



**Department of Energy**  
Savannah River Operations Office  
P.O. Box A  
Aiken, South Carolina 29802

NOV -7 2019

Ms. Susan B. Fulmer, P.G., Manager  
Federal Remediation Section  
Division of Site Assessment, Remediation and Revitalization  
Bureau of Land and Waste Management  
South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. Jon Richards  
Acting Savannah River Site Remedial Project Manager  
Superfund Division  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4  
61 Forsyth Street, SW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Ms. Fulmer and Mr. Richards:

**SUBJECT:** Savannah River Site's Responses to the Regulatory Comments on the Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines (081-M) Operable Unit (U), January through December 2018 (SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019) SEMS Number: 19

In accordance with the terms of the Federal Facility Agreement, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is submitting the subject comment responses for your files. The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control's (SCDHEC) approval and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) comments on the Revision 0 document were received on July 16, 2019 and September 12, 2019, respectively. The draft responses to the EPA comments were submitted electronically on October 8, 2019 and approved by EPA on October 17, 2019. The performance evaluation report (PER) will not be revised; however, all comment responses will be incorporated in the next PER, as applicable. The time and effort that the SCDHEC and the EPA have given on the subject operable unit are greatly appreciated.

Questions from you or your staff may be directed to me at (803) 952-8365, or the DOE Federal Project Director, Ms. Karen Adams, at (803) 952-7871.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "BTH", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Brian T. Hennessey  
SRS Remedial Project Manager  
Infrastructure and Area Completion Division

NOV - 7 2019

Ms. Susan Fulmer  
Mr. Jon Richards

2

Enclosure:

SRS Responses to EPA Comments on the Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines (081-M) Operable Unit (U), January through December 2018 (SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019) SEMS Number: 19

cc w/o encl:

D. Scaturo, SCDHEC-Columbia  
S. French, SCDHEC-Columbia  
M. Reece, SCDHEC-Columbia  
G. K. Taylor, SCDHEC-Columbia  
T. Fuss, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
G. N. O'Quinn, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
B. Cameron, SCDHEC - Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
R. Pope, EPA-Atlanta

cc w/ encl:

D. Lloyd, EPA-Atlanta  
M. McRae, TechLaw, Inc.

SRS Responses to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Comments on the  
Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines  
(081-M) Operable Unit (U), SEMS Number: 19  
SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019  
Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina  
Page 1 of 9

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

---

**EPA GENERAL COMMENT:**

EPA renews the request to address the issue noted below in italics from 2 previous EPA comments made during the last two MIPSLS reporting efforts in order to ensure that this concern is addressed during this reporting interval. Please see EPA General Comment #1, below.

EPA's comment on the 2016 and 2017 Performance Evaluation Report for MIPSLS comment is copied (in italics) and pasted below:

*Based on the information presented in the 2016 MIPSLS it appears the contaminant mass that exists below the Upland Unit is more significant than has been previously reported. For example, the text in Section 2.1 (System Overview) states the contamination is predominately within the fine-grained sediments (Upland Unit) in the zone below the sewer line to 35-feet below ground surface (bgs). However, the text in Section 1.2 (Nature and Extent of Contamination), Page 2 of 56 states the Upland Unit has limited contaminant mobility to a significant degree although volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have migrated downward, into the more permeable sediments below the Upland Unit. Furthermore, the text in Section 3.0 (Conclusions/Recommendations) on Page 10 of 56, states the vast majority of VOC production at MIPSLS has been from MH-01, and approximately 94% of MH-01 production has been from the deeper extraction well screened in the Tobacco Road formation. As seen in Figure 3 Surface Well Configuration (Typical Cutaway View), Page 17 of 56 the SVE well is screened from 60 to 100 feet bgs and only a fraction of the total well screen length is located within the silty sand unit below the Upland Unit and above the clay unit. As such, it appears a majority of the mass removal is from below the Upland Unit and it is uncertain how this may impact the mass removal estimates and the overall remedial cleanup timeframes. Please revise the **next submittal** of the Performance Evaluation Report for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines (MIPSLS) (081-M) Operable Unit (OU) (U), CERCLIS Number 19, (2017 MIPSLS) to address this issue.*

DRAFT SRS Responses to EPA Comments on the PER for Revision 0 MIPSLS dated, October 23, 2017 Page 1 of 4

