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

DEC 15 2025

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 Environmental Services
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

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

Dear Ms. Fulmer and Mr. Richards:

SUBJECT: Performance Evaluation Report for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit - January through December 2024 (U) (SRNS-RP-2025-00079, Revision 1, December 2025) (Redline and Clean Copies) and Savannah River Site's Responses to the Regulatory Comments on the Revision 0 Document, SEMS Number: 28

In accordance with the terms of the Federal Facility Agreement, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is submitting the subject information for your review and approval. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and South Carolina Department of Environmental Services (SCDES) provided comments on the Revision 0 report on August 21, 2025, and September 15, 2025, respectively. The draft responses to the regulatory comments were submitted for review via email on November 24, 2025. The EPA and SCDES approved the draft responses via email on December 8, 2025. The final responses were incorporated into the Revision 1 document (redline and clean). Please review the enclosures and provide your approval within thirty (30) days of receipt. The time and effort that the SCDES and the EPA have given on the subject operable unit are appreciated.

Questions from you or your staff may be directed to me at (803) 522-6427, or the DOE Program Manager, Mr. Charles Bryan, at (803) 952-7505.

Sincerely,
MATTHEW BAKER
Digitally signed by MATTHEW BAKER
Date: 2025.12.15 12:24:20 -05'00'
Matthew R. Baker
Acting FFA Remedial Project Manager
DOE-Savannah River Operations Office
Remediation, Deactivation, and Decommissioning Division

RDDD-26-111

Enclosure:
1. SRS Responses to the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency's Comments on the Performance Evaluation Report for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit - January through December 2024 (U) (SRNS-RP-2025-00079, Revision 0, May 2025) SEMS Number: 28
2. SRS Responses to the South Carolina Department of Environmental Services' Comment on the Performance Evaluation Report for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit - January through December 2024 (U) (SRNS-RP-2025-00079, Revision 0, May 2025) SEMS Number: 28
3. Performance Evaluation Report for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit - January through December 2024 (U) (SRNS-RP-2025-00079, Revision 1, December 2025) (Redline) SEMS Number: 28
4. Performance Evaluation Report for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit - January through December 2024 (U) (SRNS-RP-2025-00079, Revision 1, December 2025) (Clean) SEMS Number: 28

cc w/o encl:
M. Reece, SCDES-Columbia
H. J. Porter, SCDES-Columbia
J. Blalock, SCDES-Columbia
S. French, SCDES-Columbia
R. G. Stewart, SCDES-Columbia
M. Mehta, SCDES-Columbia
G. O'Quinn, SCDES-Midlands Aiken Environmental Affairs Office
T. G. Corley, SCDES-Midlands Aiken Environmental Affairs Office
C. L. Robertson, SCDES-Midlands Aiken Environmental Affairs Office
E. G. Downing, SCDES-Midlands Aiken Environmental Affairs Office
H. L. Herlong, SCDES-Midlands Aiken Environmental Affairs Office

cc w/ encl:
H. H. Cathcart, SCDES-Columbia
B. Martin, EPA-Atlanta
M. McRae, TechLaw, Inc.

Comments received 08/21/2025.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The Report references soil vapor concentration trends extending from 2011–2024 without presenting a robust statistical trend analysis (e.g., regression, 95% upper confidence limits (UCLs), or Mann-Kendall). Statements about asymptotic behavior and "decreasing VOC trends" are qualitative and would be strengthened by visual presentations and quantified long-term mass removal or concentration trends. *Please revise the Report to include statistical trend analyses for statements regarding trends and remedy goals.*

   Response: Clarification.

   The technical basis used to determine SVE shutdown criteria is vadose soil sampling. Soil vapor concentration data was used as an indicator of SVE system efficacy and if the SVE remediation was reaching soil cleanup levels. Figures 6 and 8 indicate the rapid decrease in vapor concentrations after deployment of SVE operations at ABRP and MCB, respectively. When soil vapor concentrations exhibited asymptotic behavior with decreasing VOC trends (starting in 2015 for ABRP and 2011 for MCB), SRS presented the results to the Core Team and proposed the collection of soil samples in the vadose zone in December 2022. The Core Team approved the sampling and analysis plan (SRNS-RP-2022-01080) in June 2023. Therefore, a more robust statistical trend analysis is not needed.

