

Background: You should have three handouts sent earlier.

Because I tend to talk a lot & because I have limited time, I'm going to give you a brief over-view and take questions during the discussion period.

The Hanford Advisory Board has a long history of input on both risk assessments and cleanup activities for the Hanford site.. Specific Board advice on this subject was sent to the Tri-Party Agencies in Advice #s 134, 165, 246, and 253. HAB advice #s 23, 28c, 61, 153, 175, and 190 dealt with the related issue of cumulative risk analysis and/or application of the unrestricted use scenario in calculation of risks and risk to groundwater. This advice spanned seventeen years (1995-2012), and has remained consistent. Amazing accomplishment!

The Board is aware that there are going to be a lot final RODs written for site cleanup over the next several years. These RODs are being done through the CERCLA process.

The River and Plateau Committee (RAP) has been very involved in reviewing documents and in the development of HAB advice on CERCLA cleanup process. The latest being Advice #253 regarding the 100-K Area. RAP believes the process of how risk assessments are done and their role such an important part of the CERCLA cleanup decisions process, that it warranted further discussion with the full Board.

To facilitate discussion, the RAP committee Issue Managers have brought forth, for clarification, some concerns about the risk assessment process using the 100-K area RI/FS/PP documents as an example.

The first handout lists the background of HAB involvement; reasons to care; and various concerns, specific points of interest, etc. which are linked to the other two handouts. **One take-home point from this sheet is DOE's use of a deviation from CERCLA which is precedent setting. Another point is, it remains unclear what effect, if any, Ecology's statement regarding 'not specifically approved modeling results' will have on RODs.**

1. The second handout (the flowchart) is an example of the interconnectedness of the various documents and processes involved. There are many more documents which are included in the process but I had only one sheet! **One take-home point from this sheet is that everything to the left of the dotted line are examples of documents that have not received agency approval but may be used/are being used as the basis for information feeding into the RI/FS/PP.** (see HAB Advice #253-*"The Board advises the TPA agencies to follow the CERCLA process, finish the documents in appropriate sequence in order to reach the ROD."*).
2. The third handout (Table 7-1) is an example of the huge differences in the results under the default MTCA model (Column 7) versus the Alternative Fate & Transport Model [STOMP1D](Column 9). **One take-home point from this sheet is the elimination of contaminants at waste sites from further evaluation in the risk assessment process (Column 10).** (see HAB Advice #253-*"The Board advises that, given the incompleteness and uncertainties identified in supporting documents, the TPA agencies ensure that all contaminants of concern (COCs) identified in the risk assessment and other supporting documents are evaluated within the Proposed Plan."*)

While these comments/concerns are identified for the 100-K Area, they are relevant for all other River Corridor areas and their risk assessments. Advice #253 & others on risk assessments also remain relevant.

The Tri-Party Agencies support the Board's efforts to understand the process and are here today for this purpose. Larry's presentation, I'm told, will include some discussion on these concerns.

(For those of you who are interested in having more information (e.g. Tables 7-2 thru 7-4), I have it available.)