**DOE SRS Response:** Agree. The majority of the mass removal at MH-01 has occurred in the sediment below the Upland Unit. Based on a review of the soil vapor data collected from the CPT bore nearest MH-01 (i.e., MIPS-CP007) there was elevated PCE from 30 to 60 ft bgs and a significant indication of PCE at 88 ft bgs. The PCE observed from 30 to 60 ft bgs is below the upland unit in a sandy unit. The PCE hit at 88 ft corresponds to a low permeability unit. In reviewing the hydro-conceptual model (HCM) for the site, it appears that a revision is warranted to more accurately project the Upland Unit and the screened intervals of the well at MH-01. As a result, Section 2.1 will be revised in the 2017 PER to

SRS Responses to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Comments on the  
Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines  
(081-M) Operable Unit (U), SEMS Number: 19  
SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019  
Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina  
Page 2 of 9

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

---

**more accurately explain mass removal relative to the geology of the unit as well as future expectations for the remediation. No change to the 2016 PER is proposed.**

**Responsible Party: John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)**

Text from DOE-SRS PER of 2017 for the MIPS L, page 6 of 58, dated March 2018

The majority of the mass removed by the AS VEU has been from MH-01 and more specifically from SVE-01 which is screened from 70- to 110-ft bgs. The higher concentrations observed at this SVE well are likely a product of mass diffusing from the base of the Upland Unit and other low permeability sediments located between the Upland Unit and the water table. Evidence of this VOC mass was observed at an adjacent soil boring (i.e., MIPS-CP007) drilled and sampled for soil vapor in 2003. At MIPS-CP007, PCE concentrations were elevated from 30- to 60-ft bgs and at 88-ft bgs. The highest PCE concentration was observed at 35-ft bgs and generally decreased with depth, indicating the Upland Unit as the source. The lithology at MIPS-CP007 reveals relatively sandy sediment from 35- to 85-ft bgs, so the ZOI at SVE-01 could extend into the shallow vadose zone.

1. **Page 5 of 58, DOE-SRS PER of 2018 for MIPS L, dated March 2019 – This report:** DOE-SRS asserts that observed changes in VOC vapor concentrations are directly related to mass of VOCs remaining in the Upland Unit and that the mass of VOCs in the Upland Unit will decrease to a point where the efficacy of the mobile SVEU will be minimal resulting in a transition and ultimate recommendation to passive SVEU.
  - a. EPA renews it's request for a 3<sup>rd</sup> time for DOE-SRS to address the uncertainty associated with mass removal estimates and overall remedial cleanup timeframes since it appears that only a fraction of the total well screen length is located within the silty sand unit below the Upland Unit and above the clay unit. As such, it appears a majority of the mass removal is from below the Upland Unit leading to uncertainties as outlined above.

**Response: Clarification. Total mass estimates for VOC contamination below MH-01 and timeframes for removal of that mass were not part of the contaminant migration model analysis. As such, and as addressed in previous responses, SRS believes that the VOC concentrations observed below MH-01 are likely VOCs leaching from the upland unit (30 to 60 ft bgs) and the low permeability unit at 88 ft bgs from the solid to the vapor phase. VOC concentrations at shallow wells indicate that VOCs are still present in the Upland Unit and leaching out of the Upland Unit into the underlying sandy unit would be a reasonable result of that banked contamination.**

**As maintained in previous responses, VOC removal observed at well SVE-01, screened from 21.3- to 33.5-m bgs (70- to 110-ft bgs), are likely being pulled into the well screen from both the contamination within the Upland Unit as well as what has**

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

---

**leached further down below the Upland Unit. The screened interval for this well was positioned below the Upland Unit and near a clay unit based upon soil vapor data obtained in 2004 during the initial CPT pushes.**

**During a February 28, 2017 Core Team discussion, it was agreed to proceed with obtaining soil samples at the MIPS L Manholes. As such the data obtained during a Fall 2019 sampling event will be used to further identify any contamination below the Upland Unit and will validate the lithology of the 2004 CPT pushes. The information gained during the Fall 2019 sampling event will be incorporated into the 2019 PER.**

- b. Please construct a specific cutaway figure for the SVE Well Configuration associated with Manhole 01 to facilitate review of this issue.

