

CORRES CONTROL
OUTGOING LTR NO

88 RF 3403



Rocky Flats Plant
Aerospace Operations
Rockwell International Corporation
P O Box 464
Golden Colorado 80402-0464
(303) 966-7000

Rockwell
International

Contractor to U S Department of Energy

October 26, 1988

88-RF-3403

Albert E. Whiteman
Area Manager
DOE, RFAO

DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS BY EPA ON 881 HILLSIDE
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY (RI/FS)

Attn. C. C. Jierree and K. J. Schneider

Attached for your review are three (3) copies of our draft responses to comments by EPA on the March 1, 1988 RI/FS Reports. One of the copies is for transmittal to Los Alamos National Laboratory for their review.

We are prepared to discuss these responses with you at your earliest convenience prior to arranging a meeting with the Colorado Department of Health and EPA. Please call Tom Greengard, on extension 7121, to arrange a DOE/Rockwell meeting or if you have questions that you want to discuss prior to the meeting.

K. B. McKinley
RCRA/CERCLA Program

Orig. & 1 cc - A E. Whiteman
Enc.

DIST	LTR	ENCL
SANCHINI D J	X	
BADER C P		
ERFURDT R J		
HEINTZ ER		
HOOD R C		
IDEKER EH		
KINZER J E		
KIRBY W A		
MCNETT J F		
MEYERS G W		
ROECKER J H		
SHANNON W M		
SMITH RE		
WESTON W F	X	
WOZNAK B D		
YOUNG ER		
BETCHER D H		
CARNIVAL G J		
FERRERA D W		
HARMAN L K		
HEBERT J L		
HOEY J B		
HOFFMAN R B		
KLAMANN R L		
KRIEG D M		
LOUDENBURG GE		
McKINLEY K B	X	X
NAIMON E R		
NEWBY R L		
TURNER H L		
VELASQUEZ R N		
CORRES CONTROL	X	X
BLAHA F	X	X
BLAKESLEE J	X	X
GREENGARD, T	X	X
FRICK, L. O.	X	X
HOBBS F.	X	X
JAMES, R. E.	X	X
LEWIS, B.	X	X
CLASSIFICATION		
UNCLASSIFIED	X	
CONFIDENTIAL		
SECRET		

AUTH CLASSIFIER SIG
B. L. Miller (C)
10-27-88

DATE
IN REPLY TO LTR NO

DEC #
LTR APPROVALS

ADMIN RECORD

DRAFT

EVALUATION OF RESPONSES TO EPA COMMENTS ON THE 881 HILLSIDE RI/FS

REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

SECTION 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment 3 The discussion of trace element and TDS variability should also indicate that these parameters are useful in groundwater characterization and related the related task of characterizing groundwater communication

The last paragraph suggests that trace elements and TDS are only applicable to monitoring the success of remediation In areas where data are ambiguous concerning the presence of contamination, trace elements and TDS are potentially important in defining impacted areas of the plume where the prime contaminants have not migrated due to sorption or geologic heterogeneities The response should indicate that these parameters will be considered in evaluating the potential extent of contamination

Comment 4 The commentor has a valid point in that the TDS values for wells 5-87 (1314-1712 mg/l), 59-86 (812-1047), and 8-87 (1232-1220) are factors of 2 to 3 greater than the background range from wells 46-86, 48-86, 52-86, and 54-86 (129 - 433 mg/l) This is supported by other bedrock wells within the plant site that are generally below 400 mg/l with a few between 400 and 600 mg/l Exceptions to this are wells 34-86 (at S Walnut near the PSZ) at 1779-1813 mg/l and 40-86 (downgradient of the 903 Pad) at 1011 mg/l Because these wells are somewhat distant from sources of concentrated contamination, they should be mentioned as indicators of background TDS variability