   No change to the current report is proposed.

   Responsible Party: Eric Schiefer, (803)952-6273, eric.schiefer@srs.gov

2. The Report states that 420 of 422 soil samples at the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits and Rubble Pit (ABRP) and 381 of 383 at the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin (MCB) were non-detect for trichloroethylene/tetrachloroethylene (TCE/PCE), with two estimated values below cleanup thresholds. However, no discussion is provided on the analytical sensitivity (e.g., method detection limits vs. reporting limits), reproducibility, or representativeness of split and duplicate samples. *Please revise the Report to include a quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) evaluation and assurance that acceptable data addressed the entire areas sampled.*

   Response: Agree.

The text in Section 3.0 will be revised as follows:

The results of the ABRP soil sample data were discussed with the EPA and SCDES on September 11, 2024 (i.e., Proposal to Discontinue Soil Vapor Extraction Operations) ahead of submittal of the PER (SRNS 2024b). A total of twelve borings were advanced at ABRP and sampled per the approved SAP in 2024 (Figures 9 and 10). Of the 422 soil samples, 381 were regular, 19 were split, and 22 were field duplicates. Out of 422 soil samples at ABRP, 420 samples were non-detect for TCE. Two split soil samples had estimated (UJ or J) values for TCE (6.82 µg/kg and 1.97 µg/kg) which are below the TCE cleanup level of 610 µg/kg. Data from the 2024 sampling event show that soil cleanup levels have been met at ABRP Trench Subunit for TCE. Table 12 provides a summary of ~~the sampling data~~ regular, split, and field duplicate samples collected at ABRP. For ABRP, the estimated quantitation limits (EQL) of the regular samples ranged from 0.2 µg/kg to 360 µg/kg, while the method detection limits (MDL) ranged from 0.076 µg/kg to 140 µg/kg. In contrast, split samples analyzed at a different lab had much lower EQL (4.95 µg/kg - 12 µg/kg) and MDL (0.964 µg/kg - 8.76 µg/kg) ranges. Field duplicates showed an EQL range of 170 µg/kg - 230 µg/kg and an MDL range of 65 µg/kg - 93 µg/kg. All maximum results from ABRP regular, split, and field duplicate samples were well below the cleanup level of 610 µg/kg. Table 14 provides a complete listing of ABRP soil sampling data.

A total of eleven borings were advanced at the MCB Vadose Zone Subunit and sampled per the approved SAP in 2024 (Figures 11 and 12). Of the 383 soil samples, 350 were regular, 18 were split, and 15 were field duplicates. Out of 383 soil samples, 381 samples were non-detect for PCE and TCE at the MCB Vadose Zone Subunit. Two soil samples had estimated (UJ) values for PCE and TCE (280 µg/kg and 190 µg/kg) which are below the TCE and PCE cleanup levels of 344 µg/kg. Ten soil samples had quantitation limits that exceeded the cleanup level but were qualified as non-detect. Data from the 2024 sampling event show that soil cleanup levels have been met at the MCB Vadose Zone Subunit for PCE and TCE. Table 13 provides a summary of ~~the sampling data~~ regular, split, and field duplicate samples collected at MCB. For MCB, regular samples had an EQL range of 160 µg/kg to 430 µg/kg and an MDL range of 62 µg/kg to 160 µg/kg. Split samples from another lab exhibited a much lower EQL range of 4.62 µg/kg - 34.1 µg/kg and an MDL range of 0.899 µg/kg - 7.63 µg/kg. Field duplicates had an EQL range of 180 µg/kg - 280 µg/kg and an MDL range of 70 µg/kg - 110 µg/kg. All maximum detections from MCB regular, split, and field duplicate samples were below the cleanup level of 344 µg/kg. Ten samples with non-detect results had EQL values exceeding this cleanup level, however, the MDL values were less than the cleanup level, and thus any detections above the cleanup

level (344 µg/L) would have likely been detected. Table 15 provides a complete listing of MCB soil sampling data.