**Response: Agree. The HCM depicted in Figure 3 of the PER of 2018 for the MIPS L has been revised to reflect the specific lithology observed at MH-01. The revised HCM (Figure A) is based on previously installed CPT boring MIPS-CP007 which was logged and used for a soil gas profile in 2004. As stated above, Figure 3 may be updated once additional information is obtained from the sampling event to be conducted in Fall 2019.**

- c. Provision of the above information is requested for this PER reporting interval and prior to the soil sampling effort for MIPS L since the data will be useful in present site conceptualization and future decisions, especially in conjunction with an updated contaminant migration analysis and future decisions as they pertain to the efficacy of the SVE remediation (transition to passive vs active) and in reaching the RGs for TCE and PCE for the MIPS L OU.

**Response: Clarification. As stated above in the response to Comment 1a, additional contamination information is being sought by SRS to address the concerns listed in this comment. The vadose zone sampling event is scheduled to be conducted during Fall 2019 in the vicinity of MH-01, MH-11, MH-12, and MH-13. Three soil bores will be advanced to ~100 ft bgs adjacent to MH-01 and will provide further characterization to verify the lithology and contaminant distribution near MH-01. If results are greater than the baseline RG values, a contaminant migration (CM) model will be created from the sampling results to further evaluate the effectiveness of the SVE remediation. The additional data and new model will be incorporated in the 2019 PER.**

- d. Provision of this information is requested prior to any transition to passive SVE

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

**Response: Agree. As noted in response to comments for the Sampling Analysis Plan for the MIPSLS (SRNS-RP-2018-01053, July 2019), the analytical results will be compared to the RG values after the soil sampling is complete. If analytical results are above the approved RG values, a CM model will be completed to evaluate the new analytical results as compared to the approved RG values. A report for the new modeling effort will be provided to the Core Team for review and further discussion. Any recommendations to revise the RG values based on CM model results or to transition to passive SVE will be discussed with and agreed to by the Core Team.**

**No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.**

**Responsible Party: James Kubar, 803-952-6525, [james.kubar@srs.gov](mailto:james.kubar@srs.gov)**

#### **EPA SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

**1) Page 3 of 58, Nature and Extent of Contamination, paragraph three:**

- a. Please provide a timeframe for the computer modeling and a reference for the document that contains the referenced computer modeling.

**Response: Agree. The time period for the modeling and the reference to the report will be added to the text in the Nature and Extent of Contamination section in the 2019 PER similar to the following: "Contaminant migration modeling conducted in 2004 was used to establish TCE and PCE soil concentrations that would not adversely impact the underlying groundwater (WSRC 2005).**

**Responsible Party: James Kubar, 803-952-6525, [james.kubar@srs.gov](mailto:james.kubar@srs.gov)**

**2) Page 3 of 58, Section 1.2, Nature and Extent of Contamination:**

- a. Please include a brief discussion of seasonal water surface fluctuations (potentiometric surface) and indicate over what range these fluctuations occur to facilitate an understanding of when or if the water surface may come near or intersect the longer screened interval of the deeper SVE wells.
- b. A figure that depicts this would be helpful and could be included in Figure 3 or another figure, whichever is preferred.

**Response: Agree. Text discussion similar to the following will be added to Section 1.2, Nature and Extent of Contamination in the 2019 PER:**

**"Water elevations show variations related to rainfall, proximity to streams and other physical features. Since 2009, the two nearest monitoring wells to MIPSLS sampling locations have experienced minor water elevation fluctuations. Monitoring well MSB 23R, located north of MH-01, has water level measurements ranging from 154.2 ft bgs to 149.29 ft bgs.**

SRS Responses to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Comments on the  
Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines  
(081-M) Operable Unit (U), SEMS Number: 19  
SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019  
Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina  
Page 5 of 9

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

---

**Monitoring well MSB 15D, located south of MH-01, has water level measurements ranging from 147.7 ft bgs to 143.77 ft bgs. The top of the water table is not expected to come near or intersect the screened intervals of the deeper SVE wells.”**

**Figure A, included with these comment responses, depicts the water table near MH-01 to be 35 ft below the bottom of the screen at SVE-01. Figure A will be added to the 2019 PER and referenced in the text as appropriate. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.**

**Responsible Party: James Kupar, 803-952-6525, [james.kupar@srs.gov](mailto:james.kupar@srs.gov)**

- 3) **Page 7 of 58, Section 2.2, Soil Vapor Extraction Operations:** Please provide clarification (table or text) about the timing of lockout/system repairs. From the dates given, it appears that the system was down for ~ 50 days.
- a. The number of consecutive days the soil vapor extraction unit (SVEU) was inoperable on two occasions in calendar year 2018 (CY2018) is not clearly presented in this section. For example, the second paragraph on Page 7 of 58 states the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Line (MIPSL) SVEU was inoperable for seven consecutive days on two occasions. However, the text states the MIPSL was down from March 6 to March 23, 2018 and from June 14, 2018 to July 3, 2018, which is more than 14 consecutive days on two occasions. Revise the PER 2018 to address this discrepancy.

