

SNL MWL



**National Nuclear Security Administration**  
Sandia Site Office  
P.O. Box 5400  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185-5400



APR 24 2006

CERTIFIED MAIL – RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. James Bearzi, Chief  
Hazardous Waste Bureau  
New Mexico Environment Department  
2905 Rodeo Park Rd. East, Building 1  
Santa Fe, NM 87505



Dear Mr. Bearzi:

On behalf of the Department of Energy (DOE) and Sandia Corporation (Sandia), DOE is submitting responses to public comments received by the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) regarding the Mixed Waste Landfill (MWL) Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI) Plan. The public comments on the MWL CMI Plan were submitted to NMED during the 60-day public comment period, which ended on February 7, 2006. These responses to the public comments were informally requested by NMED on February 28, 2006.

Enclosed please find two documents containing our response. Enclosure 1, entitled "SNL Responses to Public Comments on the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan", briefly summarizes the various public comments, and provides Sandia's responses. Enclosure 2, entitled "SNL Responses to Citizen Action Comments", includes more detailed responses to the fairly extensive comments submitted by Citizen Action.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (505)845-6036 or John Gould, (505) 845-6089, of my staff.

Sincerely,

*Kimberly A Davis*  
Patty Wagner *for*  
Manager

Enclosures (2)

cc w/enclosures:

W. Moats, NMED (Via Certified Mail)  
L. King, EPA, Region 6 (Via Certified Mail)  
J. Volkerding, NMED-OB

1998

1998

1998

1998

James Bearzi

(2)

APR 24 2006

cc w/o enclosures:

M. Martin, NNSA/NA-56

A. Blumberg, SNL/NM, Org. 11100, MS 0141

F. Nimick, SNL/NM, Org. 6140, MS 1089

P. Freshour, SNL/NM, Org. 6140, MS 1089

R. E. Fate, SNL/NM, Org. 6147, MS 1089

J. Peace, SNL/NM, Org. 1525, MS 0372

T. Goering, SNL/NM, Org. 6147, MS 1089

M. J. Davis, SNL/NM, Org. 6147, MS 1089

R. Finley, SNL/NM, Org. 6115, MS 0735

C. Ho, SNL/NM, Org. 6115, MS 0735

J. Estrada, NNSA/SSO, MS 0184



# CERTIFICATION STATEMENT FOR APPROVAL AND FINAL RELEASE OF DOCUMENTS

**Document title:** SNL Responses to Public Comments and Citizen Action  
Comments on the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures  
Implementation Plan, April 2006

---

**Document authors:** Cliff Ho, Dept. 6115 and Tim Goering, Dept. 6147

---

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision according to a system designed to ensure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine or imprisonment for knowing violations.

Signature: Peter B. Davies

Peter B. Davies

Director

Geoscience & Environment Center

Division 6100

Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185

Operator

4/20/06

Date

and

Signature: Kimberly A. Davis

Patty Wagner

Manager

U.S. Department of Energy

National Nuclear Security Administration

Sandia Site Office

Owner and Co-Operator

4/21/06

Date



**SNL RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS  
AND CITIZEN ACTION COMMENTS  
ON THE  
MIXED WASTE LANDFILL  
CORRECTIVE MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

**April 20, 2006**

Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

This page intentionally left blank.

**SNL RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS  
AND CITIZEN ACTION COMMENTS  
ON THE  
MIXED WASTE LANDFILL  
CORRECTIVE MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

**April 20, 2006**

**INTRODUCTION**

On May 26 2005, the Secretary of the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) approved a remedy and a Class 3 permit modification request for corrective measures for the Mixed Waste Landfill at Sandia National Laboratories, New Mexico (NMED, 2005). As part of their decision, the NMED required that the Department of Energy (DOE) and Sandia Corporation (Sandia) prepare, for NMED review and public comment, a Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI) Plan, which included a Fate and Transport Model for the MWL. The CMI Plan was prepared in the Fall of 2005, and NMED established a public comment period which ended February 7, 2006. A number of parties submitted comments, including an extensive set of comments from Citizens Action (CA), dated February 7, 2006 (Robinson, 2006).

This document presents Sandia National Laboratories' response to the public comments received by the New Mexico Environment Department regarding the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan. The first portion of this document, titled "SNL Responses to Public Comments on the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan," briefly summarizes the various public comments and provides Sandia's responses. The second portion of this document, titled "SNL Responses to Citizen Action Comments on the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan and Fate and Transport Model," includes more detailed responses to the fairly extensive comments submitted by Citizen Action. The original Citizen Action comments are presented in bold font, and DOE/Sandia responses are presented in italic font.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Enclosure 1

### SNL Response to Public Comments on the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan

[www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/snlperm\\_comments.htm](http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/snlperm_comments.htm)

Clifford K. Ho and Timothy J. Goering  
Sandia National Laboratories  
April 20, 2006

*Some comments are paraphrased for brevity*

#### **Comment from Donna Detweiler (received 1/27/2006):**

**General comment regarding the “possible contamination of groundwater resulting from spread of toxins now lodged in the SNL Mixed Waste Landfill”. If indeed the Fate & Transport Model is correct and this could happen in as little as 50 years, then my investments could easily be trashed, and the whole neighborhood dependent on Burton Well is likely to be only the first of many to be abandoned.”**

#### **SNL Response:**

*Of all the contaminants of concern simulated in the performance-assessment model, only tetrachloroethylene (PCE) was predicted to reach the groundwater in 1,000 years. In those simulations that showed PCE reaching the groundwater, 70% of the runs showed that the groundwater concentration immediately beneath the landfill (no dilution) would be less than 1 microgram per liter (detectable limit). Only 1% of the runs showed that the groundwater concentration would exceed the regulatory metric of 5 micrograms per liter. Thus, the models show that the probability of “contaminating” the aquifer with concentrations large enough to pose health risks is very small. Furthermore, long-term groundwater monitoring will be conducted at the MWL. If contamination is detected in the future, the NMED may impose additional measures.*

#### **Comments from Floy J. Barrett (received 1/31/2006):**

**These comments replicate the comments submitted by Citizen Action. Please see the responses to the Citizen Action comments.**

#### **Comments from David M. Brugge (received 1/31/2006):**

- 1. In addition to intrusion and disruption by plants, animals, and insects identified by Citizen Action, other species of insects, spiders, worms, and similar invertebrates must be identified. Subsurface fungi, molds, bacteria, and related**

- species (especially those that can become airborne) need to be taken into consideration. The agent that causes valley fever may be subject to mutation in the radioactive environment of the landfill.
2. Human intrusion is a serious matter, especially in light of the potential for domestic terrorism and the creation of a "dirty bomb" at the landfill.
  3. Just the knowledge, threat, or perception that inadequate attention to the dangers of the landfill could cause serious impact to land values for the Mesa del Sol development, as well as potential liability for the University of New Mexico and the state.

**SNL Response:**

1. *The current performance-assessment model scenarios included processes and pathways considered to be the most significant and probable.*
2. *See response to #1.*
3. *SNL is responsible for adhering to the requirements of the NMED for the MWL. All the requirements ensure the protection of public health and the environment.*

**Comments from Maurice A. Weisberg (received 2/5/2006):**

The comments from Maurice Weisberg include a number of general observations and opinions. Specific comments relevant to the results of the performance-assessment model are addressed here:

1. **Biotransport of radioactive contaminants, including vegetative, animal, and insect uptake, is likely to occur over time.**
2. **"At the rate tritium is moving laterally and deeply through the soil, we could expect contamination of the aquifer in less than ten years."**
3. **Contaminants can move much faster through the vadose zone than predictions show, possibly because of torrential rains (episodic events).**

**SNL Response:**

1. *The current performance-assessment model scenarios included processes and pathways considered to be the most significant and probable. Sandia has conducted a study of the root depths and density in the vicinity of the MWL (Peace et al, November 2004), and care will be taken during long-term monitoring to prevent deep-rooting plant species from establishing themselves on the MWL cover. In addition, the rock biointrusion barrier will be constructed with the intent to prevent intrusion by burrowing animals, and it should restrict root growth so long as the underlying materials are relatively dry (Anderson and Forman, 2002).*
2. *This assertion is not supported by our studies. Our studies show that no detectable levels of tritium will reach the groundwater. Some MWL wastes have been in place now for nearly 50 years, yet groundwater is not contaminated by tritium.*

