1282

Department of Energy

Ohio Field Office
Fernald Area Office
P. O. Box 538705
Cincinnati, Ohio 45253-8705
(513) 648-3155

FEB 12 1998

DOE-0342-98

Mr. Gene Jablonowski, Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region V, SRF-5J
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590

Mr. Tom Schneider, Project Manager
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
401 East 5th Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2911

Dear Mr. Jablonowski and Mr. Schneider:

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT SILO 3 PROJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL, REVISION D

Enclosed are the responses to your comments on the Draft Silo 3 Project Request for Proposal (RFP), Revision D. The responses have been prepared consistently with the Draft Final Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) document and discussions between the Department of Energy (DOE), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA), and the public.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Nina Akgündüz at (513) 648-3110.

Sincerely,

Johnny Reising

Johnny W. Reising
Fernald Remedial Action
Project Manager

FEMP:Akgündüz

Enclosure: As Stated

Recycled and Recyclable

cc w/enc:

N. Hallein, EM-42/CLOV
D. Yockman, DOE-FEMP
J. Saric, USEPA-V, SRF-5J
R. Beaumier, TPSS/DERR, OEPA-Columbus
T. Schneider, OEPA-Dayton (total 3 copies of encs.)
F. Bell, ATSDR
M. Schupe, HSI GeoTrans
R. Vandegrift, ODOH
F. Barker, Tetra Tech
S. M. Beckman, FDF/52-4
T. Hagen, FDF/65-2
J. Harmon, FDF/90
D. Paine, FDF/52-4
T. Patton, FDF/65-2
T. J. Stone, FDF/20
P. A. Sturgeon, FDF/20
K. N. Wintz, FDF/20
AR Coordinator, FDF/78

cc w/o enc:

A. Tanner, DOE-FEMP
D. Yockman, DOE-FEMP
R. Heck, FDF/2
S. Hinnefeld, FDF/2
EDC, FDF/52-7

RESPONSES TO THE U.S. EPA AND OEPA COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SILO 3 RFP, REV. D

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: General Comment Page #: N/A Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 1

Comment: DOE, through the RFP, should encourage the use of materials and equipment that are recyclable, reusable or easily decontaminated in the Silo 3 project. Generation of materials that may need to be disposed of in the on-site disposal facility should be kept to an absolute minimum.

Response: The Contractor is encouraged to propose the use of existing mobile facilities and skid mounted equipment to facilitate the construction of on-site remediation facilities.

The Contractor shall demonstrate, within the technical proposal, its commitment to Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP) waste minimization initiatives by incorporating the following information into its remedial design:

- The use of existing equipment;
- The use of mobile and temporary facilities;
- The use of recyclable and reusable materials;
- The minimization of secondary wastestreams;
- The use of materials and/or decontamination techniques, which promote free release of materials;
- The use of equipment and materials which will be returned to a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-licensed facility; and
- The minimization of waste identified for disposal at the on-site disposal facility.

The cost to decontaminate and dispose of all remedial facilities will be evaluated as part of the Contractors' proposals. This creates a large incentive for the Contractor to recycle existing equipment, identify materials and equipment that are reusable and/or that can be easily decontaminated, in order to minimize waste and make its proposal more cost competitive.

Action: Section L of the Request for Proposal (RFP) will be revised to include text requiring the Contractors to provide estimates of debris that will require disposal by Fluor Daniel Fernald (FDF). The RFP will encourage the use of materials and equipment that are recyclable, reusable, or easily decontaminated.

RESPONSES TO THE U.S. EPA AND OEPA
COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SILO 3 RFP, REV. D (Cont.)

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: General Comment Page #: N/A Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 2

Comment: The RFP should be revised to be consistent with the approved ESD concerning Silo 3 material disposal location. The RFP should employ the language from the ESD which states, "Off-site disposal at either the NTS or an appropriately-permitted commercial disposal facility that complies with the CERCLA 'off-site rule' (40 CFR 300.440)."

Response: The RFP only covers the scope of work that will be the Contractor's responsibility. Under this RFP, the Contractor shall be responsible for the retrieval, treatment, packaging, and interim storage of the Silo 3 material at either the FEMP or the Contractor's off-site treatment facility. This RFP does not request Contractor services for disposal. The RFP specifies the minimum waste acceptance criteria (WAC) as the treatment standard for this contract.