**Response: Clarification. Per regulatory agreement, SRS is required to notify SCDHEC and USEPA when the SVEU has been inoperable for greater than seven consecutive days. The text should have clearly stated that the SVEU was inoperable for more than seven days on two occasions, March 6 to the 23<sup>rd</sup> and June 14 to July 3<sup>rd</sup>. The SVEU was inoperable for a total of 37 days in 2018. A more accurate description for the timing of lockout/system repairs will be provided in future PER documents. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.**

**Responsible Party: John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)**

- 4) **Section 2.2, Soil Vapor Extraction Operations, Page 7 of 58:** The first sentence in the second paragraph indicates the electrical power for the MIPSL SVEU originates from the same circuit as the M-1 Air Stripper. The text also discusses the periods in CY2018 when the MIPSL SVEU system was inoperable due primarily to the M-1 Air Stripper being locked out either for repairs or recovery well installation. As such, it appears the performance of the M-1 Air Stripper directly impacts the performance of the MIPSL SVEU. To ensure future performance of the MIPSL SVEU is not impacted by M-1 Air Stripper lock out power interruptions, revise the PER 2018 to address this issue.

**Response: Clarification. The M-1 Air Stripper and the MIPSL SVEU share a common power source. When electrical power needs to be interrupted, both units are put off-line for electrical operation. However, when the MIPSL SVEU is not operable by electrical power**

SRS Responses to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Comments on the Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines (081-M) Operable Unit (U), SEMS Number: 19 SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019 Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina Page 6 of 9

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

for any length of time, microblowers are placed into service at the well head to continue remediation. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

Responsible Party: John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

- 5) **Page 8 of 58, Samples and Analyses:** Please provide a reference or information in an appendix which includes the modifications to the Modified Method 18.

**Response:** Agree. Modified Method 18 was discussed in the report, *Comparison of USEPA Method 18 Versus Savannah River Site Modified Method 18 Sampling of Vapor Extraction and Air Stripper Units*, ESH-ERP-2003-00038, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, February 7, 2003. This reference to Modified Method 18 will be added to future PERs. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

Responsible Party: John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

- 6) **Page 9 of 58, Section 2.2.2 Performance Results:** EPA's Conditional Approval Letter dated October 21, 2018 in reference to the MIPS L PER of 2017 provided conditional approval for the 2017 PER with the "understanding that additional discussion will be provided in the next reporting effort (this report – MIPS L 2018 PER) include additional discussion, clarification and comparison of the use of the average 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> highest flow rates versus the use of an average flow rate at each well." This level of discussion has NOT been provided in this report.
- a. EPA renews it's request as outlined above and further requests that this information be included in this reporting effort since it is the 2<sup>nd</sup> time it has been requested and is important when evaluating future site decisions to move to a passive instead of active SVE system
  - b. **This comment which was included in EPA Comment Letter for the MIPS L PER of 2017 and is provided here as background information for the above EPA comment**

4

i. **Section 3.0, Conclusions/Recommendations, Page 11 of 58:**

*Section 3.0 states, "SRS recommends that the monitoring of the ASVE unit and the sampling frequency remain unchanged, but that a different approach to flow rate evaluation be implemented for the MicroBlower™ systems. SRS determined that the eleven fractured MicroBlower™ wells with the smaller blower (Wells F11-1, F11-2, F11-3, F11-4, F12-1, F12-2, F12-4, F13-1, F13-2, F13-3, and F13-4) have an average flow rate of 2 cubic feet per minute (cfm). This average was obtained by taking the average of the second, third, and fourth highest flow rates of the five most recent flow measurements at each well..." However, it is unclear why the average flow rate was not calculated using all of the data obtained from the most recent flow measurement events at each well location. Revise the 2017 PER to provide a calculated average flow measurement using all of the recent flow rates for a comparison.*

