

**Five-Year Review for
Naval Reactors Facility
Operable Unit 8-05/06 Inactive Landfill Areas
and
Operable Unit 8-08 Remedial Action Sites**

December 2006

Prepared for the
U. S. Department of Energy
Pittsburgh Naval Reactors Office
Idaho Branch Office
P. O. Box 2469
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83403-2469

This Page Intentionally Blank

Table of Contents

List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xii
List of Appendices	xii
List of References	xv
Executive Summary	xvii
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Site Chronology	6
3.0 Background.....	7
3.1 Site Location and Demography	7
3.1.1 INL.....	7
3.1.2 NRF	7
3.1.3 Ecological Characteristics	7
3.2 Site Physical Characteristics	7
3.2.1 Climate Summary	8
3.2.2 Site Hydrogeology.....	11
3.2.2.1 SRPA	11
3.2.2.2 Industrial Waste Ditch.....	11
3.2.2.3 Sewage Lagoons.....	11
3.2.2.4 Perched Water	13
3.2.2.5 Groundwater Monitoring	15
3.2.2.6 Water Table Elevations	15
3.2.2.7 Flood Potential	18
3.3 Site Geology.....	18
3.3.1 Overview.....	18
3.3.2 Geology of the Snake River Plain	20
3.3.3 Geomorphology	20
3.3.4 Structural Geology	21
3.3.5 Lithostratigraphy	21
3.3.5.1 Near Surface Alluvium.....	21
3.3.5.2 Top of Basalt	22
3.3.5.3 Interbeds - Occurrence and Distribution	23
3.3.5.4 Basalt	23

3.4 Land Use and Resources	24
3.4.1 Past and Current Land Use.....	24
3.4.2 Projected Land Uses.....	24
3.4.3 Groundwater Use.....	25
3.4.3.1 Past Uses at NRF.....	25
3.4.3.2 Present Use at NRF	25
3.4.3.3 Future Use at NRF	25
3.5 History and Description of Sites.....	25
3.5.1 Landfill Sites	25
3.5.1.1 NRF-1 Field Area North of S1W	26
3.5.1.2 NRF-51 West Refuse Pit	26
3.5.1.3 NRF-53 East Refuse Pit and Trenching Area	27
3.5.2 No Further Action Sites	27
3.5.2.1 NRF-2 Old Ditch Surge Pond	27
3.5.2.2 NRF-16 Radiography Building Collection Tanks	27
3.5.2.3 NRF-18A S1W Spray Pond #1	28
3.5.2.4 NRF-22 A1W Painting Locker French Drain	28
3.5.2.5 NRF-23 Sewage Lagoons	28
3.5.2.6 NRF-42 Old Sewage Effluent Ponds	28
3.5.2.7 NRF-43 Seepage Basin Pumpout Area	28
3.5.2.8 NRF-61 Old Radioactive Materials Storage and Laydown Area.....	29
3.5.2.9 NRF-66 Hot Storage Pit.....	29
3.5.2.10 NRF-81 A1W Processing Building Area Soil.....	29
3.5.2.11 NRF-82 Evaporator Bottoms Tank Release.....	29
3.5.2.12 NRF-83 ECF Hot Cells Release Area.....	29
3.5.3 OU 8-08 Remedial Action Sites.....	30
3.5.3.1 Remediated Radiological Sites.....	30
3.5.3.1.1 NRF-11 S1W Tile Drainfield and L-Shaped Sump.....	30
3.5.3.1.2 NRF-12A Underground Piping to Leaching Pit	30
3.5.3.1.3 NRF-14 Underground Piping to Leaching Bed	30
3.5.3.1.4 NRF-17 S1W Retention Basins.....	30
3.5.3.1.5 NRF-19 Underground Piping to A1W Leaching Bed.....	31
3.5.3.1.6 NRF-21A Underground Piping to Old Sewage Basin.....	31
3.5.3.1.7 NRF-21B Sludge Drying Bed	31
3.5.3.1.8 NRF-80 A1W/S1W Radioactive Line near BB19	31
3.5.3.2 OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites	32
3.5.3.2.1 NRF-12B S1W Leaching Pit.....	32
3.5.3.2.2 NRF-14 S1W Leaching Beds	32

3.5.3.2.3 NRF-19 A1W Leaching Bed.....	32
3.5.3.2.4 NRF-21A Old Sewage Basin.....	32
3.6 Summary of Contaminants of Concern at NRF.....	32
3.6.1 Landfill Sites	32
3.6.2 No Further Action Sites.....	33
3.6.3 Remedial Action Sites.....	33
3.6.4 Groundwater Contaminants	33
4.0 Remedial Actions.....	35
4.1 Remedy Selection	35
4.1.1 Remedy Selection for Landfill Sites (OU 8-05/06).....	35
4.1.2 Remedy Selection for No Further Actions Sites (OU 8-08).....	36
4.1.3 Remedy Selection for Remedial Action Sites (OU 8-08).....	36
4.2 Remedy Implementation and Maintenance.....	37
4.2.1 Landfill Covers.....	37
4.2.1.1 Cover Construction.....	37
4.2.2 Groundwater Monitoring Network.....	38
4.2.2.1 Network Design (Location and Number of Wells)	38
4.2.2.2 Constituent Analysis Design.....	39
4.2.2.3 Well Construction	39
4.2.3 Soil Gas Monitoring Probes	39
4.2.3.1 Design Criteria.....	39
4.2.3.2 Soil Gas Probe Construction	40
4.2.4 No Further Action Sites.....	41
4.2.5 Remedial Action Sites.....	42
4.2.5.1 Phase I Remedial Actions	42
4.2.5.1.1 Excavation Activities	42
4.2.5.1.2 Debris Characterization and Disposal	46
4.2.5.1.3 Soil Consolidation	46
4.2.5.2 Phase II Remedial Actions.....	46

4.2.5.2.1 Pre-construction Testing	47
4.2.5.2.2 Site Preparation and Mobilization.....	47
4.2.5.2.2.1 Borrow Soil Testing and Source Management.....	47
4.2.5.2.2.2 Site Surveying	47
4.2.5.2.3 OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Construction	48
4.2.5.2.4 Completion Work Activities.....	48
4.2.5.2.4.1 Soil Moisture Neutron Access Tube Installation.....	48
4.2.5.2.4.2 Fertilization, Seeding, and Mulching	53
5.0 Progress Since Last Review	53
5.1 2001 Review of Inactive Landfill Areas	53
5.1.1 Protectiveness Statement	53
5.1.2 Recommendations.....	53
5.1.3 Follow-up Actions.....	54
5.1.4 Current Status.....	55
5.2 2004 Review of OU 8-08 Sites	55
5.2.1 Protectiveness Statement	55
5.2.2 Status from 2004 Review of OU 8-08 Sites.....	56
6.0 Data Review and Evaluation for Five-Year Review Process	56
6.1 Summary of Five-Year Review Process	56
6.2 Site Inspections.....	56
6.2.1 Overview of Site Inspection Activities.....	56
6.2.1.1 Inspections of Inactive Landfill Areas.....	56
6.2.1.2 Inspections of No Further Action Sites.....	57
6.2.1.3 Inspections of Remediated Radiological Sites	57
6.2.1.4 Inspection of OU 8-08 Engineered Covers	57
6.2.1.5 Inspections of Groundwater Monitoring Wells.....	58
6.2.1.5.1 Refurbishment of Well NRF-12	58
6.2.1.5.2 Refurbishment of Well NRF-6	58
6.2.1.5.3 Refurbishment of Well NRF-7	59
6.2.1.5.4 Refurbishment of Well USGS-98.....	59
6.2.1.6 Inspections of Soil Gas Monitoring Probes	60

6.2.1.6.1 Probe Reconstruction.....	60
6.2.1.7 Inspections of Soil Moisture Neutron Access Tubes	61
6.3 Data Review	61
6.3.1 Monitoring Program Overview.....	61
6.3.2 Groundwater	61
6.3.2.1 Analysis of Groundwater Monitoring Data.....	61
6.3.2.2 Inorganic Data Review	62
6.3.2.3 Organic Data Review.....	67
6.3.2.4 Data Trends	69
6.3.3 Soil Gas	73
6.3.3.1 Analysis of Soil Gas Data	73
6.3.3.2 Statistical Review	73
6.3.3.2.1 Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12).....	73
6.3.3.2.2 Trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11).....	73
6.3.3.2.3 1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (Freon 113).....	74
6.3.3.2.4 Chloroform	74
6.3.3.2.5 1,1,1-Trichloroethane.....	79
6.3.3.2.6 Tetrachloroethylene	79
6.3.3.2.7 Trichloroethylene	80
6.3.3.3 Trend Analysis.....	80
6.3.3.4 Comparison to Groundwater Data	82
6.3.4 Soil Moisture Monitoring.....	82
6.3.4.1 Soil Moisture Monitoring Results	82
6.3.4.2 Analysis of Soil Moisture Data	82
6.4 Review of ARARs.....	83
6.5 Risk Information Review.....	85
7.0 Data Assessment.....	85
7.1 Conditions External to the Remedy	85
7.1.1 Changes in Land Use or Projected Land Use	86
7.1.2 New Contaminants, Sources, or Pathway	86
7.2 Remedy Implementation and System Operations.....	86

7.2.1 Access and Institutional Controls	86
7.2.2 Remedy Performance	91
7.2.2.1 Landfill Covers.....	91
7.2.2.2 Groundwater Monitoring System	91
7.2.2.2.1 Well Fitness	91
7.2.2.2.2 Network Fitness	92
7.2.2.2.3 Adequacy of Monitored Constituents.....	93
7.2.2.2.4 Adequacy of Sampling Frequency.....	93
7.2.2.3 Soil Gas Monitoring System	93
7.2.2.4 No Further Action Sites	93
7.2.2.5 Remedial Action Sites	94
7.2.2.6 Operation and Maintenance Costs	94
7.2.2.6.1 Groundwater Monitoring Costs.....	94
7.2.2.6.2 Soil Gas Monitoring Costs.....	95
7.2.2.6.3 Soil Moisture Monitoring Costs.....	95
7.2.2.7 Assessment Summary.....	95
8.0 Deficiencies	97
8.1 Overview	97
8.2 Landfill Covers	97
8.3 Groundwater Monitoring Network.....	97
8.4 Soil Gas Monitoring Probes.....	97
8.5 Soil Moisture Monitoring Probes.....	97
8.6 Deficiencies Summary.....	98
9.0 Recommendations and Required Actions	99
9.1 Overview	99
9.2 Landfill Covers	99
9.3 Groundwater Monitoring Network.....	99
9.4 Soil Gas Monitoring Probes.....	100
9.5 Soil Moisture Monitoring Probes.....	100

9.6 Recommendations Summary 100

10.0 Protectiveness Statements 102

 10.1 Summary 103

11.0 Next Review..... 103

This Page Intentionally Blank

List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Location of NRF OU 8-05/6 Inactive Landfill Areas	2
Figure 1-2	Location of OU 8-08 No Further Action Sites	3
Figure 1-3	Location of OU 8-08 Remediated Radiological Sites.....	4
Figure 1-4	Location of OU 8-08 Engineered Covers.....	5
Figure 3-1	Location of the Naval Reactors Facility (Waste Area Group 8).....	9
Figure 3-2	36 Month Running Average Precipitation Normalized over 1 Year	10
Figure 3-3	Precipitation and Water Table Elevation	10
Figure 3-4	Top of Aquifer March 2006	12
Figure 3-5	Volume of Water Discharged to the NRF IWD	13
Figure 3-6	Current and Historical Perched Water at NRF	14
Figure 3-7	Location of NRF Groundwater Monitoring Wells	16
Figure 3-8	Water Table Elevation at USGS-12.....	17
Figure 3-9	Water Table Elevation at NRF-6	17
Figure 3-10	Water Table Elevation at USGS-98.....	18
Figure 4-1	Typical Groundwater Well Construction Diagram.....	43
Figure 4-2	Typical Soil Gas Probe Construction Diagram	44
Figure 4-3	General Cross-section of OU 8-08 Engineered Cover.....	49
Figure 4-4	NRF-12B/14, NRF-21A, and NRF-19 OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Areas.....	50
Figure 4-5	NRF-12B/14, NRF-21A, and NRF-19 Engineered Cover Areas	51
Figure 4-6	Typical Soil Moisture Neutron Access Tube Construction	52
Figure 6-1	Chromium Concentration in NRF Wells	70
Figure 6-2	Chloride Concentrations in NRF Wells.....	71
Figure 6-3	Tritium Concentrations in NRF Wells	72
Figure 6-4	Soil Moisture Curves for OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites	84

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Chronology of NRF Inactive Landfills Areas.....	6
Table 2-2	Chronology of OU 8-08 Areas.....	6
Table 3-1	Well Groups.....	15
Table 3-2	Physical Characteristic of the NRF Groundwater Monitoring Wells.....	19
Table 3-3	Contaminants of Concern in the Landfill Areas.....	33
Table 3-4	Contaminants of Concern at No Further Action Sites.....	33
Table 3-5	Contaminants of Concern at Remedial Action Sites.....	34
Table 4-1	Groundwater Monitoring Constituents.....	40
Table 4-2	Summary Data for Selected OU 8-08 5-Year Review Report.....	45
Table 6-1	Comparison of Turbidity and Metal Results from NRF-6.....	58
Table 6-2	Comparison of Turbidity and Metal Results from NRF-7.....	59
Table 6-3	Estimated NRF Background Groundwater Concentrations.....	63
Table 6-4	Comparison of MCL, Background, Individual Wells, and Well Groups.....	65
Table 6-5	Occurrence of Organic Compounds Detected in NRF-6 from 1997 to Present.....	67
Table 6-6	Comparison of MCLs and Well Group Averages.....	68
Table 6-7	Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-1.....	75
Table 6-8	Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-51.....	76
Table 6-9	Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-53.....	77
Table 7-1	Summary of Institutional Controls at NRF.....	87
Table 7-2	Yearly Operational Costs for Groundwater Monitoring Network.....	94
Table 7-3	Yearly Operational Costs for Soil Gas Monitoring.....	95
Table 7-4	Answers to Guidance Questions.....	96
Table 8-1	Summary of Deficiencies.....	98
Table 9-1	Summary of Recommendations and Follow-up Actions.....	101
Table 10-1	Summary of Protectiveness Statements for NRF CERCLA Sites.....	102

List of Appendices

- Appendix A – A Discussion of Causes for the Presence of Elevated Chromium Concentrations in Groundwater Well NRF-13
- Appendix B – Concentration Graphs for Chromium, Chloride, and Tritium in NRF Groundwater Monitoring Wells
- Appendix C – Concentration Graphs for Selected Organic Compounds in NRF Soil Gas Monitoring Wells
- Appendix D – Responses to IDEQ and EPA Comments on Draft Five-Year Review
- Appendix E – Responses to IDEQ and EPA Comments on Revised Draft Five-Year Review

List of Acronyms

A1W	Large Ship Reactor Prototype (1 st Aircraft Carrier design by <u>W</u> estinghouse)
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
BBI	Bechtel Bettis, Inc.
bls	below land surface
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFA	Central Facility Area
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
COC	Contaminant of Concern
CQA	Construction Quality Assurance
DOE	Department of Energy
ECF	Expended Core Facility
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FFA/CO	Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order
FS	Feasibility Study
IDEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
IC	Institutional Control
ICMR	Institutional Control Monitoring Report
INL	Idaho National Laboratory
IWD	Industrial Waste Ditch
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
MCLG	Maximum Contaminant Level Goal
MDL	Method Detection Limit
NFA	No Further Action
NNPP	Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program
NR/IBO	Naval Reactors/Idaho Branch Office
NRF	Naval Reactors Facility
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
OU	Operable Unit
RA	Remedial Action
RAO	Remedial Action Objective
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.
RD/RA	Remedial Design/Remedial Action
ROD	Record of Decision
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study
RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex
S1W	Submarine Thermal Reactor Prototype (1 st Submarine design by <u>W</u> estinghouse)
S5G	Submarine Reactor Plant Prototype (5 th Submarine design by <u>G</u> eneral Electric)
SRPA	Snake River Plain Aquifer
SSC	Soft Sided Container
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TOX	Total Organic Halogens
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
WAG	Waste Area Group
WEC	Westinghouse Electric Company

List of Units

°F	Degrees Fahrenheit
μ	Micro (a prefix denoting a one-millionth part or 10 ⁻⁶)
mg	Milligrams
mi ²	Square Miles
NTU	Nephelometric Turbidity Unit
pCi	Picocurie; one trillionth (10 ⁻¹²) of a curie, a measure of the amount of radioactivity
pCi/g	Picocuries per Gram
pCi/L	Picocuries per Liter
ppb	Parts per Billion
ppbv	Parts per Billion by Volume
μg/m ³	Micrograms per Cubic Meter
μS/cm	Microsiemens per Centimeter

List of References

- Alt, David D., and Donald W. Hyndman, 1989; Roadside Geology of Idaho, Mountain Press Publishing Co., Missoula, MT.
- Anderson, Jay E., and Amy D. Foreman, 2003; Evapotranspiration Caps for the INEEL, A Summary of Research and Recommendations.
- BBI, 2006; *Operable Unit 8-08 Remedial Action Report for the Naval Reactors Facility*, Volumes 1 and 2.
- BBI, 2001 to 2005; Naval Reactors Facility Environmental Monitoring Report, Report Issued Annually.
- BBI, 1999; *Phase 1 Remedial Design Report/Remedial Action Work Plan*.
- Cecil et. al, 1991; Formation of Perched Ground-Water Zones and Concentrations of Selected Chemical Constituents in Water, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho 1986-88: USGS WRIR 91-4166.
- Chen-Northern Inc., Helena MT., 1991; Industrial Waste Ditch Hydrogeologic Investigation, U. S. Naval Reactors Facility Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Idaho, Volumes 1 through VII and Appendices, prepared for WEC.
- Deer et. al, 1978; An Introduction to Rock Forming Minerals, Longman Group Limited, London, p. 250.
- DOE, 1995; Track 2 Guidance Document.
- EG&G, 1988; Naval Reactors Facility Geotechnical Investigation, Volumes I & II, for Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory.
- Envirodyne Engineers, 1988; *Engineering Report For Support Services With The NRF Industrial Waste Ditch Remedial Action Plan*, INEL; Prepared for WEC Under Sub-Contract C86-131239.
- EPA, 2004; National Primary Drinking Water Standards, 40 Code of Federal Regulations, parts 141 and 143, as updated.
- EPA, 1991; CERCLA Landfill Guidance Document.
- Everett, L. G., L. G. Wilson, and E. W. Hoylman, 1984; *Vadose Zone Monitoring for Hazardous Waste Sites*, Noyes Data Corporation, Park Ridge, New Jersey.
- Leeman, W. P., 1982; *Rhyolites of the Snake River Plain-Yellowstone Province, Idaho and Wyoming: A Summary of Petrogenetic Models*; Contained in: Cenozoic Geology of Idaho; Idaho Bureau of Mines.
- Mann, L. J., 1986; Hydraulic Properties of Rock Units and Chemical Quality of Water for INEL-1 - A 10,365-foot Deep test Hole Drilled at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho; USGS WRIR 86-4020.

Mabey, D. R., 1982; *Geophysics and Tectonics of the Snake River Plain, Idaho*; Contained in: Cenozoic Geology of Idaho; Idaho Bureau of Mines and Geology; Edited by Bill Bonnicksen and Roy Breckenridge.

Ostenaar, D. A., 1999; *Phase 2 Paleohydrologic and Geomorphic Studies for the Assessment of Flood Risk for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho*; Report 99-7, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, CO.