*Furthermore, recently collected data indicate tritium emissions from the landfill are decreasing with time as a result of radioactive decay and other natural processes (Anderson, 2004), further reducing the potential to contaminate groundwater over time.*

- 3. Our models included a broad range of percolation rates based on detailed modeling studies and precipitation data spanning over 60 years, including heavy rainfall periods. In addition, future climate states were considered where the precipitation was projected to increase to twice the current values. Field evidence shows that even after heavy rainfall events, water penetrates only the upper foot or two of the soil, and is subsequently removed from the soil profile by evapotranspiration.*

**Comments from Albuquerque Center for Peace and Justice and Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping (received 2/6/2006):**

**These comments support the comments submitted by Citizen Action. Please see the responses to the Citizen Action comments.**

**SNL Response:**

*The triggers proposed for soil, air, the vadose zone, and groundwater are at low concentrations and are based on EPA and DOE regulatory standards. Triggers were not proposed for concentrations in plants and animals because there are no applicable regulatory standards, and their populations may vary significantly from year to year. Nevertheless, biota will be monitored to ensure that they do not provide a significant mechanism for contaminant transport.*

**Comments from Penelope McMullen (received 2/6/2006):**

**These comments replicate the comments submitted by Citizen Action. Please see the responses to the Citizen Action comments.**

**SNL Response:**

*Regarding revision of the CMI Plan, the objective of the CMI Plan was to present a detailed design of the remedy selected by the NMED for the MWL. The proposed design meets the full intent of RCRA Subtitle C regulations, which include requirements for minimizing water migration through the cover, minimizing maintenance and erosion, accommodating subsidence, and having a permeability less than or equal to that of the natural subsurface soils. The Fate and Transport model results do not show any need to modify the proposed design in the CMI Plan.*

*Long-term monitoring and maintenance at the MWL will be discussed in more detail in the MWL's Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan, which will be developed after implementation of the remedy.*

**Comments from John Tauxe (received 2/7/2006):**

- 1. The uncertainty distribution for the inventory of radionuclides in the MWL is undefended. It is highly unlikely that all inventory constituents share the exact same uncertainty distribution. A more thorough analysis of these distributions should be performed.**
- 2. The contaminant transport modeling of the MWL lacks any contributions by biotic activity, including plant uptake and animal redistribution (e.g., ants).**
- 3. Current modeling of radon-222 release to the surface assumes the parent (radium-226) remains at depth. If constituents are biotically transported to the surface, the parent of radon-222 could also be transported to the surface. More sophisticated techniques are needed to model the subsequent radon-222 release to the atmosphere.**
- 4. The decay products of radon-222 (e.g., lead-210) must be accounted for in assessing dose from exposure to radionuclides involved in surface processes. Diffusing radon-222 gas will decay to lead-210 near the surface and within the cap, which will provide additional exposure to potential future receptors.**
- 5. Exposures from radionuclides in the ground surface and near surface (known as "shine") should be included along with inhalation of gases and particulates and incidental ingestion of soils by potential future receptors.**
- 6. A reasonable potential future receptor scenario is that of a residence built directly atop the MWL. This would trigger additional exposure pathways, such as exposure to indoor air with concentrations of gaseous radionuclides and VOCs.**
- 7. The period of performance of 1,000 years may not be sufficient to model peak doses.**
- 8. The future releases and decay products of PCE should be considered.**
- 9. The model touts itself as being conservative in its assumptions, but this philosophy was applied inconsistently. Large infiltration rates may be conservative for the groundwater pathway, but not for surface-based exposure.**
- 10. Monitoring of tritium and radon as triggers should occur directly above the MWL as opposed to on the perimeter.**
- 11. The sensitivity analyses are rather *ad hoc*. Selection of the parameters for the sensitivity analyses may not have included all parameters in the model.**

**SNL Response:**

- 1. We assumed that the minimum inventory was equal to the values recorded in SNL (1993), and that the maximum inventory was equal to twice the recorded inventory values (except for PCE, which was increased to ten times measured concentrations for calibration). Lacking any additional information regarding the uncertainty of the recorded values, we chose a uniform distribution. Comparisons between simulated soil concentrations and measured soil concentrations for tritium showed that this assumed inventory range was adequate (and even conservative) in allowing simulated concentrations to match (and even exceed) measured tritium soil concentrations. In addition, results of sensitivity analyses showed that the inventory was not an important parameter for mobile constituents.*

2. *The current performance-assessment model did not consider scenarios associated with intrusion, uptake, transformation, or disruption by humans, animals, plants, insects, or other biota. The scenarios that were studied included processes and pathways considered to be the most significant and probable.*

*Sandia has conducted a study of the root depths and density in the vicinity of the MWL (Peace et al, November 2004), and care will be taken during long-term monitoring to prevent deep-rooting plant species from establishing themselves on the MWL cover. In addition, the rock biointrusion barrier will be constructed with the intent to prevent intrusion by burrowing animals, and it should restrict root growth so long as the underlying materials are relatively dry (Anderson and Forman, 2002).*

3. *Our probabilistic analysis already accounts for the possibility that the radium-226 source term is at the surface (with no cover). The thickness of the cover is allowed to vary between 0 and the designed value. Therefore, the simulations already include the effect of the radon-222 source term being at the surface. Results of the sensitivity analysis shows that the impact of the cover thickness is small, relative to the uncertainty in the emanation factor, which is governed by the assumed containment integrity of the sealed radium-226 sources.*

*Additionally, most of the potential source term for Rn-222 is in hermetically sealed stainless steel source capsules. The potential release of Rn-222 from these capsules was "allowed" for modeling purposes with an assumption that up to 100% of these capsules will fail, allowing their contents to be released. Even in the event of this unlikely scenario, the area-weighted average MWL contents "vulnerable to biotic CT" would be a very small fraction of the area/volume of the MWL.*

4. *Decay products of Rn-222 were not considered in the model of Rn-222 transport to the surface, but the steady decay of Rn-222 was included. Accumulation and accountability of Rn-222 decay products would require a transient model, but a steady-state model was chosen to accommodate the long-lived parent products of Rn-222 and to accommodate liquid-phase advection in the analytical solution. It should be noted that the simulations of radon-222 leaching to the groundwater (using FRAMES/MEPAS) did include evaluation of the decay products.*
5. *The current performance assessment did not include exposure due to "shine" or incidental ingestion of surface soils. However, indirect ingestion of radionuclides through consumption of vegetables and animals irrigated or fed by contaminated water was accounted for by assigning a large intake of water (10 L/day).*
6. *The atmospheric-transport scenario in the current performance assessment assumed a "worst-case" scenario, where a receptor was inhaling air above the MWL 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This is even more conservative than assuming a home on top of the MWL, where the structure would provide additional resistance to exposure.*

7. *The 1,000-year performance period was used for those constituents that peaked well before 1,000 years (e.g., tritium, PCE). For radionuclides and heavy metals, simulations were run past 10,000 years, and these results are presented in the study. For radon, steady-state simulations were assumed, which conservatively assumes the instantaneous transport of radon to the surface.*
8. *Future releases of PCE are not considered because the entire inventory of PCE is assumed to be available for release at time zero. PCE was used as a proxy for all other VOCs because of its relatively large Henry's Constant and mobility. Several decay products of PCE, including TCE and 1,1-dichloroethene, have already been proposed for long-term monitoring in groundwater, and triggers have been established for these constituents. Vinyl chloride (VC) has never been detected in soils or groundwater at the MWL.*
9. *Parameters were not conservatively estimated if they could have a confounding effect on other processes. For example, a conservative assumption was made that the receptor drinks 10 L/day of water (as opposed to the EPA-recommended 2 L/day). This was to conservatively reflect indirect ingestion from irrigated vegetation or animals. In contrast, the range of infiltration was based on past historic data and was an accurate reflection of the range we believe will occur in the future, including climate change. Another conservative assumption was that groundwater concentration at the base of the vadose zone was compared against the regulatory metric, and did not account for dilution caused by mixing within the aquifer.*
10. *The proposed locations were selected to be consistent with the last 26 years of environmental monitoring at the MWL. However, the locations for tritium and radon monitoring could certainly be placed directly on top of the MWL cover, if considered appropriate by the NMED. Specific details on long-term monitoring at the MWL, including parameters and locations, will be determined in consultation with the NMED in the MWL Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMP). The LTMMP is scheduled to be completed after implementation of the final remedy.*
11. *All stochastic parameters used in the model were included in the sensitivity analyses. The results of the sensitivity analyses (presented in charts) only included those parameters that were found to be statistically significant.*

