

General


Los Alamos
NATIONAL LABORATORY
memorandum

*Risk Reduction & Environmental Stewardship Division
Water Quality & Hydrology Group
(RRES-WQH)*

To/MS: SWAT Team Members
From/MS: Steve Veenis, RRES-WQH, MS K497 
Phone/Fax: 7-0013/5-9344
Symbol: RRES-WQH: 02-399
Date: October 25, 2002

**SUBJECT: FINAL SURFACE WATER ASSESSMENT TEAM MEETING MINUTES FOR
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002**

1.0 PURPOSE

The Surface Water Site Assessment Team (SWAT) continues an effort to review the Laboratory's Storm Water Monitoring Program for the Multi-Sector General Permit. A Data Quality Objective (DQO) process will be used to determine the adequacy of the data collected by the Laboratory's monitoring network. The SWAT role is to provide a review of Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) Sector K – which includes Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs), station locations, analytical methods, Benchmark Parameters and approved monitoring waivers and to make recommendations on how to improve the overall approach.

2.0 DISCUSSION

2.1 Consolidating the List of SWMUs

Much of the discussion focused on how to consolidate the list of 250 “high priority” SWMUs to produce a feasible set of monitoring points. Key points related to this topic included the following:

- Contaminants of Potential Concern (COPC) data (i.e., what COPCs are likely to be associated with individual SWMUs or SWMU clusters) will be a useful input to making “essentially identical” determinations. COPC evaluations will also help the watershed management program to maintain an appropriate list of analytes for LANL watershed monitoring. COPC data is expected to be available on the Environmental Restoration website as of October 1, 2002.
- “Consolidated units” have been identified and provide a start for clustering, but we should keep in mind that the SWMUs in consolidated units do not necessarily all go to the same drainage.
- Review of detailed site maps for TA-46 and TA-35 suggests possible monitoring locations that could effectively capture SWMU clusters. This should be verified by field visits.
- There was discussion of the number of new sampling locations that could be initiated next year. If numerous new stations are identified, sampling at them may need to be staged or rotated.



2.2 Analyte Monitoring List

Compliance with the MSGP calls for sampling of MSGP Sector K benchmarks at SWMUs. There was concern that limiting the analyte list only to those benchmarks may not enhance environmental protection. One option discussed at the meeting was for LANL to voluntarily include TSS monitoring. This could help to demonstrate the effectiveness of or need for BMPs; however, it could also overlap with LANL's environmental restoration program, so there would need to be further discussion within the Laboratory before adding TSS to the list.

2.3 Best Management Practices (BMPs)

There was discussion of the relationship between monitoring and BMPs. Monitoring helps to assess the effectiveness of BMPs, but in some cases, the existence of BMPs may reduce a site's priority as a candidate for monitoring. There is an ongoing BMP effectiveness study conducted by LANL and NMED that is focused on TA-46. It is hoped that study will demonstrate whether BMPs are effective, how to enhance them, and what TSS "action level" might prompt the need for BMP installation or repair. One promising approach is to take steps to reduce run-on at industrial areas. The study and resulting report is anticipated to be complete by April 2003.

2.4 Single-Stage Samplers

Another topic was whether single stage samplers might serve as an alternative or enhancement to ISCO stations. A single stage sampler was examined at the meeting. Both NMED and LANL have some experience with this equipment. A related issue is whether single stage samplers could be rotated from one sampler site to another, or whether they should be dedicated to a given site to meet the requirements of the MSGP.

2.5 Monitoring Criteria

The overall discussion pointed to a need to establish criteria for the workgroup's eventual outputs. These criteria have several aspects:

- How do we select a given site for monitoring?
- Can we stop monitoring at a given site if the analytical results demonstrate that Sector K Benchmark Parameters are not exceeded?
- What steps do we take if we find values higher than applicable benchmarks?
- Can we establish a TSS "action level" that prompts establishment of BMPs?

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 25th in White Rock at the DOE/Oversight Bureau offices. Any exceptions taken to these minutes should be brought to the attention of the Steve Veenis (667-0013), within five (5) working days of receipt.

Participants:

Ralph Ford-Schmid
Barbara Hoditschek
Kevin Hull
Ken Mullen
Gene Turner
Steve Veenis
Steve Yanicak

SV/tml

Cy: Everett Spencer, EPA Region VI, Dallas, Texas
Ralph Ford-Schmid, DOE/OB, Santa Fe, NM
Barbara Hoditschek, DOE/OB, Santa Fe, NM
Brett Lucas, NMED/SWQB, Santa Fe, NM
James Davis, NMED/SWQB, Santa Fe, NM
James Bearzi, NMED/HWB, Santa Fe, NM
Gene Turner, DOE/OLASO, MS A316
Dave McInroy, E-ER, MS M992
Doug Stavert, RRES-EP, MS J978
Steve Rae, RRES-WQH, MS K497
Mike Alexander, RRES-WQH, MS K497
Mike Saladen, RRES-WQH, MS K497
Ken Mullen, RRES-WQH, MS K497
Tony Grieggs, RRES-SWRC, MS K490
Deb Woitte, LC-ESH, MS A187
RRES-WQH File, MS K497