The quality assurance/quality control data for split and field duplicate samples are acceptable. Soil sampling locations were chosen based on historical characterization of the source areas, current soil vapor concentrations, and within the zone of influence of the SVE wells, ensuring comprehensive data coverage for the sampled areas.

Responsible Party: Bryce Garner,(803)952-7801, bryce.garner@srs.gov

3. In the Sampling and Analysis Plan for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit to Evaluate the Effectiveness of the Soil Vapor Extraction System at Achieving Remedial Goals, SEMS Number: 28 SRNS-RP-2022-01080, Revision 0, January 2023, Section 3.0, Project Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) outlines QA/QC requirements for this Report. However, the Report has no mention of DQOs. *Please revise the Report to include a discussion of the DQOs, whether they were met, any issues with the data, and whether the data can be used to make decisions regarding the Report's recommendations.*

Response: Agree with Clarification.

Section 3.1.7 of the SAP, titled "Develop the Plan for Obtaining the Data (Project Quality Objectives)," details the six Project Quality Objectives for soil sampling characterization. The Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) for the ABRP/MCB/MBP OU specify the type and level of analytical quality required for characterization at this unit and are detailed in Sections 4 and 5 of the SAP. The six Project Quality Objectives and DQOs have been successfully met with no issues concerning the data. The soil characterization data from the 2024 soil sampling event are 100% Definitive level (D) data, suitable for making decisions based on the report's recommendations.

The text in Section 3.0 will be revised as follows:

In 2023, a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) (SRNS 2023b) was developed to provide the technical basis for discontinuing SVE operations at the ABRP Trench Subunit and MCB Vadose Zone Subunit. The SAP was approved by SCDES on June 14, 2023,

and by the USEPA on June 9, 2023. The data quality objectives (DQOs) in the SAP included the following:

1. **90% of planned samples are collected and their data are useable for completeness data quality indicator**
2. **5% of the samples will be duplicate and split samples for the comparability data quality indicator.**
3. **No target compound >= site specific estimated quantitation limit for equipment blank, field blanks, method blanks, or instrument blanks for accuracy data quality indicator**
4. **Laboratory data will be used to support a determination as to whether further remedial action is warranted.**
5. **All (i.e., 100%) samples will follow preservative guidelines as listed in Table 6.**
6. **Laboratory data will meet the analytical and contract-required detection limits listed in Table 5.**

The six Project Quality Objectives and the DQOs outlined in the SAP (SRNS 2023b) have been successfully met with no issues concerning the data. Ninety percent of planned samples were collected. Five percent of the samples were duplicate or split samples. No target compounds exceeded the EQL for any of the blank samples. The laboratory data was used to support a determination as to whether further remedial action is warranted. All samples followed the preservative guidelines listed in Table 6 of the SAP (SRNS 2023b). The laboratory data met the analytical and contract-required detection limits listed in Table 5 of the SAP (SRNS 2023b). The soil characterization data from the 2024 soil sampling event are 100% Definitive level (D) data, suitable for making decisions based on this report's recommendations.

The text in Section 4.3 first paragraph will be revised as follows:

Overall, soil-gas vapor samples have remained at very low (near the lower laboratory detection limits) asymptotic levels indicating VOCs are no longer productively being removed and VOCs are nearly depleted as shown on Figures 6 and 8. Data from the 2024 soil sampling event show that soil cleanup levels have been met at the ABRP Trench Subunit for TCE and the MCB Vadose Zone Subunit for PCE and TCE (Tables 10 and 11). The six Project Quality Objectives and the DQOs outlined in the SAP (SRNS 2023b) have been successfully met with no issues concerning the data.

Responsible Party: Bryce Garner, (803)952-7801, bryce.garner@srs.gov

4. While the Report recommendations state "Maintain LUCs to preclude residential/unrestricted land use. No change to the ABRP/MCB/MBP OU Land Use Control Implementation Plan (WSRC-RP-2006-4073, Revision 1, September 2007) is needed", it does not summarize current institutional controls (ICs), monitoring frequencies, or how continued compliance will be verified following soil vapor extraction (SVE) discontinuation. *Please revise the Report to discuss the ICs, monitoring frequencies, and how continued compliance will be performed for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit (OU).*

Response: Agree.

