



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

ARF-023664

APR 13 2022

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  
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 Draft Action Memorandum for the Non-Time Critical Removal Action for the 235-F Building (IACD-22-130, Dated February 28, 2022)

The U. S. Department of Energy is submitting the subject comment responses for your concurrence and file. The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) concurred with the draft action memorandum (AM) on March 16, 2022, and the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided comments on the draft AM on March 23, 2022. After the end of the public comment period for the *Removal Site Evaluation Report/Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (RSER/EE/CA) F-Area Material Storage Building (235-F)* (SRNS-RP-2021-00001, Revision 1, February 2022), the final AM will be updated to incorporate the comment responses. Please review these responses and provide your concurrence thirty (30) days from receipt. The time and effort that the SCDHEC and the EPA have given on the subject facility are greatly appreciated.

Questions from you or your staff may be directed to me at (803) 952-8365.

Sincerely,

**Brian T. Hennessey** Digitally signed by Brian T. Hennessey  
Date: 2022.04.13 09:34:43 -04'00'

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

IACD-22-141

APR 13 2022

Ms. Susan Fulmer  
Mr. Jon Richards

2

Enclosure:

Savannah River Site's Responses to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Comments on the Draft Action Memorandum for the Non-Time Critical Removal Action for the 235-F Building (IACD-22-130, Dated February 28, 2022)

cc w/o encl:

J. Blalock, SCDHEC-Columbia  
S. French, SCDHEC-Columbia  
M. Reece, SCDHEC-Columbia  
G. K. Taylor, SCDHEC-Columbia  
T. R. Fuss, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
G. O'Quinn, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
B. A. Cameron, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
K. L. Beatty, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
H. L. Herlong, SCDHEC-Aiken Environmental Affairs Office  
R. H. Pope, EPA-Atlanta

cc w/encl:

M. McRae, TechLaw, Inc.

Comments Received 3/23/2022

---

### **General Comment**

1. EPA Region 4's Office of Regional Counsel recommends DOE's draft Action Memorandum letter be revised or supplemented to include the substantive sections and content outlined in the model format in EPA's Superfund Removal Guidance for Preparing Action Memoranda, OSWER, Sept. 2009 (see e.g., Exhibit 4 "Basic Action Memorandum Outline").

#### **Response: Clarification.**

**DOE appreciates the recommendation regarding the guidance. However, as the lead agency, DOE prefers a simple, public-friendly explanation of the preferred non-time-critical (NTC) removal action alternative in a format that has served SRS and its stakeholders well. The reader is directed to the Removal Site Evaluation Report/Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (RSER/EE/CA) for additional details on the action and its regulatory compliance.**

**Responsible Party: Joe Burch, (803) 952-6660, joseph.burch@srs.gov**

### **Specific Comments**

1. Page 2, para. 2. Per EPA's Superfund Removal Guidance for Preparing Action Memoranda, OSWER, Sept. 2009, the Action Memorandum section pertaining to release or threatened release into the environment of a hazardous substance, or pollutant or contaminant should list the hazardous substances as defined by section 101(14) of CERCLA, or pollutants or contaminants as defined by section 101(33) of CERCLA known to be present at the site. In addition to radiological contaminants, asbestos-containing material and PCBs are present in FAMS Building 235-F building materials, structures and/or fixtures as identified in the EE/CA. The Action Memo should identify these substances, quantity, location.

#### **Response: Clarification.**

**The Action Memorandum (AM) will identify lead and PCBs as the non-radiological hazardous substances that are evaluated in the RSER/EE/CA as contributing to the human health and environmental risks and addressed by this action. Asbestos is not a primary risk driver for this action. The referenced EE/CA provides the quantities and location of radiological and non-radiological contamination is provided in the referenced RSER/EE/CA. For clarity, the following text will be added to the first paragraph of the Action Memorandum.**

**"Pursuant to the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan [40 CFR Section 300.415 and the Savannah River Site (SRS) Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) (Appendix K.1: D&D Facilities to be Decommissioned), the United States Department of Energy (USDOE) prepared a Removal Site Evaluation Report/Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (RSER/EE/CA) for the F-Area Material Storage Building (235-F) (SRNS-RP-2021-00001, Revision 1, February 2022). Elevated levels of plutonium-238 and neptunium-237 contamination within the facility meets the criteria in 40 CFR Section 300.415(b)(2)(i): Actual or potential exposure to nearby human**

Comments Received 3/23/2022

**populations, animals, or the food chain from hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants. In addition, a risk evaluation for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and lead, based on maximum detected concentrations in building paint, was conducted to demonstrate that risk from non-radiological hazardous substances is negligible when compared to the primary radiological risk drivers. Risk from exposure to hazardous substances is well bounded by the risk from exposure to plutonium-238 and neptunium-237 in the process areas. The USDOE...**

**Responsible Party: Joe Burch, (803) 952-6660, joseph.burch@srs.gov**

2. The Action Memo should summarize how the preferred alternative will address ACM and PCBs present in Bldg-235F.

**Response: Clarification.**

**The first full paragraph on page 3 of the Action Memorandum summarizes how the alternative will address the hazardous substances present within Building 235-F (i.e., grouting to entomb hazardous substances within the sealed structure to prevent exposure). Specific to PCBs, text will be added to the Action Memorandum on page 3 to clarify the risk. Refer to Comment Response 5 for the additional text.**

**Responsible Party: Joe Burch, (803) 952-6660, joseph.burch@srs.gov**

3. The Action Memo should summarize the need for provision of LUCs, the LUC objectives and identify specific LUCs (e.g., maintenance of signs, fences, deed restrictions) necessary or appropriate for the removal action to remain protective.