SECTION 2. INTRODUCTION

Comment 2. The argument presented would be strengthened by including some basis statistics concerning Sr89,90 at the 881 Hillside and in the background wells Sr89,90 is detected in wells west of the site $\mu=1.2$ pCi/l, $s=1.1$, and the maximum well 56-86 is 4.01 pCi/l (from RI Appendix F-2) Sr89,90 levels in alluvial wells at the 881 Hillside are as follows: $\mu=2.0$ pCi/l, $s=1.45$ pCi/l, and the maximum is 4.59 pCi/l (from RI Appendix F-4) Bedrock Sr89,90 at the 881 Hillside are as also follows $\mu=1.1$ pCi/l, $s=0.9$, and the maximum is 3.4 pCi/l (from RI Appendix F-5) Appendix F-4 lists one sample Sr89,90 sample in each of wells 64-86 and 65-86 at "NR" and 1.74 pCi/l, respectively Therefore, the statement that Sr89,90 is detected in these wells is true but it is barely above background A basic t-test would probably show the difference to be insignificant

Comment 6 Although it is agreed that most radionuclide backgrounds cannot be zero, the comment is requiring the RI to conservatively assume activity of zero when the error bounds of the measurement include zero The response is unclear in that establishing MDAs does not eliminate the problem For example, given the MDA of 0.2 for isotopic plutonium, will a background

DRAFT

measurement of 0.18 ± 0.19 pCi/l be conservatively interpreted as zero? The response must address how these situations will be interpreted. Also, it should be pointed out that not all background uncertainties exceed the mean. Particularly for the only "true" background well left, 55-86 U238 is at 0.115 ± 0.054 pCi/l (55-86-10-01-87). Finally, there are some radiochemistry errors evident in Appendix F-2, several gross beta sample have uncertainties of zero and there are no error bounds for Sr89,90.

SECTION 4: WASTE SOURCE CHARACTERIZATION

Comment 2 The discussion of soil sampling methods is confusing in that it implies that discrete samples and intervals deeper than one foot were for background characterization. Since the comment only addresses background characterization and not sampling technique, the discussion should be dropped.

Comment 9. How were these averages derived? Calculations from the RI Appendix F-2 radiochemistry data do not confirm (see Attachment 1). There are also some suspicious numbers in the Am-241 and Pu-238,239 data: the number of Am-241 -0.04 pCi/l results (Is this a lower detection limit?), ± 0.32 values for Pu-238,239, and the 0.11 Pu-238,239 results.

Comments 10, 11, 12,13: The RI team should be advised that the guidelines for organic data validation they reference (EPA, 1985) have been replaced with new guidance (EPA, 1988). EPA (1988) has replaced requirements for blank contamination levels (i.e. contaminant concentrations less than the Contract Required Quantitation Limit (CRQL) or $5 \times$ CRQL for the common lab contaminants listed) (EPA, 1985, p 21-22) with the criteria that "no contaminants should be present in the blanks" (EPA, 1988, p 12). Although there has not been a change in the definition of a reportable organic quantity if lab contamination exists, the "allowable" levels of common lab contaminants is no longer quantified and has presumably been reduced. Thus, the issue EPA will raise is not a definition of field contamination based on blank contamination, but the level of blank contamination itself. The RI team has taken a good approach in assuming all organic contamination is real and arguing that the risk assessment indicates the consequences are minimal.

A minor point, but one that will probably cause some concern with the regulators concerns the language dropping constituents "from further consideration as contaminants." Considering EPA/CDH's comment on the 903 Pad that the RI should not interpret data, the revised 881 Hillside RI should consider these constituents as contaminants and reference the risk assessment to indicate that they are "insignificant" contaminants.

Comment 11: The use of the 45% variance to increase the ion count threshold seems "dubious." Compounding noisy data with its own noise would appear to be an artificial way to raise the level of significant counts. The RI team should be conservative and use PETREXes recommended 1,000 count cutoff without invoking additional statistics. This approach strikes one as "slight-of-hand."

DRAFT

Comment 17 See comment 11

Comment 21 Have these geometric means been corrected for bias when transformed back from the lognormal distribution? Same response for FS Appendix 2, Comment 1.

Comment 24 The cited tabulations are missing.

