an Earth Day event in La Grande.

ODOE staff is updating its video on Hanford. The updated video will be available for distribution in a couple of weeks following the meeting. The board viewed the updated and almost-finished video, which runs about nine minutes.

Staff is working on loading some information onto the agency website for access by board members, but that process is not complete. Due to state agency website integration issues, it is not known when it will be available, but staff will keep board members informed.

### WIPP Shipment Update

Staff provided a schedule of proposed WIPP shipments from all sites, for the purpose of showing an increase in expected shipments from Hanford. With proposed budget cuts, the increased shipments may not occur as planned.

### National Academy of Sciences reports

On March 1, 2005, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) released two reports concerning waste cleanup at DOE sites. Staff provided highlights of the reports:

To improve the characterization and treatment of wastes:

- DOE should use CERCLA (Superfund) removal actions rather than remedial actions.

- Recognize that some burial grounds are so complex that it may be easier and cheaper to dig them up than to study them.
- Consider leaving waste in place if it presents little risk or if removing it with current technology would be more hazardous than leaving the waste in place.

Regarding risk and decisions about disposition of transuranic and high-level radioactive waste, the report:

- Recommends a formal, well structured, risk informed approach with external peer review and openness
- Concludes that DOE risk assessments are inadequate
- DOE should not adopt changes unilaterally
- Decisions should adhere to agreements and laws
- DOE's credibility is reduced by actual or apparent conflicts of interest
- An external regulator should be making decisions, and the NAS prefers the EPA as a regulator over the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Human health risk is a good starting point for deciding whether to retrieve waste, but other considerations must also be evaluated;
- A process is needed to decide when waste can and can not stay buried
- Retrieving all high-level waste or transuranic waste may not be feasible

The reports make no recommendations on leaving waste in place.

### Luncheon Speaker

Laura Hicks, Project Manager from the U.S. Corps of Engineers Portland District office, gave an interesting presentation on the process the Corps is going through in order to dredge parts of the Columbia River. It is not a simple process, and there have been many obstacles and legal challenges. Ms. Hicks provided staff with contact information of Washington Department of Ecology staff who maintain a database on Columbia River contaminants.

### Capping Discussion

A lengthy discussion on caps and barriers began before the lunch break and continued thereafter. Staff explained that DOE and its contractors have begun developing plans for closure of various parts of the Hanford site. In many cases, this includes the use of physical barriers over waste sites, commonly called "caps."

Mr. Niles discussed a draft plan for the central plateau, which proposes to cap 1,700 acres. This plan is a contractor deliverable, not a DOE proposal at this time. However, when the draft was released, ODOE provided comments because of concern that DOE might use the plan as a starting point for capping decisions.

The board was provided with some visuals to convey the amount of land representing 1,700 acres. For example, Tom McCall Waterfront Park in Portland is 36 acres, the

Portland Zoo is 64 acres, the campus of Oregon State University is 400 acres and Central Park in New York City is 843 acres.

A ‘cap,’ or barrier, is an engineered assembly of various components designed to control percolation through buried waste, and thus, if working properly, contains the waste. Buried waste must be isolated from plant roots, animal burrows, weather, and unintentional intrusion. Caps can be made of different materials, including soils (i.e., gravel, sand, silt, clay), geotextiles (e.g., synthetic fabrics), geo-membranes (i.e., polyethylene or polyvinyl chloride), and amendments, such as bentonite, portland cement or growth retardants.

The board was provided with information about a variety of caps and barriers used in certain applications, such as a municipal landfill, hazardous waste landfill, a municipal solid waste facility, and the regulations to which they must adhere. Caps are governed by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). RCRA details the criteria for creation and maintenance of the caps.

A subtitle “C” RCRA cap, for hazardous waste sites, was designed for use at Hanford but was determined to be inadequate, so a “Hanford Barrier” was developed. Key performance objectives for the Hanford Barrier included the ability to function in an arid to subhumid climate, have a design life of 1,000 years, limit drainage and runoff and minimize erosion, be maintenance free, minimize biotic intrusion and meet or exceed RCRA performance criteria. The Hanford barrier, as designed, was about fifteen feet thick and worked satisfactorily.

DOE is not proposing to use the Hanford barrier now. Instead, it is looking at using evapotranspiration (ET) barriers. An ET barrier is designed to store percolating precipitation and then slowly release it into the atmosphere. The design depends on the natural processes of evaporation and transpiration to dry the soil and prevent percolation through the waste. The proposed design is about four feet thick and is intended to last thousands of years.