The Department of Energy (DOE) and FDF will select the appropriate disposal location based on the ability of the facility to provide regulatory-compliant, cost-effective disposal of treated Silo 3 waste that is protective of human health and the environment.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: C.1.5 Page #: C.1-13 Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 3

Comment: The italicized section and other associated text regarding U.S. EPA's position on off-site treatment should be deleted. U.S. EPA, through the approval of the ESD, has finalized their position regarding off-site treatment. The approved ESD states, "The treatment portion of the alternate remedy may be accomplished through either on-site treatment at the FEMP to meet disposal facility WAC, or pretreatment on-site as required to reduce dispersability of thorium-bearing particulates and render the waste acceptable for transportation, followed by transportation to an appropriately permitted off-site facility for treatment using chemical stabilization/solidification or a polymer-based encapsulation process to meet disposal facility WAC."

Response: Agree.

Action: The italicized text in Section C.1.5 and other associated text regarding the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA) position on off-site treatment will be deleted.

RESPONSES TO THE U.S. EPA AND OEPA
COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SILO 3 RFP, REV. D (Cont.)

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: C.3.2.1.2 Page #: C.3-3 Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 4

Comment: The text states that FDF will retain responsibility for the overall silo integrity during the remediation process. Will FDF be responsible if the silos are damaged by the Contractor during remediation? Is there a contingency plan in place in case there is silo damage or failure?

Response: a) Maintaining silo integrity throughout the Silo 3 remediation process is one of FDF's primary safety objective. FDF will review the design and workplans and provide field oversight on the activities associated with the Contractor's penetration, waste retrieval, and decontamination of Silo 3. Due to the programmatic consequences associated with silo damage or failure, FDF will retain overall responsibility for approval of activities or modifications that may impact the integrity of the Silo 3 structure.

b) In the event of silo failure, the project will undergo an Emergency Shutdown per Section C.6.2.15.1 of the RFP. FDF has a contingency plan in place, which involves evacuation of the project area and the implementation of containment and recovery plans by emergency response teams.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: C.3.2.1.6 Page #: C.3-5 Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 5

Comment: Please describe how construction deviations will be handled by FDF. Will this be accomplished through Design Change Notices? Include all parties to be notified of deviations (i.e., regulators, stakeholders, etc.).

Response: The Contractor shall conform to applicable codes and standards for design and construction of facilities identified in the RFP. The Contractor shall request and adequately justify, in writing, any deviation from those codes and standards, or concepts that present health and safety risks to workers or the general population, and obtain written approval by FDF prior to implementation. Deviations in design and construction must still comply with any laws or regulations governing the activities.

The Contractor shall document and implement all design and construction changes in accordance with its FDF-approved Engineering Management Plan. In addition, FDF will appropriately review engineering and construction changes against the Contractor's approved Safety Basis established for the Silo 3 Project. U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA (OEPA) will be notified of any

deviations in design and construction of regulatory approved designs.

FDF will keep stakeholders and regulators informed on design and construction progress through monthly progress meetings and briefings.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: C.3.2.3.3 Page #: C.3-10 Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 6
Comment: Page C.3-10 is printed twice.

Response: Agree.

Action: The second page C.3-10 will be deleted and replaced with page C.3-11, which was inadvertently omitted.

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: C.4.6.1 Page #: C.4-8 Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 7
Comment: Will there be a penalty assessed to the Contractor if they are the cause for a missed deadline of milestone?

Response: Clause H.64, Enforceable U.S. EPA Milestones, under Section H, Special Requirements notifies the Contractor that its schedule will form the basis for certain enforceable milestones established with the U.S. EPA. Clause H.64.2 also notifies the Contractor that in accordance with General Provision A.32, Section I, the Contractor shall indemnify the DOE and FDF for any claims (i.e., assessment of penalties) by the U.S. EPA against the DOE or FDF for failure to meet any of the enforceable milestones set with reference to the Contractor's schedule resulting from fault of the Contractor.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO
Section #: C.5.1.1.3.1 Page #: C.5-10 Line #: N/A Code: C
Original Comment #: 8
Comment: The text states that a stack test may be required to demonstrate the effectiveness of control equipment. Ohio EPA agrees with this statement, but adds that continuous isokinetic sampling will be required throughout the operation of the facility.