Comment 27 The discussion of bedrock contamination at 9-74 is confusing on two counts. First, if the geologic log and completion details are not known, the RI team cannot be certain of screening solely in claystone. If this is a composite well, the statement that bedrock groundwater contamination exist at 9-74 has no basis. Second, the discussion of 9-74 contamination of BH57-87 and well 43-87 does not recognize that these locations are topographically and hydraulically upgradient of 9-74. Therefore, the only driving force for contamination to move from 9-74 to BH57-87/43-87 is insignificant diffusion.

Comment 28 Comment 11,12,13,14 of Section 4.0, second paragraph, applies to this discussion of the risk assessment. Also, "significant" should be "insignificant."

SECTION 6.0. SURFACE WATER

Comment 1 The commentor is possibly addressing the efficiency of the South Interceptor Ditch (SID) in intercepting runoff. Since the SID parallels topography, runoff from low intensity precipitation events may pond in SID depressions thereby infiltrating into colluvium upgradient of Woman Creek. The response should demonstrate that this is insignificant due to low volume and infiltration rates.

Comment 3 The depth of alluvium at wells 69-86, 2-87, and 47-87 (13 3, 8 75, and 7 0) together with an "eyeball" inspection of the SID trench would suggest that perhaps as much as the lower half of the alluvium is not intercepted. Are there construction records indicating where bedrock was intercepted?

Comment 8 Where is the blank data for SED-1 and SED-2?

SECTION 9.0. PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Response to Comment 1 -

The nature of the RI is to gather existing information and to determine, among other things, the background levels for selected constituents. This study was conducted to fulfill that purpose and as the result, background levels of various constituents have been proposed. The quality and quantity of data acquired in a retrospective study is limited and to some extent conclusions may

DRAFT

be partially unsupported. However, based on the conclusions drawn and those of the risk assessment (which selectively used worst cases), unacceptable risks to the public could be posed by consumption of alluvial ground water. As stated in the conclusion of Section 9.0, a feasibility study has been proposed.

Additional data or information gathering at this time would be of minimal value. Since the 881 Hillside study is but a small part of the Rocky Flats Plant, a further determination of cause and effect of 881 based on site data is fruitless. Eventually, it is likely that it will be necessary to repeat some of the background studies for the plant site. Such a survey would allow better comparisons with historical site data than will comparing recent potential environmental results (881 data) with site data.

Response to Comment 3

The majority of historical surveys for indigenous fauna are contained within the reference.

DOE (U S Department of Energy), "Final Environmental Impact Statement, Rocky Flats Plant Site, " DOE/EIS-0064, Washington, D C , April 1980

Other historical data can be found in Appendix II rather than Appendix G. For additional references, see

- Bly, J A , and F W Whicker, "Plutonium Concentrations in Anthropods at a Nuclear Facility," Health Physics, 37 331-336, September 1979
- Little, C.A , F.W. Whicker, and T F Winsor, "Plutonium in a Grassland Ecosystem at Rocky Flats," J. Environ. Qual., 9 350-354, 1980
- Paine, D., "Plutonium in Rocky Flats Freshwater Systems," from Transuranic Elements in the Environment, edited by Wayne C Hanson, Technical Information Center, U.S. DOE / TIC - 22800, 1980
- Wicker, F.W , "Radioecology of Natural Systems -- Final Report, "COO-1156-11, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, October 31, 1979
- Winsor, T F , and F W Whicker, "Pocket Gophers and Redistribution of Plutonium in Soil," Health Physics, August, 1980

ANALYTICAL PROGRAM, QUALITY ASSURANCE, AND DATA MANAGEMENT

Comment 1 ?

DRAFT

Comment 2 The response to this comment should include discussion of the level of contamination observed in the blanks. The best way to accomplish this would be through comparison with other CLP or CLP equivalent laboratories.

DRAFT

FEASIBILITY STUDY

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Comments 7, 10, and others: The commentors are primarily concerned with the implementation of the screening procedure as they have referenced in the March 1988 guidance rather than the result of the screening itself. It is apparent that the criteria used are equivalent to the new guidance and the implementation of it in the revised FS will change nothing.

SECTION 3.0. SCREENING OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

Comment 2 Will the revised FS address applying for variance of metals whose background is demonstrated to be above applicable ARAR?

