

10967



STATE OF IDAHO
DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1410 North Hilton • Boise, Idaho 83706-1255 • (208) 373-0502

Dirk Kempthorne, Governor
C. Stephen Allred, Director

March 14, 2002

Ms. Carol Hathaway, WAG 5 Project Manager
Environmental Restoration Program
Idaho Operations Office
U. S. Department of Energy
850 Energy Drive
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401-1563

RE: Institutional Controls Status Report for the Power Burst Facility and Auxiliary Reactor
Area, Operable Unit 5-12, for the Year 2001

Dear Ms. Hathaway:

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has completed its review of the above-referenced document, and provides the attached general and specific comments. DEQ received the document on March 1, 2002.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (208) 373-0217.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ted Livieratos".

Ted Livieratos
WAG 5 Project Manager
State Office of Technical Services

cc: Rick Poeton, EPA Region 10
Daryl Koch, WM&RD
CERCLA Src. File
COF

General Comment

1. In reviewing the Operable Unit 5-12 Institutional Control (IC) Status Report, We have noticed an inconsistency in the January 2002 RA Report, which recently went final. In Section 7.4 (Institutional Controls), it is mentioned that ICs are not required for ARA-02 and ARA-16. However, on the following page, in Section 8 (Certification that Remedy is Operational and Functional), it is pointed out that ICs will be established for ARA-02 and ARA-16. The current IC Status Report for 2001 states that institutional control is not required for either site. From the results of the post remediation sampling data, ICs may not be required for ARA-02. Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) were met for ARA-16 and the soil was excavated down to the basalt; however, because some slight contamination remains above background levels, ICs are technically required at the site. The objective in the ROD was achieved; however, unless the site is available for unrestricted and unlimited use, ICs will have to be enforced until the radioactive contamination decays to less than the background value. This is consistent with our comments sent on August 15, 2000 regarding the July 2000 OU 5-12 Institutional Control Status Report.
-

Specific Comments

1. Page 3-1, Section 3, First Paragraph

It is mentioned that PBF-16 was to be remediated to address ecological risks only, and would not require institutional controls. Please state the current status of PBF-16, i.e., whether the site has been remediated; if not, please provide the current schedule.

2. Page 3-1, Section 3, Table 3-1

Since the Phase I remedial action was completed in 2001, Sites ARA-07 and ARA-08 should be added to Table 3-1, as per Section 7.4.4, Closure Sites, of the January 2002 WAG 5 Phase I Remedial Action Report.

3. Page 3-1, Section 3, Table 3-1

For the sites that are missing the required CERCLA sign, the current status column states that they will be replaced. Since some of these sites just completed remediation last field season (i.e., ARA-16, ARA-25, etc.), they would require an entirely new sign, not a replacement. It would also be helpful to indicate approximately when the required CERCLA sign will be

replaced. The point here is to try and spot a trend. There are a number of signs that are missing. Is it because they were stolen? You have to watch out for those CERCLA souvenir hunters. They also may have been removed prior to the heavy equipment operating at the site, and were not put back up.

4. Page 4-2, Section 4.2.2, End Of Paragraph

Although the remediation goal was met and the remediation was determined to be successful for ARA-16, it should be noted that because there is some contamination remaining, ICs will be implemented until the site can be returned to unrestricted and unlimited use.

5. Page 4-3, Section 4.2.3, End Of Paragraph

It should be stated here that although the contaminated soil was removed to basalt and the remediation of ARA-25 was successful according to the ROD, contamination remains and ICs will be implemented.

6. Page 4-3, Section 4.2.4.1 and Section 4.2.4.2

The Remedial Action Report (January 2002) indicates that ARA-07 and ARA-08 will require institutional controls. Please add this statement to these specific sections.

7. Page 4-4 and page 4-5, Section 4.3.1 and Section 4.3.2

Page 8-1 of the Remedial Action Report (January 2002) indicates that institutional controls are required for ARA-02 and ARA-16.

8. Page 4-6, Section 4.3.4

Page 7-6 of the Remedial Action Report (January 2002) indicates that ICs are required for Sites ARA-07 and ARA-08.

9. Page A-3, Appendix A

Since the contact phone number at many of the sites is incorrect on the CERCLA sign, a solution for this may be to list a DOE Environmental Restoration information telephone number that can connect the caller to the current point of contact for a particular site. It would also be helpful if the date the photo was taken would be added to the picture. The inspection date may not always correspond with the photo date (many of the photos are the same as the previous IC Status Report). It would also be helpful if the ICs were included in the photo, if possible (CERCLA signs, fences, etc.).