



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Southwest District

401 East Fifth Street  
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2911TELE: (937)285-6357 FAX: (937)285-6249  
www.epa.state.oh.us

FERNALD \_\_\_\_\_

ING \_\_\_\_\_

Bob Taft, Governor

Bruce Johnson, Lt. Governor

Joseph P. Koncinski, Director

2005 JUN 21 A 11:00

FILE: \_\_\_\_\_

BRADY: \_\_\_\_\_

June 20, 2005

Mr. William Taylor  
US Dept of Energy  
Ohio Field Office  
Fernald Closure Project  
175 Tri County Parkway  
Springdale, Ohio 45246**RE: COMMENTS - DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE LEGACY MANAGEMENT AND  
INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS PLAN**

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Ohio EPA has reviewed DOE's Comprehensive Legacy Management Plan Volume I and Institutional Control Plan Volume 2 DRAFT Final 20013-PL-0001 Rev. C, received on April 21, 2005. Ohio EPA's comment's are enclosed.

If there are any questions, please contact me at (937) 285-6466 or Donna Bohannon at (937) 285-6543.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Schneider  
Fernald Project Manager  
Office of Federal Facilities Oversightcc: Jim Saric U.S. EPA  
Michelle Cullerton, Tetrattech  
Mark Schupe, HSI Geotrans  
Ken Alkema, Fluor Fernald

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 2

**COMPREHENSIVE LEGACY MANAGEMENT  
 AND  
 INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS PLAN**

**GENERAL**

1. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: General                      Page:                      Line:                      Code: C  
 Comment: Community Involvement Plan and the Institutional Control Plan constitute substantial changes to the Community Relations Plan. The CIP should be incorporated into Volume II as a revision to the Community Relations Plan under the enforceable portion of the LMICP.
  
2. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: General                      Pg #:                      Line #:                      Code: C  
 Comment: The LMICP should be written as if it's going to be submitted in it's approvable form. Current status of remediation projects, information to be included at a later date notations, references to decisions yet to be made, etc., all lead to a document that is confusing and inadequate for a thorough review. This manner of document development is going to lead to a protracted review and comment cycle that is to no one's benefit. Ohio EPA strongly recommends a revision of the document prior to January 2006 and in a format that is expected to be approvable.
  
3. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: General                      Page:                      Line:                      Code: C  
 Comment: In order to make the emergency phone number more easily found, the 1-877 number should be included on the cover of Volumes 1 & 2 or at least at the bottom of the executive summary for each volume.
  
4. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: General                      Page:                      Line:                      Code: C  
 Original Comment # 7  
 Comment: The Response to Comments packages should be included with submittal of the revised document. As shown below in the multiple instances where RtCs were not carried forward into the actual document, closer coordination of RtCs and the revised document is needed.

**VOLUME I**

5. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
 Section: General                      Page:                      Line:                      Code: C

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 3

Comment: This document still appears to lack substance. There is little that is truly defined. For example the MUEF would, may, etc., whereas, it either will or will not; the deed/use restrictions are never defined, only the OAC quoted, but how this will be handled is never detailed, etc.

6. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Section 2.4.4                      Page: 16      Line:                      Code: C  
 Comment: The information included in this section and Figure 3 would be more appropriate in Volume II. These specific details have been left out of Volume II and need to be included.

7. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 3.1                      Page: 20      Line:                      Code: C  
 Comment: The discussion of the remote monitoring system must be moved to Volume II. It appears DOE intends to abandon this effort to monitor cap performance. As such abandonment procedures and schedule must be included in Volume II to ensure the integrity of the OSDF cap is maintained. Additionally, a discussion of the basis for eliminating this monitoring program, that took so much money and effort to install, should be included so that reviewers may understand DOE's change in monitoring paradigm.

8. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Section 3.2                      Page: 20      Line:                      Code: C  
 Comment: DOE has failed to include the reburial of Native American initiatives at Fernald in Volume II, but has included it in Volume I. This information would be more appropriate in Vol II. Considering the land remains under federal ownership, DOE, then the land would be considered a resource restriction which means no digging and would fall under a "Governmental Control," which would then be governed through another institutional control via monitoring. As this is a regulatory requirement it must be included in Volume II.

9. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 5.2                      Page: 25      Line: 4<sup>th</sup> bullet      Code: C  
 Comment: This bullet discusses a database of regulatory requirements for legacy management. Obviously this bullet and discussion should be moved to Volume II. Additionally, inclusion of the FIU database as an Attachment to Volume II is appropriate. At a minimum, transmittal of the database to the agencies is needed.

10. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 6-1                      Page: 29      Line:                      Code: C  
 Comment: This table presents information pertinent to long term management of the





Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 6

19. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: CIP 11.0 Page: A.18 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: [www.fernald.gov](http://www.fernald.gov) is a well known site and the domain name should be retained. At a minimum, [fernald.gov](http://fernald.gov) could redirect visitors to the OLM Fernald web site. A future revision of the website should also retain links to related sites.

20. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: CIP 12.0 Page: A.19 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: Add under Post-Closure that the site will become accessible to the public with the exclusion of a fenced on-site disposal facility.

21. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: CIP Attachment B Page: B.1 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: Addresses for Bill Taylor and Johnny Reising are out of date since October 2004. Under Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, change the current listing to: Fernald Project Coordinator, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, 401 East Fifth Street, Dayton OH 45402-2911, (937) 285-6357, [www.epa.state.oh.us](http://www.epa.state.oh.us)

In general, contacts should be as generic as possible so this document remains applicable in the future.

## VOLUME II

22. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: General Page: Line: Code: C  
 Comment: Since the LMICP references the IEMP throughout and is the document for much of the stewardship monitoring activities, it was Ohio EPA's expectation that it would be included in the current version of the LMICP and our assumption was DOE would include it, rather than waiting until the final version in January 2006. It would have only been to DOE's benefit to include everything that was planned to be in the LMICP and saved DOE time if any changes were needed to be made, and incorporated into the final document. It even appears the document assumed it would be attached do to numerous references to it as an attachment. Partial submittals of the document only lead to additional confusion and delay in final approval.

23. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: General Page: Line: Code: C  
 Comment: The documents in general contain numerous references to activities/information that would be included at some future undetermined date. With DOE's date for "closure" fast approaching, it is imperative that these place holders be replaced with substantive details. In nearly all cases, the next revision should

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 7

replace place holders with actual details. In the few instances where information is still outstanding and place holders must be included, DOE should highlight the missing information via a footnote that provides the date for inclusion of that missing information/action. An attachment should be generated that then lists the footnotes and tracks them for revision and inclusion. Partial submittals of the document only lead to additional confusion and delay in final approval.

24. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: General Comment Pg #:                      Line #:                      Code: c  
 Original Comment# 46

Comment: The plan should provide additional detail regarding how DOE intends to implement enforcement of the ICs. This will be particularly important if a land management contractor is used. Details regarding the steps DOE will take to enforce and contingency plans for failures should be included so a clear path of action is laid out for future stewards and regulators. DOE will always retain responsibility for ensuring ICs are in place and not violated.

25. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 1.0                      Page: 1                      Line:                      Code: C

Comment: Only the OU5 ROD is cited within this section and thus incorporated as a reference. Citations for the other RODs should be included as well. In addition, discussion and reference to the various ROD amendments are necessary for the reviewer to understand the current state of the site remediation in relation to what the original RODs call for.

26. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 1.0                      Pg #: 1                      Line #: OU5 Bullet                      Code: C

Comment: The text provides a citation for the original OU5 ROD then goes on to state that document describes remediation to 30ppb. This information is incorrect and as stated in the previous comment will lead to confusion on the part of future reviewers who would review the cited ROD and find a 20ppb cleanup level. Without citation of respective ROD modifications, reviewers will be left with confusion at best and at worst the belief the cleanup was not completed in the manner laid out in the decision documents.

27. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 1.0                      Pg #: 1                      Line #:                      Code: C

Comment: The paragraph starting "As of March 2005..." does not add benefit to the document and only set's up an additional section that will require modification with each submittal of the plan. If for some reason a current remediation status is needed with each submittal, the table in Appendix A should be more than sufficient and more easily

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 8

changed out.

28. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 1.0 Page: 2 Line: Code: C  
 Original Comment #44

Comment: This sentence describes briefly what will remain on-site after closure. The text should clearly state what areas, infrastructures, etc., will be left at Fernald to remediate following closure, i.e., GMA, soil around utilities, and other specific areas. Section 2.4.4 in Volume I discusses briefly "uncertified areas" and provides a Figure designating these areas. The IC Plan should specifically delineate all areas which will remain unremediated/uncertified and those controls necessary to maintain them as protective under the planned site use. DOE's November 2004 RtC #60 states that such detail was to be provided in this document, however it still remains absent.

29. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 1.0 & Fig 1 Pg #: 2 Line #: NA Code: C  
 Comment: The description does not seem to support Figure 1 (e.g. OSDF 123 acres, OSDF 75 acres).

30. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 1.0 & Figure 1 Page: 2 Line: Code: C  
 Original Comment#: 25

Comment: DOE's RtC for Comment #41, states as does the EA, that a decision regarding the 23 acres will be re-evaluated in 2004. The text in this document reflects neither of these. The document should be revised to specifically state when and how DOE will address the status of the 23 acres. The fact that DOE continues to ignore this issue puts doubt on the rest of the issues left undetermined in this document. Though brief mention of the 23 acres is provided in Volume I, the regulatory nature of the required decision and its effects on the rest of the property necessitates its inclusion in Volume II.

31. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 1.1 Pg #: 4 Line #: Code: C  
 Comment: The section incorrectly references the OMMP, PCCIP, GLDLMP and IEMP as appendices, when the actual sections are titled attachments.

32. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 1.1 Pg #: 4 Line #: Code: C  
 Comment: The section states that the IEMP is attached however no IEMP was included in the submittal provided to Ohio EPA. Inclusion of this attachment is essential to being able to provide a thorough review of the document.

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 9

33. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 1.1 Pg #: 4 Line #: NA Code: E  
 Comment: Revise the first "be" from the second to last sentence in this section to "being".
34. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 1.4 Page: 6 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: This section on "Types of Institutional Controls" appears to be leaving out a couple different kinds of institutional controls that apply to Fernald and the OSDF. According to DOE's Draft Guide on the Use of Institutional Controls, the first bulleted item in this section should also include such controls as structural, nonstructural, active and passive.
35. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 1.5 Pg #: 6 Line #: Code: C  
 Comment: In order to comply with the OU5 ROD and Ohio Revised Code 5301.80, et seq., Ohio EPA believes the development of an environmental covenant to address the site as a whole and the OSDF in particular is necessary. This covenant would be recognized by the officials responsible for the recordation of real property documents in Ohio and will be enforceable by DOE and the State of Ohio. The covenant would address land use restrictions required in the OU2 and OU5 RODs as well as the LMICP. Additionally, this covenant would address the property use restriction ARARs for the OSDF listed in Attachment B, Table 2-1.
36. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: Table 2-1& 2-2 Pg #: 7-8 Line #: NA Code: C  
 Comment: Here and elsewhere in this document the indefinite term "may" is used (e.g. "An MUEF may provide information..., ...access may need to be limited..."). In an enforceable CERCLA document, indefinite terms are inappropriate and should be replaced by definite terms (e.g. "There will be routine patrols...")
37. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 2-1 & 2-2 Page: 7-8 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: The term "routine" which is used in the "Frequency" column needs to be defined. Routine could mean daily, weekly, or monthly. However as the text is written, there is no way of knowing. Clarify.
38. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 2-1 & 2-2 Page: 7-8 Line: Proprietary Controls Code: C  
 Comment: The points of contact "scope" section is different between the Tables 2-1 and 2-2. It will be important to have a consistent set of points of contact throughout the

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 10

LMICP. Differing contacts in various sections will only lead to confusion.

39. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 2-1 & 2-2 Page: 7-8 Line: Governmental Controls Code: C  
 Comment: As stated previously, Ohio EPA believes it is necessary to establish an environmental covenant to address the site and it should be included as a government control. Additionally, this covenant would address the property use restriction ARARs for the OSDF listed in Attachment B, Table 2-1.

40. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 2.2 Page: 8 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: The heading for the last two items in the first column should be changed from "Preventing the unauthorized use of the OSDF" to "Preventing the unauthorized access of the OSDF".

41. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 2.1.1 Page: 9 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: This section refers to an interim residual risk assessment that is not referenced elsewhere within the document. An additional discussion of this document, how it is to be developed, and how DOE expects it to effect site use prohibitions should be included.

42. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 2.1.1 Page: 9 Line: Code: C  
 Original Comment#: 58  
 Comment: Until such time as a more in-depth evaluation/discussion of the issue is completed it may be appropriate to include fishing in the list of prohibited activities. This is an issue that should be discussed/considered and made, involving all the appropriate parties including the Fernald Trustees, the FCAB, Ohio EPA, US EPA and the designated land manager, whom has not been assigned to date for the Fernald site. Apparently DOE hasn't determined who will manage the exposure, if this scenario is to become a reality. The final Land Manager will also want to accept this responsibility if fishing is allowed. Considering the possible delays in completing and agreeing upon an interim residual risk assessment some decision is needed in the near term.

43. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 2.1.1 Page: 9 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: An additional bullet that might be worth incorporating, "No tampering, manipulating or damage of structures, fences, signs, water control devices, or other federal property."



Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 12

Section #: 2.1.3.2 Pg #: 12 Line #: NA Code: C

Comment: The first part of this section states that there will be routine patrols and the last part that local law enforcement authorities will make routine patrols around the perimeter. Please state specifically who will be conducting the routine patrols. The site bridges two counties and the only local authority would be the county sheriff. What agreements/arrangements are there with each of the counties to conduct routine patrols?

49. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW

Section #: 2.1.3.3 Pg #: 12 Line #: NA Code: C

Comment: Who specifically will be organizing and conducting formal site property inspections?

50. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO

Section: Figure 2 Page: 11 Line: Code: C

Comment: The graphic suggests gates are to be in place at all vehicle access points. Does this mean DOE intends to reinstall gates at all the western property boundary drives where the gates were just removed? What was the basis for removing the gates in the first place if they are only to be reinstalled for post-closure?

51. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO

Section: Figure 2 Page: 11 Line: Code: C

Comment: The graphic suggests individual fencing and signage around the wells on the southern property boundary, signs on the SWU/WP well houses but no signs on the well houses in the south central portion of the site. What is the basis for the inconsistent approach?

52. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO

Section #: 2.2.2 Pg #: 13 Line #: Code: C

Original Comment # 66

Comment: The document should include copies of all real estate notifications and restrictions to be utilized. Additionally it must provide specific detail on how and where these restrictions will be implemented. DOE's November 2004 RtC committed to inclusion of the copies or reference to document location, neither of these actually done.

53. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO

Section: 2.2.2 Page: 13 Line: Code: C

Comment: In order to comply with the OU5 ROD and Ohio Revised Code 5301.80, et seq., Ohio EPA believes the development of an environmental covenant to address the site as a whole and the OSDF in particular is necessary. This covenant would be recognized by the officials responsible for the recordation of real property documents in



Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 14

59. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 3.1.2 Pg #: 14 Line #: NA Code: C  
 Comment: All point discharges are subject to NPDES permitting requirements thus it is possible that an NPDES permit may be required following completion of the ground water remedy.
60. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 3-1 Page: 15 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: Reference to inspection of the outfall line soil cover is not included in the this table and should be as it is should be a part of the surface water discharge inspection.
61. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 3-2 Page: 18 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: Why is late fall mowing being used as the standard mowing time? Is this based upon a management approach to maximize native grass establishment and vigor? If not it should be, or at least a basis for this time frame provided. It is the reviewer's understanding that spring mowing ~May is best for establishment of warm season grasses by cutting the non-native cool season grasses/weeds prior to their seeding and before the warm-season grasses have achieved much height. Additionally, the standing grasses, even dead stems, over the winter will help increase evapotranspiration of moisture off the cap during a usually wet time.
62. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 3-2 Page: 19 Line: Other OSDF Monit. Code: C  
 Comment: Additional detail regarding this DOE order requirement for a site wide monitoring program should be included. It is not clear why this information is not readily available and what about the site or the order will change between now and some future version of the plan. The next revision of the LMICP should include details about how this requirement is being met.
63. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: Table 3-2/Section 3.2.3 Page: 18/22 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: The section describes two possible alternatives for managing low flow leachate, whereas the table only lists off-site treatment. If it is possible DOE will consider and propose on-site treatment for the low flow leachate, then that should be consistent and clear in the document.
64. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section: 3.2.1 Page: 21 Line: Code: C  
 Comment: The incorporation of management criteria for the cap vegetation is a substantial improvement. Though 50% native grass cover might be a sufficient











Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 20

90. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 3.3                      Pg #: 3-6      Line #: NA      Code: C

Original Comment: #101

Comment: There doesn't appear to be anywhere these features in the constructed wetlands are addressed. They are not part of the OSDF GWLMP (with the exception of the OSDF monitoring wells on the perimeter of the A1PI wetlands). The A1PI wetlands have their own piezometers, depth marker, etc. These structures need to be addressed specifically and included in the maps. Note that they must also be included in the IEMP. Again this was noted as Original Comment#: 101, and RtC#117.

91. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 4.4                      Pg #: 4-2      Line #: NA      Code: C

Comment: The address provided for the point of contact is not correct and has been the wrong address since last October. This section should be revised to provide the correct address along with a consistent set of points of contact throughout the LMICP.

92. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 4.5                      Pg #: 4-3      Line #: NA      Code: C

Comment: The deed restriction requirements of the ARARs are not just applicable upon transfer of the property but speak to the property immediately and in perpetuity. These ARARs are probably best achieved through an environmental covenant on the property via Ohio Revised Code 5301.80, et seq.

93. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 5.4                      Pg #: 5-2      Line #: NA      Code: C

Comment: The other monitoring needs to be further defined. This is yet another example of a non-committal statement where something might happen. State specifically what will happen, how frequently, etc.

94. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 6.2.2                      Pg #: 6-3                      Line #: NA      Code: C

Comment: This is similar to our original comment 107. Existing text only specifies general health and cover, but does not address the native component, a design consideration of the OSDF. Managing for native cover may include techniques not currently known to us. There are two issues, one is that the criteria should include specifying native or required vegetation cover and health, the other is to discuss management strategies that maintain/increase native herbaceous cover. The discussion and procedures from Section 3.2.1 of Volume 2 should be provided here in more detail.

95. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 21

Section #: Table 7.1 Pg #: 7-2 Line #: Invasive vegetation Code: C  
 Comment: This states that "Species identification and abundance determination will be conducted if/when large trees or shrubs invade the vegetative cover of the OSDF." Surveys of herbaceous vegetation need to be made on a schedule other than when woody vegetation appears. Herbaceous vegetation surveys are needed to be sure the proper cover plants are present.

96. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 8.0 Pg #: NA Line #: NA Code: C  
 Comment: This section should include a seed specification for the cover so that acceptable (per the design criteria) replacement cover is planted should the need arise.

97. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: DSW  
 Section #: 8.1 Pg #: 8-1 Line #: NA Code: C  
 Comment: The statement "Seeding and mulching repaired areas or areas that are lacking vegetative cover" should read "Seeding and mulching repaired areas or areas that are lacking required vegetative cover."

98. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 11.3 Pg #: 11-2 Line #: NA Code: C  
 Comment: Ohio EPA strongly disagrees with DOE's assertion that Ohio EPA is only limited to a review role in modifications to the OSDF PCCIP. It is Ohio EPA's position that with regard to implementation of Ohio regulations and requirements applying to management of the OSDF that Ohio has not only review and approval authority but enforcement authority should DOE fail to follow those requirements.

### **Attachment C Groundwater/Leak Detection and Leachate Monitoring Plan**

99. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: Summary of Changes Pg #: 1 Line #: 2<sup>nd</sup> item Code: c  
 Comment: The Ohio Administrative Code and the Ohio Revised Code define the term "leachate". Ohio EPA finds it unacceptable to attempt to confuse or allude compliance with the ARARs by attempting a semantic change. The proposed change in wording is unacceptable to Ohio EPA.

### **Attachment C, Appendix B PSP for the OSDF Monitoring Program**

100. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 2.4.1 Pg #: 6 Line #: 2nd from last sentence Code: c

Mr. William Taylor  
 June 20, 2005  
 Page 22

Comment: The text states that if flows from the LDS and LCS lines are too slow to collect a sample, a grab would be taken from the respective tank using a Teflon bailer. This raises questions about the independence of the samples considering that the tanks are emptied annually and the lines are sampled quarterly. Will the data be evaluated using a statistical method which required sample independence?

101. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #:                      Pg #:                      Line #:                      Code: general

Comment: This Plan makes no mention of the remote monitors installed on the Cell 1 cap. Text in the Legacy Management Plan (Volume1) implies that the monitors will be abandoned in place. Provide a commitment and a time schedule to either remove and properly abandon the monitoring devices or develop a plan for collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and recording the data.

**Attachment C, Appendix D  
 Leachate Management System for the OSDF**

102. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #: 2.0                      Pg #: D-1                      Line #:                      Code: c

Comment: This section describes the design and basic operation of the OSDF leachate management system. We recall from several years ago discussing the possibility of leaks from electrofusion couplings in the LCS line from Cell 1 as a source of contamination in the Cell 1 LDS drainage layer. It is our recollection that this was only an issue in Cell 1 and perhaps Cell 2. The other laterals were built using the butt-fused joints.

A sketch showing the penetration of the LDS drainage layer by the LCS lateral line should be attached to this section and a bullet added to the text which discusses this issue. It might be appropriate to add this to the list of sources of "LDS fluids" (construction water, consolidation water, primary liner leakage, etc.) in places in other documents where the source of LDS flows are discussed.

103. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
 Section #:                      Pg #:                      Line #:                      Code: c

Comment: The original design of the manholes (since replaced by valve houses) had provisions to replace valves and plumbing with straight spool pieces at an indefinite time in the future when flows were deemed to negligible. We recall that this provision was made because straight runs of pipe were considered more likely to achieve the long design life of the OSDF.

A reference to the appropriate section of design package should be included. A section should be added discussing the criteria for removing the spool pieces (low flows, no evidence of leakage of the LCS layer which drive a need to separately quantify the LDS

Mr. William Taylor  
June 20, 2005  
Page 23

and LCS flows, etc.).

In a similar vein, we cannot find a mention of the plan to D&D the valve houses. Is this topic addressed in a different plan?

104. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: OFFO  
Section #:                      Pg #:                      Line #:                      Code: c  
Comment: This Plan does not mention the possibility of installing a passive leachate treatment system in the future. A section should be added to this Plan which outlines some of the criteria which must be met prior to installing passive treatment (flow volumes, concentration and treatability of hazardous leachate constituents, shut down of CAWWT, etc.). The performance objectives should also be outlined.

**Attachment D**  
**Integrate Environmental Monitoring Plan**

105. Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA                      Commentor: DSW  
Section #: Attachment D                      Pg #: NA                      Line #: NA                      Code: C  
Comment: DOE has failed to include the IEMP document in this current version of the LMICP. It must be included in the next version of this document.