

**NMED Responses to Public Comments
on the Sandia National Laboratories' Mixed Waste Landfill
Permit Modification for Corrective Measures
August 2, 2005**

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton	Sodium	1.1	The unknown amounts of metallic sodium reportedly buried in the Mixed Waste Landfill (MWL or Landfill) (see FOIA document #20, par. 4) have been omitted from discussion in the Corrective Measures Study (CMS). Metallic sodium, used in the oxide reactor fuel experiments at Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), has not been identified as a hazardous substance in the inventory of the MWL nor has it been included in the CMS risk assessment. The commenter wants to know why it was not included.	R1	Sodium reacts with water and other oxidizers. Unknown, but likely small amounts of sodium metal may be present in canisters buried in the MWL that once held oxide reactor fuel samples. Provided that the canisters remain buried and are not exposed to water beyond normal soil moisture, chemical reaction of the sodium will not proceed at a rate that will threaten human health or the environment. See also Responses R5 and R49. The presence of sodium in the Landfill does not preclude the option of capping the MWL as a final remedy.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.26	An interview with George Tucker, former SNL employee, 1995 (FOIA 3) indicates that explosives were not allowed in the MWL, however FOIA document #21 states that metallic sodium "may be present". The commenter asked the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) to address this apparent discrepancy.	R2	Metallic sodium is not classified as an explosive by the U. S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				radiological and non-radiological under industrial, recreational and residential scenarios. The commenter wants to know the reason for these differences.		the radiological risk, Department of Energy/ Nuclear Regulatory Commission (DOE/NRC) exposure assumptions were applied. The most notable difference is the inhalation factors used for the recreational scenario. Both assessments use a base inhalation rate for the recreational scenario of 30 cubic meters per day; however the EPA-based rate as shown in Table 2 has been modified to allow for the limited exposure time and duration for the recreational receptor. RESRAD requires input of the base rate, and the other modifying factors (exposure time and duration) are separate input parameters and are applied to the base inhalation rate during the model calculations. So while the inhalation rates appear different in these tables, the final inhalations rates for both assessments for the recreational scenario are the same.	
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	Waste Inventory	1.7	Accurate records of the MWL waste inventory before 1965 no longer exist and records from 1965 to 1976 are incomplete with regard to waste disposal. (SNL ER Program, 1993, Phase 2 RFI Work Plan (FOIA 101)). The commenter had several questions regarding this issue. First, the commenter indicates that SNL states that the lost records have been found but indicated that the files contain conflicting data, the researcher	R5	<p>NMED understands that some MWL records have been located at the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory (INEEL). Records are incomplete and there are some discrepancies between the known inventory and historical accounts based on interviewed witnesses.</p> <p>However, the NMED believes that while the inventory for the MWL is not complete, it is adequate to select a final remedy for the MWL. See also Hearing</p>	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	comments For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments		1.54	source". The commenter states that this has not been done. (pp. 6, 7) The commenter indicated that SNL has not fully characterized the inventory of the MWL (p. 13).	R5	See NMED Response R5; see also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 43-50.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.64	Regarding the "WERC Independent Technical Peer Review of the Working Draft CMS for MWL", Executive Summary, the first comment in Section (ii. 1): the WERC states that the site operational history (section 1.0 of the draft CMS) fails to include information that the early inventory data (once believes to be lost) can now be found in microfiche at INEEL. This information was omitted from the CMS as well as the fact that the MWL was used for disposal of chemicals prior to the opening of the CWL. This information was obtained in a document found by Citizen Action under a FOIA request. The comment requests that the information be included in the CMS, that the records be released to the public, and that as complete MWL inventory as possible be prepared.	R6	The purpose of the CMS is for the facility to evaluate potential remedial options and recommend a remedy to the administrative authority (NMED). It is not necessary to include in the CMS Report detailed information concerning the operation of the Landfill, including the waste inventory, because this information is provided to the extent known in the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Report(s). In the case of the MWL, most of this information is found in the Phase 1 and 2 RCRA RFI Reports, although some is located in other documents. The known waste inventory and other information have been made publicly available by both the NMED and the SNL to the extent that security classification requirements permit such a release of information. See also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 43-50.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				Steger, 1977, p. 11 (FOIA 50))		trenches and pits, the NMED does not have records for and does not generally know the exact volumes or mass, the exact levels of radioactivity, or the exact locations of most radioactive (including TRU), mixed, or hazardous wastes in the Landfill. The NMED does not possess records from INEEL; information from these records was summarized by SNL in the inventory provided in the Phase 2 RFI Report. The NMED does not know the quantities, types, or exact locations of fuel canisters, wastes from the Nevada Test Site (NTS), wastes contaminated with multiple fission products or metals, TRU wastes, or wastes disposed of in the radioactive chemical pit beyond the information provided in the inventory. See also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 43-50.	