Comment 5: The geotechnical stability the commentor is referring to probably concerns disrupting the french drain gravel by slumping of upslope alluvium.

Comment 8 The revised FS should contain all such calculations (i.e. 0.04 gpm) in an appendix to delay further comments.

*Check
to 7/25/85*

SECTION 4.0. DETAILED EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

Comment 7 How has the effectiveness of the Building 881 footing drain been demonstrated? If there is no evidence that it is fully functional, it should not be used as an example of the expected effectiveness of the french drain.

Comment 8 The revised FS should provide a reference for these compaction hydraulic conductivities.

APPENDIX 1. RISK ASSESSMENT

Comment 2. The response should indicate that the intricacies of the problem do not have to be exhaustively examined to identify, surround, and treat the area of contamination. In addition, the weak point in the treatment system, bedrock contamination, will be monitored.

Comment 9 The commentor has a point. Although these are all isolated organic hits, they are not associated with laboratory blank contamination. However, it should be argued that the risk associated with the organics in surface water (if conservatively assumed as significant) is minimal since the concentrations are below those used in the risk assessment for groundwater and would volatilize before traveling to the site boundary. Strontium and uranium cannot be addressed until better resolution of background is obtained.

Comment 10 This can be addressed by indicating the supposed concentrations of uranium in ponds C-1 and C-2 are below ARAR.

DRAFT

Comment 11 For the sake of completion, risks associated with volatilization of organics at the 881 Hillside should be addressed

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 1

Am-241 and Pu-239,240 in 881 Hillside Alluvial Groundwater

10-81-05-11-87
 10-81-06-18-87
 10-81-08-21-87
 -0 04
 47-86-05-13-87
 47-86-06-22-87
 47-86-08-14-87
 47-86-10-06-87
 49-86-04-08-87
 49-86-06-18-87
 49-86-08-25-87
 49-86-12-15-87
 50-86-05-11-87
 50-86-06-16-87
 50-86-08-14-87
 50-86-12-11-87
 51-86-05-13-87
 51-86-06-17-87
 51-86-08-20-87
 51-86-12-11-87
 55-86-05-18-87
 55-86-05-27-87
 55-86-07-14-87
 55-86-10-01-87
 55-86-10-01-87
 55-86D-07-14-87
 56-86-05-19-87
 86-86-05-27-87
 56-86-07-15-87
 56-86-10-01-87
 56-86-10-01-87
 average
 55-86 average

Well	Am-241		Pu-239,240	
	x	var	x	var
10-81-05-11-87	0	1.2	0.1	0.7
10-81-06-18-87	0	1.2	0.32	0.77
10-81-08-21-87	-0.04	0.56	-0.32	0.46
47-86-05-13-87	0	1.5	0.08	0.71
47-86-06-22-87	0	1.2	0	0.7
47-86-08-14-87	-0.04	0.82	0.11	0.78
47-86-10-06-87	0	0.05	0.11	0.14
49-86-04-08-87	0	4.4	0	2.2
49-86-06-18-87	0	1.3	0.42	0.82
49-86-08-25-87	0.03	0.45	-0.32	0.64
49-86-12-15-87			0	0.18
50-86-05-11-87	0	2	1	1
50-86-06-16-87	0	1.2	0	0.67
50-86-08-14-87	-0.04	0.43	-0.32	0.65
50-86-12-11-87	0	0.19	0	0.1
51-86-05-13-87	0	1.2	0	0.71
51-86-06-17-87	0	1.3	0.29	0.8
51-86-08-20-87	-0.04	0.47	-1.6	0.6
51-86-12-11-87	0	0.19	0	0.14
55-86-05-18-87	0	4.2	0.03	0.65
55-86-05-27-87	0	1.2	0.07	0.82
55-86-07-14-87	-0.04	0.44	-0.14	0.53
55-86-10-01-87	-0.022	0.16	0.03	0.042 0.05
55-86-10-01-87	0	0.16	0	0.06
55-86D-07-14-87	-0.04	0.56	0.04	0.57
56-86-05-19-87	0	1.3	0.28	0.7
86-86-05-27-87	0	1.2	0.003	0.76
56-86-07-15-87	-0.04	0.59	0	0.46
56-86-10-01-87			0.001	0.05
56-86-10-01-87	0	0.17	0	0.05
average	-0.01		0.007	
55-86 average	-0.017			0.007