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

**Response: Clarification.** As previously discussed in the 2017 PER, the average flow rate of 2 cfm was calculated by excluding the first and fifth highest flow rates at each well to account for variability in flow rates due to the effect of weather conditions on the photovoltaic powered units. By comparison, an average flow rate of 2.4 cfm was calculated using all flow rates from all MicroBlower™ wells over the last five years. When calculating mass removal, the difference between 2 cfm and 2.4 cfm is not significant. Therefore, the average flow rate of 2 cfm reported in the 2017 and 2018 PERs was used to account for system variability and to provide a consistent approach for evaluating the performance of the MicroBlower™ systems from year to year.

Discussion similar to the following text will be added to future PER reports to explain how the average flow rate of 2 cfm was determined.

“An average flow rate of 2.0 cfm was determined based on the second, third, and fourth highest flow rates from all MicroBlower™ wells. The first and fifth highest flow rates were excluded from the average to account for variances in flow rates due to the effect of weather conditions on the photovoltaic powered units. By comparison, an average flow rate considering all flow rates (highest to lowest) from all MicroBlower™ wells over the last five years resulted in an average value of 2.4 cfm. When calculating mass removal, the difference between 2 cfm and 2.4 cfm is not significant. Therefore, the average flow rate of 2.0 cfm is used to account for the variability in flow rates and to provide a consistent approach for evaluating the performance of the MicroBlower™ systems from year to year.”

No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

Responsible Party: John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

- 7) **Page 10 of 58, Section 2.3 Soil Gas Performance Data, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:** DOE-SRS refers to “spurious” 2018 data from Well 11-3 and Well 11-4 based on historical values. However, no further information is provided except to offer that that it will be considered in 2019.
- a. EPA requests additional clarification to support and explain DOE-SRS's assertion as to spurious data.

**Response: Clarification.** The 2018 concentrations at Well 11-3 and Well 11-4 were the first values above 1 ppmv measured in ten years. These values were unexpected and not thought to be representative of soil gas performance. For this reason, additional inquiry into these two wells are being conducted during 2019. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

Responsible Party: John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

- 8) **Page 10 of 58, Section 2.3 Soil Gas Performance Data:** The text in the first paragraph indicates the maximum tetrachloroethylene (PCE) concentration in CY2018 was 17.0 parts per million by volume (ppmv). However, the maximum CY2018 PCE concentration summarized

SRS Responses to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Comments on the  
Performance Evaluation Report of 2018 for the M-Area Inactive Process Sewer Lines  
(081-M) Operable Unit (U), SEMS Number: 19  
SRNS-RP-2019-00066, Revision 0, March 2019  
Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina  
Page 8 of 9

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

---

in the table on Page 10 of 58 is 15.5 ppmv (sic). Revise the PER 2018 as appropriate to address this discrepancy.

**Response: Clarification.** The 17.0 ppmv PCE value was measured from the discharge of the SVEU. The 15.3 ppmv PCE value was measured at Well SVE-01 as indicated by the table column header. In future reports, the text will be revised to identify measurements from the SVEU system as appropriate. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

**Responsible Party:** John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

9) **Page 16 of 58, Figure 2:** Please depict the Manhole locations within the MIPS L OU Boundary Map to facilitate overview of manhole locations with respect to the MIPS L boundary.

**Response: Clarification.** The location of the manholes is shown on Figure 2 by both symbol and number identification. No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

**Responsible Party:** John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

10) **Pages 25-45, Tables 3, 4 and 5:** In future reporting efforts, please include Manhole designation associated with the Well ID and station ID.

**Response: Clarification.** The Manhole designation is indicated by the first two numbers of the Well ID and the Station ID, e.g., the manhole designation for Well F11-1 is Manhole 11.

A footnote will be added to Tables 3 and 4 in the 2019 PER as follows:

“\* The manhole designation is indicated by the first two numbers of the Well ID.”

A footnote will be added to Table 5 in the 2019 PER as follows:

“\* The manhole designation is indicated by the first two numbers of the Station ID.”

No change to the 2018 PER is proposed.

**Responsible Party:** John Bradley, 803-952-2301, [john02.bradley@srs.gov](mailto:john02.bradley@srs.gov)

Comments Received: September 12, 2019

Figure A: Surface Well Configuration at MH-01 with CPT Log and Soil Gas Profile