6

RESPONSES TO THE U.S. EPA AND OEPA
COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SILO 3 RFP, REV. D (Cont.)

Response: As described in Section C.5.1.1.3.1, the requirements for isokinetic monitoring are specified in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 61 Subpart H National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for control of radioactive particulate released from a point source. The need to install isokinetic monitoring equipment, in addition to best available technology (BAT), will be determined based upon a comparison of the effective dose equivalent developed from vendor supplied emission estimates in conjunction with site source data, with the NESHAPs threshold for installation of continuous monitoring equipment (0.1 mrem/yr).

Continuous isokinetic monitoring would only be mandatory throughout operation if emission modeling estimates would exceed the threshold value for effective dose equivalent (0.1 mrem/yr) established under 40 CFR Part 61 Subpart H NESHAP for control of radioactive particulate released from a point source.

The purpose of the stack performance test is to verify that the BAT control and monitoring equipment is installed and operating correctly. This could consist of a one-time test, whereby an independent contractor takes grab samples from the stack for quantitative verification of pollutant loadings. The requirement for the stack performance test is independent of the requirement for isokinetic monitoring.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: General Comments Page #: N/A Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 9
Comment: At several locations, such as that in Paragraph 4, Section C.1.2 on Page C.1-9, the text requires the Contractor to bear expenses for all transportation, material handling, reprocessing, and labor support required for reprocessing the waste shipment rejected by the Nevada Test Site (NTS). Although such a requirement is customarily used to hold Contractors accountable to their work, it is also, likely to prompt the Contractor to increase the bid price, which may not be realistic and necessary. Therefore, the document should be revised to state that either (1) the Department of Energy (DOE), through Fluor Daniel Fernald (FDF) or entirely on its own, will work with NTS to ensure that all waste shipments satisfy NTS waste acceptance criteria (WAC), or (2) the Contractor will be reimbursed for costs associated with reprocessing the waste shipment rejected by NTS, to prevent the Contractor from increasing the bid price to cover uncertainties associated with waste rejected by NTS. DOE should also require FDF to more strictly verify that all

7

wastes processed by the Contractor meet the NTS WAC.

Response: The Contractor shall be responsible for the quality and condition of both the final wasteform and container until the packaged wasteform is transferred to FDF for transportation to the disposal facility. However, the Contractor shall retain responsibility for the final wasteform meeting the WAC.

As recommended by the comment, DOE and FDF will obtain written confirmation in advance that treated waste meets the WAC. Verification that treated waste meets the WAC will be determined by periodic sampling, as well as, through management oversight that the Contractor is operating the treatment process within the parameters established in the Process Control Plan. Any waste not meeting the WAC, due to the fault of the Contractor, shall be returned to the Contractor for reprocessing or retained for corrective action by the disposal facility at the Contractor's expense. Because the Contractor will prepare its own Process Control Plan, oversee process operations by its own technical personnel, and conduct representative sampling, any failure of the treated wasteform to meet the WAC shall be the Contractor's responsibility. FDF will provide oversight of the Contractor's process through Quality Assurance and independent laboratory analyses.

Any containers damaged due to transportation/handling after transfer to FDF will not be the responsibility of the Contractor.

Action: Related sections will be revised to clarify what responsibilities the Contractor retains.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: General Comments Page #: N/A Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 10

Comment: The text cites DOE and Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP) documents that are necessary for writing the proposal and for preparing submissions due soon after work begins. Some of these documents (for instance, NS-0003 is cited in Section J.3.2) are included as attachments. However, other documents (such as DOE-EM-5502-94, DOE-STD-1027-92, RM-2116, and DOE Guide 440.1-1, cited in Section J.3.2) are not attached. All documents cited in the Request for Proposal (RFP), except those that are widely available (such as the Code of Federal Regulations [CFR]), should be attached to the RFP.