Ostenaar, D. A., 1998; *Preliminary Paleohydrologic and Geomorphic Assessment of Flood Risk for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho*; Report 98-1, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, CO.

Sagendorf, J. F., 1996; *Precipitation Frequency and Intensity at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory*, United States Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

WEC, 1998; *Naval Reactors Facility Comprehensive Record of Decision*.

WEC, 1997a; *Remedial Action Report for the Naval Reactors Facility Inactive Landfills*.

WEC, 1997b; *Naval Reactors Facility Comprehensive Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study*.

WEC, 1995; *The Remedial Design Report and Remedial Action Work Plan for the NRF Inactive Landfill Areas*, August 1995.

WEC, 1995a; *Well Completion Summary Report for Monitoring Wells NRF-8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 at the Naval Reactors Facility*, October 1995; by Golder Federal Services.

WEC, 1994a; *Track 2 Summary Report for Naval Reactors Facility Operable Unit 8-06*, April 1994.

WEC, 1994b; *Final Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study for the Exterior Industrial Waste Ditch Operable Units 8-07 Volumes 1 and 2*, Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho Falls Idaho, September 1994.

WEC, 1994c; *Feasibility Study NRF Landfill Areas*, April 1994.

WEC, 1993; *Track 2 Summary Report for Naval Reactors Facility Operable Unit 8-05*, November 1993.

WEC, 1992; *Data Summary Report, Industrial Waste Ditch, Hydrogeologic Investigation, U.S. Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho*, Volumes I - VII, January 1992, by Chen-Northern, Inc.

WEC, 1988; *Phase I Closure Plan and Sample Collection Report*.

Executive Summary

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL), located in southeastern Idaho, is a government-owned reservation managed by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). It was listed on the National Priorities List of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) in November 1989. In accordance with the requirements of CERCLA, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State of Idaho, and DOE negotiated a Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO). That agreement described the methods by which DOE, EPA, and the State of Idaho would implement CERCLA activities at INL.

To aid in the management of this project, INL was divided into Waste Area Groups (WAGs), and the WAGs were further divided into Operable Units (OUs). The FFA/CO and the associated Action Plan identified the appropriate level of investigation for each OU. Naval Reactors Facility (NRF) was designated as WAG 8; DOE-Naval Reactors/Idaho Branch Office (NR/IBO) is the signatory DOE agency responsible for NRF (WAG 8). Under direction of the Action Plan, OUs 8-05 and 8-06 (Inactive Landfill Sites) at NRF were investigated as "Track 2" sites. The investigation resulted in the identification of three former (inactive) landfill areas that required remedial actions to ensure continued protection of human health and the environment. A Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in 1994, which implemented the presumptive remedy for municipal type landfills at NRF. As part of the presumptive remedy, engineered soil covers were constructed over the inactive landfill areas, and monitoring of soil-gas and groundwater was implemented.

In 1997, a Comprehensive Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) was performed, which identified twelve OU 8-08 No Further Action (NFA) sites (areas with a source or potential source present, but for which an exposure pathway is not available) and nine OU 8-08 Remedial Action (RA) sites. A ROD was signed the following year. The ROD identified selected remedies for the various sites including Institutional Controls at the NFA Sites and removal of contaminated soil, concrete, and pipe; off-site disposal of debris; consolidation on-site of soils above remediation goals; and construction of engineered earthen covers at the RA Sites. All on-site remedial actions were complete by the end of 2004.

Bechtel Bettis, Inc., on behalf of the signatories of the FFA/CO, has conducted a Five-Year Review that combines reviews of the OU 8-05/06 and 8-08 sites. Since contamination remains at these sites above levels that would support unrestricted release, CERCLA requires a Five-Year Review to evaluate the continued effectiveness of the selected remedies. The INL recently completed a site-wide Five-Year Review for all WAGs except WAG 8 (NRF). WAG 8 is addressed separately since it is under the jurisdiction of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) rather than the U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office, and cleanup is overseen and funded solely by the NNPP.

This Five-Year Review concludes that the selected remedies remain protective of human health and the environment.

The next NRF Five-Year Review is scheduled for five years from the issuance of this document (2011).

This Page Intentionally Blank

Five-Year Review Summary Form

SITE IDENTIFICATION

Site name (from WasteLAN): Idaho National Laboratory (USDOE), Naval Reactors Facility

EPA ID (from WasteLAN): ID4890008952

Region: 10 **State:** ID **City/County:** Idaho Falls/ Butte Co.

SITE STATUS

NPL status: Final Deleted Other (specify)

Remediation status (choose all that apply): Under Construction Operating Complete

Multiple OUs?* YES NO **Construction completion date:** 2004

Has site been put into reuse? YES NO

REVIEW STATUS

Lead agency: EPA State Tribe Other Federal Agency _____

Author name: Naval Reactors Facility

Author title: N/A

Author affiliation: Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program/ DOE

Review period:** February 2001 to February 2006

Date(s) of site inspection: Annual Inspections Associated with the Institutional Control Plan

Type of review:

- Post-SARA Pre-SARA NPL-Removal only
 Non-NPL Remedial Action Site NPL State/Tribe-lead
 Regional Discretion

Review number: 1 (first) 2 (second) 3 (third) Other (specify) _____

Triggering action:

- Actual RA Onsite Construction at OU # _____ Actual RA Start at OU# _____
 Construction Completion Previous Five-Year Review Report
 Other (specify)

Triggering action date (from WasteLAN): February 2001

Due date (five years after triggering action date): February 2006

Issues:

- Sparse vegetation
- Ant hills and animal burrows
- Elevated metal results from well NRF-13
- Siltation in NRF-6
- Plugged Probes
- Standing water in some probes in the Spring
- Low water production in NRF-13 and NRF-7

* ["OU" refers to operable unit.]

Five-Year Review Summary Form, cont'd.

Recommendations and Follow-up Actions:

- Sparse vegetation: reseeded covers in 2004
- Ant hills and animal burrows: continue to inspect sites to check if the number of holes increase and/or the holes compromise cover integrity. Remove pest if necessary and make any necessary repairs.
- Elevated metal results from well NRF-13: Pull hardware from well and inspect both hardware and well borehole for problems. Hold follow-up meeting between NRF and regulatory agencies to determine best course of action.
- Siltation in NRF-6: Monitor well for signs of sediments in samples and recondition well if necessary.
- Plugged probes: replaced probes in 2003.
- Standing water in some probes during the spring season: Look for negative effects on probe efficiency. Consider sample scheduling adjustments if probe efficiency is affected.
- Low water production in NRF-13 and NRF-7: Continue to monitor results from wells.
- Constituents collected: discontinue collection of TOX beginning in 2007.
- Sampling frequency: begin collecting groundwater and soil gas samples semi-annually beginning in 2007, and collecting soil gas data annually beginning in 2010 if supported by data.

Protectiveness Statement(s):

OU 8-05/06 Landfill Covers: The remedy at OU 8-05/06 Landfill Covers is protective of human health and the environment. The analytical data shows that the covers are effective at containing contaminants. The covers and direct contact with contaminated soils and landfill wastes are being controlled by institutional controls.

OU 8-08 NFA Sites: The remedy at OU 8-08 No Further Action Sites is protective of human health and the environment because the remedy has been effective in limiting unauthorized access and excavation. The data also indicates that activities at NRF have not adversely affected the groundwater, thereby supporting the No Further Action designation of the sites.

OU 8-08 Remediated Radiological Sites: The remedy at OU 8-08 Remediated Radiological Sites is protective of human health and the environment. The OU 8-08 Remedial Action (RA) report indicates that pipe removal and consolidation of contaminated soil has been successful in achieving remedial action objectives (RAOs). The data also indicates that activities at NRF have not adversely affected the groundwater, thereby supporting the protectiveness statement for the sites.

OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites: The remedy at OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites is protective of human health and the environment. The OU 8-08 RA report indicates that the construction of an engineered earthen cover has been successful in achieving RAOs. Exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risks are being controlled by institutional controls. The data also indicates that activities at NRF have not adversely affected the groundwater, thereby supporting the protectiveness statements for the sites.

In summary, because the individual remedies at each site are protective of human health and the environment, collectively the selected remedies for the NRF remediated CERCLA sites are protective.

1.0 Introduction

Bechtel Bettis, Inc. (BBI) operates the Naval Reactors Facility (NRF) for the U. S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Naval Reactors (NR). In 1991, DOE signed a Federal Facilities Agreement and Consent Order (FFA/CO) with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and the U. S. Environment Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10, which initiated NRF's participation in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL).

A Five-Year Review is required if the selected remedial actions result in any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining at the site at levels that would preclude unlimited use and unrestricted release of the site. This Five-Year Review is intended to determine whether the selected remedies remain protective of human health and the environment. In addition, the review reassesses the monitoring programs to ensure the correct constituents are being monitored.

BBI, on behalf of the signatories of the FFA/CO, has conducted a Five-Year Review of the remedial actions implemented at NRF for three Operable Unit (OU) 8-05/06 Inactive Landfill Areas, twelve OU 8-08 No Further Action (NFA) Sites, and nine OU 8-08 Remedial Action (RA) Sites (also referred to as Remediated Radiological Sites and OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites). This Five-Year Review was initiated in October 2005 and the draft document was submitted to EPA and Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) in February 2006. The INL recently completed a site-wide Five-Year Review for all Waste Area Groups (WAGs) except WAG 8 (NRF). WAG 8 is addressed separately since it is under the jurisdiction of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) rather than the U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office, and cleanup is overseen and funded solely by the NNPP.

In 2001, a Five-Year Review was performed for the three OU 8-05/06 Inactive Landfill Areas (two OU 8-05 and one OU 8-06 landfill areas) identified as NRF-1, NRF-51, and NRF-53. In 2004, a Five-Year Review was performed for the OU 8-08 NFA and RA Sites. This document combines the required subsequent reviews for all three operable units into a single Five-Year Review for NRF (i.e., addressing OU 8-08 earlier than required to support efficient future reviews). The review includes the three Inactive Landfill Areas identified above and twelve NFA Sites designated as NRF-2, NRF-16, NRF-18A, NRF-22, NRF-23, NRF-42, NRF-43, NRF-61, NRF-66, NRF-81, NRF-82, and NRF-83. This review also includes the OU 8-08 RA Sites designated as NRF-11, NRF-12A, NRF-12B, NRF-14, NRF-17, NRF-19, NRF-21A, NRF-21B, and NRF-80. Figure 1-1 shows the location of the Inactive Landfill Areas. Figure 1-2 shows the location of the NFA Sites. Figure 1-3 shows the location of the eight Remediated Radiological Sites (that subset of the nine OU 8-08 RA Sites that required remediation independent of cover placement). Figure 1-4 shows the locations of the OU 8-08 Engineered Covers (OU 8-08 RA Sites where covers were constructed). The required date for this review is five years after the issuance of the first Five-Year Review for the Inactive Landfill Areas, which was February 22, 2001.




Figure 1-1 Location of NRF OU 8-05/6 Inactive Landfill Areas




Figure 1-2 Location of OU 8-08 No Further Action Sites




Figure 1-3 Location of OU 8-08 Remediated Radiological Sites




Figure 1-4 Location of OU 8-08 Engineered Covers

2.0 Site Chronology

Table 2-1 summarizes the chronology of significant events for the NRF OU 8-05/06 Inactive Landfill Areas (including groundwater monitoring wells and soil gas probes). Table 2-2 summarizes the chronology of significant events for the NRF OU 8-08 sites. These lists include key construction and regulatory dates.

Table 2 1 Chronology of NRF Inactive Landfills Areas	
Date	Event
1960	Estimated initial closure of landfill site NRF-1
1963	Estimated initial closure of landfill site NRF-51
1970	Estimated initial closure of landfill site NRF-53
Circa 1987	Initial post closure discovery of landfill problem
November 1989	INL added to National Priorities List
November 1993	1 st Track 2 Investigation completed (NRF-1 and NRF-51)
April 1994	2 nd Track 2 Investigation completed (NRF-53)
September 1994	Record of Decision signed
October 1994	Remedial design began
May 1995	Groundwater monitoring wells construction began
August 1995	Remedial design completed
September 1995	Groundwater monitoring wells construction completed
February 1996	Landfill covers construction began
February 1996	Soil gas monitoring probes construction began
June 1996	Soil gas monitoring probes construction completed
September 1996	Landfill covers construction completed
September 1996	Final Inspection of landfill covers completed
February 2001	First Five-Year Review Report for OU 8-05/06 issued
November 2003	Replaced Soil Gas Probes MW1-1 and MW1-2

Table 2 2 Chronology of OU 8 08 Areas	
Date	Event
November 1989	INL added to National Priorities List
September 1997	Completion of Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS)
September 1998	Record of Decision signed
June 1999	Work at NRF-14 commenced
September 1999	Phase I Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA) Work Plan issued (remediation)
July 2002	Explanation of Significant Difference (to the Record of Decision) to add a third engineered cover was signed
August 2002	Phase II RD/RA Work Plan issued (cover construction)
June 2003	Phase I work completed
April 2004	Construction of OU 8-08 Engineered Covers began
June 2004	First Five-Year Review Report for OU 8-08 issued
October 2004	Phase II OU 8-08 Engineered Cover construction completed
October 2005	Final Inspection of OU 8-08 Engineered Covers completed

3.0 Background

3.1 Site Location and Demography

3.1.1 INL

INL is a government facility managed by the DOE. It is located 32 miles west of Idaho Falls, Idaho, and occupies 894 square miles (mi²) of the northeastern portion of the Eastern Snake River Plain. Facilities at INL are primarily dedicated to environmental research, nuclear research and development, and waste management.

3.1.2 NRF

NRF is located on the west central side of INL, as shown in Figure 3-1, approximately 50 miles west of Idaho Falls, Idaho. NRF was established in 1949 as a testing site for the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program. The Westinghouse Electric Company (WEC) operated NRF for DOE, Office of Naval Reactors from 1949 through the fall of 1998, at which time site operations were turned over to BBI. NRF covers seven mi², of which 80 acres are developed. At various times, up to 3,300 people occupied the site. Approximately 965 Bechtel employees and 200 long-term subcontractor and DOE employees are currently working at NRF. The nearest public roads to NRF are approximately seven miles west, ten miles north, and ten miles south.

3.1.3 Ecological Characteristics

The INL lies within the sagebrush steppe region of North America. The natural vegetation at the INL typically consists of a predominant shrub canopy with an underlayment of perennial grasses and forbs. The predominant shrub is Wyoming big sagebrush. Other important shrubs include Basin big sagebrush, winterfat, and green rabbit brush. Common native grasses include thick-spiked wheatgrass, bottlebrush squirreltail, Indian ricegrass, and needle-and-thread. Less common grasses are bluebunch wheatgrass (common at higher elevations on alluvial fans) and Great Basin wildrye (occurs in areas with deep soils between lava ridges, in sandy soils, and in disturbed sites). In comparison to the rest of the sagebrush steppe region, the INL supports a high diversity of forbs. Some of the common native forbs are globe-mallow, Hood's phlox, various milkvetches, paintbrushes, and mustards (Anderson 2003).

The variety of habitats on the INL supports numerous species of reptiles, birds, and mammals. Several bird species warrant special concern because of their threatened status or sensitivity to disturbance. All birds of prey that exist on the INL are protected species. Of these birds, owls, hawks, and falcons are known to exist or have been spotted at NRF. There are no known endangered or threatened species that dwell within the NRF property boundary; however, the bald eagle (currently listed as a threatened species but is likely to be de-listed in the near future) has been spotted on occasion. Other animals that can be found near NRF include: antelope, mule deer, elk, moose, mountain lions, cottontail rabbits, ground squirrels, mice, badgers, beavers, bobcats, raccoons, coyotes, jackrabbits, starlings, weasels, bats, frogs, lizards, salamanders, snakes, swans, and a variety of small birds.

3.2 Site Physical Characteristics

The INL is located on the northeastern portion of the Eastern Snake River Plain, a volcanic plateau that is composed primarily of volcanic rocks and relatively minor amounts of sediments. Underlying INL is a series of basaltic flows containing sedimentary interbeds. The Snake River

Plain Aquifer (SRPA) is the largest potable aquifer in Idaho, and underlies the Eastern Snake River Plain and INL.

3.2.1 Climate Summary

The INL is located in a temperate climate, with warm summers and cold winters. Average daily temperatures range from 7 °F during the winter to 70 °F during the summer. Temperature extremes range from -47 °F to 105 °F. NRF receives approximately 8.3 inches of precipitation per year based on data collected at a weather reporting station located five miles south of the facility.

Since 1972, southeast Idaho has experienced three droughts. Each drought has been successively more severe than the previous drought. As shown in Figure 3-2, the first drought occurred between 1975 and 1980, the second between 1988 and 1993, and the latest between late 1999 and late 2004. Figure 3-3 compares precipitation received at Central Facility Area (CFA) located five miles south of NRF to the water table elevation in well USGS-12, which is located approximately three miles north of NRF. Note that changes in water level lag behind changes in average precipitation by approximately two to three years.

Figure 3-3 also indicates that precipitation to the Snake River Plain near NRF appears to be trending downward. During three dry periods, the trough that formed in the graph represented successively lower yearly precipitation. Between January 1972 and January 1989, CFA received a total of 149 inches of precipitation. In comparison, between January 1989 and the present, a period representing the same amount of time, CFA received a total of 136 inches of precipitation. Furthermore, the regional decline in SRPA water levels follows an identical pattern which indicates that these water levels may be as much influenced by declining long-term precipitation totals as by increased water usage from the SRPA.

This analysis suggests that in the future NRF may be adversely affected by cyclical droughts in two ways. First, declining water levels, over time, may require NRF to lower pump intake levels in the wells. Second, vegetation located on the earthen covers that may be suitable for temperate climates may become severely stressed (where some of the less drought tolerant plant species may not survive) under drier conditions than those that occurred between May 2003 and April 2004, when the INL received 3.71 inches of precipitation.




Figure 3-1 Location of the Naval Reactors Facility (Waste Area Group 8)




Figure 3-2 36 Month Running Average Precipitation Normalized over 1 Year




Figure 3-3 Precipitation and Water Table Elevation

3.2.2 Site Hydrogeology

3.2.2.1 SRPA

The SRPA is the largest source of potable water in Idaho, and underlies the Eastern Snake River Plain and the INL. The aquifer is approximately 200 miles long and 50 miles wide, and covers an area of approximately 9,600 mi². The depth to the SRPA at the INL varies from approximately 200 feet in the northeastern corner to approximately 900 feet in the southeastern corner. The distance between these extremes is 42 miles.

The EPA designated the SRPA as a sole-source aquifer under the Safe Drinking Water Act on October 7, 1991. On a grand scale, the SRPA is highly permeable because of the presence of fractures in the basalt; however, permeability on a local scale may vary greatly due to the high variability in the physical properties of the aquifer. Groundwater flow in the SRPA is to the south-southwest at rates between 1.5 to 20 feet per day. Near NRF, natural recharge to the SRPA occurs by infiltration of water (from precipitation runoff) from the Big Lost River, Little Lost River and Birch Creek, and to a lesser extent by direct infiltration of water (due to precipitation) into the soil over a wide area. Man made recharge sources to the aquifer at NRF include the Industrial Waste Ditch (IWD) and the sewage lagoon.

The SRPA occurs approximately 375 feet below NRF, and consists of a series of water saturated basalt flows and interlayered volcanic and sedimentary material. Drinking water for employees at NRF comes from several production wells located in the central portion of the facility. Figure 3-4 is a map showing the top of the aquifer near NRF during March 2006 based on water table elevation data collected from NRF wells. Currently water flows beneath NRF from the northeast to the southwest.

