

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
USFWS – DDT levels in Horseshoe Landfill?	X		Discussed in the Five Year Review Report.	
What happens if commenters are dissatisfied with the response?		X	DOE considers public input in the decision making process.	DOE will capture public input and include a responsiveness summary in the final report.
Schedule for tribal consultations		X	DOE has committed to consultation with the Tribes on the Five Year Review.	The schedule for consultation is coordinated between the Tribes and DOE.
Indirect action – PUD relicensing – is DOE engaged?		X	PUD licensing is not part of a CERCLA action. Therefore, it is not a subject to be considered in the five year review process.	DOE will continue to consult with NRC and other agencies on licensing requirements and activities.
How does protectiveness assessment in the review use the state standards? (esp in the 300 Area)?	X		State standards are considered during the selection of Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements ARARs in the RI/FS/ROD and/or EE/CA/AM processes. The requirements against which the protectiveness assessments are made are determined in the RI/FS/ROD and/or EE/CA/AM processes when the remedial or removal action objectives and standards are established. The Five Year Review looks at whether those objectives and standards are still appropriate and reports on progress or success in meeting them.	
Do risk assessments use state assumptions? (especially new ecol risk)		X	The assumptions used in a risk assessment are selected during the risk assessment planning process. The state participates in developing the criteria and assumptions used in the risk assessment processes. Whether any specific assumption proposed by the state is used is not considered in the five year review.	DOE will continue to consult with the states, affected tribal governments, and others on the tools and assumptions used in conducting risk assessments. Public input about the assumptions used in risk assessments expressed during the public workshop have been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments.
What were the risk assessment assumptions used for RODs 5 years		X	The risk assessment requirements for Records of Decision have not changed	DOE will continue to consult with the states, affected tribal governments, and the public

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
ago? Have they changed?			significantly from what they were 5 years ago. However, as the Hanford Cleanup Project has moved forward the assumptions used in evaluating potential remedies have matured reflecting experiences gained during the cleanup. Public input is also considered.	on the tools and assumptions used in conducting risk assessments. Public input about the assumptions used in risk assessments expressed during the public workshop have been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments.
How does the review look at protectiveness given the array of risk assessments on site (and their discrepancies)?		X	The risk assessments are part of the RI/FS/ROD and/or EE/CA/AM processes. Discrepancies between the outcomes of risk assessments are resolved during those processes. The five year review looks at protectiveness based on whether the standards identified in remedies selected through the RI/FS/ROD and/or EE/CA/AM processes are being met.	The DOE-HQ Environmental Management Program is working across the DOE complex to ensure that risk assessments are done in a consistent fashion. The models, assumptions, and data used are being carefully scrutinized and evaluated to ensure consistency between the risk assessment efforts. Public input regarding the discrepancies in risk assessments expressed during the workshop have been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments.
Will the new data that's out there be integrated into the protectiveness assessment?	X		DOE considers new data in assessing whether selected remedies are, or will be, protective of human health and the environment upon completion.	
Is there evidence that shows concerns about long-term protectiveness?	X		The Five Year Review Report will identify areas of concern regarding long-term protectiveness.	
Can the review lay the groundwork for "fixing" assumptions about ICs?	X		The Five Year Review Report will identify areas of concern regarding the performance of Institutional Controls. The Report will identify actions to correct significant deficiencies.	
Why aren't we focusing on what it will take to reach the agreed-on end		X	The RI/FS process is used to identify and evaluate potential end states and what it will	DOE is continuing to work toward definitive decisions on Hanford Cleanup Project final

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
states?			take reach them. The ROD identifies the selected end state and the preferred remedies to reach that end state. Post-ROD remedial action work plans focus on the details of what it will take to meet them for a particular action. The Five Year Review is a retrospective review of the status of remedial actions that have been selected and implemented.	end states. In addition, the technical and environmental practicality and cost of the many options are carefully considered during the decision-making process. The public input regarding the focus on final end-states has been captured and provided to DOE management.
If the ICs aren't working, what do we do about the RODs?		X	The reason for an IC not working may or may not be related to the ROD. If an IC established in a ROD does not work because it is inappropriate for a selected remedy, the ROD may need to be amended. If an IC is appropriate but is not working because it is not being implemented properly, that is not a ROD issue.	Public input has been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the establishment and management of the implementation of institutional controls.
TCE plume (Framatome)	X		Progress in remediation of the TCE plume is addressed in the Five Year Review Report.	
Why <u>not</u> identify new standards if they're available? (re: groundwater RAOs)		X	It is not the purpose of a five year review to identify new standards. However, if new standards have been promulgated by regulatory agencies, they are considered in evaluating whether a selected remedy is still appropriate.	Public input has been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for determining if there have been any new standards promulgated that would affect a selected remedy under their project.
Public input on max reasonable exposure assumptions is critical (tribal scenarios are being used for 100/300 Area risk assessments)		X	DOE considers public input into the decision making process.	Public input on the assumptions used in risk assessments expressed during the public workshop has been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments that will be part of the bases of future RI/FS development that will be subject to the

