



0044826 034543

Nez Perce

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MANAGEMENT
P.O. BOX 365 • LAPWAI, IDAHO 83540-0365 • (208) 843-7375 / FAX: 843-7378

July 12, 1996

Mr. Robert Stewart
Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, WA 99352



RECEIVED
JUL 22 1996
DOE-RL/DCC

Dear Mr. Stewart

The Nez Perce Tribe Department of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (ERWM) has reviewed a copy of **Data for the Screening Assessment, Volume 1: Text, DOE, RL-96-16-c, Revision 0, Volume 1, UC-630, Draft, Enclosed**, for your consideration, are ERWM's specific comments and suggestions on that document.

44485

The Nez Perce Tribe specifically retained customary usage rights to the Columbia River when the Tribe ceded over 11 million acres to the Federal Government in the Treaty of 1855. By entering into The Treaty of 1855 and subsequent treaties, the Federal government has acknowledged that our Tribal Rights precede the U.S. Constitution and are retained with regard to the Columbia River. Accordingly, the Nez Perce Tribe Department of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management has support from the, U.S. Department to Energy (DOE) to participate in and to monitor relevant DOE activities.

The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM considers the protection of the Columbia River and its ecosystem to be of utmost priority. We have some comments, questions and suggestions that will improve this report. We would appreciate a written response to our comments. Listed below are our general comments:

- 1) The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM does not concur with the segmentation of the River shown in this draft. The segmentation of the River should be based on the distribution of existing data, waste sites, mapping of groundwater and vadose contamination, channel configuration of the Columbia River, and known Geologic conditions (both surface and sub-surface).

- 2) The current river segmentation obscures the fact that there are large areas along the river corridor with data gaps. The segmentation must reflect and clearly show these gaps. Areas with insufficient data should not be initially assessed in the screening assessment.
- 3) The segmentation does not appear to have been done in a consistent manner as the H, F, and Hanford Townsite sloughs are segmented differently.

The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the **Data For Screening Assessment, Volume I: Test, DOE/RL-96-16-c, Revision 0, Volume I, UC-630, Draft**. If you wish to discuss Nez Perce ERWM comments further, then please contact Dr. Stanley Sobczyk or Mr. Paul Danielson at 208-843-7375 or 208-843-7378 (fax).

Sincerely,

Stanley M. Sobczyk for D. L. P.

Donna L. Powaukee

cc: John Wagonner, DOE-RL, Site Manager
Kevin Clarke, DOE-RL, Indians Program Manager
Dave Holland, Ecology
Larry Gadbois, EPA
Russell Jim, YIN, ERWM Manager
J.R. Wilkinson, CTUIR, SSRP Manager
K. Mike Thompson, DOE-RL

RESPONSE TO

**Data for the Screening Assessment, Volume 1: Text
DOE/RL-96-16-c. Revision 0, Volume 1, UC-630, Draft**

Comments Prepared By:

Nez Perce Tribe
Department of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Staff

July 12, 1996

THE NEZ PERCE TRIBE
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENTS ON THE

**Data for the Screening Assessment, Volume 1: Text
DOE/RL-96-16-c, Revision 0, Volume 1, UC-630, Draft**

Since 1855, reserved treaty rights of the Nez Perce Tribe in the Mid-Columbia have been recognized and affirmed through a series of federal and state actions. These actions protect the interests of the Nez Perce to utilize their usual and accustomed resources and resources areas in the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River and elsewhere. Accordingly, the Nez Perce Tribe Department of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (ERWM) has support from the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE), to participate in and monitor certain DOE activities. The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM responds to documents from the DOE. The program reviews and comments on papers in an objective and straight forward manner. Each document review is usually provided in a form that lists the Page number and Paragraph number: Comment. Following are specific comments on the **Data for the Screening Assessment, Volume 1: Text. DOE/R-L-96-16-c. Revision 0, Volume 1. UC-630, Draft.**

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

Page v, Paragraph 2

Nez Perce Tribe should be changed to Nez Perce Tribe Department of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management.

Page v, Background, First Paragraph

The sentence referring to the Nez Perce Tribe should be changed to:

Since 1855, reserved treaty rights of the Nez Perce Tribe in the Mid-Columbia have been recognized and affirmed through a series of federal and state actions. These actions protect the interests of the Nez Perce to utilize their usual and accustomed resources and resources areas in the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River and elsewhere.

Page xi, Paragraph 3

The wording in this paragraph suggests contaminant concentrations in biota, cobalt-60 particles, N Springs water, and chromium in ground water are not needed for the human health and ecological screening assessment; ERWM feels these parameters are needed for the screening assessment.

Page xiii, Glossary

The organizations represented on the CRCIA Team should be identified.

Page 1.2, Approach, Paragraph I

The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM is not in concurrence with the data decisions shown in Table 1.2. See the following comment.

Page 1.2, Table 1.2

The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM strongly supports the use of soil data within the screening assessment. We support a sitewide vadose characterization program as well. Additionally, ERWM does not believe that a proper segmentation of the Columbia River has been accomplished.

Page 1.3, Segmentation

The Nez Perce Tribe ERWM does not concur with the segmentation of the river shown in this draft. The segmentation of the river should be based on the distribution of existing data, waste sites, mapping of groundwater and vadose contamination, channel configuration of the Columbia River, and known Geologic conditions (both surface and sub-surface). Furthermore, the current segmentation obscures the fact that there are large

areas along the river corridor with data gaps. The segmentation must reflect and clearly show these gaps.

The segmentation does not appear to have been done in a consistent manner as the H, F, and Hanford Townsite slough are segmented differently.

Page 2.1, Last Paragraph

The polygons representing each river segment should be available to the public in computer formats as an ARC/INFO export file and as a DXF file.

Page 2.2, Non-Hanford Data

ERWM believes that City of Pasco surface water data should be included in the assessment so that direct water quality comparisons can be made between present conditions and during reactor operations reported in the recently declassified documents.

Page 2.6, Paragraph 1

The number of sediment samples collected by the CRCIA project should be stated.

Page 3-3, First Paragraph

Since the Nez Perce Tribe ERWM does not agree with the current segmentation of the river, we do not believe the "maximum representative samples" are truly representative of river conditions.

Page 3-2, Paragraph 2

Chromium concentrations in groundwater samples from Well 199-N-80 are consistently above drinking water standards of 50 µg/L.