3.2.2.2 Industrial Waste Ditch


The NRF Industrial Waste Ditch is located at the northwest corner of NRF and extends approximately 3.2 miles to the northeast. In 1992, the volume of discharge to the IWD reached a maximum of approximately 171 million gallons per year. After the shutdown of the S5G and A1W prototype plants in the mid-1990s, the volume of discharge to the IWD declined rapidly (Figure 3-5). Since 2000, IWD effluent discharge has averaged six million gallons per year. At its maximum, water flowed in the IWD to a distance of approximately 1.8 miles. Currently water reaches a distance of approximately 150 yards.

3.2.2.3 Sewage Lagoons

The NRF sewage lagoons are two open rectangular ponds that measure 425 feet by 725 feet each. Only the northeast lagoon currently contains water. The lagoons were designed as facultative evaporation ponds; however, a portion of the effluent released to the lagoons infiltrates into the subsurface based on evidence gathered from nearby shallow wells and groundwater data. Some of the infiltrating water forms a shallow perched water zone beneath the wet lagoon. From 1990 to 2005, NRF released an estimated annual average of 17 million gallons of effluent to the sewage lagoons.

Groundwater Monitoring Network

- NRF WELL BUILT IN 1996
- NRF WELL BUILT IN 1991
- USGS WELL BUILT IN 1989
- USGS WELLS BUILT PRIOR TO 1980
- - - EXTRAPOLATED ELEVATION CONTOURS
- - - HYPOTHETICAL FLOW LINES



0 0.5 1.0
SCALE IN MILES




Figure 3-4 Top of Aquifer March 2006

3.2.2.4 Perched Water

Perched water, which lies above the regional water table between 20 and approximately 100 feet below land surface, occurs in several locations at NRF including beneath the IWD, the sewage lagoons, and historically the leaching beds/pits. In general, perched water forms at any location where a substantial surface recharge source is present. The most significant perched water at NRF is located beneath the outfall of the NRF IWD. Figure 3-6 provides a historical perspective to perched water located at NRF. This figure shows the estimated current extent of perched water (from the most current water level measurements) along the IWD and at the sewage lagoons versus its extent in 1993. Figure 3-6 also shows the locations and extent of historical perched water zones at the A1W and S1W Leaching Beds and an area located approximately 1000 ft north of the sewage lagoons.




Figure 3-5 Volume of Water Discharged to the NRF IWD

Because of reduced discharge volume to the IWD, the perched water observed at PS-6 (located approximately 1000 ft northeast of well NRF-6) in 1993 is now gone. Similarly, the perched water zone located at the outfall of the IWD has been reduced in areal extent by approximately 20 percent of what it was in 1993. The Sewage Lagoon (SL) perched water zone is estimated to be approximately the same size as in 1993.




Figure 3-6 Current and Historical Perched Water at NRF

3.2.2.5 Groundwater Monitoring

NRF has been routinely collecting groundwater monitoring data since 1989. The NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network consists of 13 wells strategically located to monitor upgradient and downgradient water quality. Figure 3-7 shows the location of the NRF groundwater monitoring wells.

The 13 wells are grouped into categories that indicate the portion of the aquifer being monitored. These categories are identified as Regional Upgradient, Regional Downgradient, Local Downgradient, and Effluent System. Table 3-1 lists the wells with the associated well category or group.

Table 3 1 Well Groups	
Well Group	Well
Regional Upgradient	USGS-12, NRF-7*
Regional Downgradient	USGS-97, USGS-98, USGS-99
Effluent System	NRF-6, NRF-13**
Local Downgradient	USGS-102, NRF-8, NRF-9, NRF-10, NRF-11, NRF-12

* NRF-7 was originally constructed as an Effluent System well, but well sample characteristics more closely represent background water quality.

** NRF-13 was originally constructed as a Regional Upgradient well, but well sample characteristics do not represent upgradient water quality. It has been included in the Effluent System well group; however, as noted in Appendix A, the well's ability to monitor the effluent system has been questioned.

3.2.2.6 Water Table Elevations

The water table in the SRPA has been declining for the past several decades. A direct consequence of this decline is that many domestic and agricultural wells in eastern Idaho had to be deepened to prevent them from going dry. The wells at NRF have been similarly affected. In 2005, well USGS-98 was deepened because the pump intake level was approximately one foot below the water level. Hydrographs for wells USGS-12, NRF-6, and USGS-98 (from north to south) have been plotted and are shown in Figure 3-8, Figure 3-9, and Figure 3-10, respectively. These wells are typical of the aquifer conditions near NRF.

These graphs display the same horizontal and vertical scales for ease of comparison and show both cyclical and long-term trends in water table elevation. The graph for USGS-12 best exemplifies the stair-step pattern of decline in water table elevation. In this well, the water level has declined about 15 feet since 1980 (valley to valley on the graph). The water level in NRF-6 has declined almost 10 feet since 1994. The most important information from these graphs is that water levels can drop rapidly; therefore, NRF must continually track water level changes to ensure ample time is available to deepen wells, if needed. Table 3-2 shows the physical characteristics of the NRF wells. This table indicates that all NRF wells have ample water above the well intake with the exception of USGS-97 (8.28 feet) and USGS-99 (15.59 feet). Presently, NRF does not anticipate the need to deepen the wells for possibly five to ten years if current trends continue.

Groundwater Monitoring Network




Figure 3-7 Location of NRF Groundwater Monitoring Wells




Figure 3-8 Water Table Elevation at USGS-12




Figure 3-9 Water Table Elevation at NRF-6




Figure 3-10 Water Table Elevation at USGS-98

3.2.2.7 Flood Potential

NRF is located in the central portion of the INL. The land surface at NRF is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from 4,840 feet near the wetted end of the NRF IWD, which is located approximately 150 yards north of NRF, to 4,870 feet at the south side of NRF. Flooding at NRF is not likely, since the facility is not located within the current 100-year flood plain. A flood of the Big Lost River with a recurrence interval in excess of 10,000 years is capable of inundating NRF (Ostenaa 1998, 1999). Recurrence interval refers to how often a flood of a given magnitude is likely to occur. This number assumes that the diversion dam located approximately 8 miles southwest of NRF is intact. Without the diversion dam, the flood recurrence interval capable of inundating NRF shrinks to something considerably less.

3.3 Site Geology

3.3.1 Overview

The INL is located on the northeastern portion of the Eastern Snake River Plain, a volcanic plateau that is composed primarily of volcanic rocks and relatively minor amounts of sediments. Underlying the INL is a series of basaltic flows containing some sedimentary layers (called interbeds).

NRF is located on the Big Lost River alluvial plain and is approximately 1.5 miles from the closest portion of the Big Lost River. The thickness of alluvial sediment near NRF ranges from several inches to in excess of 60 feet north of NRF. Near surface sediments at NRF consist of alluvial deposits of the Big Lost River and are composed of loosely compacted river deposits of

Well Name	Well Elevation at Surface	Well Elevation at Completion Depth	Elevation of Pump Intake	Most Recent Water Table Elevation	Date Measurement Taken	Water Above Pump Intake in feet	Screened Interval Closest to Pump
NRF 6	4846.62	4429.62	4444.00	4465.75	11/2/05	21.75	Stainless Steel; 4430 - 4488 feet
NRF 7	4843.09	4428.09	4433.00	4465.80	11/1/05	32.80	Stainless Steel; 4428 - 4478 feet
NRF 8	4852.33	4427.33	4437.33	4464.64	11/2/05	27.31	Stainless Steel; 4429 - 4479 feet
NRF 9	4853.47	4428.47	4441.47	4465.40	10/31/05	23.93	Stainless Steel; 4431 - 4481 feet
NRF 10	4853.10	4426.10	4438.10	4465.22	11/2/05	27.12	Stainless Steel; 4426 - 4476 feet
NRF 11	4850.73	4433.73	4441.73	4465.50	11/1/05	23.77	Stainless Steel; 4434 - 4484 feet
NRF 12	4850.83	4429.83	4436.83	4465.52	11/1/05	28.69	Stainless Steel; 4430 - 4480 feet
NRF 13	4843.59	4418.59	4438.59	4468.55	11/1/05	29.96	Stainless Steel; 4419 - 4469 feet
USGS 12	4819.58	4127.58	4461.58	4477.86	11/1/05	16.28	Open Hole; 4128 - 4235 feet
USGS 97	4858.95	4348.95	4456.95	4465.24	10/31/05	8.28	Open Hole; 4348 - 4471 feet
USGS 98	4883.29	4378.29	4440.29	4460.15	11/3/05	19.86	Perforated carbon steel; 4462 - 4482 feet
USGS 99	4872.36	4422.36	4449.36	4464.95	11/3/05	15.59	Perforated carbon steel; 4423 - 4569 feet
USGS 102	4850.81	4406.21	4429.81	4465.78	11/2/05	35.97	Open Hole; 4407 - 4491 feet

All elevations are in feet above sea level.

silt, sand, and pebble-sized gravel. Most of the soil near NRF is described as sandy loam or loess. The loess is an accumulation of wind deposited silt-sized particles probably of glacial origin.

A complex sequence of basalt flows and sedimentary layers underlie NRF. The sedimentary interbeds vary in thickness and lateral extent and separate the basalt flows that underlie the surface sediments. Samples from basalt flows have been correlated into approximately 23 flow groups that erupted from related source areas. Known eruption vents occur to the southwest of NRF, along what is referred to as the Arco volcanic rift zone, to the southeast along the axial volcanic zone, and to the north at Atomic Energy Commission Butte. The uneven alluvial thickness and undulating basalt surface at NRF are typical of basalt flow morphology.

3.3.2 Geology of the Snake River Plain

The Snake River Plain (SRP) can be described as a bow shaped plain that stretches from Ashton, Idaho at its northeastern edge to Ontario, Oregon at its western edge. Elevation of the plain varies from approximately 6500 feet near Ashton to approximately 2100 feet west of Boise, Idaho. Rocks of basaltic composition are prominent at the surface over the entire SRP, thus it is often mistakenly considered to be one region or unit possessing a common structure and origin. From a geological perspective, the SRP can be separated into two or three distinctive regions.

Some researchers (Mabey, 1982), divide the SRP into a western segment, a central segment, and an eastern segment based on the geophysical characteristics of the plain. Other researchers (Leeman, 1982, Alt and Hyndman, 1989) note that the SRP can be divided into two segments based on its physical characteristics. In either case, NRF is located in the eastern portion of the SRP. The eastern and central SRP are not fault bounded. The eastern and central SRP are best described geologically as a thin veneer of basalt overlying a very thick sequence of rhyolite (the fine-grained equivalent of granite). Both the basalt and rhyolite sequences are occasionally interlayered with sedimentary deposits. A study of the rocks encountered in INEL-1 deep borehole located approximately two miles south of NRF shows that 2200 feet of interbedded basalt and sediments overlie at least 8200 feet of rocks composed of compacted volcanic fragments and ash or their derivatives. This log is typical of the central and eastern SRP (Mann, 1986).

3.3.3 Geomorphology

NRF is located on a fluvial plain, the origin of which is attributed to historical deposition of sediments associated with the Big Lost River. Sediments deposited by the Big Lost River consist of interbedded sand, gravel, silt, and clay that in places are in excess of sixty feet thick. The sand, gravel, and silt of the alluvial plain were deposited historically during a period of time that possessed a climate that was considerably wetter than the climate of today. At present, the plain is experiencing a period of reduced-deposition. The fluvial plain surrounding NRF is oriented generally north-south, and is bounded on the east by basalt outcrops. These outcrops rise to a maximum height of approximately 30 feet above the adjacent fluvial plain. Northwest of NRF, an arcuate-shaped ridge is present at the surface. Best seen on aerial photographs, this feature is reported to be a series of extinct eruption vents (EG&G, 1988). These vents begin several miles west of NRF, but are not visible at the surface at NRF. Low lying, highly or moderately weathered basalt flows rising between 10 and 30 feet above the fluvial plain are located approximately 1/2 mile west of NRF. Beyond these low lying hills is the Lost River Mountain Range. These mountains rise to an elevation in excess of 9000 feet.

Aerial photographs taken of the area surrounding NRF show a mosaic of abandoned or dry meandering channels. Several prominent features are evident in these photographs, including a number of point bar deposits and abandoned oxbows. A major abandoned meander channel is located approximately 600 feet due west of the IWD. This channel is 12 feet across and 6 to 8 feet deep. At the surface, abandoned meander channels are present in varying states of erosion. The regional surface surrounding NRF gently dips to the north, and ranges in elevation from 4870 feet south of NRF to 4830 feet north of NRF. The elevation within the NRF security fence ranges from 4848 feet to 4852 feet above sea level. Several man-made irrigation canals cross the desert terrain near NRF. The most prominent of these canals lies approximately 1/4-mile north-northwest of NRF. This canal is 20 feet wide and 15 feet deep. It rises above the desert floor 8 to 10 feet. Water no longer flows in these channels and canals, and they do not appreciably influence the hydrogeology of the IWD. These features would affect the hydrology of NRF only during an extreme flood event (like the 10,000 year flood) associated with the Big Lost River.

3.3.4 Structural Geology

The eastern SRP lies within the Basin and Range physiographic province, but within itself exhibits few characteristics typical of the basin and range spreading. The general appearance of the plain suggests that it was formed from rifting oriented along a northeast/southwest trending axis. This would result in the apparent lateral separation of the northwest-southeast trending mountains, which are located on either side of the SRP. In actuality, rifting is occurring, but the orientation is along a northwest-southeast trending axis. Several prominent rift features embedded in the Snake River Plain are observable on high altitude reconnaissance maps of the eastern SRP. These features are believed to be extensions of the normal faults that bound the ranges located to the north and south of the plain.

A combination of the North American continent moving westward, and a rifting center located near the eastern edge of the Great Basin, has caused a stretching of the crust. This stretching is exhibited in the form of down dropped valleys and raised mountains in most of the Great Basin. In the SRP, this stretching is accommodated by plastic flow and infilling with basalt (Alt and Hyndman, 1989; Mabey, 1982; Leeman, 1982).

3.3.5 Lithostratigraphy

The following four sections discuss the important rock and sediment layers present beneath NRF. The four layers include the near surface alluvium, the boundary between the near surface alluvium and the basalt, interbeds contained within the basalt, and the basalt itself. Much of what is known about the physical characteristics of the rocks and sediments is derived from the numerous boreholes and wells that have been drilled at NRF over the past 50 years.

3.3.5.1 Near Surface Alluvium

There are two types of surface sedimentary deposits typically found at NRF. The topsoils are primarily loess deposits believed to be of wind-blown origin. Analysis of the loess shows that its primary constituent is the clay montmorillonite combined with lesser amounts of the clay illite, quartz, feldspar, and various carbonate minerals (Chen-Northern Report, 1991). Montmorillonite is a water-absorbing (swelling) clay and possesses an affinity for adsorbing positively charged ions (Deer et. al, 1978, p. 250). The thickness of the loess near NRF varies from several inches to over ten feet (EG&G Report, 1988, Phase I Closure Plan and Sample Collection Report, WEC, 1988). In some isolated locations near NRF, the removal of fine dirt by

the wind has caused fine grain sand dune deposits to form. In most places near NRF, the loess and sand deposits overlie river deposited gravels and sands.

NRF is located near the western edge of a river (meander) plain. This plain is several miles wide and consists of well rounded to sub-angular, moderately to poorly sorted sand and gravel interbedded with silt and clay. Much of the sand and gravel is stratified, which is evidence of its river origin. The gravels consist of a wide variety of rock types, the source of which are the mountains located north and west of NRF, and include material of sedimentary, metamorphic, or igneous (plutonic) origin. Individual pebbles range in size from three quarters of an inch to two inches in diameter. Some of the pebbles are composed of basalt derived from the basalt flows that surround the river plain. The shape of individual gravel pebbles is indicative of distance of transport and resistance to abrasion. Clay and fine silt interbeds are found sporadically throughout the river sediments, but are commonly found at the basalt/sediment interface. These clay interbeds usually possess lower permeability than the surrounding sand and gravel. Past geologic investigations have demonstrated that the formation of perched water is facilitated by infilling of fractures in the top of the basalt with clay (Cecil et. al, 1991).

The gravels of the Big Lost River either directly overlie a thin soil/clay layer immediately overlying the basalt or a widespread clay and silt deposit interpreted to be of fluvial (river) or lacustrine (lake) origin (F/L deposit). The contact between the alluvium and clay and silt deposit has been described as abrupt to gradational. In areas where alluvium was observed to overlay basalt, the contact was often marked by an increase in the percentage of basalt pieces imbedded within a one to two foot layer of soil located directly above the basalt bedrock. These soils ranged from white to light brown in color and are interpreted to be a buried soil horizon that developed prior to the deposition of the fluvium. The F/L deposit is coarser grained and darker in color than the soil covering the bedrock. The F/L deposit was determined to be present wherever the elevation of the top of the basalt was below approximately 4825 feet above sea level (asl).

The F/L deposit is characterized by light brown silty clay interbedded with fine sand and occasional gravels. These layers occur as repetitive fining upward sequences that range in thickness from four inches to one foot. Near the contact with the underlying basalt, these fining units are occasionally interlayered with basaltic gravels. Percolating water that originates from surface discharge sources or precipitation appears to be inhibited by the clay content of this unit. A large portion of the IWD is underlain by the F/L deposit. Borehole data indicates that the surface of this deposit slopes to the southeast.

3.3.5.2 Top of Basalt

Over the past 35 years, a number of boreholes have been drilled near NRF that have penetrated to the top of the basalt. These data were used to construct a map of the top of the basalt. It is important to understand how the surface of the basalt changes laterally because of evidence that shows that this surface can potentially impede the downward migration of water thus promoting the formation of perched water at this interface. If the surface that causes the perched water to form is sloped perched water will flow down slope. Any contaminants that may be present in the water will be carried along with the water to locations that may be some distance from their origin. This phenomenon has the potential of creating phantom contamination. That is, the occurrence of contamination for which no apparent source exists.

3.3.5.3 Interbeds - Occurrence and Distribution

Sedimentary interbeds separate many of the basalt flows that occur beneath NRF. These interbeds vary in composition, thickness, and areal extent. Four major interbeds have been identified in the subsurface. The first important interbed is brick red to red-orange in color and occurs at a depth that varies from 70 to 120 feet. This interbed is widespread and ranges in thickness from less than six inches to over 14 feet. This interbed is composed of poorly sorted mixtures of angular to subangular sand sized grains. The term lithic wacke was used to describe the sediments in these interbeds and refers to immature sandstones with high clay content and a large number of rock fragments other than quartz and chert (Chen-Northern, 1991, and Blatt et. al., Origin of Sedimentary Rocks). Dominant grain fragments are composed of basalt and quartz, with the finer constituents consisting of silt and clay. The sediments of this interbed appear to be loosely consolidated in the subsurface. Perched water has been associated with this interbed, although it is not positively known whether the interbed itself, or a tight basalt located immediately beneath, is the perching layer. Because of its wide-ranging occurrence, and physical properties, this interbed can inhibit potential contaminant migration.

Other important interbeds occurring at 200 feet, 270 feet, and 370 feet have been identified from geophysical logs from many wells near NRF. Several minor interbeds are also present. These interbeds are generally limited in areal extent.

