

6477

U-007-707 .6

**TELECON NOTE DISCUSSION**

04/08/93

USEPA      HALLIBURTON/NUS  
2  
TELECON NOTE

DOCUMENT FILE NO. 3964

*J.R. Foulk*

*Copies: M. Marcus*

*A. Sarland*

*5/11/93*  
*S.*

1078

TELECON NOTE

DATE: 04/08/93  
TIME: 1700 h

CONTACT: Ms. Eileen Helmer  
U.S. EPA, Region V  
312-886-4828

BY: Kathy Trapp

DISTRIBUTION: Pete Yerace, DOE-FN  
Jim Skridulis  
Steve Oberjohn

I contacted Eileen to discuss the following topics:

- a). review the "Habitat-based Approach" for quantifying contaminant concentrations and determining exposure
- b). receptors being considered to quantify radiation dose
- c). Eileen's understanding of the responsibilities of FEMP OUs 1-4 concerning ecorisk assessments.

The habitat-based approach being used in the OU 5 screening study remains consistent with the approach discussed at the 02/17/93 meeting held at the FEMP. As per this meeting, the OU 5 ecological risk assessment would examine those areas of the FEMP not targeted for remediation; e.g. on-site areas outside of OUs 1-4 as well as contaminated off property areas. Eileen recommended that the rationale used to establish these OU 5 habitat-based study areas be summarized in the screening study document.

We then discussed some of the rationale used in selecting ecoreceptors to quantify radiation dose. Receptors discussed were the white-footed mouse, meadow vole, pine trees, and a yet-to-be-designated fish species. Eileen indicated that the approach seemed reasonable and again recommended that the rationale used to select these species be summarized in the screening study document. We also discussed the soil-earthworm-robin pathway; I indicated that site-specific radionuclide/earthworm data were extremely limited, making assessment of this pathway difficult. She asked me to re-consider this pathway to determine if a method might exist for deriving appropriate information from the literature. I agreed to re-examine available information.

The last topic discussed during this conversation concerned ~~the~~ approach other OUs were apparently taking with regard to OU-specific ecological risk assessments. I indicated that I hadn't formally discussed this issue with anyone responsible for preparing this portion of the OU-specific RI/FS documents, but understood that at least some of the OUs were deferring evaluation/discussion of ecological risk to OU 5. As per our meeting of 02/17/93, OU 5 was

not assessing ecological risk associated with the other OUs because the current proposed remedial strategies for these OUs included some combination of contaminant removal and capping of contaminated sites. These actions would reduce/eliminate exposure to contaminants. Based on her understanding of these proposed remedial strategies, Eileen indicated to Jim Saric (EPA Region V Site Manager) that ecological risk assessments for those areas of OUs 1-4 targeted for remediation were not necessary. Therefore, any statements in RI/FS documents being prepared for OUs 1-4 which indicate that assessments of OU-specific ecological risk were being addressed in the OU 5 RI/FS are contrary to these discussions. She indicated that the final decision regarding this matter was Jim Saric's and recommended that individuals responsible for preparing these documents clarify this issue with Jim.

Mike,  
 It is my understanding that CRU 2 is  
 doing a qualitative ecological risk assessment  
 for our RI. If I'm wrong please advise.  
 Also, the qualitative risk approach is appropriate  
 for the FS? Thanks  
 Jim.