

West Valley Citizen Task Force

D v G s r, D r tor
o on r m t w r sh p, E -51
Forr st l Bu l n
. . D p rtm nt o En r y
1000 n p n n Av nu ,
sh n ton, DC 20585

: Dr t mpl m nt t on l n, D E ol y 455.1, s o sk-B s En t t s

D r r. G s r:

h st ll y C t z n sk For woul lk you to ons r our omm nts on th
r t mpl m nt t on l n () or ol y 455.1, r r n sk-B s En t t s
(BE). Ev n thou h th ol y ls w th th Compr h ns v Env ronm nt l -
spons , Comp ns t on n l ty A t (CE C A) prop rt s, n th st h r s not
CE C A prop rty, w r on r m th t n tt mpt m ht m to mpl m nt th
pol y h r , non th l ss.

n th t on l Env ronm nt l ol y A t (E A) s th ppl l l w un r wh h
losur s ons r n m or st ll y, t s xtr m ly mport nt to us th t
st h r ont nu to work on th Env ronm nt l mp t t t m nt (E) or D om-
m ss on n n on - r m t w r sh p n o not om pr o up w th n w
pol y. As th Co l t on on st ll y ul r st spo nt out n th r omm nts,
un r E A, n E s norm lly xp t to n l. r v ry on r m th t n
E -support or o D s on m ht r op n s r sult o BE m tho s,
l y n n op r z n n l l nup n losur o our st .

A D E A G

h BE v s on lls or l n us s to n or l nup: *“Thus, the first step
in the process of envisioning and then using risk-based end states as an effective
planning tool for cleanup is building a comprehensive land use plan that includes
both future use and consideration of adjacent properties”* (p 6). n t
ult to un rst n how st ont m n t on n *“mapped in context of current
and future use”* (p 2, F . 1), sp lly wh n st h r t r z t on h s not n
on t m n y s t s (s n losur , En r y Communt s All n tt r, p 6) n s
n ompl t t st ll y s w ll.

Assum n th t utur us on th s s t or ny o th hun r s t s n ons r or
losur w ll not h n ov r hun r s or thous n s o y r s s ms un r l st . h l
th . . Env ronm nt l rot t on A ny (E A) r t v s m y su st th t lt rn -
t v s l to *“activities ...consistent with the reasonably anticipated future land
use”* (p 6), wh n t om s to xp t lon -t r m ont m n t on th r s no w y th t
nyon n t r m n w th r t nty th t th pl nn utur l n us w ll om or
r m n r l ty (w tn ss ov C n l). Ev n th ssumpt on o *“perpetual federal
ownership”* (p 8) or *“transfer of property for conservation purposes”* (p 8)
om sun rt n n l h to m t r l th t r m ns r o t v or hun r s or thous
n s o y r s. t s ms mor lo l to s utur us on th r t st m sur o
l nup th t n tt n .



DEF

r l z th t th t v “lo l” s su t to nt r p r t t on. n or r to r h s ons r l to ll on m p r t s w must som how r on th l m t t ons n mpl t ons o r t n t r m s n n w y to us th m o t v ly s mu h s “poss l.” rms su h s “credible,” “rational,” “reasonable,” n “unrealistic” (p 11) r lso su t to nt r p r t t on. th r s n n t on to prop rly un r stoo ; “risk-validation” (p 14), or nst n . h tt mpt to r l ss y som w st s “incidental” (p 21) s us n t r m to t sp r s pons (n nt l mpl s l ko mport n). h t r m “clean,” us num rous t m s m n n “clean to a predetermined level,” s m sl n n stur n wh n l nup s suppos ly ompl t , only to r qu r urth r l nup.

“All interested and affected parties must re-examine the role and use of risk in cleanup” (p 10);

o t v w st pr s nts mu h mor ompl t s n r o o r sk o xposur th n most su st n s ons r r sk. h poss l “adverse events” (p 10) w ll v ry, s w ll th poss l mo s o lur , h w th ts own pro l ty o o urr n , w th th poss l ty o t r ror sm n n w, unknown m n s on to th qu t on.

“Reconsideration of the assumptions” (p 11) m y w s , v n to “review the default assumptions used by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), EPA- and/or state-generated risk guidance documents” (p 12), ut th “baseline risk assessment” (p 15) wh h “appropriately defines risk posed by relevant pathways” (p 12) s th ru l st p. r n, w r r you to th Co l t on omm nts, su st n th D p r tm nt us ro l st sk Ass ssm nt. h s r sk ss ssm nt m tho n x m n r nt poss l v rs v nts, n th r nt mo s o lur th t m y sso t w th h o th m. t s w ly pt n s nt lly- s m tho o r sk ss ssm nt n shoul t l st r omm n n pro ly r qu r y th , p r t ul rly to h n l pro l mo s o lur w th s n ntly r nt ons qu n s.