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
				public comment process.
Use USFWS ecological risk assumptions		X	The assumptions used in risk assessments are established during the risk assessment planning process. The USFWS participates in developing the criteria and assumptions used in the risk assessment process.	Public input about the assumptions used in risk assessments expressed during the public workshop have been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments.
RODs use MTCA cancer risk		X	The assumptions, including cancer risk assumptions, used in risk assessments are established during the risk assessment planning process. The state participates in developing the criteria and assumptions used in the risk assessment process.	Public input about the assumptions used in risk assessments expressed during the public workshop have been captured and provided to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments.
Look at risks and effects holistically (remember that contaminants and animals move)		X	Acknowledged	
“Integration” also means looking at cumulative risk		X	Acknowledged	
We have some clearly-defined end states and this review should incorporate them (esp. USFWS CCP and usage planning and City of Richland land use planning)		X	The current clearly defined end states are consistent with the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that define Hanford site land use. Input from other sources, including USFWS and the City of Richland, will be considered by the Department of Energy in evaluating whether changes should be made in the CLUP. Unless, or until, changes are made, CERCLA remedial action planning must be done to meet the uses defined in the CLUP. The Five Year Review does not change the land use definitions.	Defined land uses for the Hanford Site must be developed in accordance with DOE requirements and criteria established in DOE Order 430.1B <i>Real Property Asset Management</i> and DOE Policy P430.1 <i>Land Use and Facility Use Planning</i> . The primary need is that the defined land uses support the site or programmatic strategic plans & mission needs and scenarios. However, involvement of the public is a fundamental principle of both the Order & the Policy. Seeking input from local municipalities and other groups such as USFWS is also fundamental. Public input regarding final end-states expressed during the public workshop have been captured and

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
				provided to DOE senior management.
Geologic complexity <u>will</u> have a bearing on transport – risk assessments should include uncertainty based on this complexity		X	DOE agrees that geologic complexity has a bearing on transport and that risk assessments should consider that complexity. However, as noted above risk assessments are part of the remedy selection process, not part of the five year review process.	Public input about the assumptions used in risk assessments expressed during the public workshop has been passed on to the project managers responsible for the on-going and future risk assessments.
We should be looking <u>forward</u> to what we have to do for cleanup, not just look <u>back</u> at interim RODs (that's why Ecology's emphasis is on the action items)		X	The purpose of a five year review is to review cleanup progress in the five years preceding the review and to evaluate whether the selected remedies have accomplished, or can be expected to accomplish, the objectives established in records of decision. A five year review does not look forward to what needs to be done.	The comments regarding a need to look forward towards what needs to be done to complete the Hanford Site Cleanup Project expressed during the public workshop have been captured and provided to DOE senior management.
Look at those variables (flood, climate change, terrorist risk) in assessing protectiveness – be imaginative	X		The Department of Energy acknowledges the value of evaluating various scenarios in assessing protectiveness into cleanup decisions.	
Look at effects of decreased river flows	X		Acknowledged	
Look at creation of Black Rock reservoir		X	Potential impacts on the Hanford Site from the proposed Black Rock reservoir will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statements for that proposed project.	The concern about potential impacts from the proposed Black Rock Reservoir on the Hanford Cleanup Project have been captured and provided to DOE senior management. It is anticipated that DOE will be afforded an opportunity to comment on any potential impacts on the Hanford Cleanup during the NEPA or SEPA process that will precede a decision to construct the proposed reservoir.
Institutional Controls: we need to stop putting off for tomorrow what		X	DOE acknowledges the near-term need to address institutional controls. DOE believes	Institutional controls are established during the remedial investigation/feasibility

