Message

**From**: Moritz, Vera [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FC42FD8127354991AD38B2ACB5C3651A-MORITZ, VERA]
**Sent**: 9/1/2017 6:26:25 PM
**To**: 'Surovchak, Scott' [Scott.Surovchak@lm.doe.gov]; 'Spreng - CDPHE, Carl' [carl.spreng@state.co.us]
**Subject**: RE: RF - 5 year review presentation for RFSC

Carl – about anticipating questions – yes, I've been thinking about them and looking forward to responding. Keep sending any other questions you can think of, it's very helpful

As to the 2 questions in your email below, here's how I'd answer --

***- Was any soil sampling done after the 2013 floods?***
No.
Surface water acts as a comprehensive indicator of any pollution that would be at the surface. As well, the Pu/Am standard is set at one hundredth of the drinking water standard. This is a very sensitive standard.
The CAD/ROD describes the residual contamination left in the subsurface, which is very low levels. *The highest residual surface soil value for plutonium-239/240 was 183 pCi/g, found in a confirmation sample from the floor of an excavation five feet below grade (now backfilled) near the former Building 776. This location also recorded the highest remaining level of americium-241 in surface soil at Rocky Flats (51.2 pCi/g).*

- What did the recalculation of PRGs determine? (hope we don't have to get into the weeds on this)

---

**From:** Surovchak, Scott [mailto:Scott.Surovchak@lm.doe.gov]
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2017 12:37 PM
**To:** Spreng - CDPHE, Carl <carl.spreng@state.co.us>; Moritz, Vera <Moritz.Vera@epa.gov>
**Subject:** RE: RF - 5 year review presentation for RFSC

I like the outline and agree with Carl's suggestions. The map really will set the stage for COU/POU/OU-3 discussions. I'll pass it on to my group here for suggestions as uniformed audience members. I think that covers the anti's.

**From:** Spreng - CDPHE, Carl [mailto:carl.spreng@state.co.us]
**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2017 9:28 AM
**To:** Moritz, Vera
**Cc:** Surovchak, Scott
**Subject:** Re: RF - 5 year review presentation for RFSC

Vera,

I think this is a good basic outline of the process and report. There won't be room on some slides for all the words; some bullets will have to be shortened to fit. Consider moving the map up to at least in front of slide #9, maybe even further, to provide some context and orientation for the presentation.

We should all be anticipating questions/comments, for example:
- Was any soil sampling done after the 2013 floods?
- What did the recalculation of PRGs determine? (hope we don't have to get into the weeds on this)

You'll do great. We'll be there to provide moral support (from the back row).

Carl

**Carl Spreng**
Corrective Action Unit

P 303.692.3358 | F 303.759.5355 | C 303-328-7289
4300 Cherry Creek Drive S, Denver, CO 80246-1530
carl.spreng@state.co.us |

On Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 5:39 PM, Moritz, Vera <Moritz.Vera@epa.gov> wrote:

Scott – Here's what I've been thinking about a presentation for the 9/11 RFSC – what do you think? Would it be possible to get one of your folks to render this into a set of power point slides that I could use for the presentation? Many thanks!!! – Vera Carl – any suggestions for improvement?

**Slide 1** –

Overview

Fourth Five Year Review Report – Rocky Flats

Rocky Flats Stewardship Council Meeting

September 11, 2017

**Slide 2**

EPA guidance

Comprehensive Five Year Review Guidance

Office of Emergency and Remedial Response

https://semspub.epa.gov/work/HQ/128607.pdf

**Slide 3** –

roles and responsibilities

CERCLA §120 and EO 12580 provide the basis for EPA' s oversight role at other Federal

agency NPL sites.

EO 12580 paragraphs 2(d) and (g) delegate remedial responsibilities to the Department of Defense (DOD) and

the Department of Energy (DOE)

five-year reviews are conducted by the Federal agency but EPA retains

final authority over whether the five-year reviews adequately address the

protectiveness of remedies.