3.3.5.4 Basalt

Underlying the alluvium is approximately 1500 to 2000 feet of transitional olivine to alkaline olivine basalts. Minerals present in this section include magnesium olivine, clinopyroxene, calcic-plagioclase, spinel, and magnetite (Chen-Northern, 1991). Depth from the surface to the top of the basalt surface ranges from zero to 60 feet, but is typically 30 feet. The basalt consists of individual flows ranging in thickness from 5 feet to over 70 feet. Basalt that is void of interconnected vesicles and fractures is nearly impermeable. The hydraulic conductivity (an approximation of a material's ability to pass water) measurements from basalt cores collected from a borehole located just north of the NRF site are generally in the range of 1×10^{-8} cm/sec (Chen-Northern, 1991). However, local fracturing greatly increases effective conductivity values. Extremely variable transmissivity (hydraulic conductivity times the aquifer thickness) values are common at NRF as is evidenced by values from NRF-2 and NRF-7, which are located approximately 1200 feet apart. Measured transmissivity in these wells were 3.1 ft²/day in well NRF-7 and 576,000 ft²/day in NRF-2. A well with a transmissivity value of 3.1 ft²/day can produce approximately 3000 gallons of water per day while a well with a transmissivity of 576,000 ft²/day can produce in excess of 3,000,000 gallons of water per day.

Based on evidence observed from cores collected at NRF, it appears that most of the fractures in the basalt are probably the result of the cooling process. If this is so, these fractures will be confined to one flow, and will not transect other flows. These fractures appear to be randomly distributed in the horizontal plane, but are concentrated at the top of individual flows in the vertical plane. Some flows are completely fracture free, while other flows are fractured from top to bottom. No evidence exists to substantiate the conclusion that one set of fractures is continuous from the surface to the aquifer (i.e., providing an uninterrupted pathway for potential contaminants to follow). There is evidence that indicates that some portions of the basalt, perhaps occurring in quasi-linear trends, are more highly fractured than the surrounding basalt. An increase in the frequency of fractures in the basalt would expedite surface water infiltration into the aquifer. It would be improper to assume that these "fracture zones" act as conduits, allowing surface water to flow unimpeded from the surface directly to the aquifer. Water that

may infiltrate along these hypothetical trends would interact with surface soils, clay-lined fractures, and the soils contained in interbeds. In areas where these trends are present, however, travel time through the basalt would tend to decrease.

3.4 Land Use and Resources

3.4.1 Past and Current Land Use

INL was established in 1949 as the National Reactor Testing Station by the United States Atomic Energy Commission as a site for building, testing, and operating nuclear reactors, fuel processing plants, and support facilities with maximum safety and isolation. In 1974, the area was designated as the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory to reflect the broad scope of engineering activities conducted there. The name was changed to Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in 1997 to reflect the redirection of its mission to include environmental research. In 2005, the name was changed to INL to emphasize its role as one of the United States' leading national laboratories.

The Bureau of Land Management manages the areas surrounding INL for multipurpose use. Communities nearest to INL are Atomic City (south), Arco (west), Butte City (west), Howe (northwest), Mud Lake (northeast), and Terreton (northeast). In the counties surrounding INL, approximately 45% is agricultural land, 45% is open land, and 10% is urban. Fences and security personnel strictly control public access to facilities at INL. A total of 90 miles of paved highways pass through INL and are used by the public.

NRF consists of three former Naval nuclear reactor prototype plants, the Expended Core Facility (ECF), and miscellaneous support buildings. Construction of the Submarine Thermal Reactor Prototype (S1W) at NRF began in 1951. The prototype completed operation in 1989. The Large Ship Reactor Prototype (A1W) was constructed in 1958 and completed operation in January 1994. The Submarine Reactor Plant Prototype (S5G) was constructed in 1965 and completed operation in May 1995. The prototypes were used to train sailors for the nuclear Navy and were used for research and development purposes. ECF, which receives, inspects, and conducts research on Naval nuclear fuel, was constructed in 1958 and is still in operation. The Dry Storage Overpack Facility was completed in 2001 to store expended Naval nuclear fuel in a non-aqueous environment.

3.4.2 Projected Land Uses

NRF is projected to continue operations until at least 2035. Operations will continue to include receiving, inspecting, and conducting research on Naval nuclear fuel, as well as the temporary dry storage of Naval nuclear fuel until a permanent national repository is available. Other NRF operations will include the decontamination and disposition actions associated with retired buildings and facilities.

3.4.3 Groundwater Use

The SRPA is the largest aquifer in Idaho and the principal source of drinking water for thousands of Idaho residents. For the majority of the past century, water withdrawal from the SRPA was limited to its periphery at relatively small quantities. In the past forty years, demand for both potable water and water for agricultural uses has increased in response to an increasing population base in eastern Idaho. Increased water demand coupled with several extended droughts has caused a decline in the SRPA water table. Demand for water in eastern Idaho is expected to increase in the future, which will result in a continued decline of the water table.

3.4.3.1 Past Uses at NRF

NRF has been in operation since the early 1950s. Up through the mid-1990s, the site was primarily used for training Navy personnel to operate nuclear propulsion plants aboard Naval vessels. Well NRF-1, drilled in 1950, supplied early demand for water at NRF. Water from this well was used for drinking, irrigation, sewerage, and cooling the S1W prototype plant. As the number of plants increased so did the number of Navy students and full time employees. The demand for water also increased. Additional water wells were constructed in 1951 (NRF-2), 1956 (NRF-3), and 1964 (NRF-4). During its peak period in the mid-1980s, NRF had three operating prototypes (S1W, S5G, and A1W), ECF, and approximately 3,300 full-time, part-time, and Naval personnel. At that time, peak water demand was approximately 300,000,000 gallons per year. Most groundwater used at NRF was eventually returned to the environment in one of several ways. NRF water was discharged to the IWD or to the Sewage Lagoons where it was evaporated, used by vegetation, or infiltrated into the subsurface. The balance of the water was used to irrigate lawns or was supplied to cooling towers for indirectly cooling operating reactors (evaporative losses).

3.4.3.2 Present Use at NRF

Current water usage at NRF is approximately 33,000,000 gallons per year. This use is primarily limited to domestic consumption, irrigation, and ECF operation. The environmental fate for groundwater is the same as described above except that cooling tower evaporation is no longer occurring. Approximately 965 BBI employees and 200 long-term subcontractor and DOE employees are currently working at NRF.

3.4.3.3 Future Use at NRF

In the near future, water usage at NRF is expected to remain stable or rise slightly, due to increased personnel.

3.5 History and Description of Sites

3.5.1 Landfill Sites

NRF operations over the time period when the landfills were active consisted of Naval ship reactor prototype facilities and support operations (i.e., cooling systems operations; water treatment operations; laboratory operations; production support operations from paint, electrical, machine, and equipment maintenance shops; and subcontractor construction support operations). The characteristics of the refuse disposed of in the three landfills were influenced by the NRF facilities and the various support operations. The typical waste disposal practice at

the sites was to dispose of refuse in trenches, incinerate the combustible refuse, and then bury the residual material. When these sites were abandoned, the remains were left in place and covered with soil from the surrounding area.

The resulting primary contaminant source at all three landfill areas is refuse material and refuse degradation products buried at the sites. From records kept since 1971 of wastes sent from NRF to the Central Facilities Area landfill, it is estimated that almost two-thirds of the waste would have consisted of office trash. Less than one percent of the waste would have consisted of solid and liquid chemicals, waste oil, and solvents (WEC 1994a).

In addition, during the operational period of these landfills, major construction activities were carried out. These activities included the construction of two prototype plants and other support buildings (i.e., training facilities, storage buildings, etc.). These construction activities would have contributed a considerable amount of construction debris to these landfills, therefore decreasing the estimated hazard (i.e., reduced percentage of chemicals). Figure 1-1 shows the location of the landfills.

Since contaminated soil remains at these sites with concentrations of contaminants of concern above risk-based concentrations that prevent unrestricted use of the area, Institutional Controls (ICs) have been implemented. ICs used at NRF preserve the underlying assumptions of the RI/FSs developed for WAG 8 that will protect human health and the environment. Section 7.2.1 discusses site ICs in more detail.

3.5.1.1 NRF-1 Field Area North of S1W

Use of NRF-1 started in approximately 1951 and continued until 1960. The locations of the primary disposal areas within NRF-1 were identified from old drawings, photographs, verbal testimony, and records. NRF-1 covers an area of 192,500 square feet (350 feet wide and 550 feet long). Within this area, there was a previously utilized trench containing buried waste and a mounded area consisting of surface debris and soil. The buried waste disposal trench is located on the west side of the site. The depth of this trench ranges from approximately four feet on the north end to 25 feet on the south end relative to the surrounding grade. The dimensions of this trench are 120 feet wide and 375 feet long. From historical records, photographs, and drawings, the bulk of the waste was disposed of at the southern half of the site where the trench dimensions were greater. The north end of the trench was covered when Spray Pond #2 was constructed around 1954 (WEC 1995), thus limiting the amount of wastes that were disposed of at the north end of the trench.

3.5.1.2 NRF-51 West Refuse Pit

NRF-51 started operating in about 1957 and continued until 1963. Previous investigations indicated the shape of this unit was irregular with curved boundaries. The overall size of the site was originally estimated to be approximately 450 feet long, varying in width from 100 to 175 feet. Based on photographs and a magnetometer survey of the location, only one disposal trench was identified. The trench was originally estimated to be approximately 250 feet in length, 15 to 20 feet wide, and 10 to 15 feet deep (WEC 1993). The length and width of the trench were further refined by a magnetometer survey which determined it to be 175 feet long and 40 feet wide (WEC 1995). Analysis of photographs indicated the materials disposed of at NRF-51 tended to be construction debris rather than the types of wastes found in the other two units. In addition, it was noted that there were no drums in the trench at the time the

photographs were taken. It is believed that a portion of this site was previously used as a construction staging area.

3.5.1.3 NRF-53 East Refuse Pit and Trenching Area

NRF-53 was used as a disposal area from about 1956 to 1970. The various types of waste that may have been disposed of in this area include waste petroleum products, small quantities of waste paints and solvents, construction debris, scrap metal, and cafeteria waste. Geophysical data indicated that there were at least five pits or trenches at NRF-53. Based on the geophysical data and verbal testimony, the trenches were estimated to have been up to 90 feet wide by seven to ten feet deep and up to 350 feet long. The area of site NRF-53 that included both surface debris and the trenches was approximately 400,000 square feet.

3.5.2 No Further Action Sites

The NFA designation was created by the FFA/CO signatory agencies for those sites with a source or potential source present, but for which an exposure route was not available. The following sections discuss each of the NFA Sites. Figure 1-2 shows the location of the NFA Sites.

Since contaminated soil remains at these sites with concentrations of contaminants of concern above risk-based concentrations that prevent unrestricted use of the area, ICs have been implemented. ICs used at NRF preserve the underlying assumptions of the RI/FSs developed for WAG 8 that will protect human health and the environment. Section 7.2.1 discusses site ICs in more detail.

3.5.2.1 NRF-2 Old Ditch Surge Pond

This site was originally a gravel or soil pit. In 1959 the pit was connected to the NRF interior waste ditch system and a pond area formed. The pond and connecting ditch were used from approximately 1959 to 1985. Low-levels of radioactivity and slightly elevated levels of metals were detected in the pond. The pond became contaminated with very low levels of radioactivity when water with trace amounts of cobalt-60 and cesium-137 was released to the ditch in the late 1960s. Accumulation of radioactivity in the upper several feet of ditch sediments produced slightly elevated activity levels that are below remediation goals established in the ROD (WEC 1998).

3.5.2.2 NRF-16 Radiography Building Collection Tanks

This building was originally a decontamination building used for cleaning radioactive equipment. The decontamination solutions were sent to two underground tanks. These tanks were used from 1954 to 1960. Adjacent to the building was a concrete pad that was used for outdoor storage of radioactive material. The concrete pad was removed in 1979. The tanks were removed in 1993 with no indication of leakage. Sampling results showed arsenic (which was found at depth adjacent to the underground tanks), cesium-137, cobalt-60, and uranium-235 above risk-based screening levels; however, the risk assessment performed for this site was very conservative and a risk management decision was made that the actual risks are acceptable.

3.5.2.3 NRF-18A S1W Spray Pond #1

The S1W Spray Pond #1 is a large concrete structure that contained cooling water for plant operations. At one time, a chromium based corrosion inhibitor was used in the water. Leakage and overspray from the pond caused an elevated chromium concentration in the surrounding soil. A risk assessment showed a low risk for this site assuming the Spray Pond remains in place, thus limiting exposure to the soil below the basins in the event that any contamination is present.

3.5.2.4 NRF-22 A1W Painting Locker French Drain

This site is the location of a former French drain that may have received paints, solvents, and possibly mercury. A removal action was performed in 1994 after receiving public comment on the proposed action. Sampling performed after the removal action showed elevated levels of lead and mercury remained. The excavated hole was 12 feet deep and was grouted to the surface eliminating all exposure pathways. A risk assessment of the site after the removal action estimated the risk to be low. Although no exposure route is present, a source remains at the site.

3.5.2.5 NRF-23 Sewage Lagoons

This site is the current sewage lagoons. The lagoons are two open rectangular ponds that measure 425 feet by 725 feet each. The northeast lagoon is currently active, while the southwest lagoon is typically dry and receives overflow from the active lagoon on occasion. Both lagoons are lined with clay. The sewage lagoons were built in 1960 and expanded to their current length in 1972. The lagoons were designed to be evaporative ponds; however, subsurface seepage of liquid effluent from the active lagoon has created a shallow perched water zone beneath the pond. This water contains non-hazardous chemicals (salts). Sampling of the sediment has shown the presence of slightly elevated levels of metals and radionuclides and only trace amounts of organic compounds in the upper 12 inches of soil. Most contaminants are believed to be contained within the lagoon sludge or lagoon clay lining. The risk assessment for the site was very conservative and a risk management decision was made that the actual risks are acceptable.

3.5.2.6 NRF-42 Old Sewage Effluent Ponds

This site is the location of a former temporary sewage pond used in the 1950s. There is no direct evidence that a hazardous source exists at the site; however, process knowledge gained from sampling of the current sewage lagoons suggests that elevated amounts of metals, semi-volatile organics, and low-level radionuclide contaminants may be present. The site is currently covered with a ten-foot layer of soil. Based on current conditions (i.e., ten foot soil cover), the risk associated with this site was estimated to be low.

3.5.2.7 NRF-43 Seepage Basin Pumpout Area

This site is an area that physically surrounds NRF-21A and was formed when the contents of NRF-21A (Old Sewage Basin) were pumped out into the surrounding area in 1958. The effluent to NRF-21A had been cross-contaminated with radioactivity in 1956. Characterization sampling performed in 1996 showed arsenic, cesium-137, carbon-14 and plutonium-239 above risk-based screening levels; however, the risk assessment performed for this site was very conservative and a risk management decision was made that the actual risks are acceptable.

During the spring and summer of 2002, in conjunction with remediation of NRF-21A, the amount of contaminated soil and the size of NRF-21A were found to be larger than anticipated. A portion of NRF-21A extended into the previously identified NRF-43 area. NRF and the regulatory agencies decided that the NRF-21A basin area, including the portion that extended into NRF-43, would be capped with an engineered cover similar in design to those intended for NRF-12/14 and NRF-19. This decision was documented in an Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) issued in 2002. Construction of the cover was completed in 2004.

3.5.2.8 NRF-61 Old Radioactive Materials Storage and Laydown Area

This site is the historic location of a radioactive material storage and laydown area that was used from 1954 to 1960. Soil sampling showed detectable amounts of cesium-137 that were well below remediation levels. The risk associated with this site was determined to be low.

3.5.2.9 NRF-66 Hot Storage Pit

This site is an area where a tanker truck collected radioactive liquid waste for transportation to other INL facilities for processing. Spills reportedly occurred in this area. Contaminated soil was removed from the area in 1980. Sampling during the remedial investigation showed slightly elevated amounts of cesium-137 that were well below remediation levels.

3.5.2.10 NRF-81 A1W Processing Building Area Soil

This site is the area around a radioactive materials processing building where known spills have occurred in the past. Typically, these spills were cleaned up to the maximum extent possible at the time. Cesium-137 and cobalt-60 were the only radionuclides detected during past sampling, and all results were below remediation levels.

3.5.2.11 NRF-82 Evaporator Bottoms Tank Release

This site consists of the soil above an underground storage tank vault. One spill was known to have occurred at the area in 1972. The spill was cleaned up to the standards at the time, but slightly elevated amounts of radioactivity were reported after the cleanup. Additional cleanup was performed in 1977. The remaining radioactivity is below remediation levels.

3.5.2.12 NRF-83 ECF Hot Cells Release Area

NRF-83 is located within an operational building (ECF). Radioactive liquid was released in 1972 from a pipe to a concrete trench. The soil below and adjacent to the trench also became contaminated. Cleanup actions taken in 1972 did not include the soil below the trench. The contaminated soil was discovered in 1997 when a concrete pad adjacent to the concrete trench was removed during ECF upgrade work. Elevated amounts of cobalt-60 and cesium-137 are present in the soil. All accessible contaminated soil was removed and replaced with clean soil during the construction project. Thirty-seven cubic yards of contaminated soil are estimated to remain under the trench to preserve the integrity of the trench. A new concrete pad was poured at the location of the old concrete pad excavation. The contaminated soil below the trench is not presently accessible and no exposure route is available.

3.5.3 OU 8-08 Remedial Action Sites

Nine sites were determined in the NRF Comprehensive RI/FS (WEC, 1997b) to have unacceptable or potentially unacceptable risks that must be addressed. The primary radionuclides of concern were cesium-137 and strontium-90, both of which have a 30-year half-life. During remedial activities, contaminated soil was removed from eight sites (three of which were associated with sites that were later capped) and consolidated in the S1W Leaching Beds area. These eight sites are referred to as Remediated Radiological Sites. Figure 1-3 shows the location of the Remediated Radiological Sites. Four sites are topped with three engineered covers (two sites are under one cover). These sites are referred to as OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites. Figure 1-4 shows the location of the Engineered Cover Sites.

The following sections discuss each of the nine OU 8-08 RA Sites. Since contaminated soil remains at these sites with concentrations of contaminants of concern above risk-based concentrations that prevent unrestricted use of the area, ICs have been implemented. ICs used at NRF preserve the underlying assumptions of the RI/FSs developed for WAG 8 that will protect human health and the environment. Section 7.2.1 discusses site ICs in more detail.

3.5.3.1 Remediated Radiological Sites

3.5.3.1.1 NRF-11 S1W Tile Drainfield and L-Shaped Sump

This site consisted of a below-surface concrete L-shaped sump and four underground perforated drainfield pipes of various lengths downstream of the sump. The drainfield was likely used between 1953 and 1955 for sewage and radioactive liquid discharges. The drainfield area was approximately 36 feet wide by 150 feet long and consisted of four perforated pipes buried parallel to each other approximately 11 feet deep. Each outside leg of the drainfield extended about 150 feet, while both inner legs were 50 feet long. The drainfield was connected to the sump, which was an L-shaped concrete structure. Each leg of the sump was 11 feet long and three feet wide with a maximum depth of approximately 12 feet. The sump was isolated from the drainfield in 1955 but was used until 1960 as part of the sewage system.

3.5.3.1.2 NRF-12A Underground Piping to Leaching Pit

This site consisted of an underground pipe (465 feet in length) that ran from the S1W Retention Basins (NRF-17) to a subsurface concrete manhole. This pipe is known to have leaked on occasion. From the manhole, a perforated pipe used for draining and leaching purposes ran approximately 400 feet to the S1W Leaching Pit (NRF-12B) at a depth of approximately eight to ten feet. This site was used from 1955 through 1961 for radioactive liquid discharges.

3.5.3.1.3 NRF-14 Underground Piping to Leaching Bed

This site included the underground pipe (approximately 530 feet) leading to the leaching beds from the S1W Retention Basins (NRF-17). The pipe was laid in 1960 and delivered radioactive effluence from the S1W, S5G, and A1W prototype plants to the leaching bed.

