



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Southwest District Office

401 East Fifth Street  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2911  
(513) 285-6357  
FAX (513) 285-6249

FERNALD  
LOC B-0808

FEB 23 12 34 PM '01

George V. Voinovich  
Governor

FILE: 644655 2  
LIBRARY

3518

February 22, 2001

Mr. Johnny Reising  
U.S. Department of Energy, Fernald Area Office  
P.O. Box 538705  
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8705

Re: A1P1 PRAIRIE GRASS ESTABLISHMENT STUDY 2000 ANNUAL REPORT

Dear Mr. Reising:

Ohio EPA has reviewed DOE's January 15, 2001 submittal "Area 1, Phase 1 Prairie Grass Establishment Study 2000 Annual Report." Ohio EPA's comments on the document are attached.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Schneider  
Fernald Project Manager  
Office of Federal Facilities Oversight

cc: Jim Saric, U.S. EPA  
Terry Hagen, FDF  
Mark Shupe, HSI GeoTrans  
Francie Hodge, Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
Ruth Vandergrift, ODH

PRAIRIE GRASS ESTABLISHMENT STUDY FINAL  
PROJECT REPORT 1998-2000

- 1) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Results and Discussion                      Pg #: 3                      Line #: NA                      Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: At the bottom of the first paragraph the statement is made "Note that the values for grass cover and weediness from the original plots are biased because the data for the low quality plots that were reseeded, are not included in the calculations". I don't understand this statement. The original plot data appears to be separated from the reseeded plot data. This being the case, I don't see how the data from one influences the data from the other. Please explain.
  
- 2) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Results and Discussion                      Pg #: 3                      Line #: NA                      Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: In the middle of the second paragraph it is stated that "Among the individual wood chip plots, plot 17, reseeded, and plot 18, original, had a high percentage of prairie grass cover and essentially no weed cover". Although the point is being made that the wood chip cover appears to be the most beneficial to supression of weeds and allowing prairie grasses to dominate (as evidenced by Figure 4a), plot 18 is shown on Figure 4 to have no mulch.
  
- 3) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Results and Discussion                      Pg #: 3                      Line #: NA                      Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: In the middle of the second paragraph it is stated that "Presumably, the high success rate resulted from the protective action of the wood chips and lack of an amendment that contains weed seeds". A series of bar charts showing just the wood chip mulch plots separated by amendment to illustrate this would be a welcome addition.
  
- 4) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Results and Discussion                      Pg #: 3                      Line #: NA                      Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: In the third paragraph it is stated that "...the composted sludge had the highest weed coverage" and in the preceding paragraph that "...the plots with straw had the lowest establishment of prairie grass, likely due to weed dominance". Did the plots with the composted sludge and the straw mulch have the highest weed content of all the plots?
  
- 5) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Results and Discussion                      Pg #: 3                      Line #: NA                      Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: In the end of the third paragraph it is stated that "...amendments are likely a source of weeds." Although this is true, is it possible that the enrichment of the soil with nutrients favors weed growth over prairie grass growth?

Mr. Johnny Reising  
February 22, 2001  
Page 2

- 6) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Results and Discussion Pg #: 3 Line #: NA Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: There is no discussion of the oat vs no oat cover in the final report. There should be some information about these treatments.
- 7) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Conclusions Pg #: 4 Line #: NA Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: It is stated "Note, however, the level is biased high because the unsatisfactory plots were reseeded and the data of these plots did not contribute to the averages". The meaning of this is not clear to me (as indicated above). Please explain.
- 8) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Tables 1-3 Pg #: 8 and 9 Line #: NA Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: The lower sections of these tables under "Initial Degree of Establishment" are not clear and I wonder if some of the labeling is not correct. Please explain.
- 9) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Photographs Pg #: Line #: NA Code: C  
Original Comment #:  
Comment: Many of the labels along the upper and right side edges have been cut off and the numbers do not appear.