



Citizens Advisory Board
Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory

Final Proposed Plan for Waste Area Group 5 (WAG 5) - Power Burst Facility/Auxiliary Reactor Area at the INEEL

RECOMMENDATION

The Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) reviewed the final Proposed Plan for Waste Area Group 5 (WAG 5) - Power Burst Facility/Auxiliary Reactor Area at the INEEL.

We were pleased to see that the document was visibly improved from a prior version, which was reviewed by the INEEL CAB's Environmental Restoration Committee. The comments submitted by that Committee were obviously taken to heart and incorporated to a great extent. In addition, it is evident that the document preparers were largely successful in their attempts to prepare a document that will support public review. It is well organized and formatted, easing review and enhancing comprehension. The rationale for selection of the preferred alternatives is well presented. We conclude that the preferred alternatives are indeed appropriate. We await the issuance of the Record of Decision. The INEEL CAB recommends that the three agencies proceed expeditiously so that cleanup activities at WAG 5 can begin shortly.

Review of the Proposed Plan generated questions about the likely schedules that would apply under each of the remedial alternatives. While such information is not typically presented in Proposed Plans, we think that the public may be interested in learning about expected implementation schedules for each remedial alternative to support informed comparisons among alternatives. We acknowledge that detailed schedules may only become available as a result of negotiations with the regulators that culminate with the issuance of a Record of Decision. **The INEEL CAB recommends that DOE include a detailed implementation schedule in the Record of Decision for WAG 5. In addition, we recommend that DOE include rough implementation schedules for each remedial alternative in future Proposed Plans.**

Use of the term "Future Residential Scenario Cancer Risk" in Tables 3, 5, 6, 10, and 12 creates confusion for the reader. Explanations to the committee and subsequently to the Board by knowledgeable staff allowed an understanding of what was meant by the term. **The INEEL CAB recommends changing the term or adding appropriate explanations in future Proposed Plans and in the Record of Decision for WAG 5.**

The explanation of the numbering of the alternatives evaluated for the contaminated soil sites (page 14) was inadequate. It did not allow the reader to develop a full understanding of why only Alternatives 1, 3b, 5a, and 5b are presented. We recognize the need for consistency between a proposed plan and the related remedial investigation/feasibility study documentation. We nonetheless suggest that this Proposed Plan could have provided a better numbering mechanism that would generate less confusion for the reader. **The INEEL CAB recommends that future Proposed Plans use clearer numbering schemes.**