C A G G E E

h l n opt on to “review the default assumptions used by the NRC, EPA- and/or state-generated risk guidance documents” (p 12) m y pt l, h n n r ul t ons m -str m s not lw y s o. A r nt tt mpt to m n l ws ppl l to our st s s -n-po nt (s n losur , D E t r). v ously D E nt n s to st y str tly w th n th l w “... to be consistent with but not exceed statutory requirements” (p 31), or to s k w v rs or m n m nts “...to identify or eliminate ARARs [appropriate or relevant and appropriate requirements]...” (p 18), or to “Amend CERCLA ... include federal facilities as having the ability to waive an ARAR...” (p 18).

A p r m ry on r n o th C F st ll l s w th D E’s r n t on o h h-l v l w st s “ st n nt l to pro ss n.” Althou h th our t rul th t th n nt l port on o th D E or r v ol t s th ul r st ol y A t, D E s ont nu n ts or ts to n w ys to l r “appropriate disposal fission products...other than high-level waste” (p 21). h su sts v lop n r sk- s l ss t on “that includes an exempt category of waste” (p 21). h s propos t ons w ll r w th n .

A C

nst tut on l Controls h v not n n n r s rous on r n o p opl t ll st s n th r sur-roun n r s. h su st on th t th y m ht “bolster the integrity of engineered remedies” (p 22) s ms to r ss only on sm ll p r t o th p nor m o ssu s lt w th n th us o nst tut on l ontrols. Furth r on rns w h v w th th nst tut on l ontrols s t on o th r s r low:

- “Use institutional controls to improve protectiveness” (p 22) - h s runs ontr ry to th t ons su st n t on 4.4.1 to n lu rly ons r t on o nst tut on l ontrols, t r m n n omp r osts w th oth r “alternative remedial design strategies” (p 22), n nsur l n

transformation using "certified real property Specialist" (p 22). Enforcement controls would thus be limited to those that are, or numerous surveys and on the numerous states throughout.

- "Design and implement effective, site-specific ground water strategies" (p 23) - DE states that, to pump and treat, on the other hand, the long-term strategy for ensuring protectiveness" (p 23). However, the work done to date is not known or long term. While, on the one hand, on the other hand, on the other hand.
- "Minimize damage to natural resources" (p 24) - DE will attempt to minimize natural resources by "seek exemptions from liability" (p 24). However, the right to on the one hand, the DE will work to exempt from the responsibility, to the one hand, to the one hand.

C

Cost must be considered, but the issue is "whether costs are proportional to its overall effectiveness" (p 19) is a summary, which is, in some cases, would be a better than the opposition to short-term strategy. "DOE should work with its regulators to provide transparency and clarity to the public in situations where trade-offs of cost versus protectiveness are a factor" (p 19). In this survey, the proportionality, but the emphasis throughout the plan is on the environmental impact. Although the environmental protection requirements are necessary to the extent that the environmental impact is not, the environmental protection requirements are not. However, the environmental protection requirements are not. However, the environmental protection requirements are not.

At the same time, it is worth noting that the environmental protection requirements are not. However, the environmental protection requirements are not. However, the environmental protection requirements are not.

Enclosed you will find a copy of our Final Report, which summarizes the state of the environment. For more information, please contact the state.

incerely,



Director
North Carolina
State Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Enclosure:

Environmental Action Plan, the new direction for the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, ECA comments to the DE Department of Environment and Natural Resources, "Cleanup Driven by Risk-Based End State" and Department of Environment and Natural Resources, "Development of Risk-Based End State Visions;" February 3, 2003

DE Director, Robert A. Harman to Dennis Strickland (proposed), the proposed legislation to the state of North Carolina, the proposed legislation to the state of North Carolina, the proposed legislation to the state of North Carolina, 2003

State Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Final Report, July 29, 1998

: . . n tor Ch rl s hum r
. . n tor ll ry o h mCl nton
. . pr s nt t v Amory ou hton
. . pr s nt t v hom s ynol s
. . pr s nt t v k u mn
. . pr s nt t v ou s l u ht r
Bo rth r, D E
El z th ow s, D E
. . kson, D E
t r m th, E DA
ul ulo, E DA
Ch Gl mn, C
n tt En , E A
m , DEC
C F l n st(w thout n losur s)