**Comments from Citizen Action (received 2/7/2006):**

**The following includes an abbreviated list of comments submitted by Citizen Action regarding the fate and transport (performance-assessment) model. A separate document, Enclosure 2, entitled "SNL Responses to Citizen Action Comments", contains additional responses to the detailed comments submitted by Citizen Action..**

- 1. The model fails to consider biological transport of contaminants.**

2. **The model fails to consider human intrusion.**
3. **The model fails to consider beryllium and metallic sodium as potential contaminants of concern, among others.**
4. **The model fails to consider new compounds formed as a result of radiolysis.**
5. **The model fails to consider animals, plants and humans as “triggers.”**
6. **The model fails to consider “trigger levels” for the entire inventory of contaminants in the known inventory of the landfill.**
7. **The model fails to consider conducting a risk assessment for the F & T model.**
8. **The model fails to use current data for current levels of radionuclides, heavy metals and volatile organic releases.**
9. **The model fails to consider the deterioration of waste containers.**

**SNL Response:**

1. *The model did not specifically address biological uptake and transport of contaminants by plants and animals. The intent of the biointrusion barrier is to prevent this occurrence. Sandia has conducted a study of the root depths and density in the vicinity of the MWL (Peace et al, November 2004), and care will be taken during long-term monitoring to prevent deep-rooting plant species from establishing themselves on the MWL cover. In addition, the intent of the rock biointrusion barrier is to prevent intrusion by burrowing animals, and it should restrict root growth so long as the underlying materials are relatively dry (Anderson and Forman, 2002).*
2. *Human intrusion was not considered in the model as the model was necessarily limited to conservative, reasonable scenarios. For modeling purposes, we assumed that the exposed individual was located at the landfill. Inhalation and dermal exposure was assumed to occur 24/7 above the landfill. In addition, drinking water was assumed to be taken directly beneath the landfill and consumed at a rate of 10 L/day (2 L/day recommended by EPA for risk assessments).*
3. *The constituents that were modeled were chosen because of their high relative mobility and/or their large inventory. Beryllium and metallic sodium were not evaluated in the current model. Beryllium is a relatively minor component of the MWL inventory, and metallic sodium is not listed in the inventory.*
4. *Radiolysis was not considered in the current model. Radiolysis is considered unlikely at the MWL, as it is not significant in low-level radioactive waste.*
5. *Our recommended triggers include surface-concentration measurements for radon gas and tritium in soil pore water. Long-term monitoring will include monitoring of biota to ensure that they do not provide a significant mechanism for contaminant transport.*
6. *Triggers were specified for the constituents that were found to potentially exceed performance metrics. For PCE, which was a proxy for all VOCs, triggers were specified for all VOCs measured at the site since PCE was found to potentially exceed the groundwater concentration metric.*
7. *Our study does provide a risk-based performance-assessment analysis using relevant regulatory performance standards as metrics (e.g., dose, groundwater concentrations). Probabilistic, uncertainty analyses are performed to develop distributions of scenario results that are compared against the metrics. Sensitivity*

analyses are also performed to identify the most important parameters and processes that impact the simulated performance metrics. Standard conversion factors (U.S. EPA slope factors) can be used to convert dose (which is reported in our analysis) to risk of cancer incidence or fatality.

8. The latest data that were available to evaluate concentrations of tritium and PCE at various depths beneath the MWL were from 1993. These data provided the necessary calibration for the models. Additional data will be collected during long-term monitoring of the MWL, and these data can be used to update the MWL Fate and Transport model, if necessary. Groundwater concentrations are taken much more frequently (on an annual basis), and there is no evidence of groundwater contamination from the MWL.
9. All of the constituents (except for radium-226, which are contained in "sealed sources") were conservatively assumed to be uncontained and available for leaching.

#### REFERENCES:

Anderson, February 2004, "*Results of Tritium Emission Flux Measurements for Sandia National Laboratories Mixed Waste Landfill*," URS Corporation, Austin, Texas.

Anderson, J.E. and A.D Forman, March 2002. "*The Protective Cap/Biobarrier Experiment. A Study of Alternative Evapotranspiration Caps for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory*," prepared by Stoller for U.S. Department of Energy – Idaho Field Office Environmental Surveillance, Education and Research Program, Contract DE-AC07-00ID13658, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Peace, J.L., P.J. Knight, T.S. Ashton, and T.J. Goering, November 2004, "*Vegetation Study in Support of the Design and Optimization of Vegetative Soil Covers, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico*," SAND2004-6144, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.

**Enclosure 2:**

**SNL Responses to Citizen Action Comments on the  
Mixed Waste Landfill  
Corrective Measures Implementation Plan  
and  
Fate and Transport Model**  
([www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/snlperm\\_comments.htm](http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/snlperm_comments.htm))

Clifford K. Ho and Timothy J. Goering  
Sandia National Laboratories  
April 20, 2006

**Introduction**

This document contains SNL responses to comments submitted by Citizen Action regarding the MWL Corrective Measures Implementation Plan and Fate and Transport model. The complete set of Citizen Action comments is presented below, along with Sandia responses in italics.

All public comments, including the Citizen Action comments, are also available on the NMED website, at [www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/snlperm\\_comments.htm](http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/snlperm_comments.htm)

This page intentionally left blank.

**Review of Sandia National Laboratories'  
Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measure Implementation Plan  
and  
Fate and Transport Model:**

**Comments and Recommendations**

**February 7, 2006**

Prepared on behalf of:  
Citizen Action New Mexico  
Sue Dayton, Director  
P.O. Box 262  
Albuquerque, NM 87047  
Sue Dayton, Coordinator  
505-262-1862  
[sdayton@swcp.com](mailto:sdayton@swcp.com)

Prepared by  
Paul Robinson  
Research Director  
Southwest Research and Information Center  
PO Box 4524  
Albuquerque, NM 87106  
[srcpaul@earthlink.net](mailto:srcpaul@earthlink.net)  
505-262-1862

This page intentionally left blank.

## INTRODUCTION

These Comments and Recommendations address portions of the Sandia National Laboratories' (SNL) Mixed Waste Landfill (MWL) Corrective Measure Implementation Plan (CMIP) and Fate and Transport Models (FTM) posted on the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) Website. NMED required SNL to provide these documents as part of the Permit Modification issues to SNL regarding the MWL in May, 2005.

The Corrective Measure Implementation Plan ("CMIP") is posted at [http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/SNL/MWL/SNL\\_Mixed\\_Waste\\_Landfill\\_CMI\\_Work\\_Plan\\_\(11-2005\).pdf](http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/SNL/MWL/SNL_Mixed_Waste_Landfill_CMI_Work_Plan_(11-2005).pdf). The Fate and Transport Model ("FTM"), titled "Probabilistic Performance-Assessment Modeling of the Mixed Waste Landfill at Sandia National Laboratories" Document Number SAND 2005-6888 is posted at [http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/SNL/MWL/Fate\\_and\\_Transport\\_\(Probabilistic\\_Performance-Assessment\\_Modeling\\_of\\_the\\_MWL;%2011-2005\).pdf](http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/SNL/MWL/Fate_and_Transport_(Probabilistic_Performance-Assessment_Modeling_of_the_MWL;%2011-2005).pdf).

The Permit Modification issued by New Mexico Environment Department for the Mixed Waste Landfill (posted at [http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/SNL/MWL/Final\\_Decision/Permit\\_Language\\_for\\_the\\_Mixed\\_Waste\\_Landfill.pdf](http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/hwb/SNL/MWL/Final_Decision/Permit_Language_for_the_Mixed_Waste_Landfill.pdf)) requires that Sandia/DOE submit a CMIP that "shall, at a minimum, include:

- a. A description of the selected remedy;
- b. A description of the remediation system objectives;
- c. An identification and description of the qualifications of key persons, consultants, and contractors that will be implementing the remedy;
- d. Detailed engineering design drawings and systems specifications for all elements of the remedy;
- e. A construction and construction quality assurance work plan;
- f. An operation and maintenance plan;
- g. The results of any remedy pilot tests, such as landfill cover test plots;
- h. A schedule for submission to the Administrative Authority of periodic progress reports;
- i. A schedule for implementation of the remedy;
- j. A health and safety plan;
- k. A comprehensive fate and transport model that studies and predicts future movement of contaminants in the landfill and whether they will eventually move further down the vadose zone and/or to groundwater;
- l. Triggers for future actions that identify and detail specific monitoring results that will require additional testing or the implementation of an additional or different remedy."