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.11	"...the most common metal disposed of at MWL is lead. Also, barium, beryllium and chromium were probably disposed of. No records are available on the quantities of metals disposed of..." (SNL ER Program Information Sheet, FOIA, 1987 (FOIA 90)). The commenter asked if NMED has accurate records of quantities of metals (such as lead) disposed of at MWL.	R8	See Response R8. See also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 43-50.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd		1.14	"... MWL received a variety of radioactive and potentially radioactive/hazardous mixed	R8	See Response R8. See also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 43-50.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.17	<p>plutonium reportedly contained in the 19 drums as reported in the MWL known inventory? The commenter also request that these records, apparently on microfiche and stored at INEEL, be made available to the public in order to fully characterize the content of the MWL.</p> <p>In an interview with former SNL employee H. Abbott (interview date unknown), he states "Possible mixed fission products went to dump. Lots of fuel in mountains stored. Only neutron activated material went to the dump. Lots, large amounts of DU (depleted uranium)." The commenter would like a list of the fission products, volumes, and curies disposed of at the MWL. The commenter asked if NMED has records of where these mixed fission products originated. The commenter also asked what "lots of fuel stored in mountains" refers to.</p>	R10	<p>NMED does not know where fission-product contaminated wastes were generated, although it is possible that some of the waste was generated locally at SNL. Some of the waste is from the NTS and possibly other DOE facilities in the U.S.</p> <p>NMED has no knowledge of any nuclear fuels stored "in mountains". Nuclear fuels are not hazardous waste, and thus are not subject to RCRA. See also Response R8.</p>	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.22	<p>"Records of disposal in pits from Nevada Test Site and South Pacific were examined and then disposed of at the MWL." (Interview with former SNL employee Bob Schwing, 1995(FOIA 7).) The commenter asked if there are such records, and in which section at</p>	R8	See Response R8.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	Dayton, 2 nd submittal For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments		1.51	mentions a radioactive acid pit and indicates that chemicals, radioactive materials were disposed of in the pit until 1969. The commenter indicated that this pit was not disclosed to members of the SNL/Citizens Advisory Board. The commenter asked if NMED has a complete inventory of waste disposed of in the radioactive acid pit. The commenter stated that pit contents (see examples, pits 35-36) do not match the gamma levels at surface taken by SNL (pp. 7, 8).	R13	That certain pit contents have gamma radiation sources in them that are not included in the inventory simply means that the inventory is incomplete. Again, NMED is aware that the inventory is incomplete; but it is adequate for remedy selection.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.65	WERC describes the MWL inventory as: Anecdotal testimony in the records regarding disposal of non-stabilized free liquids. The location of many dangerous materials appears to be unknown such as nuclear fuel canisters and radioactive sealed sources. The amount of hazardous waste is not well understood, i.e.; inventory does not match characterization of Pit 35 and Trench B and C. Volumes of waste vary widely in different sections of the report. Meanings of words "debris" and "all waste" in the CMS are	R14	The meaning of the terms "all waste" and "debris" as used in the CMS should be taken as their ordinary meanings. See also Responses R5, R8, and R13.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				questions regarding the complete inventory at the Landfill.			
