

# HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

A Site Specific Advisory Board, Chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act

**Advising:**

US Dept of Energy  
US Environmental  
Protection Agency  
Washington State Dept  
of Ecology

**CHAIR:**

Todd Martin

**VICE CHAIR:**

Susan Leckband

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Local Business**  
Harold Heacock

**Labor/Work Force**

Mike Keizer  
Thomas Carpenter  
Susan Leckband  
Jeff Luke  
Rebecca Holland

**Local Environment**

Gene Van Liew

**Local Government**

Maynard Plahuta  
Pam Larsen  
Gwen Luper  
Rob Davis  
Jerry Peltier  
Jim Curdy  
Bob Parks

**Tribal Government**

Russell Jim  
Gabriel Bohnee

**Public Health**

Margery Swint  
Jim Trombold

**University**

Mark Oberle  
Jane Twaddle

**Public-at-Large**

Norma Jean Germond  
Keith Smith  
Bob Parazin

**Regional Environ-  
ment/Citizen**

Todd Martin  
Greg deBruler  
Paige Knight  
Gerald Pollet  
Susan Kreid

**State of Oregon**

Larry Clucas  
Ken Niles

**Ex-Officio**

Confederated Tribes of  
the Umatilla  
Washington State  
Department of Health

June 2, 2006

Keith Klein, Manager

U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
P.O. Box 550 (A7-50)  
Richland, WA 99352

Michael Bogert, Regional Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

Re: CERCLA Five-Year Review

Dear Msrs. Klein and Bogert,

The Hanford Advisory Board (Board) recognizes the time and effort Department of Energy (DOE) staff spent preparing the draft Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Review Report for the Hanford Site. The Board believes DOE's review misses critical parts of the intent of a Five-Year Review, including the failure to incorporate new information.

**The Five-Year Review misses part of the intent of a Five-Year Review**

The Five-Year Review does not provide the insights the Board hoped to see in such a review. While the Five-Year Review requirement provides room for interpretation, the Board believes a Hanford Five-Year Review would be more useful if it assessed the ongoing protectiveness of remedies *beyond the institutional control period*. This point is where the Board disagrees with the current Five-Year Review, as it bases its protectiveness statements primarily on exposures being limited by institutional controls.

For example, the Review states that groundwater remedies are effective because institutional controls prevent use of the groundwater. This statement ignores the spread of contamination and human/ecological exposures due to shoreline contamination, upwelling in the river and the loss of institutional controls.

Because of these omissions, the Board is unable to assess whether Hanford cleanup is on track to meet the Board's cleanup goals in the long-term. For example, the current Review does not provide an analysis of whether cleanup is on track to meet the "unrestricted use" goal in the River Corridor. The review also asserts for the River Corridor that the current cleanup is protective of the environment. Until the

HAB Consensus Advice #190  
Subject: CERCLA Five-Year Review  
Adopted: June 2, 2006  
Page 1

Envirolissues Hanford Project Office  
713 Jadwin, Suite 4  
Richland, WA 99352  
Phone: (509) 942-1906  
Fax: (509) 942-1926

risk assessments for the River Corridor are completed, there is not enough data to make that conclusion.

**The Five-Year Review should incorporate new information**

The draft Five-Year Review states that it will answer the question, “Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?” The Review appears to have overlooked several new pieces of information. If this new information impacts protectiveness, it may trigger a reconsideration of Record of Decision (ROD) requirements as well as discussion in the Five-Year Review.

Examples of new information that should be assessed include:

- The City of Richland’s industrial re-use study, which addresses assumptions for potential land use in the 300 Area;
- Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation Study Number VII (BEIR VII) Report of the National Academy of Science relative to new risk data;
- Protectiveness as defined by the Yakama Nation and the Nez Perce Nation (Seattle State of the Site meeting September 2005) to fulfill Natural Resource Trustee responsibility per 40 CFR 300.615;
- Recent studies and negotiations with Priest Rapids dam operators addressing river fluctuations and resultant effect on contaminant levels;
- New data on chromium risks based on the report “Chromium Toxicity Test for Fall Chinook Salmon Using Hanford Site Groundwater” (PNNL-13471). The U.S. Geological Survey has additional findings/data that show genetic damage; DOE should be assessing the ramifications of this.

**Advice**

The Board advises DOE that the draft CERCLA Five-Year Review Report should address the following items:

- Expand the review of protectiveness of current remedial actions beyond reliance on current or near-term institutional controls that limit exposure. This extended analysis would help assess and determine whether or not the current cleanup remediation strategy will meet the long-term cleanup goals expressed by the Board.

- Formally consider and respond to public input, and show how public values for use of resources are incorporated into evaluations of reasonable maximum exposure scenarios – for both the near- and long-term time periods.
- Update the review using available new information.
- Evaluate the breadth of the review to identify shortfalls that should trigger amendments to Interim and/or Final RODs.

Finally, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should give serious consideration to Board advice in determining whether the cleanup remedies under review are, in fact, protective of human health and the environment.

Sincerely,



Todd Martin, Chair  
Hanford Advisory Board

---

*This advice represents HAB consensus for this specific topic. It should not be taken out of context to extrapolate Board agreement on other subject matters.*

cc: Cliff Clark, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
Jay Manning, Director, Washington State Department of Ecology  
Shirley Olinger, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Official, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection  
Dave Brockman, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Official, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office  
Nick Ceto, Environmental Protection Agency  
Jane Hedges, Washington State Department of Ecology  
Doug Frost, U.S. Department of Energy Headquarters  
The Oregon and Washington Congressional Delegations