Response: DOE documents (guides and Orders) are generally available to the

8

Contractors bidding on this project through DOE publication services, as well as through the Internet. Therefore, they are not included as attachments. The attachments included in Section J.4 of the RFP are those site specific and project specific documents that would not be available to potential Contractors, such as RM-2116.

Action: Site document RM-2116, Safety Analysis Program Requirements, will be included as an attachment in the final RFP.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: General Comment Page #: N/A Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 11
Comment: The document does not provide line numbers that are generally provided in all FEMP documents. The document should be revised to specify line numbers that can be used to refer to specific text commented on in the Specific Comment section.

Response: FDF regrets any confusion or additional effort placed on the U.S. EPA by omitting line numbers from the draft RFP. Line numbers are normally removed from final documents. The next revision of the RFP is expected to be a final document, and will not include line numbers. FDF notes your comment and will endeavor to ensure future submittals include line numbering.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: General Comment Page #: N/A Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 12
Comment: This section consists of many attachments. To facilitate the prompt location of a relevant document, either the introduction to this section or the Table of Contents to Section J should include an index of all attachments, arranged in order of the title or the document number used in text to cite the document.

Response: Section J, page i, provides a table of contents for Section J. This includes an index of all attachments in Section J.4. Where these attachments are referenced by document number and title in the RFP text, the specific attachment number is generally provided to the reader for prompt location of the relevant document. This reference convention has been utilized on previous procurement actions at the FEMP and is generally recognized by the Contractors.

9

RESPONSES TO THE U.S. EPA AND OEPA
COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SILO 3 RFP, REV. D (Cont.)

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: B.2.2 Page #: B-1 Line #: 2 Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 13
Comment: The phrase "...accordance Section..." should be corrected to read "...accordance with Section..."

Response: Agree.

Action: The phrase will be corrected to read "...accordance with Section..."

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: Table B.2-1 Page #: B-2 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 14
Comment: The description of Line Item 008 in the table refers to Section C.3.2.4. However, the referred section is not included in the document. The document should be revised to address this issue.

Response: Section C.3.2.4 is found on page C.3-11, which was inadvertently omitted from the RFP.

Action: Page C.3-11 will be included in the final RFP.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C Page #: i Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 15
Comment: Page i of the Table of Contents in Section C indicates that Section 3.2.4 is presented on Page 3-11. However, Page 3-10 is repeated in place of page 3-11. The document should be revised to insert Page 3-11.

Response: Agree. Page C.3-11 was inadvertently omitted from the RFP.

Action: The second page C.3-10 will be deleted and replaced with page C.3-11.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.1.2.3 Page #: C.1-8 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 16
Comment: In line 7 of the paragraph entitled "Personnel," the phrase "low-level waste"

10

should be revised to read "low-level radioactive waste."

Response: Agree.

Action: The text will be revised to read "low-level radioactive waste."

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.1.5 Page #: C.1-13 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 17
Comment: The text in line 4 of paragraph 6 on Page C.1-13 requires the Contractor to provide feedback to FDF regarding the advantages of off-site treatment. The text should be revised to require that the Contractor provide FDF with feedback regarding both advantages and disadvantages of the off-site treatment of waste. The consideration of disadvantages, such as an increased risk of exposure resulting from an accident during shipment of waste for off-site treatment, is important in evaluating the feasibility of off-site treatment of Silo 3 waste. The findings of off-site treatment evaluations should be presented to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) for review.

Response: Based on feedback on the Silo 3 RFP, off-site treatment will be incorporated into the final Silo 3 RFP as an allowable alternative for remediation of Silo 3 material. Prior to Silo 3 material being shipped off-site for final treatment, pretreatment at the FEMP will be required to reduce the dispersability concerns associated with the Silo 3 material.

Action: The Silo 3 RFP will be revised to include off-site treatment as an allowable alternative for remediation of Silo 3 material under this contract.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.1.5 Page #: C.1-14 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 18
Comment: The text in Line 2 under Bullet 4 states that FDF will add 18 months to the Contractor's project schedule if a Record of Decision (ROD) amendment is required to allow for the off-site treatment of waste. The process of ROD amendment may be completed in less than 18 months; therefore, the text should be revised to state that FDF will add the time needed to amend the ROD to the Contractor's schedule to determine the Contractor's overall project schedule.