In response to comments identified during review of the FTM and CMIP, recommendations regarding specific revisions to the FTM and CMIP are identified. The recommendations include revising the CMIP to reflect modifications proposed for the FTM.

Due to the technical nature of the FTM, the reliance of NMED on a contractor to conduct a technical review of the FTM, and the numerous areas of deficiency in the FTM noted in these comments it is also strongly recommended that NMED convene a "technical discussion group"

to serve as a public meeting to provide for an exchange among interested stakeholders regarding the adequacy of the FTM and CMIP. It is recommended that such a technical discussion group include representatives of the permittee, the NMED and members of the public who have expressed an interest in the studies conducted by SNL and/or submitted comments to the NMED on the CMIP and/or FTM. It is recommended that this technical discussion group be convened prior to the determination that the FTM and CMIP are either "comprehensive" or "complete" with respect to the technical requirements applicable to the wastes at the MWL.

#### I. Fate and Transport Model Comments and Recommendations

A. General Comments: The document submitted to comply with the FTM requirements in the Permit Modification is not comprehensive with respect to:

1. The volume of each individual waste product and physical state of containers for the full range of contaminants at the Mixed Waste Landfill;
2. Potential for releases including vadose zone and groundwater contamination due to transport not considered in the FTM including mechanisms such as biological transport of contaminants through the ground surface, human intrusion, and movement of contaminants by wind/air;
3. Modeling for the complete suite of radionuclides and daughter products, metals, and volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds in the known inventory of the MWL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The FTM should be revised to provide the "comprehensive" model required by the Permit Modification and the CMIP should be modified to reflect the findings of the revised FTM following its acceptance as technically complete and comprehensive by NMED.

*SNL Response: See response to each of the detailed items below.*

B. Areas not addressed in the FTM:

1. The FTM fails to address biological transport of contaminants resulting from plant and animal uptake of contaminants and subsequent dispersion of soil, plant and animal material by wind, including vertebrate and invertebrate animals entering the landfill and plants transporting contaminants taken up through their root systems. Data presented at the December 2004 MWL Public Hearing by SNL demonstrate that deer mice and vegetation at the MWL show contamination with low levels of tritium and radon.

*SNL Response: The model did not specifically address biological uptake and transport of contaminants by plants and animals. However, the biointrusion barrier will be constructed with the intent to prevent this pathway for uptake and transport.*

2. The FTM fails to address transport of contaminants resulting from human intrusion associated with accidental events and the eventual failure of the land use restriction portions of the institutional controls proposed by SNL for the MWL. Accidental or unforeseen events that could be included in FTM model assumptions should be understood to include discharges of large volumes of water at the site on the order of disposal of more than 270,000 gallons of reactor cooling water at the site or the

pooling of snow melt and rain water above trenches, circumstances that occurred at the MWL while it was an active disposal site.

*SNL Response: Land-use restrictions are recorded on the facility property legal documentation for notification purposes in accordance with regulation. Further, the institutional controls are to be carried out under the Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMMP). Inhalation and dermal exposure was assumed to occur continuously (24/7) above the landfill. In addition, drinking water was assumed to be taken directly beneath the MWL, and dilution caused by mixing within the aquifer was neglected (groundwater concentrations were taken to be equal to the concentration at the base of the vadose zone). Finally, the reactor cooling water was placed within the MWL when placement could occur as an active disposal site and no such additional placement will occur in the now-closed unit.*

3. The FTM fails to provide a comprehensive fate and transport analysis as it does not include calibrated model “realizations” for the full range of radioactive and hazardous constituents identified at the MWL including: a wide range of radionuclides, a wide range of metals and inorganic compounds including beryllium, nickel, chromium, sodium, lithium, and the range of volatile organic compounds already demonstrated to have been escaped from the MWL. A comprehensive list of radionuclides, metals and volatile organic compounds can be found in what is identified in the CMIP at p. 4-2 as “[a] detailed MWL waste inventory, by pit and trench, ... provided in the Environmental Restoration Project “Responses to NMED Technical Comments on the Report of the Mixed Waste Landfill Phase 2 RCRA Facility Investigation Dated September 1996” (SNL 1998).”

*SNL Response: The constituents modeled were chosen conservatively because of their high relative mobility and/or larger quantity identified in the inventory.*

4. The FTM fails to identify or address fate and transport dynamics associated with the potential for formation of mobile, potential hazardous compounds by radiolysis - the process by which radionuclides can mix with non-radioactive constituents and form new compounds – to occur among waste constituents of the MWL.

*SNL Response: Radiolysis is the molecular decomposition of a substance as a result of radiation. The modeling of constituents (amount and characteristics) formed as a result of radiolysis is highly uncertain and speculative. In addition, radiolysis is more likely to occur from high-level radioactive waste, rather than the low-level waste disposed of at the MWL.*

5. The “triggers” identified in the FTM fail to include monitoring mechanisms to reflect either human intrusion, biological transport, or the waste constituents identified at the MWL, but not considered in the FTM.

*SNL Response: Our recommended triggers include surface-concentration measurements for radon gas and tritium in soil pore water. Specific details on long-term monitoring of the MWL will be addressed in the MWL Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMMP). The LTMMMP will be developed in consultation with the NMED following implementation of the final*

remedy at the site, and is scheduled for completion in 2008.

The FTM fails to identify means to monitor, model and assure the effectiveness of institutional controls or the consequences of the failure of such passive site protection measures.

*SNL Response: Institutional controls or the consequences of the failure of such passive protection measures are not appropriate for inclusion in the FTM. The Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMMP) will address these issues.*

**The FTM fails to provide a risk assessment/performance assessment analysis in its evaluation of the potential for release of contaminants from the MWL.**

**RECOMMENDATION: In order for the FTM to be fully “comprehensive,” NMED should require that the FTM be revised and expanded to address each of the areas of incompleteness identified above.**

*SNL Response: Our study does provide a risk-based performance-assessment analysis using relevant regulatory performance standards as metrics (e.g., dose, groundwater concentrations). Probabilistic, uncertainty analyses are performed to develop distributions of scenario results that are compared against the metrics. Sensitivity analyses are also performed to identify the most important parameters and processes that impact the simulated performance metrics. Standard conversion factors (U.S. EPA slope factors) can be used to convert dose (which is reported in our analysis) to risk of cancer incidence or fatality.*

#### **C. Areas addressed inadequately in the FTM:**

- 1. The FTM relies on data regarding releases of radionuclides, heavy metals and VOCs (“volatile organic compound”) from the Phase 1 and Phase 2 RCRA Feasibility Investigation (RFI) gathered 1993 – 1995. FTM at 14. No new data gathering was conducted. No new data gathering is proposed to calibrate or verify the modeling conducted.**

*SNL Response: Our analysis also uses information and results from site studies conducted by Wolford (1997, 1998), WERC (2001), Peace et al. (2002), Peace et al. (2003), and Peace and Goering (2005).*

*Data gathering continues at the MWL, and will continue into the future under the long-term monitoring program. Currently, groundwater is sampled on an annual basis at the site, and analyzed for a wide suite of potential contaminants, including volatile organic compounds, tritium, and uranium. Sandia’s Environmental Monitoring Program collects soil and vegetation samples along the MWL perimeter annually (since 1980). The soil and vegetation samples are analyzed for tritium and gamma-emitting radionuclides.*

*Data collected during long-term monitoring at the MWL will be used to update the fate and transport model for the site on a 5-year basis, and to re-evaluate the likelihood of contaminants reaching groundwater.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** The NMED should require that SNL conduct a monitoring program to verify the accuracy of the model parameters and model results identified in the FTM. This program should include sampling of the vadose zone at and beneath the MWL to determine if the FTM's predictions and assumptions accurately reflect conditions at the MWL.