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	Off site tritium monitoring and source	1.9	<p>“They have a feel for what is in there but the numbers are questionable...use vegetation as indicator, succulent plants work best. Elevated concentrations [found] up to 5 km away. (Interview the Donna Hartzel to G.L, 1989 (FOIA).) The commenter asked if NMED has reviewed this document and if NMED has conducted any off-site radiological monitoring to detect tritium in vegetation. Does the statement in the document mean that biological transport of tritium has been occurring for years? What are the elevated concentrations of tritium referred to in this report and is this still occurring. What does the term “have a feel for” mean in terms of describing the MWL inventory?</p>	R17	NMED has been aware for many years that vegetation growing on and near the MWL contains small amounts of tritium, as tritium moves with water and has been released from the Landfill. NMED has not reviewed this particular report and has not collected and analyzed samples of vegetation at the MWL. However, the levels of tritium flux from the Landfill do not demonstrate that an unacceptable risk to the environment occurs at the Landfill.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd Submittal	Reactor vessel plates	1.12	<p>The commenter indicated that “SP-4 contains what is purported to be reactor vessel plates. Very little is known about these plates, their origin, number, size or configuration.” (Memo from Jerry Pease/SNL to Mark Jackson, John Gould/DOE/KAO, 1997 (FOIA 22).) The commenter asked if there is still little known about the reactor vessel plates.</p>	R18	NMED is only aware of what was reported in the inventory. As indicated in the inventory, sample pieces of reactor vessel plates, with radioactivity dose levels of 2 rem/hour on contact, are buried in pit SP-4. The plates originated from a reactor that was decommissioned in 1978, which once existed at a location in the San Fernando Valley. Sample sections are reported to be 6-ft long. Reactor vessel plates not retained as	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/ Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.27	"After 1975, SNL required liquid wastes to be solidified prior to disposal. Before this time unsolidified radioactive liquids, whether containerized or not were disposed of in the MWL. (ER Program/Site Health and safety Plan, 1992 (FOIA 115,116).) The commenter points out that this conflicts with SNL statement that no liquids were disposed of at MWL. The commenter wants NMED to comment on this.	R19	See Response R19.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.18	In a 1989 interview with SNL employee Donna Hartzel, she states "Two summers ago workers found 5 feet of water in nearby completed trench. Workers pumped water into the trench to the west." The commenter asked if the above quote supports the DOE/SNL assertion that workers were not allowed to dispose of liquids into MWL.	R19	See Response R19.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.20	"Organic wastes were disposed of at the MWL beginning in 1959 and continued until 1962 when the Chemical Waste Landfill (CWL) was opened." (ER Program/Site Health and Safety Plan, 1992 (FOIA 116).) Uncontainerized liquids were disposed of at the CWL ; it makes sense that liquids were disposed of at MWL prior to being sent to CWL. Why would	R20	There is abundant evidence that liquid wastes were commonly disposed of in the CWL. SNL has admitted to this practice. Although the waste disposal practices between the two landfills appear to be inconsistent, NMED does not know the reason why this was the case. Each landfill must be assessed on a site-by-site basis.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
M	Citizen, Steve Dapra		13.7	<p>been no controls since it was generated...." The commenter asked what those statements mean.</p> <p>The commenter indicated that certain parties claimed that fuel rods are buried in the MWL. This claim is answered in a letter from Ron Curry, Secretary of New Mexico Environment Department to Dr. Maurice Weisberg, M.D, (August 22, 2003). The claim is both false and unreasonable. Fuel rods are extremely expensive and they would not be buried.</p>	R23	<p>investigated this matter and has determined that the fuel rod samples were removed from the canisters prior to the disposal of the canisters in the MWL.</p> <p>See Response R23.</p>	No
N	Citizen, Maurice Weisburg, M.D.		14.1	<p>The commenter indicated that his principal concerns involve the possible presence of high-level wastes buried with metal containers that have undergone irradiation in onsite research reactors in TA-5. Related to that concern is an SNL document dated October 15, 1993 "Site Team Report on Spent Fuels", which is an assessment of the vulnerability of storage of irradiated nuclear fuels, both fresh as well as previously irradiated. In only a few instances are these materials referred as spend fuels or high-level wastes. Instead the term used is "RINM" (reactor irradiated nuclear material). The statement on page 3 of the executive summary states</p>	R24	<p>NMED believes that many of the steel containers within the Landfill have or will rust. Any liquids contained within the steel containers could migrate from the Landfill if conditions are appropriate; however, this does not necessarily mean that any release would pose unacceptable risk to human health and the environment. Thus, NMED agrees that continued monitoring of the vadose zone and the ground water is necessary to ensure protection of human health and the environment.</p> <p>With respect to comments on reactor irradiated nuclear material and the Sandia Pulse Reactor, this issue is not directly related to the MWL and will not be discussed further in these responses.</p>	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				\$181,570,000. The commenter asked why MWL couldn't be cleaned up today based on the above excavation scenario and the cost estimates performed in 1984.		NMED Secretary to reevaluate the performance of the Landfill cover/bio-intrusion barrier and the feasibility of excavation every five years.	
