



Department of Energy

Field Office, Idaho
785 DOE Place
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401-1562

May 12, 1992

Received WAG-6		
MAY 13 1992		
Action	Info	File

Mr. James L. McAnally, Manager
Environmental Restoration Department
EG&G Idaho, Inc.
P. O. Box 1625
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Meeting Minutes on Review of the OU 6-02 Track 1
Decision Documentation Package - ERD1-123-92

Dear Mr. McAnally:

Enclosed are DOE-ID minutes from a comment resolution meeting on the subject Track 1 Decision Documentation Package (DDP). Please address these concerns through the revision of the DDP prior to resubmittal of the document to this office.

If you have any questions regarding these minutes, please contact L. A. Green at 526-0417.

Sincerely,

Alice C. Williams, Director
Environmental Restoration Division

Enclosure

cc w/enc: L. V. Street, EG&G

DATE: April 23, 1992

MEETING MINUTES OF OU-6-02 TRACK 1 DECISION DOCUMENTATION PACKAGE REVIEW

At the request of Donna Nicklaus (DOE-ID), a meeting was held April 22, 1992 to review the BORAX septic tank (OU-6-02) Track 1 Decision Documentation Package. Leah Street, T. J. Meyer, Mark Lusk (EG&G), and Lorie Cahn (C-N Geotech) attended.

1. All agreed that the leach field connected to the septic tank should be addressed. Leah will investigate whether the leach field should be included in the septic tank OU or whether it should be added as a new OU. She will find out what the process entails and make recommendations as to which way to proceed. It may make sense to include both the septic tank and the leach field as one unit.
2. The Track 1 will be revisited. Although the tables generated by GWSCREEN would indicate a risk for soil and groundwater ingestion, the assumptions used to generate these numbers and the inherent limitations were not considered. The fact that this is a septic tank and not surface soil will be considered and implausible pathways eliminated. Current Track 1 and 2 guidance from EPA on soil depths will be used (soil ingestion is for less than the 5-ft depth that the tank was buried, and that the basement scenario is for dermal contact). After revisiting the qualitative risk assessment, the recommendation may change from removal of the tank and its contents and limited sampling, to no removal action, or removal of the tank contents only.
3. Other revisions discussed were referencing the percent of 1,4-DCB in urinal cakes, and including the non-detect from the radiological field screen.