*SNL Response: The FTM used realistically conservative data and sensitivity analyses to identify potential data gaps that additional data would be needed to fill. No additional data needs were identified during this process.*

*The NMED Class 3 Permit Modification for the MWL requires Sandia to develop a Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMP) for the MWL within 180 days after NMED's approval of the Corrective Measures Implementation Report. The LTMMP will be developed in consultation with the NMED, and will provide details of the monitoring program for the MWL, and triggers for the site. Data collected during long-term monitoring at the MWL will be used to evaluate the continued effectiveness of the remedy selected for the MWL. These data will also be used to update the fate and transport model for the site every 5 years, as required by the State of New Mexico Final Order, dated May 26, 2005.*

- 2. The FTM appears to have failed to identify or consider either the mechanisms for deterioration of waste containers or the consequences of the deterioration of waste containers in any manner during development of the input parameters and assumptions for its VOC, heavy metal and radionuclide models, with the single exception of the radon model runs in which radium-226 containers were determined to deteriorate in 1,000 years.**

*SNL Response: This assertion is incorrect as all constituents were assumed to be exposed in the landfill WITHOUT containment. For the analysis of radon-222 transport, we assumed the source of anthropogenic radon-222 (radium-226) was contained in sealed sources. Up to 100% of these sealed sources were assumed to be exposed (broken) in the realizations.*

The failure to address container deterioration systematically in the FTM results in the model using inappropriate, non-conservative assumptions about the "source terms" of waste constituents. The MWL waste containers, or the MWL waste containers SNL is aware of, include 55-gallon drums, plastic bags and other short-lived containers with an identifiable lifespan that is very short, a few decades in the case of 55-gallon drums, compared to the extremely long-lived hazards associated with the MWL contents other than tritium and cobalt-60.

The failure to address the limits on the durability containers due to deterioration mechanisms and resulting contaminant releases ignores a primary critique of SNL's data presented at the December 2004 MWL Public Hearing, as identified by the Hearing Officer, that SNL studies and models to date have failed to address the inevitable deterioration of waste containers.

**RECOMMENDATION:** To reflect the intent of the Hearing Officer as stated in her Final Report and Proposed Final Order, the FTM should be revised to identify and address fate and

transport dynamics that would occur as a result of the deterioration of all VOC, heavy metal and radionuclide containers at the MWL.

Also, the FTM's analysis of potential radon movement should be revised to both identify mechanisms that would result in deterioration of the radium-226 containers and conduct model realizations for container deterioration faster than the 1000-year period reported such as deterioration within 100-years of disposal.

- 3. The FTM concludes that PCE, the one organic compound modeled in the FTM, would reach groundwater for all 100 model runs ("realizations") with the majority of the model runs showing PCE reaching groundwater within 50 years.**

The FTM states: "Figure 22 [on p. 55] shows the simulated PCE concentrations in the groundwater as a function of time for all 100 realizations. The majority of the realizations show the aquifer concentrations peaking before 50 years. Depending on the time of disposal, this corresponds to peak concentrations occurring by 2010 – 2040. [emphasis added]. To date, no detectable amounts of PCE have been found in the groundwater at the MWL. This is still consistent with the simulations which show a large amount of variability in the simulated concentrations resulting from uncertainty included in the input parameters." FTM at pp. 54-55. Figure 22 is attached these comments as APPENDIX A.

Thus, the FTM confirms that a volatile organic compound already shown to have escaped from the MWL, tetrachloroethylene (PCE), is likely to reach the groundwater aquifer within 50 years in most model runs. This finding should serve as a basis for NMED to focus a substantially higher degree of attention on the need for a corrective measure at the MWL that can be demonstrated to effectively control releases of VOCs.

Figure 23 in the FTM shows the concentration of PCE anticipated in the groundwater by the model realizations. This figure shows that the vast majority of the realizations – about 80% - show PCE levels in the groundwater in the range of 1 – 5 micrograms per liter, equivalent to parts per billion. Prediction of those concentrations of PCE reaching the groundwater represent a prediction of significant contamination as PCE is not naturally occurring and therefore **zero** PCE would be predicted to have reached groundwater if no PCE were already shown to have escaped from the MWL. Figure 23 is attached to these comments in APPENDIX A.

*SNL Response: In contrast to the statement above, only 30% (not 80%) of the realizations results in groundwater concentrations ranging from 1 – 5 micrograms per liter. Only 1% of all the realizations show a groundwater concentration that exceeds the regulatory metric of 5 micrograms per liter.*

The FTM shows that PCE reaches groundwater based on data from previously detected releases of VOCs at the MWL as, the FTM notes: "Although no quantitative estimates of the volumes of these contaminants disposed of in the MWL exist, soil samples provide an estimate of the extent and concentration of the region contaminated with VOCs at the MWL." FTM at p. 52.

*SNL Response: No PCE has been detected in the groundwater at the MWL. The quote above refers to measured values of PCE in soil-gas samples taken at 10 and 30 feet below the surface.*

The lack of information about this highly mobile contaminant in the MWL inventory, or the form and condition of containers used for disposal of PCE and other VOCs and SVOCs, prevents SNL from conducting analyses based on accurate estimates of the amount of VOCs and SVOCs in the MWL. The lack of recent or current VOC and SVOC monitoring data since the 1993 Phase 2 RFI prevents SNL from accurately reflecting the current extent of VOC and SVOC releases from the MWL in the FTM.

*SNL Response: The extent of contamination by VOCs and SVOCs in subsurface soils at the MWL was characterized during the Phase 2 RFI. Concentrations of contaminants were found to be at low levels, below risk thresholds, and the MWL was proposed for No Further Action in 1996. Because the nature and extent of contamination had been adequately characterized during the Phase 2 RFI, and because contaminant levels were so low, monitoring was not continued for VOCs and SVOCs in soil.*

*There is little information about PCE in the MWL inventory because only small quantities of solvents such as PCE were disposed of at the site (primarily on rags and contaminated equipment).*

*See response below.*

As SNL has no information available about the VOC waste volume and disposal practices the FTM used the: “[M]aximum measured gas concentration (5,900 ppb) ... as a minimum value in a uniform distribution increasing to ten times this value to develop a range of equilibrium aqueous concentrations.” FTM at p. 52. In other words, since the MWL permittee acknowledges that it has no information on the amount or form of the PCE (and other VOCs and SVOCs) in the landfill or how the containers they were disposed in have aged, the model used the amount of VOCs and SVOCs more than a decade ago that had already leaked from the landfill for the “source term.”

*SNL Response: The maximum inventory for PCE was increased (from the minimum value estimated from measured values) by a factor of 10; with this distribution, the simulation results fell within the range of measured values in 1993 at 10 and 30 feet below the subsurface. This calibrated the model for the latent period between emplacement (which is unknown) until the time of measurement in 1993.*

This method of identifying the “source term” for the PCE FTM does not account for the likelihood that the amount of PCE, and other VOCs, leaking from waste containers may have increased significantly since 1993 when the VOC releases used to develop the FTM were detected.

The FTM only modeled one organic compound, PCE, though a dozen VOCs and SVOCs were demonstrated to have been released from the landfill by 1995. In spite of the demonstration that PCE would reach groundwater within 50 years in all model realizations, the FTM failed expand

its modeling study to address the fate and transport of other organics detected in the Phase 2 RFI monitoring data.

*SNL Response: PCE was chosen conservatively because of its relatively large Henry's Constant and relatively high mobility. Because results showed that PCE could reach the groundwater, all other VOCs that have been measured in the soil gas at the site have been marked as "triggers" for monitoring in the groundwater.*

Similarly the FTM fails to identify or present model realizations for the decay products of PCE and the other VOCs and SVOCs demonstrated to have escaped the MWL in 1993. This is particularly problematic as at least one decay product of PCE, vinyl chloride, has a maximum contaminant level (MCL) established by EPA of 2 ppb, less than the proposed trigger level of 2.5 ppb proposed for PCE in the FTM at p. 62. See EPA "National Primary Drinking Water Regulations" at [http://www.epa.gov/safewater/contaminants/dw\\_contamfs/vinylchl.html](http://www.epa.gov/safewater/contaminants/dw_contamfs/vinylchl.html).