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, comments by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D.	Animal/plant transport of contaminants	1.31	The commenter stated that buried waste can be mobilized to the ground surface through plant roots and animals and insect burrowing can dramatically increase infiltration of water into the Landfill with covers as thick as those proposed.	R26	<p>NMED agrees that bio-intrusion via burrowing animals and roots can cause contaminants to migrate to the ground surface, and can create open spaces that will locally increase cover permeability.</p> <p>Once on the surface, contaminants can continue to migrate by the activities of other animals, and by wind erosion and surface water erosion/solution. The degree of contamination that could be brought to the surface by plant roots or burrowing animals is case specific, depending much on the size and chemical/physical characteristics of the waste, and the size and burrowing habits of the animals. Water erosion is probably the most significant threat to cover integrity in terms of creating exposure to waste over a short time frame. All of these factors form the basis for NMED to require maintenance of the cover and continued monitoring of surface soil. In the case of the MWL, bio-intrusion is not expected to play a major role in the migration of contaminants because the wastes are relatively insoluble and the debris items mostly large in size. The required bio-barrier should limit the ability of small burrowing animals to</p>	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D. For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, comments by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D.		1.38	contaminants across the Landfill surface to off-site areas. The commenter states that SNL's conclusion that the waste has not been mobilized to the ground surface by animals is poorly supported as it is 1) based on soil sampling taken (in Part) from areas of the Landfill recently backfilled; 2) sampling was coarse in resolution; 3) samples were non-random in space; and 4) samples purposely did not include disturbed areas created by burrowing animals.	R27	Although the commenter criticizes surface soil sampling at the MWL because in his opinion it was not random, he also recommends the collection of samples from biased sampling locations (animal burrows and older parts of the Landfill). There have been several surface soil sampling events conducted at the MWL and these efforts have been adequate. For future monitoring, NMED believes that the collection and analysis of soil samples from burrows and ant mounds should be done as suggested by this commenter.	No
F	Citizen, Carl White, Dept. of Biology, UNM		6.1	The commenter stated that rodents are present on the site, and that they can burrow allowing water infiltration. The rodents can also bring up materials out of the Landfill, and then they would be consumed by other animals and predators, which would distribute any contaminants. The commenter believes it is foolish to discard the bio-intrusion barrier.	R28	NMED agrees that a bio-intrusion barrier is necessary at the MWL to minimize the impact of burrowing animals and reduce the penetration of plant roots. In addition, NMED intends for the SNL to maintain the cover system and monitor animal burrows for any future migration of contaminants.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, comments	Evapotranspiration Cap	1.35	The commenter indicated that both cap designs (Dwyer et, al. SNL Environmental Restoration Group) do a credible job of analyzing the evapotranspiration (ET) cover, and	R29	NMED agrees that an ET, with the addition of a bio-barrier, should provide adequate protection of ground water. NMED also agrees that it remains necessary to continue monitoring the	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments		1.53	The commenter suggests that SNL follow recommendation from EPA and DOE that SNL conduct a risk assessment that includes "no administrative controls in place after 100 years (pp. 12, 13).	R31	years in the future). Nonetheless, NMED intends to enforce institutional controls through SNL's RCRA permit as long as such controls are needed. See Response R31	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, comments by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D.	Climate Change	1.41	The commenter stated that changes in climate could radically affect the integrity of the cap.	R32	SNL is required by order of the NMED Secretary to reevaluate the performance of the evapotranspiration cover every five years. If significant climatic changes were to occur during this period that would adversely affect the performance of the cover system, NMED can impose additional requirements or a new remedy for the MWL to ensure protection of human health and the environment.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, comments by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D.	