{In Archive} New Peer Review Record Comment for Entry 240345, Document 240345 REV DRAFT CHARGE 2-7-12.PDF

Sci-Inv-HISA-ISI-Public-Comments 03/01/2012 06:16 PM

To: Rebecca Foster, Sci-Inv-HISA-ISI-Public-Comments

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

A new comment has been added to record number 240345, document title 240345 REV DRAFT CHARGE 2-7-12.PDF.

Name: John Corra
Email Address: john.corra@wyo.gov
Affiliation: Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality

Comment: March 1, 2012

To whom it may concern:

The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality submits the following comments regarding the Peer Review Charge for the "Investigation of Ground Water Contamination near Pavillion, Wyoming".

1. First paragraph of draft Charge:

a. Defining the Wind River Formation as an 'aquifer' is inappropriate, given the presence of natural gas-bearing and producing sands within the formation. The Wind River is both a water-producing and a natural gas-producing formation. Use of the term 'aquifer' suggests that the entire formation produces water, which is incorrect.

b. Delete the term Underground Source of Drinking Water as it confuses the public by implying that water-bearing sands within the formation are suitable for consumption. As demonstrated by samples collected from numerous private water supply wells in the area, water quality in some wells does not meet federal drinking water standards for naturally occurring contaminants such as uranium, arsenic, nitrate, or total dissolved solids, nor meet federal advisory levels for other constituents such as sulfate, sodium, or fluoride. Furthermore, characterizing the Wind River Formation as a USDW fails to recognize that, at a minimum, the natural gas bearing sands within the formation qualify for standing as non-USDW's under both state regulations governing groundwater classification, as well as aquifer 'exemption' under federal regulations (40 CFR 146.4(a)(1)). If suggesting that the Wind River Formation qualifies as a USDW by use, it should be noted that only the upper portion of the formation is used to provide (unsuitable) water for drinking water, and that the lower portion of the formation does not

provide water for human consumption at all.
2. The charge should specify that the peer reviewers consider all data collected during Phases 1, 2, 3, and 4 of EPA's investigation when answering the questions posed in the charge.
3. Item(1):
a. Several important source terms are not identified: fuel loading areas fuel storage tanks equipment maintenance, repair and storage areas dumps and disposal sites liquid storage facilities (oil production related, and other), pipelines, etc. EPA should be more specific and provide a comprehensive list of potential sources of contamination and clarify that part of the charge to the peer panel is the identification of all potential source terms associated with various activities that do, or may exist within the study area. If possible, EPA should add that site visit by some, or all of the peers would enhance their understanding of the "on-the-ground" situation.
4. Item (3):
a. The question presumes that it can be answered 'Yes', or 'No', but doing so may be impractical for those who may believe that more data or information is needed in order to answer the question. The peer panel should identify the type of additional
information required to answer the question to their satisfaction, and which method, or methods they would recommend as being capable of providing that information. It is encumbent upon EPA to allow and encourage peer panel members to consider all potential sources and migration pathways that could explain how the contaminants alleged to have been found in MW01 and MW02 got there.
b. Add the phrase, "Are there other possibilities besides" to the beginning of the question.
c. Add a new question that asks 'Is the "lines of evidence" approach a suitable method for trying to arrive at the conclusions suggested in the questions a. and b.? If not, what approach would work best in order to prove, or disprove the hypothesis that is implied in questions a. and b.?'
5. Item (4):
a. We encourage EPA to include a question regarding whether the peer panel accepts and agrees with the Conceptual Site Model (Figure 4, ESI,

August 2010), or would make recommendations on how the conceptual model should be modified and, specifically, whether potential migration pathways should be identified and illustrated on Figure 4.

6. Item (5):

a. It would be helpful if the peer panel identified the method, or methods they would recommend as being capable of providing that information