*SNL Response: PCE was modeled as a proxy for all VOCs, including its decay products. Biodegradation of PCE (and TCE) to vinyl chloride in groundwater would occur only under anaerobic conditions, which do not exist at the MWL.*

As no information is presented in the FTM regarding fate and transport model realization data for any PCE decay product, no information is presented regarding concentrations of any decay products in groundwater that may have been predicted by the FTM model realizations. The FTM should be revised to correct inconsistencies in data presented regarding PCE releases from the MWL. The FTM states that the maximum PCE detected in 1993 was 5,900 ppb at p. 52, but lists the maximum concentration of PCE in 1993 as 5,200 ppb on Figure 21 at p. 53.

*SNL Response: The numbers reported are correct. Figure 21 shows the maximum concentration measured at 10 feet, which was 5,200 ppb. Figure 22 shows the maximum concentration measured at 30 feet, which was 5,900 ppb. The higher of the two values was used for inventory calibration.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** Because PCE was shown to reach groundwater in all model realizations within approximately 50 years, the FTM should be revised to include model realizations reflecting future movement of all VOCs and SVOCs found to have been released from the landfill in 1993. These additional models and model realizations should be revised to include consideration of the decay products of PCE and the other VOCs and SVOCs that were shown to have escaped the MWL by 1993. Decay products modeled should include any decay products, such as vinyl chloride, that may have MCLs as low or lower than that established for PCE.

The FTM should be revised to reflect the potential for container deterioration to have resulted in significant additional VOC and SVOC releases from the MWL at rates well beyond the "ten times" indicated in the FTM at p. 52. As substantial additional deterioration of VOC and SVOC containers is likely to have occurred since 1993, it is reasonable for the FTM to be revised to include consideration of VOC and SVOC source terms 100x and 1000x the maximum values detected in the vadose zone in 1993 for all VOCs and SVOCs detected at the landfill. Model

realizations considering source terms 100 – 1000 times concentrations detected in 1993 will allow the FTM to address the potential for additional releases since 1993 or releases not detected in 1993.

The FTM should be revised to include evaluation of the vapor phase transport mechanism attributed to the VOCs that reached the groundwater at the Chemical Waste Landfill at SNL. This revision should be included to ensure that the assumptions regarding PCE movement used in the FTM reflect real world conditions as demonstrated at other landfills at SNL.

The FTM should be revised to include a VOC and SVOC detection and monitoring system to provide real world data to verify results of model realizations.

The NMED should request a revision of the FTM that corrects any inconsistencies in data used and presented in the FTM. The indication that the FTM authors may have understated the maximum PCE gas concentrations in 1993 by more than 10% (the difference between 5,900 and 5,200) in one of its models (as reflected in Figure 21) should serve as a basis for the NMED to require verification that the appropriate, higher value was used in the FTM. In addition, the NMED should require that SNL verify that model realizations were indeed conducted with using values “ten times” the 1993 maximum gas concentration of PCE as neither Figure 21 or any other portion of the FTM discussion of VOC model realizations appear to reflect the use of values “ten times” 1993 maximum gas concentrations asserted by the FTM at p. 52.

The NMED should consider requiring improvements in the Corrective Measure proposed for the MWL to prevent future releases of VOCs and SVOCs from the MWL as the FTM (and a 1995 Argonne National Laboratory study cited in the FTM, as discussed below) demonstrates the high probability of VOCs reaching groundwater beneath the MWL at values at or near applicable maximum contaminant level standards.

*SNL Response: See detailed responses above regarding these recommendations.*

- 4. The FTM identifies a 1995 Argonne National Laboratory [cited as Johnson 1995 in the FTM] report at p. 16 that showed that VOCs released from the MWL could reach the water approximately 250 years from the time of disposal. This study was not provided to NMED as part of either the Corrective Measures Study (CMS), Corrective Measure Implementation Plan (CMIP) or the references for either of those reports.**

The FTM at p. 16 states: “The [Argonne National Laboratory study report as Johnson, 1995] study also included screening calculations for aqueous-phase transport of PCE and TCE, and predicted that these VOCs could reach the water table approximately 250 years from time of disposal. No calculations were conducted for vapor-phase transport, which has proven to be the most significant transport mechanism for organic compounds in the vadose zone at nearby ER sites, including the Chemical Waste Landfill.”

This 1995 study is cited as: "Johnson, R., D. Blunt, D. Tomasko, H. Hartmann, and A. Chan, 1995, A Human Health Risk Assessment for the Mixed Waste Landfill, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL." Though the FTM asserts that the Argonne Study used a "worst case scenario" approach, the failure of the 1995 Study to consider vapor-phase transport mechanisms, which has been shown to have resulted in VOCs escaping the Chemical Waste Landfill at SNL reaching the groundwater aquifer, appears to contradict that assertion.

The combination of the 1995 Argonne study with the FTM demonstrates that the high mobility of VOCs is not controlled by the proposed Corrective Measure at the MWL and the likelihood that VOCs will reach the groundwater aquifer beneath the MWL even if the currently approved Corrective Measure is installed at the MWL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The NMED should require SNL to provide the agency with copies of the 1995 Argonne Study, review the Study, and consider its relevance regarding the adequacy of the Corrective Measure identified in the Permit Modification since SNL failed to present the Study to NMED or the public or consider it during the development of the Corrective Measure Study.

The NMED should review the Corrective Measure approved in the Permit Modification as the conclusions of the 1995 Argonne Report are contrary to the conclusions presented in the CMS and MWL hearing by SNL that contaminants such as VOCs *could not* reach groundwater at the MWL site. See statement "Contaminants are unlikely to reach groundwater ..." CMS at 29.

*SNL Response: Neither the Argonne National Laboratory report by Robert Johnson nor the early modeling results by Sandia National Laboratories provide any new information to the case, and details on these reports have been included in public documents for years. Both reports are discussed in depth in Section 5.6 of the Mixed Waste Phase 2 RCRA Facility Investigation Report (SNL/NM, 1996). In addition, the Argonne report was provided to WERC and to the public during the first WERC peer review of the MWL in 2001 (Reference No. 53, Appendix D, WERC 2001). The results of the Argonne National Laboratory study, and the modeling results by Sandia are also summarized in Appendix E of the Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan (SNL/NM, 2005).*

The "trigger levels" identified in the FTM fail to provide for early detection and early response to releases prior to the exceedence of health-based standards. The proposed trigger levels fail to provide either early detection or early response as they are set at values at or near regulatory standards rather than at levels that would demonstrate the "edge of the plume," which is the purpose of trigger levels as identified by the MWL Hearing Officer's Final Report at pp. 35 – 40.

*SNL Response: Triggers for contaminant releases to the surface were set at values that are orders of magnitude below values that were simulated to yield exceedances to regulatory metrics. The triggers for groundwater concentration were chosen to be half the MCLs. These values are considered conservative, as MCLs are typically health-based standards.*

The trigger levels identified in the FTM are values that are well above background concentrations for the constituents identified and fail to identify levels that would demonstrate that the “edge of a plume” has reached a location of concern or that statistically significant increases in the concentration of contaminants have been detected by monitoring activities.

Exceedences of the proposed trigger levels identified in the FTM would demonstrate that significant and extensive contamination has already occurred, not conditions at the “edge of the plume,” and would result in subsurface contamination that would be much more expensive to remedy than contamination detected at trigger levels set at concentrations exceeding background by a statistically significant value, such as 25% or 50%, above locally appropriate background values.

Though neither the Permit Modification or the Secretary’s Final Order provide a specific definition for “trigger levels,” several sources can be identified that demonstrate that the appropriate understanding of “trigger level” as identified in the MWL Hearing Officer’s Final Report is a concentration of a constituent designated to “detect contamination” or the “edge of a plume,” rather than an exceedence of a regulatory standard.

In her Final Report, the Hearing Officer identified an example of trigger levels as: “one trigger could be that if contaminants moved a specific distance deeper under the landfill, then this might result in NMED ordering future excavation” at p. 40.

At the MWL Public Hearing in December 2004, NMED’s technical witness Willam Moats stated, “...triggers themselves would be designed around detection of contamination in the vadose zone and the groundwater.” MWL Hearing Transcript at p. 1141.