check 0.000 vs 0.00

ANNOTATED TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 10 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Soil Gas/SWMU Definition	
2	SWMU 177	
3	General Bedrock Contamination	
4	TDS Contamination in Bedrock	
5	Volatile Organic Contamination in Bedrock	
6	Metal Contamination in Bedrock	
7	General Bedrock Contamination	
8	Volatile Organics in Woman Creek Surface Water	
9	Water Quality of Surface Water Discharges	

SECTION 20 INTRODUCTION

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Volatile Organics in Ground and Surface Water	
2	Strontium	
3	Uranium, Strontium, and TCE in SID and Woman Creek	

SECTION 40 WASTE SOURCES CHARACTERIZATION

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Background Characterization Needed for Risk Assessment	
2	Background Characterization of Soils	
3	SWMU 61/SWMU Analysis	
4	Metals in Soils	
5	Metals in Alluvial Groundwater/Risk Assessment	
6	Radionuclide Background	
7	Radionuclide Background	
8	Radionuclide Background in Soils	
9	Radionuclide Background in Soils	
10	Volatile Organic Laboratory Artifact/Blank	
11	Acetone in Soils	
12	2-Butanone in Soils	
13	BEHP in Soils	
14	SWMU 102/Organics in Soil	
15	SWMU 103/Organics in Soil	
16	SWMU 105/Organics in Soil	
17	SWMU 106/Organics in Soil	
18	Organics in Soil/Blanks	
19	SWMU 119 1/Organics in Soil	
20	SWMU 119 2/Organics in Soil	
21	SWMU 130/Organics in Soil-	

SECTION 50 SITE HYDROGEOLOGY

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Geologic Logs	
2	Lignite Layers/Transport of Contaminants	
3	Springs and Seeps	
4	Groundwater Flow Velocities	
5	Gravel Lenses/Colluvium	
6	Vertical Gradients	
7	Packer Tests	
8	Aquifer Tests	
9	Aquifer Tests	
10	Correlations Along Dip	
11	Volatile Organics/Groundwater	
12	Background Characterization	
13	Background Characterization	
14	Background Characterization	
15	Radionuclide Background Levels	
16	Radionuclide Background Levels	
17	Geologic Logs/Background Characterization to Bedrock	
18	Radionuclide Background Levels	
19	Radionuclide Background Levels	
20	Laboratory Blanks/SWMU Delineation	
21	Bedrock Contamination	

22	Groundwater Flow Velocities
23	Vertical Gradient/Groundwater Communication
24	Metals in Bedrock
25	Radionuclides in Bedrock
26	Uranium Ratios
27	Organics in Bedrock
28	Volatile Organics in Bedrock
29	Major Ions in Bedrock
30	Natural Geochemical Environment
31	Discontinuous Gravel Lenses
32	Vertical Gradient/Groundwater Communication
33	Uranium Background in Bedrock
34	Volatile Organics in Bedrock
35	Vertical Gradient/Groundwater Communication Metals Leaching
36	Volatile Organics/Groundwater Communication
37	SWMU 119 2
38	Woman Creek Surface Water/Risk Assessment
39	Groundwater Contamination Conclusion

SECTION 60 SURFACE WATER

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	SID and Woman Creek Communication	
2	Surface Water/Background/Organics	
3	Sodium and Uranium in SID	
4	Organics in SID	

5	Pond C-2 Releases
6	SID Water Quality
7	Volatile Organics and Radionuclides in SID
8	SED Data
9	Radionuclides in SEDs

SECTION 90 PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Background Characterization/Pond C-2 Releases	
2	Pond C-2 Releases/Population at Risk	
3	Ecological Risk Assessment	

SECTION 110 ANALYTICAL PROGRAMS, QUALITY ASSURANCE, AND DATA MANAGEMENT

<u>COMMENT NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Quality Assurance/Data Quality Objective	
2	Laboratory Blank/Artifact	