Moisture Measurements	1.42	The commenter indicated that SNL's proposed plan to use a neutron moisture gauge (NMG) are vague on how the monitoring data will be used to conclude that percolation is or is not occurring. NMG is labor intensive (data must be downloaded and managed) and the NMG must be calibrated to soil (difficult when layered soils are involved), and reliable measurements are limited to	R33	NMGs have been shown to be an effective tool to monitor soil moisture. NMED agrees that specific calibrations must be conducted and that correction factors may need to be applied to account for changes in soil bulk density. The final order issued by the NMED Secretary requires that SNL submit for MNED approval a long-term monitoring plan, and a list of "triggers" which will set in motion additional testing or the implementation of an additional or	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, comments by Tom Hakonson, Ph.D.		1.44	Dr. Tom Hakonson has the following recommendations: 1) Any post-closure plan should provide measurements on all possible migration pathways that include vadose zone transport, soil sampling for surface contaminants and biological transport; 2) Soil surveys should be required in undisturbed areas closed early in the Landfill operation with comprehensive long-term sampling program after MWL is closed consisting of sampling of surface soils and biota; 3) A comprehensive sampling plan should be required that reflects the inventory of the contaminants in the Landfill, not just tritium; 4) The use of bio-intrusion barriers to keep animals from burrowing into the Landfill has had mixed reviews in terms of effectiveness, a wire mesh type barrier proposed by Dwyer is the best choice for the MWL in terms of effectiveness. The commenter would like NMED to address these recommendations.	R36	<p>days of completion of the remedy (ET cover with bio-barrier).</p> <p>NMED agrees that a surface soil, subsurface soil, soil vapor, and ground water monitoring program must be established to ensure early detection of any future migration of contaminants. The scope of the exact program is to be detailed in the long-term monitoring and maintenance plan required by the RCRA permit as a result of the Secretary's final order. The NMED also agrees that the sampling plan should require a wide range of contaminants to be analyzed for, and not limit the analytes solely to tritium. Sampling, in part, should include the sampling of animal burrows and ant mounds. However, surface soil sampling should be conducted in every area of the MWL, and not be limited to older portions of the Landfill.</p> <p>The NMED prefers a rock bio-intrusion barrier to that of a wire mesh because the NMED believes that a rock barrier is likely to last longer and will not corrode and release heavy metals into the environment.</p> <p>Finally, NMED agrees that a bio-intrusion barrier is necessary.</p>	No
A	For Citizen Ac For Citizen	Baseline Risk Assessment	1.45	The commenter indicated that a new baseline risk assessment for the MWL has not been conducted	R37	NMED accepts the baseline risk assessments as presented in the Phase 2 RFI and the CMS Reports. NMED	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments		1.47	The commenter indicated that SNL discarded samples showing high concentration of constituents of concern and kept samples concentrations with false positives (p. 9)	R38	See Response R38.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments	Risk Assessment, combining chemical and radiological risk	1.48	The commenter stated that radionuclide and cancer risk should be combined, not subtracted as SNL has done in its risk assessment (pp. 11, 12).	R39	NMED does not concur that the cancer and radiological risks were subtracted from each other, but rather the risks were evaluated independently as was the practice at the time the risk assessment was done. Currently, the EPA treats radiological contaminants as carcinogens, and calculates the risk differently as compared to the past. However, in the case of the MWL, the risk will not be sufficiently different if calculated using the newer method to require a different remedy for the Landfill. See also HO Report, ¶¶ 109-27.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments	Risk Assessment, Children vs adults	1.49	The commenter indicated that SNL's calculations apply only to an adult male and has used outdated conversion factors instead of newer dose conversion factors (DCF) that evaluate dose to children as well as adults (pp. 11, 12).	R40	NMED believes that DCFs were appropriately applied, as the site will be restricted to industrial use. The evaluation of an adult only is reasonable in this case. See also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 109-27.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr.	Filtered Water Samples	1.50	The commenter indicated there are questions which remain regarding the filtering of water samples by SNL (p. 8).	R41	NMED agrees that use of filtered water samples could result in an underestimation of the total levels of metals and radionuclides present in the ground water. However, most samples	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments	Risk Assessment, Cr-VI versus Cr-III	1.56	The commenter asked why the RFI Phase 2 states all chromium contamination at MWL is chromium III, the most conservative type. The commenter asked if NMED knows the type of all chromium contaminants at MWL.	R43	<p>NMED has previously provided comments to SNL concerning hexavalent (Cr-VI) versus trivalent (Cr-III) chromium. NMED concurs that the assumption that all chromium is trivalent chrome is not a conservative assumption, but rather is the least conservative approach.</p> <p>The inventory for the MWL does not specifically list any Cr-VI-contaminated wastes, suggesting that little, if any, Cr-VI wastes were disposed of in the Landfill. Sampling and analysis of soil beneath the trenches and pits did not find evidence of a chromium release. Finally, there is no evidence of a release of Cr-VI in filtered samples of ground water.