

CERCLA Five-Year Review

May 23, 2006

Public Workshop – Portland, Oregon

Summary Issues/Comments

- You take the full intent and spirit of the law!
- You never have a self assessment by those doing the work; industry/academia does not allow this.
- Caps are just psychological barriers for humans. They do not protect the ecosystem.
- What do you mean by institutional controls (ICs)?
- The term “IC” worries us.
- Further define ICs.
- The process needs to be re evaluated. Define process: _Can you change the protocols of the Five-Year Review?
- Concern with plumes reaching the River and Oregon
- Why isn't more clean up occurring to prevent further contamination?
- Funding constraints
- The review doesn't assess long-term effectiveness
- How many wells?
- Concern with wording in EPA Guidance objectives – “to confirm”
- Concern with use of caps. Disagreement with the use of caps between the public and the regulatory agencies
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services – cleaned up to unrestricted uses
- Integration of risks
- Lack of educational risks to the public
- Bioconcentration needs to be part of the assessment and review
- Need independent Review

CERCLA Five-Year Review

May 24, 2006

Public Workshop – Hood River, Oregon

- Pg. 3.1.5 – 300 Area attenuation
- Definition of protectiveness; accessing areas; what is DOE's basis for protectiveness?
- Haven't defined what protectiveness means for critters
- Availability of studies (fish)
- Funding concerns to conduct cleanup
- CERCLA Report should be a roadmap to end state
- Information that is put out is crude and "scares me to death".
- Concerned with plumes reaching the River
- Report hasn't addressed deep vadose zone.