3.5.3.1.4 NRF-17 S1W Retention Basins

This site consisted of two concrete basins partially below grade that collected radioactive water from various facilities. This was a storage area prior to releasing the water to NRF-11, NRF-12A/12B, and NRF-14. The basins were constructed in 1951. The basins comprised two

adjacent concrete structures, each 140 feet long by 34 feet wide. One of the basins was known to have leaked approximately 33,000 gallons in 1971. The leak was directly below the basins.

3.5.3.1.5 NRF-19 Underground Piping to A1W Leaching Bed

This site consisted of two underground pipes leading to the A1W Leaching Bed (NRF-19). The pipes were placed in service in 1957 and delivered radioactive effluent from A1W to the leaching bed. One pipe was six inches in diameter and was referred to as the dilution pipe. This pipe was used to transfer radioactive effluent from a dilution tank to the leaching bed. Another pipe was two inches in diameter and was referred to as the bilge pipe. This pipe was used to transfer liquid collected in the prototype plant bilges to the leaching bed.

3.5.3.1.6 NRF-21A Underground Piping to Old Sewage Basin

This site consisted of a ten-inch concrete pipe, constructed in a bell and spigot configuration that led to the Old Sewage Basin from the L-shaped sump (part of NRF-11). Each section of concrete pipe was three feet long and each joint appeared to be grouted to prevent leakage. The concrete pipe leading to the sewage basin was approximately 435 feet long and ranged from seven feet deep near the L-shaped sump to 11 feet deep at the sewage basin. Leakage along the joints caused the surrounding soil to be contaminated.

NRF-21A also includes the Old Sewage Basin itself. During the spring and summer of 2002, in conjunction with remediation of NRF-21A, the amount of contaminated soil and the size of the NRF-21A basin area were found to be larger than anticipated. A portion of NRF-21A extended into the previously identified NRF-43 area. NRF and the regulatory agencies decided that the NRF-21A basin area, including the portion that extended into NRF-43, would be capped with an engineered cover similar in design to those intended for NRF-12/14 and NRF-19, rather than continuing with excavation of the NRF-21A basin area.

3.5.3.1.7 NRF-21B Sludge Drying Bed

This site consisted of a concrete bed that received sludge from the sewage system. It was cross-contaminated from a radiological system. The bed was constructed in 1951 as part of the sewage system at NRF. The bed was a concrete slab that was 28 feet long by 29 feet wide and was approximately five feet below grade.

3.5.3.1.8 NRF-80 A1W/S1W Radioactive Line near BB19

This area consisted of an underground pipe that was known to have leaked near the west side of the S1W Spray Pond. This pipe carried radioactive water for eventual discharge to the S1W Leaching Beds (NRF-14). This pipe was buried approximately six feet below the surface. During decontamination and disposition work at NRF in 1995, portions of the pipe were removed and contamination was detected in the soil. NRF-80 also includes an area on the east side of the S1W spray pond where remedial actions were not necessary but residual contamination exists.

3.5.3.2 OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites

3.5.3.2.1 NRF-12B S1W Leaching Pit

This site consisted of a former pit area that was used for radioactive discharges. The pit was constructed at the end of the drainfield piping (NRF-12A) in 1957 and was used until 1961. The pit was filled with soil, and in 1978, an asphalt cap was placed over the pit. The asphalt cap was removed during the summer of 2003. A single cover addresses both NRF-12B and NRF-14.

3.5.3.2.2 NRF-14 S1W Leaching Beds

This site consisted of two leaching beds, one constructed in 1960, and the other in 1963. These beds were open ponds that collected radioactive water and allowed the water to leach into the subsurface or evaporate. Each bed was about 75 feet by 125 feet at the water line and was 13 to 15 feet deep. The ponds were used until 1979. Large cobblestones were placed in the leaching beds in 1972. Earthen ramps were constructed to allow sampling equipment into the beds in 1992. A single cover addresses both NRF-12B and NRF-14.

3.5.3.2.3 NRF-19 A1W Leaching Bed

This site consisted of an underground leaching bed. Perforated pipes ran through an engineered leaching bed that consisted of various layers of gravel and sand. The bed was constructed west of NRF in 1957, and was used continually from 1958 to 1964 and sporadically between 1964 and 1972. The bed was 200 feet long and 50 feet wide.

3.5.3.2.4 NRF-21A Old Sewage Basin

This site consisted of an open pond used for non-radiological discharges that was cross-contaminated from a radiological system. An unknown amount of radioactive effluent was sent to the sewage basin. The sewage basin was constructed in 1956 and measured 72 feet by 72 feet by 11 feet deep. The basin was enlarged in 1957 in the southeast direction and was used until 1960. The basin was then filled in with soil. This cover was selected after the ROD due to the unexpected extent of contamination, and was documented via an ESD to the ROD.

3.6 Summary of Contaminants of Concern at NRF

3.6.1 Landfill Sites

Evaluation of historical sample data and records indicated that three waste types of specific interest were placed into the landfill areas: waste oil, solvents, and chemicals. As a result of the evaluation of data for the three designated landfill areas, several Contaminants of Concern (COCs) were identified as shown in Table 3-3.

Table 3 3 Contaminants of Concern in the Landfill Areas		
Site	Metals	Volatile Organics
NRF 1 NRF 51 NRF 53	Chromium, mercury, and silver	1,1,1-trichloroethane, tetrachloroethylene, trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11), Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) ⁽¹⁾ , 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (Freon 113), chloroform, and trichloroethylene

(1) Freon 12 was detected in soil gas samples collected at NRF-1 after remedial actions were completed.

3.6.2 No Further Action Sites

Table 3-4 summarizes COCs for the NFA Sites.

Table 3 4 Contaminants of Concern at No Further Action Sites	
Site	Contaminants of Concern
NRF 2	Cesium-137
NRF 16	Cesium-137, Uranium-235
NRF 18A	Chromium
NRF 22	Lead, Mercury
NRF 23	Cesium-137
NRF 42	Cesium-137
NRF 43	Cesium-137
NRF 61	Cesium-137
NRF 66	Cesium-137
NRF 81	Cesium-137, Uranium-235
NRF 82	Cesium-137
NRF 83	Cesium-137, Cobalt-60

3.6.3 Remedial Action Sites

Table 3-5 summarizes COCs for the RA Sites. This table shows the COCs prior to remediation and the COCs remaining after remedial actions.

3.6.4 Groundwater Contaminants

Groundwater at NRF contains both natural and anthropogenic constituents. Naturally occurring groundwater constituents are determined by the chemical properties of the rocks located in the source area and along the groundwater flow path. Examples of naturally occurring groundwater constituents near NRF are calcium, potassium, and magnesium.

Through the course of NRF's operation, some chemicals and radionuclides have been released to the environment, either accidentally or intentionally in accordance with practices acceptable at the time. Many of the same constituents are detectable in the groundwater. The IWD RI/FS Work Plan and the NRF Comprehensive RI/FS provided lists of potential contaminants released at NRF. Not all of the constituents have been observed in the groundwater. Several reasons for this include limited source, low migration potential, dilution, or degradation through various natural processes, and very conservative estimates of the quantities of the constituents released. The following constituents have been consistently observed in groundwater at NRF (Effluent System and Local Downgradient well groups) in concentrations (greater than three standard deviations) above local background levels: aluminum, nickel, iron, chromium, calcium,

potassium, magnesium, sodium, chloride, and sulfate. Small quantities of chloroform and tetrachloroethylene have also been detected. The natural background concentration for these organic compounds is zero. Tritium in groundwater also exceeds (greater than three standard deviations) local background concentrations. All organic and radionuclide data are significantly below their respective Federal or State regulatory level (e.g., EPA drinking water standards).

Water upgradient to NRF could theoretically contain man-caused contamination that is unrelated to the Naval Reactors Program. The Big and Little Lost River systems are the primary source of recharge to the SRPA north (or upgradient) of NRF. No contaminants are known to exist in groundwater sampled by the Regional Upgradient wells.

Table 3 5 Contaminants of Concern at Remedial Action Sites		
Site	COC Prior to Remedial Actions⁽¹⁾	COC After Remedial Actions⁽²⁾
NRF 11	Cesium-137, Plutonium-244	Cesium-137
NRF 12A	Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Plutonium-244, Strontium-90	Cesium-137, Strontium-90
NRF 12B	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Neptunium-237, Lead, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Neptunium-237, Lead, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90
NRF 14 (Cover Area)	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Neptunium-237, Lead, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Neptunium-237, Plutonium-238, Plutonium-244 ⁽³⁾ , Strontium-90, Uranium-235 ⁽³⁾ , Lead
NRF 14 (Pipe area)	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Neptunium-237, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90	Aroclor-1242 ⁽⁴⁾ , Cesium-137
NRF 17	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Neptunium-237, Plutonium-238, Plutonium-244, Strontium-90, Uranium-235	Cesium-137, Strontium-90
NRF 19 (Cover Area)	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90
NRF 19 (Pipe Area)	Americium-241, Cesium-137, Nickel-63, Plutonium-238, Strontium-90	Cesium-137, Strontium-90
NRF 21A (Cover Area)	Cesium-137	Cesium-137, Strontium-90
NRF 21A (Pipe Area)	Cesium-137	Cesium-137
NRF 21B	Cesium-137, Uranium-235	Cesium-137
NRF 80	Cesium-137	Cesium-137, Cobalt-60 ⁽⁵⁾

- (1) COCs were identified in the NRF Comprehensive RI/FS (based on the 100-year future residential scenario)
- (2) COCs were based on confirmatory sampling performed during Remedial Actions and the potential unrestricted release of the area (present day residential)
- (3) These are identified as COCs because this area was used to consolidate soil from other sites where these were identified as COCs.
- (4) Aroclor-1242 was detected (below a ten foot depth) at levels greater than residential unrestricted release values but less than occupational values.
- (5) Cobalt-60 (Co-60) was not a COC as determined in the ROD. However, this was based on the assumption of 100 years of controls and the resulting radioactive decay of Co-60. Co-60 is a COC when considering the potential for present-day unrestricted release of an area

4.0 Remedial Actions

4.1 Remedy Selection

4.1.1 Remedy Selection for Landfill Sites (OU 8-05/06)

A Feasibility Study (FS) was performed for the landfill areas (WEC, 1994c). The FS was a comprehensive evaluation of potential remedial action alternatives for OUs 8-05 and 8-06 landfills that represent NRF-1, NRF-51, and NRF-53. The presumptive remedy for CERCLA municipal landfills as given in the EPA directive 9355.0-049FS, "Presumptive Remedy for CERCLA Municipal Landfill Sites," was used for these landfill units, since they were similar in nature and content to municipal landfills and the EPA directive expects the presumptive remedy to be used at all appropriate sites. Using the presumptive remedy eliminated the need for the initial identification and screening of alternatives during the FS.

The Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) for the landfill areas were developed in accordance with the RI/FS CERCLA Landfill Guidance (EPA, 1991). The RAOs specified the contaminants and media of interest, exposure pathways, and preliminary remediation goals, to support development of a range of source containment alternatives. The attainability of the RAOs to protect human health and the environment was addressed through the detailed evaluation of each remedial action alternative. Compliance with potential chemical-specific applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) was one method used to evaluate the extent to which each remedial action alternative would meet the RAOs.

The RAOs for the environmental media of groundwater, soil, and surface water for the landfills were identified as follows:

Human Health:

- Ensure that the SRPA downgradient of NRF has no contaminant levels above Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) due to migration of contaminants from the landfills.
- Minimize infiltration and resulting contaminant leaching to the SRPA.
- Restrict intrusion into the landfill contents. (Since the landfill contents were not sampled and characterized, it was not possible to accurately assess the risk for future receptors).
- Prevent direct contact with the landfill contents.
- Control surface water runoff and erosion of the landfill covers.
- Meet all ARARs.

Environmental Protection:

- Meet all ARARs.

4.1.2 Remedy Selection for No Further Actions Sites (OU 8-08)

A NFA decision was made by DOE, IDEQ, and EPA for those sites with a source or potential source present, but for which an exposure pathway is not available under current conditions. The NFA decision means the site is included in a CERCLA review performed at least every five years to ensure that site conditions used to evaluate the site have not changed and to verify the effectiveness of the NFA decision. This remedy selection did not require any additional remedial action other than ICs such as signs and fencing, administrative controls on excavation, and inspections.

4.1.3 Remedy Selection for Remedial Action Sites (OU 8-08)

The ROD-selected remedy for the RA Sites was “Limited Excavation, Disposal, and Containment.” This remedy was divided into two phases to expedite the remedial action process. The Phase I RD/RA Work Plan activities included excavation of contaminated soil above cleanup levels, consolidation of contaminated soil from other RA Sites to NRF-14, removal and characterization of piping and concrete fixtures for disposal off-site (away from NRF), and backfilling with clean soil. The Phase II RD/RA Work Plan activities originally included construction of engineered covers over the filled S1W Leaching Pit/Bed area (NRF-12B/14) and A1W Leaching Bed (NRF-19). In 2002, the selected remedy for site NRF-21A was modified per an Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) to the ROD to include construction of the same type of engineered cover over NRF-21A. To prevent unauthorized intrusion and excavation and to control land use and transfer, ICs were included as part of the selected remedy for the RA Sites. These actions address human health risk posed by the RA Sites and also address ecological risk. In addition to engineered earthen covers, the selected remedy at NRF-12B/14, NRF-19, and NRF-21A also included installation of soil moisture probes.

To protect human health and the environment, RAOs for the RA Sites were developed and documented in the ROD. These RAOs are discussed below:

Human Health:

- Prevent external gamma radiation exposure from all radionuclides of concern that exceed a total exposure pathway excess cancer risk of 1 in 10,000 for the future 100-year residential receptor.
- Prevent ingestion of soil and food crops contaminated with radionuclides of concern that exceed a total pathway excess cancer risk of 1 in 10,000 for the future 100-year residential receptor.
- Prevent exposure to soil contaminated with lead that exceeds the EPA recommended screening level of 400 parts per million (ppm) for lead cleanup.

Environmental:

- Prevent erosion or intrusion by resident plant or animal species in contaminated soils that could cause the release of contaminated soils.

- Prevent exposure to COCs that may cause adverse effects on populations of resident species.

4.2 Remedy Implementation and Maintenance

Remedy implementation included the remedial design, remedial actions, and subsequent operations and maintenance (O&M). Details of remedy implementation are summarized below. A more detailed account of remedy implementation for the inactive landfills can be found in the RA Report for the Inactive Landfills (WEC, 1997a). A detailed description of remedial actions associated with the OU 8-08 Sites, including construction of the OU 8-08 Engineered Covers is located in the OU 8-08 RA Report.

4.2.1 Landfill Covers

The regulatory requirements regarding final closure of landfills (WEC, 1995) provide for the placement of a final cover designed and constructed to:

- Have a permeability (where permeability is expressed as hydraulic conductivity with units of centimeters per second (cm/sec)) less than or equal to the natural subsoils of the surrounding area,
- Function with minimal maintenance,
- Promote drainage and minimize erosion,
- Accommodate settling and subsidence to maintain integrity of the cover, and
- Minimize the migration of liquids.

The design criteria for the landfill covers included the selection of appropriate soils that minimize erosion with properties (i.e., permeability) that will also limit infiltration. The cover design incorporated an appropriate slope that provides adequate surface runoff. To further minimize erosion and the migration of liquids through the landfill, the landfill cover included a top vegetative layer. To minimize settling and subsidence, the surfaces of the landfill areas were preloaded with fill material, compacted, and leveled to the same elevation as the surrounding natural surfaces, which provided a stable base for the cover. The landfill cover was then placed over the top of each of the landfill areas, moderately compacted (except the upper foot of topsoil), completed with a proper surface slope, and seeded. To minimize maintenance of the vegetative cover, indigenous plants were used.

4.2.1.1 Cover Construction

Landfill cover construction operations are summarized below. The construction activities included: (1) site clearing, (2) landfill unit base layer fill and grading, (3) subsurface soil cover construction, (4) topsoil cover construction, and (5) vegetative cover.

Site Clearing

Site clearing activities removed vegetation greater than three inches in diameter and surface debris, and provided scarification of the landfill base to facilitate blending of newly placed soil layers. Cleared soils that were sufficiently free of debris were stockpiled adjacent to each landfill for use as the top soil cover, since these soils contained organic matter beneficial to re-establishing the vegetative cover.

Base Layer

A motor grader, bulldozers, water truck, and smooth drum roller and/or sheep's foot roller were used to knock down, process, and compact the fill material into place for the landfill cover base at each of the landfill areas. Each of the three landfill units was filled, compacted, and graded as necessary to achieve a three to five percent gradient.

Subsurface Soil Cover

Each of the three landfill units was filled and graded using appropriate soil for the subsurface cover layer to achieve a minimum three foot cover at NRF-1 and a minimum two foot cover at NRF-51 and NRF-53 with a three to five percent gradient.

Top Layer

Each of the three landfill units was filled and graded to achieve a minimum one foot final topsoil cover with a three to five percent gradient. Soil for the topsoil cover was loosely placed with minimum compaction, to ensure the establishment of adequate vegetation. The final topsoil cover thickness at NRF-51 and NRF-53 was one foot. The final topsoil cover thickness at NRF-1 averaged 1.5 feet.

Vegetative Cover

The vegetative cover consisted of indigenous vegetation with the characteristics specified in the RD/RA Work Plan (WEC 1995). The specific plant mixtures described in the Work Plan were also recommended for use as appropriate vegetative cover for erosion control based on studies at other INL sites.

Mulching, seeding, and fertilization were performed in accordance with the RD/RA Work Plan. Mulch was applied after placement of the top layer in early summer to minimize erosion. Prior to application of the mulch, the soil surface was scarified using a spring-tooth harrow to loosen the soil and permit anchoring of the mulch. Straw mulch was applied and then anchored in the soil using a crimping disk. Fertilization and seeding were done in late summer to provide a greater chance for plant growth in the spring.

4.2.2 Groundwater Monitoring Network

4.2.2.1 Network Design (Location and Number of Wells)

Groundwater monitoring was part of the remedy selected for the Landfill Areas. The NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network consists of individual wells designed and built over a period of approximately 50 years. In 1995, NRF built six new groundwater monitoring wells (NRF-8 through 13). These wells were administratively included into a network with existing wells that were located upgradient (USGS-12 and NRF-7) and downgradient (USGS-97, -98, -99, and -102) of NRF. Two wells (NRF-6 and NRF-13) are currently a part of the Effluent System Monitoring Group. However, as discussed in Appendix A, the ability of NRF-13 to monitor NRF effluent has been questioned.

The locations of five newly constructed wells (NRF-8 through 12) were optimized with the aid of a computer program called Monitoring Efficiency Model (MEMO). These wells, along with USGS-102, were placed along a semi-circular arc just south of NRF. These became what NRF

called the Local Downgradient well group. The purpose of these wells was to be the first line of detection for constituents that may have been released from NRF.

The configuration of the NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network allows NRF to collect samples for comparison to assess what impacts, if any, operations at NRF have on the aquifer.

4.2.2.2 Constituent Analysis Design

The identification of analytes to be monitored at NRF focuses on those that had been identified from the following: compounds that had been identified in process waste streams, potential degradation products, those addressed in 40 CFR 141 considered as relevant and appropriate, and detection of the constituents in samples taken from monitoring wells and other site investigation sampling activities (i.e., soil and soil gas sampling). Selection of target compounds for analysis was based on whether a compound is characteristic of the waste, easily and reliably detected analytically, and/or addressed by an applicable regulation to be monitored. The constituents for which analyses are performed are presented in Table 4-1.