</p>	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments	Risk Assessment, Inhalation of metals	1.57	The commenter stated that SNL claims the inhalation pathway doesn't apply to metals due to their "lack of volatility". This was found to be incorrect as metals can attach to soil particles and be inhaled. The commenter asked if SNL's risk assessment included inhalation pathway of heavy metals.	R44	NMED agrees that inhalation of metals in soil does occur and should be evaluated using a particulate emission factor (PEF). SNL did consider the inhalation of both vapor phase and particulate airborne compounds (see Appendix I, Table 1 and the soil inhalation equation presented on page I-85).	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal, Dr. Resnikoff's comments	Risk Assessment, sources of toxicological parameters	1.58	The commenter states that NMED recommends SNL use EPA's IRIS and HEAST or EPA's NCEA to determine toxicological parameters. The commenter asked if information from these sources	R45	Toxicity data from these databases were applied in the risk assessments (refer to Table 13, Appendix I).	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				situation. The commenter asked for NMED to comment on this.			
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	Risk Assessment, waste vs releases	1.62	At the same meeting it was stated that "the risk assessment is based on known releases from the site...several questions remained unanswered during the meeting about the amount and type of waste in the MWL". The commenter would like NMED to respond to this.	R49	Pursuant to EPA Directive OSWER 9355.0-30, a risk assessment does not have to be conducted on contents of landfill but rather only on the contaminants released. See also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 109-27.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	Risk Assessment, Sensitivity analysis	1.63	At the same meeting it was stated, "It would seem that a sensitivity analysis of the risk assessment would give some indication of the significance of this concern especially in light of the relative nature of the assessment noted above. (WERC executive summary, p.v.)	R50	A sensitivity analysis of the contents of the MWL is not necessary, as direct exposure to these contents would result in unacceptable risk.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal		1.69	WERC addresses SNL's risk analysis and recommends that SNL conduct a sensitivity analysis. A problem is SNL's consistent "bending" of information to favor its preferred alternative. To correct this situation it would behoove the NMED to require DOE to conduct an independent sensitivity analysis. The commenter asked that the uncertainties related to the inventory of the Landfill be addressed in a risk assessment that	R50	See Response R50; see also HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 109-27.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
						<p>treated to meet the standards at 20.4.1.800 NMAC incorporating 40 CFR 268.40.</p> <p>Although a CAMU was not evaluated in the CMS, given the similar size of the CWL and the MWL, the costs and construction logistics for a CAMU would likely be on the order of that of the existing CAMU located next to the CWL.</p>	
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	Soil Vapor Monitoring /Extraction	1.68	WERC recommends that SNL include a soil vapor extraction alternative as part of a long-term monitoring strategy.	R53	NMED agrees that a soil vapor monitoring system could be designed with the option to be convert it into a soil vapor extraction system should it become necessary in the future.	No
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	Fate and transport model	1.70	WERC recommends that SNL conduct a numerical fate and transport model for simulation of the MWL. The data from this could then be integrated into a risk assessment that considers the sensitivities of various options for the MWL. The commenter asked if NMED will require SNL to develop such a model.	R54	The final order issued by the NMED Secretary requires the SNL to submit to the NMED for approval a fate and transport model.	Yes
A	For Citizen Action, Sue Dayton, 2 nd submittal	General Comments	1.71	The commenter indicated that in 2001 Citizen Action asked the Secretary of NMED to issue an order to SNL to complete a CMS for the MWL. Citizen Action believes that the plan to cover the Landfill with 3 feet of dirt was not	R55	The CMS evaluated several potential remedies, including the SNL preferred remedy of covering the Landfill and excavation. The remedy of a cover, with a bio-barrier, was shown to be protective of human health and the environment, to be cost-effective, and to offered	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
