



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 5
77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD
CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

4949

JUL 09 2003

Mr. Johnny W. Reising
United States Department of Energy
Feed Materials Production Center
P.O. Box 398705
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8705

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

LIBRARY

FILE: SRF-6
1446.7A

2003 JUL 10 11:29

ERNAULD
LOG
D-III
64

RE: 2002 Site Environmental Report

Dear Mr. Reising:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has completed its review of the United States Department of Energy's (U.S. DOE) 2002 Site Environmental Report.

This document summarizes site-wide monitoring activities for 2002. Overall, the report is technically adequate. However, U.S. EPA has enclosed comments which should be addressed in next year's Site Environmental Report.

Please contact me at (312) 886-0992 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

James A. Saric
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Section
SFD Remedial Response Branch #2

Enclosure

cc: Tom Schneider, OEPA-SWDO
Sally Robison, U.S. DOE-HDQ
Jamie Jameson, Fluor Fernald
Terry Hagen, Fluor Fernald
Tim Poff, Fluor Fernald

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS ON
"TRANSMITTAL OF THE 2002 SITE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT"

FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section No.: 2.1 Page No.: 20 Line No.: Not Applicable (NA)
Original Specific Comment No.: 1
Comment: The address of the Public Environmental Information
Center is not listed in the document and should be included.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section No.: 2.1.2 Page No.: 26 Line No.: NA
Original Specific Comment No.: 2
Comment: The volume of contaminated soil removed from each area
is not listed and should be included.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section No.: 2.2.4 Page No.: 35 Line No.: NA
Original Specific Comment No.: 3
Comment: The text states, "Other informational notifications
were made as deemed appropriate." A list or general
examples of these notifications should be included.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section No.: 3.2 Pages No.: 44 and 45 Line No.: NA
Original Specific Comment No.: 4
Comment: Figures 3-1 and 3-2 do not show groundwater flow
direction. Groundwater flow direction is in Figure 3-8;
however, the extraction and reinjection wells are not shown.
A figure should be included that shows the current
30-microgram-per-liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) total uranium plume,
extraction and re-injection wells, and the groundwater flow
direction. In addition, no figures depicting the current
vertical extent of the plume are included in the report. If
groundwater modeling has been completed as stated in the
text, these figures should be included.

Commenting Organization: U.S. EPA Commentor: Saric
Section No.: 3.3.1.1 Page No.: 51 Line No.: NA
Original Specific Comment No.: 5
Comment: Table 3-1 summarizes target pumping rates, total gallons
pumped, and the amount of uranium removed for each
groundwater restoration module. The South Plume
Optimization module, which includes extraction wells 32308