4.2.2.3 Well Construction

The wells constructed specifically for the NRF groundwater network were designed to similar specifications. The goal was to create wells that were cost effective, met or exceeded State and Federal guidelines, and provided the data needed by NRF. The typical NRF well has a surface casing ranging from 12 to 22 inches in diameter. This surface casing terminates at the top of the first basalt encountered and is grouted in place. Most NRF wells are constructed with ten-inch diameter carbon steel casing from the surface to approximately 50 feet above the aquifer. In some wells, this casing is 12 inches in diameter. This casing is also grouted in place in such a manner as to prevent the grout from bridging and separating from the borehole wall. The casing in the NRF wells then telescopes down to a stainless steel six-inch casing isolated from the carbon steel casing with dielectric insulating material. The bottom 50 feet of the casing consists of stainless steel screen. Either welds or internal threads join all casings. Each well is fitted with a submersible pump connected to a three-phase five-horsepower motor. Water is pushed to the surface through a 1½-inch stainless steel pipe. Figure 4-1 shows the major design elements of the NRF groundwater monitoring wells.

4.2.3 Soil Gas Monitoring Probes

4.2.3.1 Design Criteria

Soil gas monitoring was part of the remedy selected for the Landfill Areas. To assess the effectiveness of the three landfill covers in limiting water infiltration and soil gas emissions, soil gas monitoring (utilizing a soil gas emissions survey) was implemented at the cover and probe locations shown in Figure 1-1.

Soil gas monitoring was initiated and conducted periodically after the landfill cover had been placed at each location. The monitoring included a soil gas emissions survey over the landfill cover and the placement of permanent soil gas monitoring probes around the perimeter of the landfill areas for the collection and analysis of subsurface soil gas samples. The soil gas emissions survey was utilized to assess the effectiveness of the landfill cover. The soil gas monitoring probes were used to detect any potential gaseous contaminant migration. The soil gas probes were designed with a screened section at the top of the basalt or at the top of the

fluvial/lacustrine layer, as applicable. A top removable sampling assembly is attached to the probe opening for access during sampling evolutions (WEC, 1997a).

4.2.3.2 Soil Gas Probe Construction

Soil gas monitor probes were installed after the placement of the final topsoil layer at each landfill. The drill rig used a four-inch hollow stem auger that produced a six-inch diameter hole. Monitoring locations were selected and staked prior to drilling. Fourteen monitor probes were installed with a PVC casing size of 1.05-inch outer diameter (0.75 inch inner diameter), a surface protective casing size of six inches, a bentonite seal of three feet, and use of 8-12 silica sand to form the sand pack around the probes. Figure 4-2 depicts the typical soil gas monitor probe construction. Borings were advanced to depths as determined by the presence of fluvial/lacustrine deposits or the presence of basalt. Monitor probe depths ranged from 12.5 to 26.5 feet (WEC, 1997a). Protection of the monitor probes was achieved through the installation of six-inch steel casings with lockable caps.

Constituent	Analytical Method	MCL (mg/L)	MCLG** (mg/L)
Aluminum	6010A ICP	0.2***	*
Antimony	6020 ICP/MS	0.006	0.006
Arsenic	6020 ICP/MS	0.01	0.01
Barium	6020 ICP/MS	2	2
Beryllium	6020 ICP/MS	0.004	0.004
Cadmium	6020 ICP/MS	0.005	0.005
Calcium	6010 ICP	*	*
Chromium	6020 ICP/MS	0.1	0.1
Copper	6020 ICP/MS	1.3	1.3
Iron	6010A ICP	0.3***	*
Lead	6020 ICP/MS	0.015****	0
Magnesium	6010A ICP	*	*
Manganese	6020 ICP/MS	0.05***	*
Mercury	7476A	0.002	0.002
Nickel	6020 ICP/MS	*	*
Potassium	6010 ICP	*	*
Selenium	6020 ICP/MS	0.05	0.05
Silver	6020 ICP/MS	0.1***	*
Sodium	6010A ICP	*	*
Thallium	6020 ICP/MS	0.002	0.0005
Zinc	6020 ICP/MS	5***	*
Sulfate	300	250***	*
Chloride	300	250***	*
Nitrate as Nitrogen	353.2	10	10
Nitrite as Nitrogen	354.1	1	1
Total Organic Halogens (TOX)	9020B	*	*

Table 4 1 Groundwater Monitoring Constituents (Continued)			
Constituent	Analytical Method	MCL (mg/L)	MCLG (mg/L)
Ni 63	DOE STL-RC-0055	4 mrem/year	*
Sr 90	EPA 905	8 pCi/L	*
Tritium	R-1173-76	20,000 pCi/L	*
Quantitative Isotopic Gamma	EPA 901.1	*	*
Benzene	524.2	0.005	0
Carbon Tetrachloride	524.2	0.005	0
1,1 Dichloroethane	524.2	*	*
1,2 Dichloroethane	524.2	0.005	0
1,1 Dichloroethylene	524.2	0.007	0.007
Cis 1,2 Dichloroethylene	524.2	0.07	0.07
Trans 1,2 Dichloroethylene	524.2	0.1	0.1
Ethylbenzene	524.2	0.7	0.7
Methylene Chloride	524.2	0.005	0
1,1,2,2 Tetrachloroethane	524.2	*	*
Tetrachloroethylene	524.2	0.005	0
Toluene	524.2	1	1
1,1,1 Trichloroethane	524.2	0.2	0.2
Trichloroethylene	524.2	0.005	0
Trichlorofluoromethane	524.2	*	*
Vinyl Chloride	524.2	0.002	0
Xylenes (total o+p+m)	524.2	10	10
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	525.1	*	*
Benzo(a)pyrene	525.1	0.0002	0
Di n butylphthalate	525.1	*	*
Di(2 ethylhexyl)phthalate	525.1	0.006	0
Di n octylphthalate	525.1	*	*
Isophorone	525.1	*	*
Naphthalene	525.1	*	*
Phenanthrene	525.1	*	*
Pyrene	525.1	*	*

* Not Applicable

**MCLG – Maximum Contaminant Limit Goal

***Secondary Maximum Contaminant Limit

****Treatment Technique – A required process intended to reduce the level of a contaminant in drinking water - Action Level

4.2.4 No Further Action Sites

The primary remedial action implemented at the NFA Sites is ICs. NFA Sites have been posted with signs that indicate site identification, site hazard, access restrictions, and a point of contact. Sites NRF-16, NRF-23, NRF-61, NRF-66, and NRF-81 are enclosed within fences. The remaining sites are either outside the NRF site fence (thus away from the general NRF population) or are beneath structures (resulting in limited access). All sites are inspected at least annually followed by the issuance of an Institutional Control Monitoring Report (ICMR) containing the results of the inspections.

4.2.5 Remedial Action Sites

Remediation work associated with the OU 8-08 RA Sites was divided into two major tasks called Phase I and Phase II Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA). The Phase I and Phase II RD/RA Work Plans for OU 8-08 provided the design criteria for the selected remedies.

Phase I remedial actions began in 1999 and were completed in June 2003, and involved excavation at eight of the nine sites (all except NRF-12B, which did not require excavation) with potentially elevated risk levels. These remedial actions resulted in the removal of contaminated soil above remediation goals as stated in the ROD from the surface to at least ten feet below ground surface.

Phase II work, which included construction of the earthen covers (at NRF-12B/14, NRF-19, and NRF-21A) and installation of soil moisture probes, began in April 2004, and was completed in October 2004.

4.2.5.1 Phase I Remedial Actions

The remedial actions for Phase I included three major work projects that facilitated the overall work effort. The work projects for Phase I were defined as follows: (1) excavation activities, (2) debris characterization and disposal, and (3) soil consolidation.

4.2.5.1.1 Excavation Activities

The excavation project involved the following work elements:

- Soil excavation;
- Demolition (often reversed with soil excavation, as appropriate);
- Confirmatory sampling; and,
- Site Restoration (backfill to grade, repave, etc.).

Soil Excavation

Most soil excavation was performed using a backhoe, trackhoe, or remotely operated demolition robot (primarily used for soil removal at NRF-17). Removed pieces of asphalt paving or concrete and grubbing wastes (sagebrush, grasses, etc.) were segregated as much as practical from contaminated soils. In some cases, such as near obstructions, at areas with high contamination levels (radiological controls discussed below), or for small quantity soil removal, hand shoveling was performed.

Excavation occurred in eight of the nine RA Sites (the exception being NRF-12B). Soil with cesium-137 greater than 16.7 picocuries per gram (pCi/g) was excavated to a minimum depth of ten feet (strontium-90 and lead were not identified above cleanup levels in any of the excavation sites). Concrete structures that extended below the ten foot depth at NRF-11 and NRF-12A were also removed. Additional soil below ten feet was excavated at several locations, to support potential unrestricted release of such areas within the 100-year future land use period (i.e., following sufficient radioactive decay). Table 4-2 summarizes remedial activities associated with Phase I work.




Figure 4-1 Typical Groundwater Well Construction Diagram




Figure 4-2 Typical Soil Gas Probe Construction Diagram

Table 4 2 Summary Data for Selected OU 8 08 5 Year Review Report			
Site	Feet of Pipe Removed	Volume of Soil Removed	Volume of Concrete Removed
NRF-11 (Including L-Shaped Sump)	488' 6"	120 yd ³	21 yd ³
NRF-12A (Including Concrete Manhole)	824' 8"	5505 yd ³	2.6 yd ³
NRF-12B/14	N/A	N/A	N/A ^(a)
NRF-14 (supply line)	530'	165 yd ³	N/A
NRF-17	N/A	1120 yd ³	1,875 yd ³
NRF-19	200'	86 yd ³	N/A
NRF-21A	435'	890 yd ³	N/A
NRF-21B (Sludge Drying Bed)	N/A	60 yd ³	19 yd ³
NRF-80	93'	4 yd ³	N/A
TOTALS	2571' 2"	7,950 yd³	1,917.6 yd³

(a) No concrete was removed, but 400 yd³ of asphalt was removed

Demolition

Several sites required demolition of concrete structures or removal of piping. The demolition of most structures simply required reducing the structure to a size needed for disposition actions. The debris was characterized prior to disposal. Excavated metallic pipe was size-reduced for disposal. Cement or ceramic type piping was removed in sections at the bell and spigot connections. The pipe was properly characterized and packaged for disposal at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) on INL.

Confirmatory Sampling

Soil samples were collected periodically during remediation work and analyzed by NRF Chemistry for total and isotopic gamma activity. Radiation surveys were performed on the excavated soil and periodically in the excavated hole. Samples were also collected during and after the excavation and demolition work. After achieving satisfactory preliminary results from NRF data indicating completion of remedial actions, follow-up samples were taken for off-site independent analyses to provide the actual confirmation data needed. The off-site analyses verified that the preliminary NRF data was accurate, and confirmed that remediation goals were met. Hence, the confirmatory sampling ensured soil above cleanup levels was removed and provided information on the contaminant levels, if any, that remained in the soil.

Site Restoration

Fill material was taken locally from the NRF gravel pit located southwest of the NRF site and from excavation activities associated with construction actions at ECF. All excavated holes were filled to grade with clean soil and compacted.

All excavated areas were generally returned to preexisting conditions (e.g., to historic pre-NRF site grade) as much as possible. Compaction of the soil was 90% or better and, in roadways, 95% or better. Where required, sites were repaved with asphalt after soil removal. The S1W Retention Basins (NRF-17) area is presently being used as a laydown area for a construction project adjacent to the former location of the basins. After the construction project is complete, the area will be returned to a lawn or other productive use. The construction project does not impact this site.

4.2.5.1.2 Debris Characterization and Disposal

The characterization and disposal of debris (e.g., concrete and piping) from the RA Sites was conducted in accordance with a Waste Management Plan (BBI, 1999). Most of the debris was radioactive and was packaged in accordance with the INL Reusable Property, Recyclable Materials, and Waste Acceptance Criteria and disposed of at the RWMC. None of the debris generated during the remedial actions was hazardous according to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); therefore, disposal at a RCRA licensed facility or in accordance with the INL Site Treatment Plan was not required.

4.2.5.1.3 Soil Consolidation

Excavated soil containing radioactivity above cleanup levels or above 30 pCi/g total gamma activity was consolidated into the S1W Leaching Beds (NRF-14). The soil was placed into Soft Sided Containers (SSCs), temporarily stored, transported to, and placed in the leaching beds area (still in the containers). A temporary road leading to the S1W Leaching Beds was constructed to support the heavy equipment used to move the SSCs.

4.2.5.2 Phase II Remedial Actions

The OU 8-08 Phase II remedial actions entailed the construction of engineered covers over three designated areas, NRF-12B/14, NRF-19, and NRF-21A. The controlling elements in the design of the engineered covers included providing a barrier to prevent exposure to and direct contact with contaminated soil, limiting biotic intrusion, limiting infiltration, and providing erosion control. Therefore, the engineered covers were constructed incorporating the following design considerations: (1) the use of appropriate soil material and vegetation that minimize erosion; (2) features that limit infiltration (use of soil with an appropriate hydraulic conductivity, soil layer of a sufficient thickness for adequate water storage, and vegetation for evapotranspiration); (3) appropriate material and thickness to provide a barrier that will prevent exposure to and direct contact with the contaminated soil by any individual and also inhibit biotic intrusion; and (4) appropriate slope to provide adequate drainage. The engineered cover design consists of three components: a top soil layer for the vegetative cover, a subsurface soil layer, and a biobarrier layer. The engineered cover layers, beginning with the biobarrier layer, were placed on top of a base support layer. In turn, the base support layer was only applied after a stable subgrade was established, to minimize subsidence. Neutron access tubes for soil moisture monitoring were also installed during this project.

The engineered cover installation project entailed the following work elements:

- Pre-construction testing at the individual sites for hydraulic conductivity determination of the soil beneath the contamination layer;
- Site preparation and mobilization;
- Construction of engineered covers over the designated areas, including geotechnical testing of the soil material;
- Completion work activities.

A summary of these tasks is provided below.

4.2.5.2.1 Pre-construction Testing

Pre-construction testing activities consisted of drilling a total of nine soil borings (three around the perimeter of each planned cover area) for obtaining samples of the soil layer beneath the contamination layer. This was to verify that the hydraulic conductivity of the underlying soil layer was greater than or equal to the proposed hydraulic conductivity of the engineered cover. These data were needed to ensure that the cover would adequately minimize infiltration and prevent leachate from accumulating under the contamination layer (this phenomenon is known as the bathtub effect). The hydraulic conductivity for all of the samples was greater than the required hydraulic conductivity for the engineered covers (1×10^{-5} cm/sec). Results of the geotechnical investigation indicated that conditions were suitable to construct the engineered covers as designed.

4.2.5.2.2 Site Preparation and Mobilization

The site preparation phase included site clearing and other preliminary steps, the sampling of borrow and in-place soils, and site surveying activities. Mobilization included establishing the project trailer, grading, and preparation of an equipment yard, and the transport of equipment and equipment services to the site.

Areas with preexisting natural soil cover were cleared of vegetation within the cover area, followed by filling and compaction of any areas that contained pits, cavities, or any other type of depressions that might be an indication of subsidence. The asphalt cover over NRF-12B was broken up and removed. Existing fencing at NRF-12B/14 and at NRF-19 was removed. Site preparations at NRF-21A included leveling the remaining three to five foot mounded area to the surrounding grade.

To ensure the areas were suitable for the placement of engineered covers, clean fill material was placed over all three cover locations. This fill material was placed as a stable subgrade. The thickness of this subgrade was at least one foot. The fill material used for this subgrade was obtained from the NRF gravel pit. Inspections prior to commencing construction determined that there were no soft spots or any other defects at any of the three areas to be covered.

4.2.5.2.2.1 Borrow Soil Testing and Source Management

Four types of soil materials were used as engineered cover material (or pre-cover material) including pit-run gravel for the base support layer, crushed gravel and cobble for the biobarrier layer, clay-rich native soil for the subsurface layer, and native soil with some gravel for the top layer. Geotechnical testing of the soil borrow material, which included the collection of soil samples, was performed to assess the suitability of soil for use as cover material. Suitable material was excavated (using a bulldozer) and processed (e.g., pit-run gravel was crushed and sorted) as required, and loaded into transport trucks. The cobble was obtained from an off-site commercial vendor.

4.2.5.2.2.2 Site Surveying

Site surveying activities commenced during mobilization and continued through the cover installation process. Site surveys were performed after the placement of each cover layer. The

survey data were used to develop the as-built drawings, including cross-sections, and to provide a verification of the actual quantities of material used.

4.2.5.2.3 OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Construction

The engineered covers constructed at the three designated areas, NRF-12B/14, NRF-19, and NRF-21A, all employed the same construction methods. The cover construction activities included: (1) base support layer fill and grading, (2) biobarrier cover construction, (3) subsurface soil cover construction, and (4) topsoil cover construction. Gravel material was used to form the base support layer for the engineered cover to provide stability by minimizing or eliminating subsidence. This subgrade consisted of a compacted layer of pit-run gravel with a minimum thickness of one foot. The base support layer serves as a base/foundation that provides additional stability (sufficient load bearing capacity) for the upper three soil layers of the engineered cover, thereby minimizing subsidence problems with the cover. The biobarrier layer was constructed by placing cobble between two layers of crushed gravel. The purpose of the biobarrier layer is to inhibit biotic intrusion. The subsurface cover layer was constructed for minimizing water infiltration. The cover side slopes (where the cover edges will meet with the surrounding natural surfaces) were constructed as to achieve a maximum three horizontal to one vertical (3H:1V) ratio. Water was added during construction to aid compaction and prevent desiccation cracking. The soil was placed in five, ten-inch lifts (four feet minimum total thickness) at all cover locations.

A six to twelve inch topsoil cover layer was also constructed with soil material designed to support native vegetation, inhibit erosion, and promote drainage by placement of a three to five percent top slope. Soil material for the topsoil layer was loosely placed, with minimum compaction resulting from grading the material to the final surface grade. Construction Quality Assurance (CQA) practices were implemented to ensure construction quality. All CQA test results were within the acceptable limits (BBI, 2006).

The general cross-section of the engineered covers is shown in Figure 4-3. The engineered cover top view with finished grade for each of the three areas is shown in Figure 4-4 and Figure 4-5.

4.2.5.2.4 Completion Work Activities

The project completion phase included the installation of neutron access tubes for soil moisture monitoring, final surveying of the engineered covers, area seeding including the placement of mulch, pre-final and final inspections by regulators, and the preparation of the OU 8-08 RA Report. A summary of the installation of neutron access tubes for soil moisture monitoring and area seeding/mulching are described in the following sections.

4.2.5.2.4.1 Soil Moisture Neutron Access Tube Installation

Six neutron access tubes were installed. The access tubes were placed about a foot deep into the base support layer (i.e., they are located in the central portion of the covers where the base support layer is thickest). Tubes consisted of two-inch nominal size steel pipe, approximately seven feet in length. Two monitoring locations were selected per site. A bentonite seal was placed at the surface around each access tube, and then soil was placed on top of the bentonite seal and mounded to shed precipitation away from the access tube. Figure 4-6 depicts the typical access tube construction.




Figure 4-3 General Cross-section of OU 8-08 Engineered Cover



Figure 4-4 NRF-12B/14, NRF-21A, and NRF-19 OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Areas




Figure 4-5 NRF-12B/14, NRF-21A, and NRF-19 Engineered Cover Areas




Figure 4-6 Typical Soil Moisture Neutron Access Tube Construction

4.2.5.2.4.2 Fertilization, Seeding, and Mulching

Fertilization, seeding, and mulching were performed after cover construction. Prior to seeding, fertilizer was applied at all three cover areas. Following fertilization, the soil surface was tilled two to three inches deep. Seeding was performed at all three cover areas with native plant species including sagebrush. The covers were mulched immediately after the fertilization and seeding were completed. Supplemental irrigation was temporarily applied at each location to promote plant growth.