**RECOMMENDATION:** To insure that trigger levels identify the “edge of a plume” and “detect contamination,” rather than the exceedence of regulatory standards, the trigger levels applied to the monitoring systems at the MWL should be set at concentrations that reflect a significant increase above background values rather than at a concentrations that approach regulatory standards and are many times higher than background conditions. The location of the monitoring systems at which the trigger levels would apply should be beneath the landfill, but well above the groundwater level for the trigger levels to serve as an “early warning system” rather than confirmation of groundwater contamination by applying proposed trigger levels at an elevation at which groundwater is found as proposed in the FTM.

To provide “detection of contamination,” trigger levels should be established at a level 25 – 50% above initial concentrations for contaminants of concern. Verification of contaminant concentrations when detected will provide assurance that values that exceed background concentrations by a significant amount are not anomalous or indicative of analytic error.

*SNL Response: The trigger levels proposed in the MWL CMI Plan represent conservative values that were selected based on regulatory metrics. They were selected based on the objectives of minimizing false positive detections, while still protecting human health and the environment. The final trigger levels for the MWL will be selected in consultation with the NMED, and will be presented in Sandia’s Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan for the MWL.*

5. **The trigger levels proposed in the FTM fail to identify trigger levels for waste constituents that apply at the edge of the MWL or in the vadose zone below the site but above the water table.**

The FTM lists recommended “trigger levels” in Section 4.2.1 at pp. 61 – 62. The list fails to include vadose zone trigger levels for contaminants identified in the MWL and only lists vadose zone trigger level for “infiltration” as measured by moisture content increase.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The FTM should be revised to provide for a vadose zone monitoring program that includes analysis of all of the constituents identified on pp. 61 – 62 and other constituents that may be identified based on these comments or other recommendation provided to the NMED to insure that all transport mechanisms, both anticipated and unanticipated, are addressed by the trigger levels implemented at the MWL.

*SNL Response:* The proposed vadose zone monitoring program consists of neutron moisture monitoring to assess changes in infiltration over time. Vadose zone monitoring parameters, frequencies and locations will be determined in consultation with the NMED during the development of the Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMMP).

6. **The FTM discussion of “Trigger Levels” does not address the degree to which monitoring for moisture content changes would reflect vapor phase movement of VOCs.**

Vapor phase movement of VOCs is noted as the mechanism for VOC transport to groundwater at the Chemical Waste Landfill at SNL. See quote from Johnson 1995, FTM at p. 16.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The FTM should identify effective technologies for detection of vapor phase movement of VOCs into the vadose zone beneath the MWL. These technologies should be included in an expanded monitoring system to provide for detection of VOC and SVOC releases from the MWL.

*SNL Response:* See detailed response to Comment No. 5, above.

7. **A broad range of sources of uncertainty in the FTM were identified by the FTM lead author Dr. Clifford Ho in a powerpoint presentation at a DOE-sponsored public meeting on the FTM in January 2006. The “uncertainty variables” identified by Dr. Ho included: waste inventory and size; thickness of cover and vadose zone; and transport parameters including: infiltration, adsorption coefficient, saturated conductivity, moisture content; tortuosity coefficients, and boundary-layer thickness.**

The FTM Report posted at on the NMED site does not identify the “uncertainty variables” in as clear and succinct a manner as the presentation by Dr. Ho and does not identify the range of

values use for each of the “uncertainty variables” parameters used in model realizations to account for those sources of uncertainty for each of the contaminants modeled.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The FTM should be revised to identify the full range of uncertainty variables associated with each of the constituents addressed in the FTM.

The FTM should be revised to identify the range of values used in model realizations to account for the uncertainty associated with each variable.

*SNL Response: The report includes a description of all the uncertain variables and their ranges (see Tables 2-5 (pp. 26-29)).*

## **II. Corrective Measures Implementation Plan Comments and Recommendations**

### **A. The CMIP fails to effectively incorporate the content and findings of the FTM in either the evaluation or design of the Corrective Measure proposed for the MWL.**

While the CMIP includes the full text of the FTM as Appendix E in the CMIP as posted by NMED, the body of the CMIP does not appear to refer to or incorporate any of the information identified in the FTM in the substance of the CMIP.

Neither the “Regulatory Basis” (Section 3), “MWL Characteristics” (Section 4), “Technical Basis” (Section 5), “Vadose Zone Moisture Monitoring” (Section 7), “Conclusions” (Section 8) nor “References” (Section 9.0) sections of the CMIP identify or refer to the FTM or the data it contains.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The CMIP should be revised to incorporate the analyses and findings in the FTM - when it is determined to be comprehensive and meet the requirements of the Permit Modification and associated guidelines and regulations by NMED - in the design, operation and monitoring and maintenance plans proposed by the permittee for the MWL.

*SNL Response: The objective of the CMI Plan was to present a detailed design of the remedy selected by the NMED for the MWL. The proposed design meets the full intent of RCRA Subtitle C regulations, which include minimizing water migration through the cover, minimizing maintenance and erosion, accommodating subsidence, and having a permeability less than or equal to that of the natural subsurface soils. The Fate and Transport model results do not show any need to modify the proposed design in the CMI Plan.*

### **B. The CMIP fails to provide a comprehensive or detailed long-term operation and maintenance plan for public comment or review.**

While the MWL Permit Modification requires the permittee to provide an operation and maintenance plan, the CMIP only provides information about vadose zone instrumentation and defers the presentation of information on the duration and frequency of the operation and maintenance plan until the conclusion of an unspecified consultation process with NMED. That approach is identified as the process for development of a MWL long-term monitoring and

maintenance plan. No aspects of a MWL monitoring program other than vadose zone monitoring are identified or addressed in the CMIP. See CMIP p. 7-1.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The CMIP should be revised to include a comprehensive long-term monitoring and maintenance program for public review and comment. The proposed long-term monitoring and maintenance program should include: all parameters to be monitored, all media – including air, soil, vadose zone, groundwater and biota (plants and animals); recommended limits of detection for analytic equipment to be use; frequency of sampling and analysis; quality control and quality assurance measures; monitoring and maintenance cost estimates; MWL cover inspections and maintenance activities; and measures to verify that all institutional control aspects of the proposed corrective measure are in place and enforced for the full closure and post-closure period at the MWL.

*SNL Response: The NMED Class 3 Permit Modification for the MWL requires Sandia to submit a Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan to the NMED within 180 days after the NMED's approval of the CMI Report, following remedy implementation. Additional details on the proposed long-term monitoring and maintenance program will be presented in the Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan, which will be developed in consultation with the NMED after implementation of the remedy.*

**C. The CMIP proposes only three vadose zone monitoring sites – boreholes - and does not provide a demonstration that such an arbitrary and limited number of instruments will provide comprehensive vadose zone monitoring.**

The CMIP at p. 7-1 describes a vadose zone monitoring program that includes three access holes based on the “simplicity, low cost and long-term viability” of the approach. Unfortunately, the permittee did not consider it appropriate to provide a vadose zone monitoring program that is comprehensive enough to comply with the MWL Permit Modification or capable of monitoring the vadose zone beneath all of the MWL. This shortcoming in the CMIP is particularly significant in light of the FTM demonstrations that groundwater contamination due to VOC releases is inevitable as it occurs in all model realizations.

In its analysis, the CMIP fails to identify locations where contaminants from the MWL have been shown to have migrated from their point of disposal into the vadose zone in the Phase 2 RFI investigation nor does it correlate those locations with the three vadose zone monitoring sites in the CMIP. These locations are identified in the record of the MWL public hearing and include data from the “RFI Phase 2” conducted in the early 1990s.

No information is available on the extent of the migration of contaminants since the RFI Phase 2 investigations as such an investigation has not been required by NMED or attained and reported by SNL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The CMIP should be revised to incorporate data from an investigation of the current extent of migration of contaminants into the vadose zone. The NMED should require SNL to conduct investigations using technologies such as ground penetrating radar and other geophysical methods to detect moisture distribution in addition to soil borings and other

methods to insure that the vadose zone monitoring program can be demonstrated to be comprehensive and addresses the full extent of vadose zone contamination beneath and adjacent to the MWL.

The CMIP should be revised to include additional vadose zone monitoring that is capable of providing a comprehensive capacity to detect contaminants released from the MWL.

