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- Finding & interpreting key information
- Opportunities for community engagement
Basics about Federal Facilities Cleanup

CERCLA (a.k.a. Superfund)

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

- Identify site and assess hazards
- Implement remedies to address hazards
- Monitor to ensure continued protection

Five-Year Review
Purpose of a Five-Year Review

“The purpose of a five-year review is to evaluate the implementation and performance of the remedy in order to determine if the remedy is or will be protective of human health and the environment.”

– U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
It’s also an important resource for…

- Other federal agencies
- States and Tribal authorities
- Local governments and community groups
- The public
Steps in a Five-Year Review

- Notify the public: Public notices are issued when review process begins and when the final report is released.
- Review key documents: Decision documents & Remedial Action Objectives, monitoring & maintenance reports, new investigations, technical memos.
- Assess contaminant levels: Review remedy and analyze data on each contaminant.
- Conduct interviews and site inspection: May involve site workers and community members.
- Write report: Assess whether remedies are protective.
Roles and Responsibilities

- **Federal Owner**
  - Prepares report

- **State/Tribal Authorities**
  - Review/comment

- **EPA**
  - Review/comment
  - Confirms lead agency’s assessment or issues independent assessment
Finding & Interpreting Key Information

- Protectiveness statements
- Issues & recommendations
- Technical assessment
- Maps & graphs
Is the remedy protective?

- Protective
- Protective in the short term
- Will be protective
- Protectiveness deferred
- Not protective
More about protectiveness statements…

- May be several per site (one for each “operable unit, or OU”)
- May include one site-wide statement
- Reflect current health standards
Example: Protective

“The remedy at OU-X is protective of human health and the environment because encapsulation has taken place, and land use controls that protect the cap are working as needed to prevent exposures.”
Example: Protective in the Short Term

“The remedy at OU-Y currently protects human health and the environment because land use controls to prevent groundwater use are in place, and groundwater treatment will continue until concentrations throughout the plume are below the standard/MCL. To be protective in the long term, removal of a remaining hot spot soil source is underway.”
“The remedy at OU-Z is not protective because contaminants in surface water remain above levels required to support a cutthroat trout fishery. In order to be protective in the long term, continuing releases to surface water need additional control. Human health is not affected at this OU because contaminants are below all human health standards.”
## Other Key Information: Issues & Recommendations

### Summary of Issues and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Actions</th>
<th>Affects Current Protectiveness</th>
<th>May Affect Future Protectiveness</th>
<th>Responsible Organization within DOE</th>
<th>TPA Lead Regulator</th>
<th>Action Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>100/300 Crosscutting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 1.</strong> Additional risk assessment information is needed to evaluate the interim actions prescribed within the records of decisions and to develop final cleanup decisions.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>EPA/WDOE</td>
<td>06/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1-1.</strong> Submit Draft A of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment Report.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>EPA/WDOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1-2.</strong> Submit draft sampling and analysis plan for Inter-Areas Shoreline Assessment.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>EPA/WDOE</td>
<td>08/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Protectiveness Affected Now or in the Future?

### Responsible Parties

### Timeline for Actions
Other Key Information: Technical Assessment

Graph showing concentration over time:
- Remedy begins in 1992
- Below MCL in 2001
Other Key Information: Maps
Other Key Information: Maps
Executive Summary

- Brief synopsis of findings
- Highlights key issues and recommendations
A note about scope...

- Provides some background and progress since last five-year review
- But, focus is on current situation—like a snapshot
Community Engagement
Opportunities for Engagement

• Public notices
• Interviews
• Meetings, if applicable
• Opportunities between five-year reviews
Points of Contact

- Site Project Manager(s)
- Lead agency public affairs representative
- EPA Community Involvement Coordinators
For More Information

• EPA maintains several websites with information about five-year reviews:
  – All about five-year reviews:
    www.epa.gov/superfund/fiveyearreview
  – All about clean-up at federal facilities:
    http://www.epa.gov/fedfac/
  – Superfund community involvement site:
    http://www.epa.gov/superfund/community/index.htm
Thank You!

This presentation was developed by the Five-Year Review Workgroup as part of an interagency collaboration between the Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Department of Energy, and U.S. Department of the Interior.