Cleanup levels for contaminants in surface soils at the ABRP/MCL/MBP OU were based on industrial land use. Therefore, land use controls (LUCs) as presented in the Land Use Control Implementation Plan will still be required until concentrations of hazardous substances are at levels that allow for unrestricted use. The text in Section 4.3 will be revised to provide a description of the current LUCs as follows:

"5. Maintain current land use controls (LUCs) to preclude residential/unrestricted land use. No change to the ABRP/MCB/MBP OU Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP) (WSRC-RP-2006-4073, Revision 1, September 2007) is needed. The LUCs specified in the LUCIP include OU warning signs, SRS boundary controls to restrict public and trespasser access, Site Use Program to prevent onsite worker exposure to contamination left in place, and property record notices. Custodial responsibilities for maintenance and annual inspections will be maintained by the Post-Closure Maintenance Group until the concentrations of hazardous substances are at levels that allow for unrestricted use. Remedial action reviews will continue to be conducted every five years to ensure the remedy is still protective of human health and the environment."

Responsible Party: Eric Schiefer, (803)952-6273, eric.schiefer@srs.gov

5. In Section 2.1.2 (Historical Information) the Report states "Rebound testing conducted on September 12 and 13, 2012, indicated that the VOC removal at the ABRP Trench Subunit is

significantly diffusion limited (SRNS 2017)." *This supports the conclusion that the SVE system has likely reached asymptotic performance and could be discontinued, but the potential for rebound still exists. Please revise the Report to include a plan to verify that rebound has not occurred before the SVE system can be entirely discontinued, the equipment removed, and the wells abandoned.*

Response: Clarification.

The goal of the 2024 sampling initiative described in Section 3.0 was to assess the present TCE concentrations at ABRP within the remedial zone of influence to determine if the current SVE system can be discontinued or optimized for more effective cleanup. Out of 422 soil samples, 420 showed no detectable levels of TCE. Two split soil samples displayed low estimated (UJ or J) TCE values (6.82 µg/kg and 1.97 µg/kg), well below the cleanup level of 610 µg/kg. The results of the soil sampling eliminate any concerns about potential rebound. Based on these results, soil cleanup levels have been achieved, the SVE system can be completely discontinued, the equipment can be removed, and wells abandoned.

No change to the current report is proposed.

Responsible Party: Bryce Garner, (803)952-7801, bryce.garner@srs.gov

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. **Section 1.3, Groundwater, Page 2 of 76:** The Report notes that the M-Area Aquifer Zone (MAAZ) wells have decreasing trends and TCE is "trending downward to the MCL." A trend chart or time-series data summary would clarify this statement and better support the assertion of mass depletion. Additionally, no statistical confidence is provided regarding when compliance is expected to be fully achieved. *Please revise the Report to include statistically based support for this statement.*

   Response: Clarification.

   A qualitative assessment of groundwater contaminant trends is presented using data from the Annual 2023 M-Area and Metallurgical Laboratory Hazardous Waste

Management Facilities Groundwater Monitoring and Corrective Action Report as a line of evidence to support the effectiveness of the SVE system in preventing additional contaminant transport to groundwater. In the Record of Decision for this OU, cleanup levels of 610 µg/kg for ABRP soils and 344 µg/kg for MCB soils were established. The 2024 soil sampling event confirmed that these cleanup levels have been achieved, and therefore the SVE system can be discontinued.

No change to the current report is proposed.