5.0 Progress Since Last Review

5.1 2001 Review of Inactive Landfill Areas

5.1.1 Protectiveness Statement

Protectiveness statements were originally presented in the 2001 Five-Year Review for the NRF Inactive Landfill Areas. These protectiveness statements confirmed that the landfill covers were effective at containing contaminants by inhibiting infiltration of precipitation and by preventing direct contact with contaminated soils and landfill wastes. Furthermore, the landfill covers appeared to limit the migration of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) away from the landfill areas; therefore, it was concluded that the landfill covers were working as designed and thus they were protective of human health and the environment.

5.1.2 Recommendations

In the 2001 NRF Inactive Landfill Areas Five-Year Review, DOE NR/IBO provided recommendations pertaining to the landfill covers, the groundwater monitoring network, and the soil gas monitoring probes.

The 2001 review discussed problems with sparse vegetation areas and weeds and raised the possibility of re-seeding some of the landfill. It was recommended that if little or no improvement was noted, NRF would make plans to re-seed any bare spots. Plans were also identified to post the landfills with warning signs.

DOE NR/IBO did not propose any major changes to the NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network or sampling methodology. However, some minor changes were proposed. These changes included discontinuing analysis for gross alpha and beta, total kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN), total organic carbon (TOC), and phosphorus, as well as changing sample collection frequency from four times per year to three times per year.

The 2001 review identified additional issues related to the NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network. The first issue was that the upgradient groundwater quality relative to NRF was not well defined. USGS-12 is an older well (constructed in 1950) located at a distance that is not ideally suited to be an upgradient well, and NRF-7 is not physically upgradient to NRF.

The second issue related to the Groundwater Monitoring Network concerned well screens. NRF was concerned that a 50 foot screened interval design may inadvertently underestimate the impact that NRF operations have on the aquifer, since potential contaminants released to the aquifer will stay close to the surface of the aquifer. However, the 2001 review concluded that

since the detectable results are all far below risk-based levels of concern, well data appeared to remain useful and applicable to assessing NRF's impact on the aquifer.

The third Groundwater Monitoring Network issue was that water samples from two wells, NRF-10 and NRF-13, consistently contained higher than desired levels of suspended solids, which were believed to be responsible for elevated metal concentrations in water samples. The 2001 review indicated the sources of the suspended solids are sedimentary interbeds that intersect the screened interval of the wells. The suspended solids in the wells contained metals that in turn raise the level of these metals in the water analyses. Groundwater sample results that are biased high for metal content in downgradient wells could exaggerate any conclusion that activities at NRF have adversely affected groundwater quality. This condition prompted NRF to state that DOE NR/IBO, EPA, and IDEQ will develop a list of criteria for re-evaluating groundwater chromium and for considering possible responses in the event that apparent trends in chromium concentrations observed in NRF-13 continue, and Federal MCLs exceeded for an average of four quarters.

Finally, the 2001 review noted as a deficiency that the scarcity of wells within the NRF fenced area increased the chance of near-site undetected releases. No actions were recommended, and subsequent downgradient sample results continued to show that ongoing operations at NRF did not adversely affect the quality of aquifer water.

The 2001 review also identified two issues with the soil gas probes. The first issue was that two of the probes, MW1-1 and MW1-2, were plugged and not working correctly. NRF indicated that an attempt to unplug the wells would be made. If unsuccessful, two options were to be considered: 1) seek regulatory agreement that no action was needed; or 2) construct new monitoring probes to replace the plugged probes. The second issue was that some of the probes periodically contained water. No corrective actions were recommended in the 2001 review for moisture in the probes since the moisture did not impede sample collection.

5.1.3 Follow-up Actions

Based on recommendations from the 2001 NRF Inactive Landfill Areas Five-Year Review, the following actions were performed.

Although the annual inspections of the landfill covers at NRF-1 and NRF-51 from 2001 to 2004 revealed new vegetation growth occurring in the sparse areas at the southwest corner of NRF-1 and areas along the east perimeter of NRF-53, it was occurring slowly and re-seeding was necessary in these areas. Due to drought conditions that persisted in eastern Idaho, re-seeding was delayed until precipitation increased to near normal amounts. Re-seeding was performed during the late fall of 2004 just prior to several significant snow events. Additionally, warning signs were posted at the landfill cover sites in 2003.

Beginning in 2003, proposed NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network changes were implemented. Specifically, the analyses for gross alpha and beta, TKN, TOC, and phosphorus were discontinued. Additionally, with regulatory agency agreement, sample collection frequency was changed from four times per year to three times per year.

On two occasions (December 2004 and July 2006) since the 2001 Five-Year Review, the concentration of chromium in NRF-13 exceeded the federal MCLs. NRF performed an evaluation of this well and the results are presented in Appendix A and summarized in Section 6.0.

The malfunctioning of two soil gas probes (MW1-1 and MW1-2) due to plugging was also addressed. Between 2001 and 2003, NRF inspected the interior of the plugged soil gas probes and attempted to clear the obstructions by mechanical means. These attempts were unsuccessful; therefore, NRF replaced the two probes in 2003. The new soil gas probes were constructed using a slightly modified version of the specifications used to build the original soil gas monitoring probes. This was done to maintain overall consistency while addressing issues that contributed to the problems encountered in the old probes. The modifications included adding more sand pack material below and above the slotted pipe section, to ensure that the bentonite would not migrate into the slotted pipe section. The existing probes adjacent to the new probes were abandoned by cutting off the surface pipe even with the existing pad and pouring grout down the pipe, up to the surface of the pad. The new probes were initially tested immediately after construction to ensure they were functioning correctly. Additional discussion of replacement of these probes is provided in Section 6.2.1.6.1.

5.1.4 Current Status

The 2005 inspection of the landfill covers at NRF-1 and NRF-51 revealed that the re-seeding that was performed in the late fall of 2004 had resulted in the growth of some new seedlings, particularly at the NRF-1 southwest corner and the NRF-51 sparse area.

The proposed NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network changes (as noted in Section 5.1.3) have been fully implemented. NRF has performed an evaluation of NRF-13 which concludes that the elevated chromium results are related to sedimentation. Details of this evaluation are included in Appendix A.

The new soil gas probes have operated correctly and provided useable data since their reconstruction. Additionally, although some of the soil gas probes continue to periodically contain some water (as noted in Section 6.2.1.6), subsequent sample results have confirmed that these probes provide adequate useable data.

5.2 2004 Review of OU 8-08 Sites

5.2.1 Protectiveness Statement

Protectiveness statements were originally presented in the 2004 Five-Year Review for the Naval Reactors Facility OU 8-08 Sites. These protectiveness statements confirmed that visual inspections, soil gas data, and groundwater data indicated that the selected remedies for the NFA sites appeared to be effective at limiting unauthorized access and excavation. Based on this assessment it was concluded that the selected remedies remain protective of human health and the environment.

The 2004 review also stated that it was expected that all evidence presented in the upcoming Remedial Action (RA) Report (issued in its final form in March 2006) would indicate that the selected remedies, i.e., soil, concrete and pipe removal, and consolidation of contaminated soil at NRF-12B/14, would be protective of human health and the environment by achieving Remedial Action Objectives.

Section 6.4 of the RA Report (BBI, 2006) stated that based on all available information, NR/IBO certified that the remedial actions intended to be performed at the OU 8-08 sites as described in the Record of Decision were fully performed and that the Performance Standards were attained;

therefore, NRF concluded that all nine OU 8-08 remedial action sites were in a state that protects human health and the environment.

5.2.2 Status from 2004 Review of OU 8-08 Sites

Remedial actions associated the OU 8-08 Sites, including issuing the Remedial Action Report, were not complete when the 2004 Five-Year Review was issued; therefore, no recommendations were presented at that time. An evaluation of data collected in association with the remediation of OU 8-08 Remedial Action Sites confirm that RAOs have been achieved.

6.0 Data Review and Evaluation for Five-Year Review Process

6.1 Summary of Five-Year Review Process

This Five-Year Review is intended to determine whether the selected remedies remain protective of human health and the environment. In addition, the review reassesses the monitoring programs to ensure the correct constituents are being monitored, and to ensure the frequency of sampling and the number of wells are correct. BBI personnel have reviewed past site information, including sampling data (groundwater, soil gas, and soil moisture), ICMRs, work plans, ARARs, and RODs, and were responsible for drafting this Five-Year Review. NR/IBO, EPA, and IDEQ personnel have also reviewed this information and approved this report. This document is available at the INL Information Repository. Public notification of the Five-Year Review and its availability will be given in local newspapers.

6.2 Site Inspections

6.2.1 Overview of Site Inspection Activities

Annual inspections of the various CERCLA sites are required per the O&M plans and results are reported annually in the ICMR. Additional inspections were performed as part of the final inspection certification of the OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites. In addition, routine surveillances are conducted as a matter of good practice. The following sections discuss results of inspections at the various sites.

6.2.1.1 Inspections of Inactive Landfill Areas

Annual inspections of the landfill covers are required. Annual inspections revealed mostly minor problems (e.g., anthills, rodent holes). The following is a summary of the more important observations (e.g., sparse vegetation, vehicle intrusion) associated with the inspections.

The initial NRF Inactive Landfill Areas Five-Year Review (February 2001) discussed problems with sparse vegetation areas and weeds. The inspections of NRF-1 and NRF-51 from 2001 to 2004 indicated improvement with some new growth occurring in the sparse areas at the southwest corner and areas along the east perimeter. Even though the natural re-vegetation process had increased the vegetation density, it was occurring slowly and re-seeding was necessary in these areas. Due to drought conditions that persisted in eastern Idaho, re-seeding was delayed until precipitation increased to near normal amounts. Re-seeding was performed during the late fall of 2004 just prior to several significant snow events. The 2005 inspection revealed that the re-seeding had resulted in the growth of some new seedlings, particularly at the NRF-1 southwest corner and the NRF-51 sparse area. All areas will continue to be closely monitored during future inspections.

The 2003 annual inspection revealed evidence that vehicles had driven on the extreme west side of NRF-1. Only minor damage to some vegetation and to the surface of the cover was observed. This intrusion occurred prior to the placement of additional signs with larger lettering that could be seen from a distance. Site personnel were retrained and monitoring of the area was increased until a temporary fence was placed to enclose the area. NRF posted the landfill areas with new signs easily seen from a distance to warn employees, subcontractors, or potential trespassers of no unauthorized entry into these sites. Permanent fences have since been constructed around each of the Inactive Landfill Areas.

6.2.1.2 Inspections of No Further Action Sites

NRF issued an Initial ICMR in 2001 and annual ICMRs between 2002 and 2005. Each ICMR included site inspections of the NFA Sites. No significant deficiencies were noted during site inspections. Minor deficiencies (e.g., sagging fences) were addressed when they were noted, as soon as circumstances allowed (e.g., weather conditions).

6.2.1.3 Inspections of Remediated Radiological Sites

Formal inspections of the Remediated Radiological Sites will begin in 2006 since the RA Report was finalized earlier in 2006. However, these sites have been inspected as part of routine surveillances. Most sites have been restored to near pre-work conditions. NRF-17 is presently being used as a staging area for a construction project and will be restored to surrounding lawn conditions or put to other productive use after project completion. Signs for the sites have been received and installed.

6.2.1.4 Inspection of OU 8-08 Engineered Covers

Several inspections were conducted at the three OU 8-08 engineered cover areas in preparation for the pre-final and final inspections by the regulatory agencies. These inspections were conducted shortly after the covers were constructed and after seeding had been performed. The inspections occurred during the summer and fall of 2004 and during the spring, summer, and fall of 2005. The inspections included, but were not limited to, the following items: 1) whether erosion had occurred after significant rainfall events (0.75 inches or greater of rainfall in one day (Sagendorf, 1996)), 2) the occurrence of any subsidence, and 3) whether sufficient vegetation was growing on the covers. Only minor evidence of erosion was observed during 2004. More significant evidence of erosion was observed during 2005 at NRF-12B/14 and NRF-19 but was limited to small areas on the side slopes. These areas were repaired and re-seeded during the fall of 2005.

During the fall of 2004, representatives of the IDEQ and EPA visited the OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites and performed a pre-final inspection. The following is a summary of the deficiencies noted: 1) gates had not been secured with locks; 2) warning signs had not been installed; 3) minor subsidence and desiccation cracking observed around neutron access tubes were noted and required repair by mounding and compacting additional soil around the tubes and sloping the mounds such that precipitation is shed radially; and 4) vegetation had not been established on some side slopes and perimeter areas. The first three deficiencies were corrected by NRF as soon as conditions permitted. The deficiency associated with vegetation was self correcting as spring and summer plant growth occurred.

During fall of 2005, IDEQ and EPA personnel performed final inspections of the OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites to ensure that deficiencies noted during the pre-final inspections had been corrected. Both agencies agreed this had occurred.

6.2.1.5 Inspections of Groundwater Monitoring Wells

The United States Geological Survey (USGS), the organization assisting in the collection of NRF groundwater samples, inspects wells during the sampling process. Any problems with the wells are reported to NRF personnel. Maintenance or repairs are handled through the USGS under the cognizance of NRF personnel. NRF personnel also periodically inspect well locations. Since the last Five-Year Review, inspections of the wells have revealed only minor problems (e.g., cracked paint, cracked concrete pad, etc.) which were corrected shortly thereafter. Other more serious problems were discovered during scheduled sampling events (or as the case with USGS-98, during in-house analysis of groundwater elevation data). These problems are discussed below.

6.2.1.5.1 Refurbishment of Well NRF-12

In February 2002, while collecting first quarter groundwater data, the USGS reported that well NRF-12 would not produce water. The pump, motor, riser pipe, and measuring-line were pulled and examined. It was determined that the motor had failed. The motor and pump were replaced and the electrical wiring was upgraded. The well has functioned as designed since 2002.

6.2.1.5.2 Refurbishment of Well NRF-6

While collecting samples from well NRF-6 in November 2003, the USGS noted in their logbook that the generator used to power the pump motor cutout repeatedly during well purging. The purge water was dark red for almost one minute after turning the pump on. The sample was eventually collected and analyzed. Several of the constituent results were significantly elevated above their historical averages. Table 6-1 shows the results for constituents that were elevated. The historical averages for these constituents are included for reference.

	Turbidity	Chromium	Copper	Iron	Manganese	Nickel
November 2003	52	460	23	39,000	350	100
Historical Average	5	39	7	749	7	15

Metal results in ppb

Turbidity in Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU)

Prior to the collection of samples in March 2004, the USGS tested the well and determined either the pump or pump motor had failed. These components were pulled from the well and examined. The motor had overheated and seized, apparently due to silt that had accumulated around the motor. Further examination revealed that corrosion of the pump, motor, measuring-line, and riser pipe had occurred. The pump and motor and other affected parts were replaced with new parts (the wiring was also upgraded). A videolog of the well showed that while extensive precipitation/sedimentation had occurred and thickly deposited on the well screen, no corrosion of the screen itself was evident. The pump and motor assembly was placed five feet above its original position when reinserted in the well. Subsequent testing of the well showed

that the well functioned properly and subsequent sample results have returned to historical levels with some constituents dropping below historical levels.

Section 5.2 of Appendix A discusses data trends in this well, and also compares the groundwater data to sample turbidity. Turbidity is an indicator of the presence of suspended solids in the water sample. Suspended solids, whether from sediments or corrosion products, will likely contain metal constituents. Samples containing these solids can produce results with elevated metal concentrations. Analysis in Appendix A indicates that, the elevated metal results in NRF-6 for November 2003 were a result of high suspended solids in the well. The high suspended solids were likely derived from well sediments, corrosion products, or both.

6.2.1.5.3 Refurbishment of Well NRF-7

Beginning in November 2002 and continuing into 2004, the analysis results for aluminum, chromium, iron, manganese, and nickel from well NRF-7 were abnormally elevated compared to historical results. As part of an investigation of the cause for the anomalous data, USGS pulled the pump, pump motor, measuring-line, and riser pipe from the well during the fall of 2004. Examination of the well components showed that they were still in acceptable condition; however, since the pump and motor were nearly 15 years old, they were both replaced along with the pump motor wiring. A videolog of the well showed that the screen was in excellent condition. Table 6-2 is a summary of data collected before, during, and after the period in question. These data show that the anomalous results occurred in association with high suspended solids (turbidity). Section 3.4.2 of Appendix A discusses these results in more detail and suggests that they are the result of sediment in the well. Subsequent sample results from this well returned to near historical levels.

Table 6 2 Comparison of Turbidity and Metal Results from NRF 7						
	Turbidity	Aluminum	Chromium	Iron	Manganese	Nickel
Before 11/2002	9.4	177	11	365	8.8	9.4
During Anomaly*	104	3,234	23	3,700	95	22
After 3/2004	5.5	70	14	302	7.3	10.3

Metal results in ppb

Turbidity in NTU

*November 2002 to March 2004

6.2.1.5.4 Refurbishment of Well USGS-98

During 2004, an evaluation of water table elevation in the NRF wells determined that the water table elevation in well USGS-98 was very near the pump intake level, which would result in the well becoming inoperative. Maintenance of the well was scheduled for late February or early March of 2005 in order to accommodate the first trimester sampling of the well in late March. The maintenance crew had intended to pull the pump and motor, inspect the condition of pump, motor, and well casing, and then reinstall the pump and motor approximately 20 feet deeper in the well. During the extraction process, the well casing was pulled up out of the well along with the pump and motor. It was later determined that the pump, motor, and probably the riser pipe had rusted to the casing.

In order to restore the well, a drill rig was used to remove silt that had accumulated in the bottom of the well. A new pump and motor, riser pipe, measuring-line, casing, and screen were

installed in the well. The pump intake was placed 20 feet deeper than before. The well has functioned properly since its refurbishment.

6.2.1.6 Inspections of Soil Gas Monitoring Probes

The initial Five-Year Review (February 2001) for the Inactive Landfill Areas stated that MW1-1 and MW1-2 (soil gas monitoring probes at NRF-1) were not functioning properly because of a plugging problem with both probes. The plugging problem may have been due to defective construction. That Five-Year Review stated that attempts would be made to clear the probes, and if unsuccessful, two options would be considered: 1) seek regulatory agreement that the plugged probes are in a non-critical area and no further action is required; or 2) construct new monitoring probes to replace the problem probes.

Follow-up annual inspections indicated that MW1-1 and MW1-2 soil gas monitoring probes remained partially plugged even after attempts were made to unplug the probes. Since the mechanism causing the plugging problem was unknown, NRF initiated plans to replace these probes during 2003. A third probe (MW1-4) was found to contain standing water while collecting samples. This has been an intermittent problem that appears to be related to precipitation events and standing water that accumulates in puddles next to the engineered cover, leading to the formation of a small perched water zone.

No problems were encountered with any of the soil gas monitoring probes during subsequent inspections after the construction of the replacement probes. Replacement probe construction is discussed below.

6.2.1.6.1 Probe Reconstruction

An inspection of MW1-1 and MW1-2 was performed using a small diameter down-hole video camera. The video camera used for inspecting the probes identified standing water, which may have been from condensation inside the pipe, and obstructions about an inch below the water level, in both probes. The obstruction in MW1-2 was encountered at about two feet above the top of the slotted section (see Figure 4-2). The obstruction in MW1-1 was encountered at approximately the top of the slotted section of pipe.