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
needs to be addressed today (recognize this in the review) - DOE be clear about definition of ICs and distinguish ICs from O&M			that the current need for ICs has been properly addressed and that appropriate institutional controls for the current site cleanup activities are presently in place. DOE seeks to be clear about the definition of ICs. DOE also believes that for some circumstances, surveillance & maintenance is not only appropriate, but is essential as an IC.	study/record of decision process. DOE believes that cleanup decisions should only utilize institutional controls when more permanent physical remedies are technically or economically infeasible. DOE also believes that careful consideration must be given to the functionality of institutional controls when they will be part of a final remedy. The concerns regarding use and implementation of institutional controls expressed during the public workshop have been passed on to DOE senior management.
This needs to be a proactive review – the TPA is the driver		X	The purpose of a five year review is to take a retrospective look at cleanup progress in the five years preceding the review and to evaluate whether the selected remedies have accomplished, or, prospectively, can be expected to accomplish, the objectives established in records of decision. A five year review is by intent retrospective, not prospective.	The conclusions from the five year review have identified some issues that will require corrective actions. These corrective actions will need to be forward looking. They may require amendments to existing records of decision (subject again to a public review and comment process) or other changes that will affect future work. The actions will be assigned to the appropriate project manager for incorporation into the project plans.
Note: we didn't have the Monument at the time of the last 5-year review		X	Acknowledged.	
Assess protectiveness based on unrestricted use in its complete definition	X		Remedy selection is based on desired end states consistent with defined land uses as established in Action Memoranda and Records of Decision. If the established end state and land use support unrestricted use that would be one of the criteria used in selecting the remedies. The Five Year Review evaluates whether the selected remedies are, or are expected to be,	

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
			protective of human health and the environment when completed.	
Examine assumptions about protectiveness of ICs currently in place, <u>including</u> increased use along the river because of Monument planning, econ dev plans, B reactor museum, etc.	X		Needs for Institutional Controls are evaluated as part of the RI/FS/ROD and/or EE/CA/AM processes that rely on defined land uses. Speculated potential future land uses are not an appropriate basis for selecting ICs. If land uses are redefined in the future, ICs may need to be re-evaluated to ensure they still meet the need.	
Need to see integration of trust responsibility into protectiveness assessment		X	The Department of Energy trust responsibilities are fully integrated into Hanford CERCLA decisions.	The concerns regarding integration of natural resource trustee responsibilities expressed during the public workshop have been captured and provided to DOE senior management.
Review include actions for reaching goals re: resource protection		X	The purpose of a five year review is to take a retrospective look at cleanup progress in the five years preceding the review and assess whether the selected remedies have accomplished, or, prospectively, can be expected to accomplish, the objectives established in records of decision. A five year review is by intent retrospective, not proactive.	Remedial action objectives established during the RI/FS/ROD process will be protective of human health and the environment (natural resources) when completed. The purpose of a five year review is retrospective in nature, i.e., to look at progress to the time of the review in meeting remedial action objectives established in a ROD. The conclusions from the five year review will identify issues that require corrective actions to reach those objectives. Corrective actions are forward looking. They may require amendments to existing records of decision or other changes that will affect future work and will be subject to another public review period. The actions will be provided to the appropriate project manager for incorporation into the

PUBLIC INPUT	SCOPE		DOE COMMENTS	RECOMMENDED PATH FORWARD IF OUT OF SCOPE (If applicable)
	IN	OUT		
				project plans.
Review is opportunity for public to provide input on ROD assumptions		X	The purpose of a five year review is to take a retrospective look at cleanup progress in the five years preceding the review and to evaluate whether the selected remedies have accomplished, or, prospectively, can be expected to accomplish, the objectives established in records of decision. If the five year review evaluation indicates that a selected remedy from a Record of Decision is not functioning as anticipated, then it may be necessary to amend a ROD, in which case public input would be sought on the amendment.	Public input regarding assumptions used in selecting remedial actions in Records of Decision has been captured and provided to the appropriate project manager(s) for incorporation into the project plans.
Take a tour with public as part of site inspection		X	Site inspections are performed on a regular basis by DOE, EPA, and Ecology. These inspections and data from these inspections are used in the five year review process.	
May be more useful to have public meetings on specific topics, targeted		X	DOE is committed to working with interested stakeholders on meeting requests and will consider additional outreach efforts.	
Need biological assessment data		X	DOE agrees that there may be needs for biological assessment data. However, this input does not provide enough detail to respond.	The expressed need for additional data to support biological assessments has been captured and provided to DOE senior management and the project managers responsible for conducting of risk assessments and remedial actions.