Responsible Party: Bryce Garner,(803)952-7801, bryce.garner@srs.gov

2. **Section 2.1.4, Sampling Methods and Results, Page 5 of 76:** TCE values for ASH-06 (e.g., 3.383 parts per million by volume () in 2018) suggest it remains a high-concentration well. Yet, the Report recommends ceasing operations. *Please revise the Report to provide additional lines of evidence to justify that residual mass is inaccessible or unlikely to impact groundwater, potentially using mass transfer rate analysis or rebound evaluations.*

Response: Clarification

The technical basis used to determine SVE shutdown criteria is vadose soil sampling to reach agreed-upon cleanup levels. Vadose soil sampling focused on the area around ASH-06. Soil vapor concentration data was used to help determine the location of soil sampling. The analytical results for soil data confirm that cleanup levels have been met and eliminate the need for performing indirect analysis such as mass transfer rate analyses or rebound evaluations.

No change to the current report is proposed.

Responsible Party: Eric Schiefer, (803)952-6273, eric.schiefer@srs.gov

3. **Section 2.1.4, Sampling Methods and Results, Page 7 of 76:** The calculations for estimating mass removal, Equation 1, include assumptions about flow rates and operational periods. The method should specify how uncertainties in flow rates and operational periods were accounted for, particularly for BaroBalls™ flow rates. *Please revise the Report to*

expand on the text in the footnotes and discuss whether the calculated mass removed is biased high or low due to the assumptions used and noted uncertainties.

Response: Clarification.

The footnotes identified for Equation 1 summarize the assumptions used for determining the flow rate and operational period for MicroBlowers™ and BaroBalls™. MicroBlower™ and BaroBalls™ each have their own set of assumptions, so they are described separately in this response.

For the MicroBlowers™, the flow rate is measured directly with a handheld flow meter every quarter and the operational period is assumed to be 12 hours per day. The flow rate measurements at the MicroBlowers™ can have variability based on multiple factors including variable power to the blower motor based on solar availability, impact of barometric pressure, user error with the handheld flow meter, etc. Historical flow rate measurements can be used to determine if a flow rate is higher or lower than the average. The MicroBlowers™ are designed to operate 24 hours per day with the use of batteries; however, most MicroBlowers™ at SRS do not produce enough electricity to adequately charge the batteries, or the batteries lose the ability to charge over time, so operation is limited to daylight hours. The operational period is assumed constant at 12 hours per day, so the mass calculations are a function of both flow rate and concentration. With flow rates being variable and concentrations generally decreasing, mass removal rates have mostly declined over the years.

For BaroBalls™, the flow rate is not measured directly at the ABRP and MCB subunits. Average flow rates measured from BaroBalls™ at the Metallurgical Laboratory (Met Lab) Hazardous Waste Management Facility are the basis for the constant flow rate of one cubic foot per minute used to calculate mass removal rates at the ABRP and MCB BaroBalls™. The flow rates measured at Met Lab were variable over the period of measure. When a change in barometric pressure occurs, flow rates start out high and eventually decrease as the change in pressure equalizes between the atmosphere and the subsurface. An average flow rate was used to simplify the mass removal calculations at the Met Lab BaroBalls™. The average flow rate of one cubic foot per minute observed at Met Lab passive SVE wells is utilized in all mass removal calculations for all BaroBalls™ at SRS. With the flow rate being

averaged and spread over 24 hours per day it assumes the BaroBall™ is always venting rather than periodically venting at higher flow rates. This assumption likely creates an over estimation of mass removed from a BaroBall™ in each month during periods of excessive inflow events, barometric high pressures, and an underestimation of mass during excessive periods of outflow events, barometric low pressures. Throughout the year with flow rate and operational period is assumed constant, the mass removal rate becomes a function of concentration. Concentrations have generally decreased; therefore, mass removal rates have also decreased with time.

The total mass removed for a specific MicroBlower™ or BaroBall™ represents periods of over and underestimated mass over the period of measure. With the presence of variability in the mass removal calculations, it is important to observe the long-term mass removal trends to observe how the mass has changed with continued removal.

No change to the current report is proposed.

Responsible Party: Branden Kramer, 803-952-6378, branden.kramer@srs.gov

4. **Section 4.3, Recommendations, Page 13 of 96:** Recommendation #3 states that wells will be abandoned "as funding becomes available." This raises concern about the indefinite status of infrastructure. EPA typically requires post-remedial performance verification; therefore, a specific schedule or requirement for abandonment verification should be included. *Please revise the Report to include a schedule, timeline, and plan for decommissioning SVE wells and equipment.*

Response: Agree.