	submittal			<p>present the true costs of an excavation scenario; failed to produce a baseline risk assessment; failed to include historical data that relates directly to risk; failed to consider the full inventory of the Landfill and numerous uncertainties associated with the Landfill; and failed to consider recommendations of independent reviews that attempt to find an appropriate solution for this waste site.</p>		<p>important recommendations from WERC. The CMS Report presented an adequate number of alternatives, including excavation, the preferred alternative of Citizen Action. The cost data provided in the CMS are adequate for the intended purpose; the cost data represent estimates only, and are not intended to represent detailed cost estimates in support of procuring contracts. Whether the cost estimates are precisely accurate or not, the excavation alternatives will undoubtedly be much more expensive than the capping alternatives. NMED finds that the cost estimates for the alternatives, including the excavation alternatives, are within the proper order of magnitude. See also HO FOF/COL and Report.</p> <p>The CMS and the Phase 2 RFI Reports include a baseline risk assessment. Uncertainties with respect to the investigation of any solid waste management unit will always exist because sampling by definition means that only a sample of soil is analyzed for contaminants not all of the soil that exists at the site. Technical expertise and professional judgment must necessarily be used to make a decision on the adequacy of site investigations.</p> <p>See also Responses R5, R6, R7, R8, R48, and R49.</p>	

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
B	Albuquerque Center for Peace and Justice and Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping, Janet Greenwald	Future funding for excavation	2.3	The commenter urges NMED to clean up the MWL now; she is concerned about shrinking government budgets, and that addressing the clean up later may be too late. The commenter is concerned about the contamination of the land and water and nearby communities.	R61	Current releases of contaminants and expected future releases of contaminants do not pose and are not expected to pose unacceptable risk to the land, ground water, or the community. The evidence does not presently support excavation of the Landfill in the near term due to the unacceptable risk to onsite workers and because the cover with biobarrier is protective.	No
C	Anonymous Citizen	Capping and Monitoring the MWL	3.1	The commenter believes that capping and long-term monitoring is the correct choice. The commenter is concerned about the cost, the risk to workers and the waste management issues, which the commenter believes are substantial if the Landfill is excavated at this time.	R62	NMED generally agrees with this comment. However, NMED will not allow any remedy to be implemented that is not protective of human health and the environment, regardless of costs.	No
D	Citizen, Lois Chemistruct	No Further Action (NFA)	4.1	The commenter would like to see NFA at this time and a vegetative soil cover	R63	NMED believes that granting NFA status without implementing the selected remedy does not provide adequate protection of human health and the environment. For modest additional cost and effort, the facility can provide a more protective landfill cover with a higher degree of predictable performance. Also, compared to what is proposed in the Phase 2 RFI Report, NMED believes that more robust monitoring and post-closure care of the Landfill are needed to ensure protection of human health and the environment.	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				O& M cost.		year period upon which the estimate is based. NMED does not expect a lot of maintenance of the cover to be needed over any 30 year period.	
H	Citizen, Thomas P. Swiler, former member of the Sandia National Laboratories Citizen Advisory Board	Ground Water Monitoring	8.1	The commenter does not believe there is any evidence that the Landfill is leaking contaminates that would endanger ground water or cause a plume that would increase the cost of remediation. The commenter found the indication that showed contaminates could leak from the MWL, which was provided by Dr. Mark Baskaran to be flawed.	R66	Although a few contaminants have migrated from the Landfill and occur in surface soil and subsurface soil, data show that ground water has not been impacted, nor likely is it to be impacted in the future. Thus, NMED does not agree with the assertions made by Dr. Baskaran that ground water at the MWL is contaminated. However, NMED believes that continued ground water monitoring is prudent and necessary to ensure long-term protection of human health and the environment.	No
H	Citizen, Thomas P. Swiler, former member of the Sandia National Laboratories, Citizen Advisory Board	Questioning the need to cap the MWL	8.3	The commenter does not support the capping of the MWL. He believes that the MWL already has maintenance free vegetative cover formed by nature and the passing of time and is not convinced that adding an additional layer of soil and establishing a new vegetative cover over the MWL will make it safer. He is concerned that such action will give many a false sense of closure and about the additional cost of the cover. He would like to know how the additional cover would make MWL safer in terms of reducing the percolation of water through MWL, reducing moisture	R67	The scientific evidence shows that a properly designed and constructed ET cap and bio-intrusion barrier will provide additional protection over that of the current operational cover, with only modest additional cost. Furthermore, there is almost no scientific data on the physical characteristics of the operational cover, such as the cover thickness, the material(s) from which it was constructed, or construction quality assurance. This is a concern because the future performance of the current operational cover can not be modeled with confidence. Also, the NMED is aware of one instance where a piece of radioactive debris was not buried	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				objection if that proposal is implemented. Also, he has no objection if the monitoring time is greater than 20 years.			
