



**Rocky Mountain
Remediation Services, L.L.C.**
... protecting the environment

Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
P.O. Box 464
Golden, Colorado 80402-0464
Phone: (303) 966-7000



April 1, 1997

Distribution:

TRANSMITTAL FOR THE OU7 PASSIVE SEEP INTERCEPT TREATMENT SYSTEM
MEETING MARCH 31, 1997 - NPC-009-97

The highlights of the OU7 Passive Seep Intercept Treatment System meeting with EPA are attached.

If you have any questions regarding these notes, please contact Marla Broussard at extension 6007.

Norm Cypher
Acting Manager
Water Management & Treatment

AEW

Attachment:
As Stated

Distribution:

DOE
Norma Castaneda

EPA
Jean Lillich
Tim Rehder

Kaiser-Hill
Ann Sieben

RMRS
Corinne Bogert
Marla Broussard
Russ Cirillo
Keith Motyl

cc:
Carl Spreng, CDPH
RMRS Records (2)

A-OU07-000469

ADMIN RECORD

OU7 AGENCY MEETING
Monday, March 31, 1997
9:00 am/T893B-67

OU7 Passive Seep Intercept Treatment System Situation:

K-H Opened: (A. Sieben)

- A. Sieben summed up the situation as the current leachate water quality coming from under landfill contains vinyl chloride (VC) at 2-3ppb.
- The GAC system of treatment has been effective in removing all other contaminants; however, it was not intended to address vinyl chloride.
- GAC is not effective against VC.
- A. Sieben suggested group look at removing from ARAR list. Current agreements have VC written into them.

EPA Response: (T. Rehder)

- EPA is uncomfortable with making the proposed VC change to agreements.
- Wants to be assured that water is at EPA standard.
- Suggested new samples might provide data needed to assess appropriate action.

Discussion:

- J. Schmuck indicated there is no recent seep water data.
- R. Cirillo indicated he has not been sampling the locations (3) because when the treatment agreement was instituted, the landfill area was going to be closed within 18 months. Parameters of treatment were not designed for the long-term.
- T. Rehder would like to see influent data. It may have altered in past 2 years.
- K. Motyl raised the following questions in light of the fact that VC is not removed by GAC treatment:
 - If interim measure is taken away, how would that affect people?
 - Is treatment best? If not, what else could or should be done?
- T. Rehder suggested that, based on older data available, raw water may be right at EPA standard.
- J. Schmuck: GAC is not the effective method of decontamination for VC; air stripping is more effective. Maybe a rock cascade for water to pass over. VC is very volatile.
- M. Broussard: GAC was selected as the treatment for identified contaminants of concern and GAC is not effective in treating VC to meet ARARs and ALF standards. There are no provisions in IM/IRA to change treatment.; ARARs are to be met to the extent practicable. Consequently, is meeting the VC ARAR of 2ppb.
- K. Motyl: Situation may require an evaluation as to whether additional treatment is needed to address VC.
- T. Rehder: Suggested sampling of seep to determine current level of influent VC and risk from VC, and if additional treatment is needed.

- J. Schmuck: Runoff into pond water has never shown a level of contamination to cause concern.
- A. Sieben is concerned about compliance with ALF.
- K. Motyl: If new sampling data readings are above 2, it will trigger an evaluation.
- T. Rehder: Does not want necessarily to see GAC change-out; prefers to see more sampling data first.
- J. Lillich: Wants to see cost evaluation of GAC change-out.
- R. Cirillo: Agreed that samples could be taken from 3 locations over 3 months and that he could show data associated with historical GAC change-outs.
- J. Lillich/T. Rehder asked for samples once/month from 3 locations over next quarter. J. Lillich expressed desire to be present during sampling.
- C. Bogert indicated best time to take samples will be mid-month on a Thursday. Historical data reflects readings at 2-3ppb consistently in effluent.
- A. Sieben: In interim, if data reading is 2ppb, will not change-out; if data reading is 3, will change-out.
- T. Rehder: Once effluent and influent relationship is known, and readings from new samplings are available, an assessment can be made as to appropriate action.
- M. Broussard: Reminder per KFCA, once an assessment is complete, the risk must be ranked and put on the prioritization list. It does not result in an immediate action.

Summary/Actions

- R. Cirillo and C. Bogert will do new sampling over the next quarter (3 months), once per month in 3 different locations pending K-H/DOE approval.
- R. Cirillo will provide the cost of GAC change-out. This is to include both current change-out estimate as well as historical costs incurred.
- K. Motyl: Landfill will likely not be capped and closed for another 5-7 years or more. Landfill will not be added to in the interest of not giving rise to additional amounts of contaminants.
- At the end of 3 months, new data will be assessed and evaluated.