EPA will either concur with the final Federal agency protectiveness determination, or EPA may provide independent

findings.

**Slide 4**

Contents of the 5 YR (1)

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Background

3.0 Remedial Actions

4.0 Progress Since the Last Five-Year Review

5.0 Five-Year Review Process

6.0 Technical Assessment

- 6.1 Question A: Is the Remedy Functioning as Intended by the Decision Documents

- 6.2 Question B: Are the Exposure Assumptions, Toxicity Data, Cleanup Levels, and RAOs Used at the Time of the Remedy Still Valid?

- 6.3 Question C: Has Any Other Information Come to Light That Could Call into Question the Protectiveness of the Remedy?

Question the Protectiveness of the Remedy?

7.0 Issues, Recommendations, and Follow-Up Actions

**Slide 5**

Contents of the 5 YR (2) – Appendices

Appendix A Site Chronology

Appendix B Rocky Flats Legacy Management Agreement Attachment 2

Appendix C Risk Assessment Review for COU, POU, and OU3

Appendix D RFLMA Contact Records

Appendix E Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring

Appendix F Documents Reviewed

Appendix G Site Inspection Checklist

Appendix H Changes to Applicable, Relevant, and Appropriate Requirements

Appendix I Responses to Stakeholder Input on the FYR

**Slide 6**

**Question A: Is the Remedy Functioning as Intended by the Decision Documents?**

• Institutional controls are in place and effective in meeting the objectives presented in Table 2. Physical controls are in place and effective at preventing human health exposures from contaminated groundwater, surface water, and soil.

• Required groundwater and surface water monitoring is ongoing and supports achievement of RAOs in the long term.

• Operation and maintenance (O&M) of remedy components at the OLF, PLF, and groundwater treatment systems is ongoing and supports achievement of RAOs in the long term.

**Slide 7**

**Question B: Are the Exposure Assumptions, Toxicity Data, Cleanup Levels, and RAOs Used at the Time of the Remedy Still Valid?**

-The exposure assumptions, toxicity levels, cleanup levels, and RAOs used at the time of the remedy are still valid,

-There were no changes in exposure pathways or assumptions

-Revisions/changes to surface water quality standards and toxicity levels were assessed and determined to not impact the remedy

**Slide 8**

**Question C: Has Any Other Information Come to Light That Could Call into Question the Protectiveness of the Remedy?**

The remedy remained protective despite high precipitation events and extreme weather variability

**Slide 9**

OU3 and POU determinations of UU/UE

The 2006 CAD/ROD determined that conditions in the POU are acceptable for unrestricted use and unlimited exposure

In May 2007, the POU was deleted from the NPL and the lands comprising the POU were transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for

establishment as the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge.

Operable Unit 3 consists of lands outside the site boundary.

addressed under a separate CAD/ROD June 1997, and the OU was deleted from the NPL in May 2007.

A review of changes to toxicity factors conducted for this FYR confirmed that conditions in OU3

and the POU remain suitable for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure.

**Slide 10**

Map (from p. 2 of the FYR

**Slide 11**

**Protectiveness Statement**

**The remedy at the COU is protective of human health and the environment.**

-Interim removal actions completed prior to the CAD/ROD included the removal of contaminated

soils and sediments, decontamination and removal of equipment and buildings, construction of

cover systems at the two landfills, and construction and operation of four groundwater treatment

systems.

-A monitoring and maintenance plan is in place to ensure the long-term integrity of the remedy.

-Routine inspections of remedy components ensure that maintenance and repairs are identified and implemented.

-Groundwater treatment systems continue to reduce contaminant load to surface water.

-Surface water and groundwater monitoring provide assurance that water quality at the COU boundary is protective.

-Institutional controls are effective in preventing unacceptable exposures to residual contamination by prohibiting building construction,

controlling intrusive activities, restricting the use of groundwater and surface water, and protecting engineered remedy components.

-Physical controls are effective at controlling access to the COU.