In the alternative, the CMIP should be revised to demonstrate that the proposed vadose zone monitoring system is configured in a manner that can detect all potential routes of migration of contaminants, including volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds, identified beneath or adjacent to the MWL in the RFI Phase 2 investigation.

*SNL Response: See response to Recommendation B above. Vadose zone monitoring will be addressed in more detail in the Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMP), which will be developed following implementation of the remedy.*

**D. The CMIP fails to address the technical literature related to bio-intrusion barriers or identify monitoring systems appropriate for detect of release associated with bio-intrusion into the MWL.**

An extensive body of technical literature has been developed on bio-intrusion barriers as well as releases of contaminants through vertebrates, invertebrates and plants that have been shown to have penetrated bio-intrusion barriers. This data was summarized in a report by a leading international expert on bio-intrusion barrier design and function prepared for Citizen Action New Mexico and presented to the NMED as part of its comments on SNL's proposed corrective measure at the MWL. This report, "Review of Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico Evapotranspiration Cap Closure Plans for the Mixed Waste Landfill," by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D., Environmental Evaluation Services, LLC, is available at [http://www.radfreenm.org/pages/hakonson\\_full.htm](http://www.radfreenm.org/pages/hakonson_full.htm).

In his report, Dr. Hakonson's asserted that assumption that "tritium is now present in vegetation and animals that now occupy the MWL" was correct. He also cited investigations in which Sr-90, Cs-137 and Pu - all contaminants found at the MWL - have been discovered in animals occupying similar landfills containing mixed wastes and further states that biological transport of radioactive contaminants is likely to occur over time and increase over the long-term.

Information presented at the Mixed Waste Landfill Public Hearing in December 2004 by SNL confirms Dr. Hakonson's assertion regarding deer mice and vegetation at the MWL which show contamination with low levels of tritium and radon. See MWL Hearing Record Transcript at pp. 102 - 104 as noted in Hearing Officer Final Report at pp. 7 and 35.

Regarding biological transport of contaminants, Dr. Hakonson's report states: "Both plants and animals have the potential to transport buried waste to the ground surface. Plants do so via roots that can penetrate several meters into the landfill. Furthermore, most plant species have the capability to penetrate the relatively thin cover soil layer proposed for the MWL. This means that the term, "shallow rooted" as used by the SNL/NM ET cap designers is inappropriate given that the grass species that they propose to use to revegetate the ET cover all have the capability to

send roots several meters into the soil. If soil moisture penetrates beyond the existing rhizosphere, plant root distribution will extend downward to capture moisture at the deeper depths.

“Roots in contact with waste can incorporate soluble constituents and transport them to the ground surface. This uptake process is analogous to a one-way valve in that contaminants are pumped upward to above ground vegetation that eventually senesces and deposits associated contaminants on the ground surface. Burrowing by animals and insects also has the potential to access buried waste several meters below the ground surface. This can lead not only to chemical and radiation exposures to the organisms but also to physical transport of the waste upward in the soil profile and to the ground surface.

“This leads to what I believe is one of the more important deficiencies in the proposed MWL closure, namely the assumption that vertical and horizontal transport of site contaminants resulting from biological processes is not an important contributor to exposure pathways. My review suggests that relevant data from the MWL on contaminants in vegetation, animals, and soil cast to the surface by burrowing animals apparently do not exist. The reason biointrusion may be important is that it represents the major mechanism leading to vertical transport of contaminants to the ground surface and through the drying effect of plant transpiration on cover soils, plays a major role in the evolution of volatile contaminants from the ground surface. While vertical transport by biota may be small on a short time scale, over many decades these processes may become dominant in mobilizing buried waste.

“It is my opinion that the soil sampling done by SNL/NM in 1990 as a part of the Phase 2 RFI provides little information that can be used to answer questions about the effects of biointrusion in transporting MWL contaminants to the soil surface. The RFI soil sampling grid resulted in evenly spaced samples (i. e., that were non-randomly distributed), that provided coarse spatial resolution of contaminant concentrations, and that involved sampling locations that were recently disturbed such as Trench F where backfill was added just months before the soil samples were taken. Furthermore, those samples that were taken in 1990 represent a single snap shot in time and depending on the degree of past mechanical disturbances that occurred within the MWL boundaries, they may represent a snap shot with little elapsed time between soil surface disturbance and when the soil samples were taken.[emphasis added].”

**RECOMMENDATION:** The CMIP should be revised to include a thorough investigation and re-sampling of the soil at the MWL to identify bio-intrusion mechanisms and biological transport of contaminants, and consider the relationship of these findings of such investigations to the Corrective Measure for the MWL. The NMED should consider revisions to the Corrective Measure permitted for the MWL based on information concerning biological transport in Dr. Hakonson’s report and sampling data collected from the flora and fauna at the MWL by SNL since biological transport of contaminants has occurred - and continues to occur - at the dump.

The implementation of a comprehensive sampling program designed to detect levels of radioactive contamination in plants and animals living at the MLW is strongly recommended as a part of the CMIP with appropriate trigger levels to be used to determine future corrective actions at the MWL.

*SNL Response: The objective of the Corrective Measures Implementation (CMI) Plan was to present a detailed engineering design for the MWL remedy.*

*Biological transport is a potential mechanism for contaminant migration from the MWL. Tritium, the most mobile radionuclide disposed of in the MWL, has been detected at low levels in vegetation and small mammals at the MWL. The tritium levels measured to date are consistent with levels in the soil, and are not present at concentrations that represent a concern to environmental health. Tritium concentrations in soil and vegetation are decreasing over time due to radioactive decay and other natural processes.*

*The remedy selected by the NMED includes a rock biointrusion barrier. The intent of the rock barrier is to prevent any intrusion by burrowing animals, and it should restrict root growth so long as the underlying materials are relatively dry (Anderson and Forman, 2002). Care will be taken during long-term monitoring to prevent the establishment of deep-rooted species on the cover.*

*Additional details for long-term monitoring of biota will be presented in the MWL Long-Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan (LTMMP), which will be developed in consultation with the NMED and completed once the MWL remedy has been implemented.*

## APPENDIX A




Figure 22. Simulated PCE groundwater concentrations for 100 realizations.

“Figure 22 shows the simulated PCE concentrations in the groundwater as a function of time for all 100 realizations. The majority of the realizations show the aquifer concentrations peaking before 50 years. Depending on the time of disposal, this corresponds to peak concentrations occurring by 2010 – 2040. So far, no detectable amounts of PCE have been found in the groundwater at the MWL. This is still consistent with the simulations, which show a large amount of variability in the simulated concentrations resulting from uncertainty included in the input parameters (see next section).” FTM at 54 –55.




Figure 23. Cumulative probability for simulated PCE peak groundwater concentrations for 100 realizations.

## REFERENCES for DOE/SNL Responses

Anderson, J.E. and A.D Forman, March 2002. "*The Protective Cap/Biobarrier Experiment. A Study of Alternative Evapotranspiration Caps for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory,*" prepared by Stoller for U.S. Department of Energy – Idaho Field Office Environmental Surveillance, Education and Research Program, Contract DE-AC07-00ID13658, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

NMED, 2005. "*Final Order, State of New Mexico before the Secretary of the Environment in the Matter of Request for a Class 3 Permit Modification for corrective measures for the Mixed Waste Landfill, Sandia National Laboratories, Bernalillo County, New Mexico, EPA ID #5890110518,*" May 26, 2005.

Robinson, P. February 2006. "*Review of Sandia National Laboratories' Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan and Fate and Transport Model,*" prepared on behalf of: Citizen Action, New Mexico by Paul Robison, Research Director, Southwest Research and Information Center, February 7, 2006.

Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico (SNL/NM), November 2005. "*Mixed Waste Landfill Corrective Measures Implementation Plan,*" prepared at Sandia National Laboratories by J. Peace, T. Goering, C. Ho and M. Miller for the U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque, NM.

Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico (SNL/NM), September 1996. "*Report of the Mixed Waste Landfill Phase 2 RCRA Facility Investigation, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico,*" report prepared by Sandia National Laboratories for the U.S. Department of Energy.

WERC, A Consortium for Environmental Education and Technology Development, "*Final Report, Independent Peer Review of the U.S. Department of Energy Sandia National Laboratories' Mixed Waste Landfill,*" August 31, 2001.