Response: This text was included because it was not known at the time of writing the

11

draft RFP whether U.S. EPA would require a Record of Decision (ROD) Amendment for alternatives requiring off-site treatment of the Silo 3 material. The U.S. EPA has expressed the opinion that the Draft Final Explanation of Significant Differences written for remediation of the Silo 3 material may be feasible for off-site treatment of the Silo 3 material. Pretreatment to reduce dispersability of the Silo 3 material must be performed at the FEMP, prior to shipment to the off-site treatment facility. Therefore, the text under Bullet 4 referring to a ROD Amendment will be deleted from the RFP text.

Action: Text relating to a ROD amendment for off-site treatment of the Silo 3 material will be deleted.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.4.2.1 Page #: C.4-2 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 19

Comment: a) The text requires the Contractor to provide drinking water; however, under Bullet 2, it states that the potable water will be provided by FDF. The text should be revised to clarify whether drinking water will be provided by FDF or the Contractor.

b) In addition, the text requires the Contractor to provide FDF with the locations of drinking water outlets. This requirement should be reevaluated after the text is revised to address the issue discussed above.

c) The text also states that telephone service will be monitored by FDF and may be suspended if it is misused by the Contractor. The text should be revised to define the misuse of telephone service.

d) The text also states that power, potable water, fire suppression water, and telephone services will be provided by FDF, but it does not clarify whether the Contractor will be required to pay for these utilities or not. The text should be revised to clarify this issue.

Response: a) The Contractor shall be required to provide bottled drinking water for workers. As required under Section J.3.3.1.33 of this RFP, the locations of bottled drinking water stations in radiologically-controlled areas will be approved by FDF to minimize worker exposure and contamination, and minimize the amount of low-level radioactive waste generated during the project.

b) FDF will provide potable water for use in the process, restroom, and shower facilities.

c) Misuse of telephone service will be clarified in the text to mean non-business use of telephones and fax machines.

d) The Contractor shall not be charged for use of power, potable water, fire suppression water, and telephone services.

Action: The RFP text in Section C.4.2.1 will be modified to clarify these points.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.4.4.3 Page #: C.4-6 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 20
Comment: The text discusses "United Postal Service" deliveries. The text should be corrected to "United Parcel Service," "United States Postal Service," or both, as appropriate.

Response: Agree, "United Postal Service" is an editorial error.

Action: The text will be revised to read "United Parcel Service."

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: Figure C.4-2 Page #: C.4-25 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 21
Comment: The text states that only the Operations Work Plan will be submitted to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) and U.S. EPA for review. However, because of the complexity of this project, problems may develop as they have at other projects such as the previous vitrification pilot plant at Operable Unit 4 and the similar unified project at Pit 9 of the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. To assist in the early recognition of problems, OEPA and U.S. EPA should also review the Site Preparation, Process Design, and Facilities Engineering Packages; Process Control Plan; Operations and Maintenance Plans; and all other relevant engineering documents. This review would provide an additional check for major errors and omissions. In addition, at a minimum, OEPA should receive the Pre-operational Environmental Control Plan to minimize the possibility of additional regulatory violations.

Response: Based on weekly discussions with the U.S. EPA and OEPA, the agencies will be provided the Operations Work Plan (OWP) for review and approval. Included in the OWP will be the Contractor's Process Control Plan, Environmental Control Plan, Contingency Plan, Sampling and Analysis Plan, Description of Operation and Equipment, and Description of Health and

Safety Plan. The OWP must be approved by the U.S. EPA prior to the Contractor beginning operations.

In order for U.S. EPA and OEPA to provide a timely comprehensive review of the OWP, other documents such as the Pre-operational Environmental Control Plan, Site Preparation, Process Design, Facilities Engineering Packages, and Maintenance Plans may be provided to the U.S. EPA and OEPA for informational purposes. The OWP will contain the substantive information contained in these documents.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: Table C.5-1 Page #: C.5-2 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 22
Comment: Under Item 1, the table lists the description of off-site disposal as a part of the design criteria for the minimum required process operations to be performed by the Contractor. However, according to the rest of the document, off-site disposal consists of disposing of treated wastes at the NTS, which is the responsibility of FDF. The document should be revised to clarify the requirement of including off-site disposal as a part of the design criteria for minimum required process operations performed by the Contractor.