The board was provided information about the way in which ET barriers work, and what concerns they present, such as potential failure due to wind erosion, water erosion, an overwhelming event, such as rain on snow, and problems with design life. Also, a wildfire could burn all the plant life on top of the barrier.

As part of the process to determine when caps should be used, DOE must follow criteria in CERCLA. Staff provided an overview of the CERCLA design criteria applicable to caps and barriers:

1. Overall protection of human health and the environment
2. Compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs)
3. Long-term effectiveness and permanence
4. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment
5. Short term effectiveness

6. Implementability
7. Cost
8. State acceptance
9. Community acceptance

It was suggested that the board may want to focus on three of the nine criteria in its consideration of caps or barriers, i.e., long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; and community acceptance.

Long term expectations are based on numerical modeling. This creates uncertainty about the inventory of waste, performance of the caps and construction methods. Containing the wastes for thousands of years is difficult, due in part to the degradation of the caps and intrusion into the waste. Capping waste sites does not change the wastes' toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment. Community acceptance may be difficult to achieve.

A variety of wastes are buried at the Hanford site:

Tank and leaked tank waste

177+ tanks, containing approximately 53 million gallons of a variety of radioactive elements and corrosive and toxic chemicals; the waste in each tank is unique; 67 tanks and 1 million gallons of waste have leaked to the soil, and reached groundwater

Specific retention trenches

500,000 gallons of high-level liquid waste has been discharged to the soil; the waste has the same basic makeup as the tank waste; trenches were operated until the waste was seen in groundwater

Carbon tetrachloride

Over 1,000 metric tons dumped to the soil; it is heavier than water and only sparingly dissolves in water; moves as vapor, liquid, and in water; degrades very slowly

Buried transuranic wastes

833 kilograms of plutonium in transuranic waste; 1,079,000 kilograms of uranium; much is mixed with hazardous waste; pre-1970 waste is being treated differently than newer waste, although it is the same; drums are corroding and failing

Immense volumes of liquid wastes

Tank waste was treated to remove cesium 137 and strontium 90, resulting in an increase in liquids; 300,000 gallons of cascade tank waste was discharged to soil; it is highly radioactive and has reached groundwater. Overall, more than 440 billion gallons of contaminated liquids were discharged to Hanford's soils.

Other burial ground wastes

Many burial grounds have complex wastes, incomplete records, and are radioactive and toxic

PUREX tunnels and miscellaneous

The tunnels are extremely radioactive and there are no plans for cleaning them up; the contaminant composition is largely unknown

Staff said because of the quantity and complexity of the wastes, capping decisions should not be made without a thorough analysis of the options. Most of the buried wastes dissolve and move in water, are radioactive and toxic, and are contaminating the groundwater. Simply covering them may not be the best solution. Further, half-lives of some of the radioactive isotopes are in the millions and billions of years.

Complicating things is staff's concern that DOE does not have a sufficient understanding of the way water moves in the subsurface at Hanford. Many of DOE's proposals are based on the concept of water moving only downward through the soil, but there are many examples on site of water moving sideways. These issues must be addressed before capping is considered as a solution.

In some instances, such as the environmental restoration disposal facility (ERDF), staff believes capping makes sense. ERDF is a landfill that was engineered from the beginning ultimately to be capped. The Integrated Disposal Facility, IDF, likewise will be engineered to provide for capping once it is full. Placing caps or barriers over existing waste sites that have not been designed for it may not make sense.

Board members discussed various scenarios in which caps may be appropriate and how the board would expect DOE to approach capping decisions, including criteria by which DOE can assess the validity and viability of caps in certain situations. The board agreed that DOE should be managing this in a way that protects future generations and in a way that will be able to assure future generations that the best available technology was used. Cost should not be the primary driver for decision-making.

Caps may be acceptable only in areas where the consequences of failure are acceptable, or where the site has been specifically designed and engineered for barriers. DOE should not consider capping a site until full characterization of the waste contained therein has been completed.

The board agreed that staff should draft a position paper on capping, highlighting its concerns. Staff agreed to provide a draft to board members for review.

#### Administrative

The next board meeting will be July 26 and 27, 2005, in the Hood River area.

The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.