

000025786

27



215 UNION BOULEVARD SUITE 550  
LAKEWOOD CO 80228 1842  
303 980 6800 FAX 303 980 1622

**PROJECT  
FILE**

2029-074-001

20 July 1993

Ms Cindy Gee  
EG&G Rocky Flats Inc  
P O Box 464  
Golden, Colorado 80402 0464

Subject Meeting Minutes 13 July 1993  
Contaminant Selection  
EG&G Operable Unit Number 1  
Roy F Weston, Inc (WESTON) Work Order No 2029-074 001 0020

Dear Ms Gee

Attached are the minutes of the contractor meeting held Tuesday 13 July 1993 to discuss the contaminant selection Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions or comments

Sincerely

ROY F WESTON INC

Janell B Bergman, P G CPG  
Project Manager

Michael A. Anderson, Ph D P E  
Project Director

JBB/MAA/bq  
cc M D Gibson (EG&G)  
Project File (2029 74-01)

ADMIN RECORD



**MEETING MINUTES  
DISCUSSION OF DERTERMINATION OF CONTAMINANTS  
EG&G, OPERABLE UNIT NUMBER 1, ROCKY FLATS PLANT  
HELD 13 JULY 1993**

**Meeting Attendees**

Cindy Gee and Dennis Smith (EG&G)  
Paul Singh (MMES/RFO)  
Mike Anderson, Celia Greenman, and Ken Napp (WESTON)  
Diane Niedzwiecki, Jeff Swanson, Amy Johnson, and Joe Schieffelin (CDH)  
Scott Grace (DOE/ERD)  
Howard Rose (DOE/RFO)  
Gary Kleeman and Bonnie Lavelle (EPA)  
Ted Ball (PRC)

**Items Discussed**

- 1 Contaminant selection. C Gee was adamant that a decision was needed to determine what is a contaminant and requested that the discussion stay focused
  
- 2 Data set. EPA had concerns that the data set they received on diskette was not the one used for statistical summaries WESTON explained that for the statistical summary the data were Ganskyized That is if a value was nondetect and the detection limit was twice the contract detection limit, then it was thrown out for the purpose of calculating means Otherwise the statistical analysis would be biased on the high side For the ANOVA test, there was no Ganskyizing nondetects were replaced with one half the reported detection limit.  
  
EPA had a concern that there was a disconnect in that the number of records in the data set received on diskette was different from the number of observations listed in the statistical summary Specific examples would be provided to WESTON
  
- 3 Risk Assessment. EPA took the position that if analytes which are contaminants of surface water and sediments only (not of OU1 origin) are not evaluated for cumulative risk in the OU1 risk assessment, then the risk assessment should be caveated as being incomplete because it does not address cumulative risks EG&G responded that the risk assessment will be caveated that cumulative risks are presented for all contaminants of OU1 origin, and that the risk assessment is not incomplete but rather is in compliance with the NCP
  
- 4 Metal contaminant selection. EPA opened this discussion by saying that they were not prepared to provide final comment on the selection of metal contaminants at OU1 Cindy Gee expressed the importance of having resolution now or there would be budget and schedule ramifications for the project. She stressed that the meeting

was called by EPA for the express purpose of achieving resolution on metal contaminant selection. CDH requested a break to discuss the matter with EPA. When the session resumed, each of the metals identified as not being contaminants at OU1 were discussed. CDH had no problems eliminating the identified metals EPA concluded they had no problems eliminating the metals, however they reserved the right for further review and would take responsibility for schedule slippage should they have further comments of significance at a later date EPA further noted that their problem with the "scientific reasoning" approach was not technical but rather programmatic. EPA also noted a few errors in the information previously transmitted by WESTON WESTON stated that the statistical data would be carefully QAed and resubmitted to the agencies within a week. At EPA's request, WESTON will also examine turbidity data to see if suspended material in well water explains the high concentration of metals observed.

- 5 Organic contaminant selection. WESTON brought up whether anyone had comments on the organic contaminant selection. There was some discussion of acetone methylene chloride and 2 butanone as being laboratory contaminants The discussion included interpretation of the "B" qualified data, occurrence of these analytes in background samples, and the high variability of concentrations of these analytes in samples with known contamination by other solvents It appeared that there was agreement on the analytes not being contaminants at OU1 There was no discussion of the other organic analytes that were dismissed as presented in previous submittals
- 6 PAHs There was a basic difference in methodology of how to treat PAHs EG&G wanted to limit COCs in the risk assessment to those arising from known OU1 sources EPA wanted to consider cumulative risks regardless of contaminant origin. EG&G stated this required an upper management decision. CDH raised the concern that they had not commented heavily on PAHs in the draft report because it was implied that they would be discussed in the risk assessment. If PAHs were dropped en masse because EG&G considered these compounds to not be of OU1 origin, CDH would provide comment on the final report indicating a deficiency CDH suggested that PAHs be discussed in a different forum, as the issue was relevant to each OU EG&G said that this would be considered

CDH asked if the contaminants agreed on today would be those discussed in the Nature and Extent of Contamination in the RI, complete with graphical portrayal of extent of contamination. EG&G concurred, stating that discussions for each contaminant would be included in the RI