I	Citizen, Craig D. Richards	Re-evaluation of Data/assumptions	9.1	The commenter is satisfied with the vegetative cover for the near further, but asked where the funding will come from and when a re-evaluation of all the data and assumptions over time will be done. The commenter indicated that the radioactivity, transport modes, technology will change rapidly over the next 30-50 years and that technical breakthroughs may offer a full-scale disposal option rather than just monitoring and storage. MWL inventory charts indicate that Co-60 and H-3 "go away" by 2039/2049; what year has been selected for future excavation? The commenter believes the cost estimates for the NFA/vegetative cover and vegetative cover/barrier seem too low (i.e. less than \$2 million for monitoring the MWL for the next 70 years). He expressed concern regarding the cost estimates.	R68	<p>Under RCRA, SNL must provide the funds to implement the remedy.</p> <p>The final order issued by the NMED Secretary requires SNL to reevaluate the feasibility of excavation every five years. Therefore, new technologies will be taken into account during the re-evaluations.</p> <p>The future excavation alternatives did not include a specific date or time period after which excavation would begin. The cost estimates for future excavation assumed the Landfill would be excavated 50 years after closure.</p> <p>After the initial costs of installing the monitoring devices are incurred (some actually are already in place), annual monitoring costs will not exceed a few tens of thousands of dollars. The estimated costs for the cover alternatives are in the right order of magnitude.</p>	Yes
J	Citizen, Robert Anderson	Avoiding excavation	10.1	The commenter believes that dangerous, unknown constituents at the site should not be left in place because there are too many risks associated with them for the	R69	The remedy selected by the NMED is protective of human health and the environment. Post-closure care and monitoring will be conducted to ensure the safety of the public and the	No

Commenter ID	Commenter/Affiliation	Topic Area	Comment Number	Comment Summary	NMED Response Number	NMED Response	Revised Final Permit? Yes or No
				Laboratories', Response to Dr. Baskaran's Final Report, "Mixed Waste Landfill Review," pp. 33-35.		contamination above risk-based standards. Air quality sampling conducted by the NMED DOE Oversight Bureau at the MWL and three background stations did not detect any air contamination above risk-based standards.	
M	Citizen, Steve Dapra	Tritium	13.5	The commenter indicated that tritium contamination below or near the MWL has been studied and discussed in some detail. See the "Department of Energy and Sandia National Laboratories' Response to Dr. Baskaran's Final Report, "Mixed Waste Landfill Review," pp.19, 24, 28-29, 33-35.	R74	NMED agrees that tritium contamination in surface soil and the vadose zone has been adequately characterized by SNL. The activity levels of the tritium contamination are sufficiently low that the tritium contamination does not pose unacceptable risk to human health or the environment under an industrial land use scenario.	No
M	Citizen, Steve Dapra	Hiding Behind Classified Status	13.6	The commenter stated that certain parties have claimed that SNL or DOE has been concealing Landfill contents using classified status, but the commenter believes that these claims are unsupported. (See Memorandum from Rich Kilbury, DOE Oversight Bureau SNL/ITRI, to Roger Kennett, DOE Oversight Bureau, Program Manager, SNL/ITRI, July 21, 2000).	R75	Other than security requirements associated with classified information, NMED has no evidence or reason to suspect that SNL has intentionally withheld information on the Landfill's contents. The inventory for the Landfill was in part prepared from classified records, with the classified information removed, in order to produce an inventory that the public could review. NMED reviewed a sample of these records and was able to correlate the information with the Landfill inventory. See HO FOF/COL, ¶¶ 43-50.	No
N	Citizen, Maurice	Monitoring	14.2	The commenter believes that air monitoring and monitoring of the	R76	NMED agrees with this comment.	No