Pending Core Team approval, SRS plans to decommission the SVE wells in FY2027.

The text in Section 4.3 will be revised as follows:

"3. Abandon all wells (MicroBlowers™ and BaroBalls™) associated with the ABRP/MCB/MBP OU and dismantle and remove SVE equipment ~~as funding becomes available~~ in Fiscal Year 2027 pending Core Team approval."

Responsible Party: Eric Schiefer, (803) 952-6273, eric.schiefer@srs.gov

5. **Figure 6, ABRP Passive Soil-Gas Vapor Concentration Over Time Trend Diagram, Page 29 of 76 and Figure 8, MCB Soil-Gas Vapor Concentration Over Time Trend Diagram, Page 31 of 76:** The soil vapor concentration trend diagrams should include confidence intervals or note whether detection limits changed over time. Without this information, it is unclear if concentration stability reflects actual plume asymptotes or analytical limitations. *Please revise the figures to include confidence intervals or trend analyses.*

   Response: Clarification.

   Figures 6 and 8 in the PER illustrate a decline in VOC concentrations since 2015 and 2010, respectively. There have been no significant changes in method detection limits during the duration of the asymptotic decline. The stability of these concentrations is supported by the 2024 soil sampling event. Soil results from both ABRP and MCB verify that the agreed-upon cleanup levels have been met.

   No change to the current report is proposed.

   Responsible Party: Bryce Garner,(803)952-7801, bryce.garner@srs.gov

MINOR COMMENT

1. **Table of Contents, List of Tables, Page iv of vi:** Table 12 (Summary of ABRP Soil Sampling Results) and Table 13 (Summary of MCB Soil Sampling Results (Page 63 of 76) are missing from the list of tables in the table of contents. *Please revise the list of tables to include Tables 12 and 13.*

   Response: Agree.

   Tables 12, 13, 14 and 15 will be added to the Table of Contents.

   Responsible Party: Eric Schiefer, (803)952-6273, eric.schiefer@srs.gov

SRS Responses to South Carolina Department of Environmental Services' Comments on the Performance Evaluation Report for the A-Area Burning/Rubble Pits (731-A, -1A) and Rubble Pit (731-2A) and the Miscellaneous Chemical Basin/Metals Burning Pit (731-4A, -5A) Operable Unit – January through December 2024 (U), SEMS Number: 28 (SRNS-RP-2025-00079, Revision 0, May 2025)

Comments received 09/15/2025

SPECIFIC COMMENT

1. Section 4.3, Recommendation, page 13 of 76. Point five of the report recommendations states, "No change to the… Land Use Control Implementation Plan… is needed"; however, this report does not include a description of current institutional controls or how they will be addressed as SVE is discontinued. *Please revise the report to include a discussion of the institutional controls in place and how they will change in the future.*

Response: Agree

Cleanup levels for contaminants in surface soils at the ABRP/MCL/MBP OU were based on industrial land use. Therefore, land use controls (LUCs) as presented in the Land Use Control Implementation Plan will still be required until concentrations of hazardous substances are at levels that allow for unrestricted use. The text in Section 4.3 will be revised to provide a description of the current LUCs as follows:

The text in Section 4.3 will be revised as follows:

"5. Maintain current land use controls (LUCs) to preclude residential/unrestricted land use. No change to the ABRP/MCB/MBP OU Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP) (WSRC-RP-2006-4073, Revision 1, September 2007) is needed. The LUCs specified in the LUCIP include OU warning signs, SRS boundary controls to restrict public and trespasser access, Site Use Program to prevent onsite worker exposure to contamination left in place, and property record notices. Custodial responsibilities for maintenance and annual inspections will be maintained by the Post-Closure Maintenance Group until the concentrations of hazardous substances are at levels that allow for unrestricted use. Remedial action reviews will continue to be conducted every five years to ensure the remedy is still protective of human health and the environment."

Responsible Party: Eric Schiefer, (803)952-6273, eric.schiefer@srs.gov