**Response: Clarification.**

**LUCs are not required at this time. This NTC removal action addresses the risks from hazardous substances by entombing them in grout within a stable, durable, sealed structure that eliminates the potential for exposure. Land use will remain industrial and Land Use Controls will be put into effect later in a Record of Decision that will include the permanently decommissioned Building 235-F. Text will be added to the Action Memorandum on page 3 to address land use. Refer to Comment Response 5 for the additional text.**

**Responsible Party: Joe Burch, (803) 952-6660, joseph.burch@srs.gov**

4. Add the following language to the Action Memo regarding ARARs compliance: "Pursuant to 40 CFR 300.415(j), removal actions shall, to the extent practicable considering the exigencies of the situation, attain 'Applicable' or 'Relevant and Appropriate Requirements' (ARARs) as defined in 40 CFR 300.5. ARARs include any standard, requirement, criterion, or limitation under any Federal environmental law, such as Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) requirements pertaining to PCBs, Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Maximum Contaminant Levels, Clean Air Act (CAA) NESHAPs

SRS Responses to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Comments on the  
Draft Action Memorandum for the Non-Time Critical Removal Action for the 235-F Building  
(IACD-22-130, Dated February 28, 2022)  
Page 3 of 4

Comments Received 3/23/2022

---

pertaining to ACM, RCRA requirements pertaining to waste characterization, treatment and disposal, and any more stringent promulgated standard, requirement, criterion, or limitation under a State environmental or facility-siting law. The preferred removal alternative is expected to comply with the ARARs identified by DOE and EPA Region 4 in the EE/CA, Appendix C- Potential ARARs and TBC Criteria for Building 235-F.”

**Response: Clarification.**

**The following text will be added to the end of the second paragraph on page 3 of the AM.**

**“The preferred NTC removal alternative is expected to comply with the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) identified by the USDOE and USEPA Region 4 in the RSER/EE/CA, Appendix C—Potential ARARs and TBC Criteria for Building 235-F.”**

**Responsible Party: Joe Burch, (803) 952-6660, joseph.burch@srs.gov**

5. The preferred alternative A-2, ISD of First and Second Process Areas/Engineered Roof, will leave PCB remediation waste (including bulk product waste) in place (i.e., in situ disposal) and thus must meet the risk-based disposal regulation 40 CFR 761.61(c), which states “may sample, cleanup or dispose of PCB remediation waste in a manner other than prescribed in 40 CFR 761.61(a) or (b) or store remediation waste in a manner other than prescribed in 40 CFR 761.65 if application approved in writing by EPA Regional Administrator and EPA finds that the method will not pose an unreasonable risk of injury to [sic] human health or the environment. Each application must include information described in 40 CFR 761.61(a)(3).” The appropriate information required in an application can be provided in a CERCLA document (e.g. the EE/CA and Action Memo) that is reviewed by EPA. Refer to 40CFR 761.62(c) which covers risk-based disposal of bulk product waste. Please add a statement to the Action Memo regarding the information in the EE/CA that the PCBs in question are in sealants and paint and not in a mobile liquid form and that the sealants and paint will remain inside the building. Further, please state that the alternative will result in the building being partially filled with cement grout and sealed for in situ disposition keeping the PCBs from direct contact with any receptor and mitigating the risk of any leaching through multiple layers of concrete and through approximately 50 feet of soil to groundwater. In addition, please state that the entire F Area is an industrial area with multiple other facilities that under CERCLA future land use assumptions will remain industrial. Please add that the multiple other facilities and units are yet to be addressed which will require a final Remedial decision in the future and at that time, a full CERCLA Baseline Risk Assessment will be completed for the area.

**Response: Clarification.**

**All details are described within the RSER/EE/CA. Text will be added to the Action Memorandum on page 3 as follow:**

**“Alternative A-2 meets the effectiveness criteria by grouting of the process areas and sealing the doors and penetrations along the exterior walls of Building 235-F to prevent exposure to**

Comments Received 3/23/2022

**radioactive and hazardous contamination contained within the building. Entombing the contamination within the building and grouting the underground storage tank will prevent release of contamination. Constructing a sloped reinforced concrete roof on Building 235-F will prevent rainwater infiltration and delay contaminant transport to groundwater. PCBs may be present in sealants and paints in a non-liquid form and will remain inside the building. The in-situ entombment described within this action will prevent direct contact of any receptors to the PCBs and mitigate the risk of any leaching to the groundwater through multiple layers of concrete and approximately 50 feet of soil. The technical, environmental, and waste-specific information contained within the RSER/EE/CA indicate that this alternative will not pose an unreasonable risk or injury to health or the environment as required by 40 CFR 761.62(c).**

Administratively, this alternative provides the most flexibility in implementation because it is possible to grout one area at a time should a phased approach to implementing the NTC removal action be needed due to funding or resource limitations. **Building 235-F is situated within the industrial F Area which contains multiple other facilities and units yet to be addressed. Land use in F Area is reasonably assumed to remain industrial. In the future, a final CERCLA remedial decision for F Area will include a baseline risk assessment that considers all facilities and actual and potential releases in the area. Land use controls implemented as part of a future decision for F Area will include the permanently decommissioned Building 235-F.**

Responsible Party: Joe Burch, (803) 952-6660, joseph.burch@srs.gov