Response: Although FDF and DOE will be responsible for transportation and disposal of the treated Silo 3 waste, the Contractor shall be responsible for producing a treated waste that meets the established WAC, as well as, packaging the treated waste in a container that meets both the Department of Transportation and the WAC requirements. Therefore, minimum operations must include the WAC the treated Silo 3 waste and the container must meet for disposal. The Contractor shall design a treatment facility that can produce a treated wasteform that will meet the minimum WAC specified in the contract. The "Reference" column in Table C.5-1 refers the Contractor to the appropriate sections in the RFP for clarification of the requirements.

Action: No further action.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.5.1.1.9 Page #: C.5-16 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 23
Comment: The text cites Section 4 of the "American Society for Testing and Materials

(ASTM) Book of Standards," dated March 1996. However, the most recent publication of the cited volumes of Section 4 are December 1996 for Volume 4.07, April 1997 for Volume 4.08, and May 1997 for Volume 4.09. All volumes of the "ASTM Book of Standards" are revised and published annually. To ensure that the most current versions of ASTM and all other references are used, the document should be revised to require the use of most recent versions of the referenced materials, requirements, and regulations.

Response: Agree.

Action: The text will be revised to state ..."shall be done in accordance with the latest revision of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), Section 4 (Soil and Rock; Dimension Stone; Geosynthetics)."

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.6.2.10.3.3 Page #: C.6-9 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 24

Comment: The text requires the Contractor to coordinate efforts with FDF personnel to obtain NTS acceptance of treated Silo 3 waste. Considering this requirement, it is not clear why the NTS would reject treated Silo 3 waste shipments (see General Comment 1) if treated wastes are shipped to the NTS only after obtaining NTS approval. The text should also be revised in light of the response to General Comment 1.

Response: The Contractor shall be responsible for the quality and condition of both the final wasteform and container until the packaged wasteform is transferred to FDF for transportation to the disposal facility. However, the Contractor shall retain responsibility for the final wasteform meeting the WAC.

DOE and FDF will obtain written confirmation in advance that treated wasteform meets the WAC. Verification that treated wasteform meets the WAC will be determined by periodic sampling, as well as, confirmation the Contractor is operating the treatment process within the parameters established in the Process Control Plan. Any waste not meeting the WAC due to Contractor fault shall be returned to the Contractor for reprocessing or retained for corrective action by the disposal facility at the Contractor's expense. Because the Contractor will prepare its own Process Control Plan, oversee process operations by its own technical personnel, and conduct representative sampling, any failure of the treated wasteform to meet the WAC shall be the Contractor's responsibility.

Containers damaged due to transportation/handling after transfer to FDF will

not be the responsibility of the Contractor.

Action: Related sections will be revised to clarify this concern.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.6.2.14.4 Page #: C.6-17 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 25
Comment: The text refers to fenceline radon concentrations without specifying the location of the fenceline. The document should be revised to include a site plan clearly identifying the fenceline being referred to in the text.

Response: The referenced fenceline is the site boundary, shown as the dashed outline in Figure J.2-1 of Attachment J.2.

Action: For clarification, the text will be modified to reference Figure J.2-1.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.6.2.15.1 Page #: C.6-22 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 26
Comment: The phrase "until a mutual" should be revised to read "until the cause of the shutdown has been positively identified and rectified and a mutual...."

Response: Agree.

Action: The text will be revised to read, "until the cause of the shutdown has been positively identified and rectified and a mutual..."

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section #: C.7.2.1.6 Page #: C.7-5 Line #: N/A Code: N/A
Original Comment #: 27
Comment: The text requires the Contractor's supervisor to complete Nevada Field Office-325 training, if needed. The text should be revised to clarify if the Contractor will be required to arrange and pay for this training.

Response: FDF will provide the facilities and instructors to conduct the Nevada Field Office-325 training. The Contractor shall be responsible for scheduling the

appropriate personnel for the training, as well as wages for the time spent by personnel in training.

Action: The text will be revised to clarify this issue.

16