State of New Mexico
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
Hazardous & Radioactive Materials Bureau
2044 Galisteo
P.O. Box 26110
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502
(505) 827-1557
Fax (505) 827-1544

GARY E. JOHNSON
GOVERNOR

MARK E. WEIDLER
SECRETARY

EDGAR T. THORNTON, III
DEPUTY SECRETARY

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

TRACK: LANL, 5/8/97, N/A, DOE/LANL, HRMB/NEK, NM Highlands

May 8, 1997

Mr. Theodore J. Taylor, Program Manager
Los Alamos Area Office
Department of Energy
528 35th Street, Mail Stop A316
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

Mr. Jorg Jansen, Program Manager
Environment Restoration
Los Alamos National Laboratory
1900 Diamond Drive, Mail Stop M992
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

RE: Request for Supplemental Information for the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Report for Potential Release Sites (PRSs) in Technical Area 50, SWMUs 50-004(a,c) and 50-011(a), at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) NM0890010515

Dear Mr. Taylor and Mr. Jansen:

The Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Bureau (HRMB) of the New Mexico Environment Department has reviewed the NOD Response, dated November 26, 1996, and referenced by EM/ER: 96-597, to the RCRA Facility Investigation Report for Potential Release Sites in Technical Area 50, SWMUs 50-004(a,c) and 50-011(a), dated March 26, 1996, and referenced by EM/ER: 96-171. HRMB is requesting supplemental information to the RFI Report. LANL must respond to the request for supplemental information noted in the attachment within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. Also, it should be noted that the NOD Response referred to SWMU 50-001(a) and should be corrected to indicate SWMU 50-011(a) in subsequent correspondence and documentation.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact either myself or Mr. John Kieling of my staff at (505) 827-1558.

Sincerely,

Robert S. (Stu) Dinwiddie
RCRA Permits Management Program
Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Bureau

RSD:jek

attachment

8843

tv

cc: T. Davis, NMED HRMB
R. Dinwiddie, NMED HRMB
J. Kieling, NMED HRMB
T. Glatzmaier, DDEES/ER, MS M992
G. Saums, NMED SWQB
M. Johansen, LAAO, MS A316
M. Leavitt, NMED GWQB
D. McInroy, EM/ER, MS M992
D. Neleigh, EPA, 6PD-N
J. Parker, NMED DOE OB
S. Yanicak, NMED DOE OB, MS J993
FILE: Reading and HSWA LANL FU-5/OU 1147/TA-50/50-004(a, c), 50-011(a)
TRACK: LANL, 5/8/97, N/A, DOE/LANL, HRMB/JEK, RE, File

Comments Pertaining to LANL's NOD Response to the RFI Report for TA-50, SWMUs 50-004(a,c) and 50-011(a)

General Comment: In the revised RFI Report provide information regarding human and ecological risk assessment for SWMUs 50-004(a & c) and 50-011(a).

General Comment: In the revised RFI Report, please include the following information for SWMUs 50-004(a & c) and 50-011(a): 1) the organic vapor readings and any associated notes (field screening) for each soil interval from each soil coring; 2) the field laboratory measurement results (especially for the volatile organics) for each soil interval from each soil coring; 3) the lithologic soil descriptions for each soil coring, which would include any noted visual or olfactory contamination. Best Professional Judgement

General Comment: In the revised RFI Report please include the following for SWMUs 50-004(a) and 50-011(a): 1) A table showing the metal, volatile, and semivolatile results for each soil interval analyzed. The table shall include the analytical method used for each "active" sample, and the detection limit for each sample analyzed. The background concentrations for metals and radioactivity shall also be included in this table. Best Professional Judgement.

Page 1-3 of the RFI Report; Section 1.2.1.1: This paragraph mentions that contaminated soil was removed where the pipe leaked, what was the approximate depth (or the depth range) of removal of these areas? Best Professional Judgement.

Page 5-2 of RFI Report; Table 5-1: This table indicates that soil sample AAC0258 was taken at .75-1.5 feet; sample AA0259 was taken at 1.5-3.0 feet; and, sample AAB6106 was taken at 3.5-4.25 feet. Previous pages in the report indicate that the trench was 5 to 6 feet in depth, were these samples taken erroneously or did the trench depth change in those locations? Please clarify in the revised RFI Report. Best Professional Judgement.

Page 5-9 of the RFI Report; Section 5.2.4: Corehole RDH-3 was not drilled. What alternative investigation technique is LANL planning to replace the corehole work? Also, sample borehole 50-023 was not performed due to overhead utility lines, can the sample location be moved to either side by 10-20 feet, without being affected by the overhead utility line? In addition, soil sample location 50-3024 was not found in Table 5-6. Please include it in the revised report. Best Professional Judgement.

Page 5-14; Page 5-14: Sample AAC0230 at the 6-7 foot interval was found to be almost 3 times the background concentration for lead. NMED recommends deeper sampling at this location. Best Professional Judgement.

Page 5-18; Table 5-9: Table 5-9 does not include the semivolatile results. Also, please include the analytical method used and the detection limit for each result. Best Professional Judgment.

Page 5-21; Field Investigation: Please include a larger scaled map of the decommissioned septic tank system showing the locations of the soil corings. Also, NMED disagrees with LANL's conclusion that the 45 degree corehole (as required in the approved workplan) which was supposed to intersect the 50 foot shaft is not needed. NMED will require this coring, although it may not be necessary for the coring to be at an 45 degree angle. It would appear that a boring placed next to the 50 foot "drywell" would be sufficient, provided that appropriate sampling intervals were included and that the boring went 55-60 feet in depth. Best Professional Judgement.