Attempts to clear the restrictions by mechanical means were conducted without success; therefore, NRF replaced the two original probes in 2003. The new monitoring probes were placed as close to the original probes as physically possible. The new probes were checked for proper completion and functionality immediately after their construction by: 1) running a depth-measuring device down the pipe to ensure proper depth, and 2) attaching the sampling equipment to the probes and verifying that sufficient airflow could be drawn to collect samples.

The new soil gas probes were constructed using a slightly modified version of the specifications used to build the original soil gas monitoring probes. This was done to maintain overall consistency while addressing issues that contributed to the problems encountered in the old probes. The modifications included adding more sand pack material below and above the slotted pipe section, to ensure that the bentonite would not migrate into the slotted pipe section. The existing probes adjacent to the new probes were abandoned by cutting off the surface pipe even with the existing pad and pouring grout down the pipe, up to the surface of the pad.

6.2.1.7 Inspections of Soil Moisture Neutron Access Tubes

Inspection of the soil moisture neutron access tubes was performed by NR/IBO, IDEQ, and EPA during a pre-final inspection of the OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Areas in 2004 and a final inspection in 2005. The pre-final inspection noted that the access tubes needed to be mounded with soil so that water would be shed radially away from the access tubes, followed by seeding the soil mound. The soil mounding was performed during the latter part of 2004. The seeding of the mounds was performed in 2005. During the final inspection, IDEQ and EPA noted the deficiencies were corrected.

6.3 Data Review

6.3.1 Monitoring Program Overview

NRF collects various types of data including groundwater, soil gas, surface soil gas emissions, and soil moisture. These data are used to assess the effectiveness of remedies that have been implemented and to determine if operations at NRF are having an adverse effect on the environment. Surface soil gas emissions data for the three inactive landfill cover areas are acquired during an annual survey using a portable meter. No VOCs have been detected from these surveys. The following sections discuss the results of the other monitoring performed at NRF. A summary of yearly monitoring results is included in the annual NRF Environmental Monitoring Report (BBI, 2001 to 2005).

6.3.2 Groundwater

6.3.2.1 Analysis of Groundwater Monitoring Data

Groundwater monitoring data collected from monitoring wells located around NRF were analyzed. This analysis covers the period from the well's construction or initial inclusion into the monitoring network through March 2006.

NRF collects groundwater data from 13 groundwater wells located around the site as shown in Figure 3-4. These data were placed into the following groups; upgradient background (Regional Upgradient Group), downgradient (Local Downgradient and Regional Downgradient Groups), and Effluent System water quality.

As noted in Section 7.3 of the 2001 Five-Year Review, upgradient water quality relative to NRF is not well defined. NRF-7 was originally placed to monitor water released from the IWD. Based on water quality characteristics, the data collected from NRF-7 were included with USGS-12 to become the Regional Upgradient Group. The basis for doing this was provided in the 2001 5-Year Review.

NRF-6 and NRF-13 have been placed in the Effluent System well group. NRF-6 is known to monitor effluent from the IWD. Although NRF-13 was originally constructed as an upgradient well, it was included as an Effluent System well because its results do not reflect upgradient quality water. For the following analysis, NRF-13 data has been included with the Effluent System Group since during the period of this Five-Year Review (2001-2006) it has been part of the Effluent System Group. However, as noted in Appendix A, the wells' ability to monitor the effluent system has been questioned.

6.3.2.2 Inorganic Data Review

Analysis of inorganic data included a comparison of upgradient background water quality to downgradient (including Effluent System) water quality and evaluating monitoring results for trends. Because organic constituents were seldom detected in the groundwater, they are discussed separately in Section 6.3.2.3.

For purposes of this groundwater analysis, several key constituents were considered. Key constituents included in the assessment were based on the following criteria:

- Contaminants of concern (COCs) as described in the RODs for the OUs 8-05/06 and 8-08 sites that are routinely measured due to potential for detection. These include cesium-137 and organic compounds.
- Constituents detected in the soil during confirmation sample analysis that were also consistently detected in groundwater samples and were known to have been released at NRF in the past. These constituents include chromium.
- Constituents that are good geochemical indicators. This group includes calcium, chloride, sodium, and tritium. These constituents generally do not interact with the aquifer, and therefore reflect important aquifer properties such as dispersion and groundwater flow paths.
- Constituents that are consistently present in NRF groundwater samples and act as geochemical indicators. This group includes aluminum, iron, manganese, and nickel. These constituents may interact with the aquifer.

This analysis compared long-term monitoring results to two benchmarks. These benchmarks were Federal drinking water guidelines and local background concentrations. The purpose of comparing to Federal drinking water guidelines was to determine compliance with Federal regulations. Comparison of NRF groundwater quality to local background concentrations was intended to assess the relative impact that NRF operations have had on the aquifer. The results of these comparisons were used to assess whether the selected remedies are functioning correctly and that the remedies are effective.

Local background concentrations were estimated using data from Regional Upgradient wells NRF-7 and USGS-12. For this report, data from NRF-7 were averaged with data from USGS-12 for all constituents except the statistical outliers. These outliers included data listed at a high method detection limit (MDL) if the constituent concentration were known to be significantly less than that MDL. For example, data listed at the MDL of 10 ppb for antimony were considered outliers since other data from the wells showed antimony at a much lower concentration or at a lower MDL. This would indicate that the higher MDL of 10 ppb would bias the calculated background concentration. Similar outliers were found with arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, copper, lead, manganese, nickel, silver, and thallium. In addition, NRF-7 data collected from November 2002 to March 2004 were considered outliers for aluminum, chromium, iron, manganese, calcium, potassium, and magnesium due to sediments in the samples as indicated by elevated turbidity measurements (see Section 5.2 of Appendix A for additional discussion of this event). Table 6-3 shows the most current estimate of regional background concentrations. These background concentrations, which are synonymous with the regional upgradient concentrations, are also listed in Table 6-4.

Table 6 3 Estimated NRF Background Groundwater Concentrations

Constituent	pH	Spec. Cond.	Aluminum	Antimony	Arsenic	Barium	Beryllium	Cadmium	Chromium
Units		µS/cm	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb
MCL	6.5 to 8.5 (a)	(b)	200 (a)	6	10	2000	4	5	100
Mean	8.0	403	< ^(c) 100	<< ^(c) 0.74	< ^(c) 3	< 100	<< ^(c) 0.9	<< ^(c) 0.5	9
Std. Dev	0.3	154	107	0.93	1	33	0.7	0.3	4
Max	8.9	610	560	<< 5.10	6	160	2.0	<< 1.0	27
Min	7.4	202	< 10	0.04	1	49	< 0.2	0.0	1
Constituent	Copper	Iron	Lead	Manganese	Mercury	Nickel	Selenium	Silver	Thallium
Units	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb
MCL	1000 (a)	300 (a)	15	50 (a)	2	100	50	100 (a)	2
Mean	<< ^(c) 4	319	< ^(c) 1.7	< 6	<< ^(c) 0.1	< ^(c) 4.9	< 4	<< ^(c) 0.8	<< ^(c) 0.2
Std. Dev	8	679	1.0	6	0.1	3.9	2	0.3	0.2
Max	67	4800	5.6	24	0.2	14.0	6	2.8	<< 0.5
Min	1	< 10	0.3	1	0.0	0.5	1	0.2	0.0
Constituent	Zinc	Calcium	Potassium	Magnesium	Sodium	Chloride	Sulfate	NO ₂	NO ₂ + NO ₃
Units	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb
MCL	5000 (a)	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)	250000 (a)	250000 (a)	1000	10000
Mean	<< ^(c) 14	45159	2482	15005	11456	17135	22655	<< 8	1102
Std. Dev	17	18649	566	5505	3060	13300	8976	4	659
Max	120	77000	3700	24000	17700	42000	38000	20	2500
Min	3	16000	1500	8300	4500	4000	13000	1	360
Constituent	TKN	TOX	P as P	TOC	Strontium-90	Cesium-137	Gross Alpha	Gross Beta	Tritium
Units	ppb	ppb	ppb	ppb	pCi/L	pCi/L	pCi/L	pCi/L	pCi/L
MCL	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)	8 (d)	200 (d)	15.0	(d)	20000 (d)
Mean	<< 460	<< 19	49	< 686	0.1	0.1	2.0	4.1	29
Std. Dev	297	13	65	500	0.1	0.7	1.0	1.5	31
Max	2200	55	400	3600	0.7	1.7	5.4	7.6	131
Min	78	3	5	100	-0.3	-4.6	0.2	0.7	-29

< A significant portion of the data used to create this value are at or below the MDL
 << Most of the data used to create this value are at or below the MDL
 (a) Secondary MCL
 (b) MCL not determined
 (c) Two or more MDLs were used in the creation of this number
 (d) Individual nuclides have a pCi/L MCL for drinking water which will give a dose of 4 mrem/yr

The mean concentrations for all NRF inorganic groundwater constituents were compared to background concentrations and Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL; 40 CFR 141, 143) in Table 6-4. With the exception of aluminum in two wells, iron in six wells, and chloride in one well, none of the mean concentrations exceeded secondary Federal MCLs.

Table 6-4 shows that most elevated constituents are associated with wells NRF-6 and NRF-13. NRF-6 is located immediately downgradient of the IWD; therefore, sample results from this well reflect contributions from the IWD effluent. These include calcium, chromium, iron, potassium, magnesium, sodium, chloride, and sulfate. Salts (i.e., calcium, potassium, magnesium, sodium, chloride, and sulfate) discharged to the IWD are from NRF water conditioning operations. Section 6.3.2.4 discusses trends in NRF-6 for selected constituents.

NRF-13 is located upgradient from the IWD. Sample results from NRF-13 typically contain elevated metal concentrations. Appendix A contains a comprehensive analysis of geochemical, geological, and hydrological data associated with this well. This analysis includes comparisons to individual wells NRF-6, NRF-7, USGS-12, and regional background data (consisting of combined data from NRF-7 and USGS-12). Appendix A concludes that the occurrence of elevated metals in this well is due to high suspended solids present in water samples. The high suspended solids are most likely from natural sediments in the well, with the possibility of a small contribution from corrosion of well hardware. NRF-13 is scheduled for maintenance after collection of the 2006 third trimester groundwater samples. Section 6.3.2.4 discusses trends in NRF-13 for selected constituents.

Downgradient wells USGS-97, -98, and -99 contain zinc concentrations that are elevated compared to background but are significantly below the MCL. Zinc levels in these wells are probably associated with well construction issues rather than groundwater issues. This is supported by the observation that the mean zinc concentration in USGS-98 was approximately 150 ppb prior to the replacement of the pump, motor, and well screen in this well early in 2005 compared to a mean of approximately 12 ppb after the refurbishment. Well components and construction history for USGS-97 and USGS-99 are similar to that of USGS-98.

The levels of tritium in NRF-10 and NRF-11 were elevated with respect to background, although significantly lower than the MCL. These wells are located downgradient of the S1W Leaching Beds/Pit (NRF-14 and NRF-12B). It is believed that residual contamination from historical releases to this site is responsible for the elevated tritium.

Table 6 4 Comparison of MCL, Background, Individual Wells, and Well Groups

Constituent Units	pH	Spec. Cond. $\mu\text{S/cm}$	Aluminum ppb	Antimony ppb	Arsenic ppb	Barium ppb	Beryllium ppb	Cadmium ppb	Chromium ppb
MCL	6.5 to 8.5 (a)	(b)	200 (a)	6	10	2000	4	5	100
Background	8.0 \pm 0.3	403 \pm 154	100 \pm 107	0.74 \pm 0.93	3 \pm 1	100 \pm 33	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	9 \pm 4
NRF 6	7.8 \pm 0.1	1419 \pm 188	32 \pm 21	0.81 \pm 1.22	4 \pm 1	94 \pm 35	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	32 \pm 7
NRF 7	8.3 \pm 0.2	246 \pm 12	150 \pm 133	0.72 \pm 0.91	3 \pm 2	67 \pm 21	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	12 \pm 3
NRF 8	7.9 \pm 0.1	573 \pm 22	178 \pm 626	0.63 \pm 0.98	4 \pm 1	124 \pm 12	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.4 \pm 0.3	8 \pm 2
NRF 9	7.9 \pm 0.2	618 \pm 24	38 \pm 17	0.68 \pm 1.19	3 \pm 1	133 \pm 13	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.4 \pm 0.3	11 \pm 3
NRF 10	7.9 \pm 0.2	580 \pm 29	308 \pm 404	0.84 \pm 1.59	4 \pm 2	132 \pm 13	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.4 \pm 0.3	14 \pm 3
NRF 11	7.9 \pm 0.1	600 \pm 37	86 \pm 78	0.90 \pm 1.75	4 \pm 2	136 \pm 15	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	18 \pm 4
NRF 12	7.9 \pm 0.1	644 \pm 50	37 \pm 18	0.97 \pm 1.65	4 \pm 1	149 \pm 20	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.4 \pm 0.3	19 \pm 5
NRF 13	8.0 \pm 0.2	563 \pm 54	2882 \pm 3889	0.84 \pm 1.50	4 \pm 1	104 \pm 21	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.4 \pm 0.3	72 \pm 54
USGS 12	7.8 \pm 0.1	543 \pm 51	32 \pm 38	1.00 \pm 1.61	3 \pm 1	127 \pm 21	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.6 \pm 0.3	7 \pm 1
USGS 97	7.9 \pm 0.1	585 \pm 25	60 \pm 145	0.89 \pm 1.56	3 \pm 1	129 \pm 23	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.6 \pm 0.3	6 \pm 1
USGS 98	7.9 \pm 0.2	417 \pm 34	32 \pm 22	0.72 \pm 1.13	3 \pm 2	54 \pm 6	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	6 \pm 1
USGS 99	7.9 \pm 0.1	524 \pm 20	48 \pm 98	0.73 \pm 1.13	3 \pm 2	107 \pm 15	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.9 \pm 1.8	6 \pm 2
USGS 102	7.9 \pm 0.1	572 \pm 20	30 \pm 18	0.73 \pm 1.22	3 \pm 1	116 \pm 17	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.6 \pm 0.4	7 \pm 1
Regional Upgradient	8.0 \pm 0.3	403 \pm 154	100 \pm 107	0.74 \pm 0.93	3 \pm 1	100 \pm 33	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	9 \pm 4
System Effluent	7.9 \pm 0.2	1070 \pm 449	1775 \pm 3321	0.82 \pm 1.35	4 \pm 1	99 \pm 29	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	50 \pm 41
Local Downgradient	7.9 \pm 0.1	595 \pm 40	129 \pm 335	0.79 \pm 1.40	4 \pm 2	131 \pm 18	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.5 \pm 0.3	12 \pm 6
Regional Downgradient	7.9 \pm 0.1	509 \pm 75	46 \pm 99	0.78 \pm 1.28	3 \pm 2	101 \pm 34	1.0 \pm 0.7	0.7 \pm 1.1	6 \pm 1

Constituent Units	Copper ppb	Iron ppb	Lead ppb	Manganese ppb	Mercury ppb	Nickel ppb	Selenium ppb	Silver ppb	Thallium ppb
MCL	1000 (a)	300 (a)	15	50 (a)	2	100	50	100 (a)	2
Background	4 \pm 8	319 \pm 679	1.7 \pm 1.0	6 \pm 6	0.1 \pm 0.1	4.9 \pm 3.9	4 \pm 2	0.8 \pm 0.3	0.2 \pm 0.2
NRF 6	3 \pm 2	749 \pm 917	1.6 \pm 0.9	7 \pm 7	0.1 \pm 0.1	15.4 \pm 11.2	4 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.4	0.5 \pm 1.6
NRF 7	6 \pm 12	514 \pm 867	1.8 \pm 1.1	10 \pm 7	0.1 \pm 0.1	8.4 \pm 3.1	4 \pm 2	0.8 \pm 0.4	0.2 \pm 0.2
NRF 8	4 \pm 3	239 \pm 533	2.0 \pm 1.0	4 \pm 8	0.1 \pm 0.1	2.9 \pm 2.0	4 \pm 1	0.7 \pm 0.5	0.2 \pm 0.2
NRF 9	4 \pm 3	149 \pm 161	1.9 \pm 0.9	2 \pm 2	0.1 \pm 0.1	2.3 \pm 1.5	4 \pm 1	0.7 \pm 0.5	0.2 \pm 0.2
NRF 10	4 \pm 6	450 \pm 581	2.0 \pm 0.9	11 \pm 13	0.1 \pm 0.1	14.6 \pm 8.4	4 \pm 1	0.7 \pm 0.5	0.1 \pm 0.2
NRF 11	5 \pm 6	193 \pm 276	1.9 \pm 0.9	5 \pm 4	0.2 \pm 0.3	8.0 \pm 4.1	4 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.7	0.4 \pm 1.0
NRF 12	4 \pm 3	165 \pm 319	1.9 \pm 0.9	2 \pm 2	0.1 \pm 0.1	13.2 \pm 12.3	4 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.6	0.1 \pm 0.2
NRF 13	7 \pm 7	3500 \pm 4302	2.3 \pm 1.3	58 \pm 64	0.1 \pm 0.1	28.9 \pm 18.7	4 \pm 2	0.9 \pm 0.7	0.1 \pm 0.2
USGS 12	2 \pm 2	161 \pm 420	1.5 \pm 0.8	3 \pm 5	0.1 \pm 0.1	1.7 \pm 1.4	4 \pm 2	0.9 \pm 0.4	0.2 \pm 0.2
USGS 97	6 \pm 17	235 \pm 575	2.6 \pm 1.6	3 \pm 6	0.1 \pm 0.1	1.7 \pm 1.4	4 \pm 1	0.9 \pm 0.4	0.2 \pm 0.3
USGS 98	12 \pm 51	215 \pm 378	4.5 \pm 3.0	3 \pm 4	0.1 \pm 0.1	1.3 \pm 0.6	3 \pm 2	0.9 \pm 0.4	0.3 \pm 0.6
USGS 99	3 \pm 3	310 \pm 724	2.2 \pm 1.0	5 \pm 8	0.1 \pm 0.1	1.6 \pm 0.9	3 \pm 2	0.8 \pm 0.3	0.2 \pm 0.2
USGS 102	3 \pm 3	417 \pm 1539	1.6 \pm 0.8	3 \pm 4	0.1 \pm 0.1	1.6 \pm 0.8	4 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.4	0.4 \pm 1.1
Regional Upgradient	4 \pm 8	319 \pm 679	1.7 \pm 1.0	6 \pm 6	0.1 \pm 0.1	4.9 \pm 3.9	4 \pm 2	0.8 \pm 0.3	0.2 \pm 0.2
System Effluent	5 \pm 5	1924 \pm 3160	1.9 \pm 1.1	35 \pm 54	0.1 \pm 0.1	21.1 \pm 16.2	4 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.5	0.4 \pm 1.2
Local Downgradient	4 \pm 4	283 \pm 853	1.8 \pm 0.9	5 \pm 8	0.1 \pm 0.1	7.9 \pm 8.8	4 \pm 1	0.8 \pm 0.5	0.2 \pm 0.7
Regional Downgradient	7 \pm 32	254 \pm 577	3.1 \pm 2.3	4 \pm 6	0.1 \pm 0.1	1.6 \pm 1.0	3 \pm 2	0.9 \pm 0.4	0.3 \pm 0.4

(a) Secondary MCL
(b) MCL not determined

Between 1 and 2 std. dev. greater than background
Between 2 and 3 std. dev. greater than background
Greater than 3 std. dev. from background

Group Configuration –

Regional Upgradient Group
Effluent System Group

USGS-12 and NRF-7
NRF-6 and NRF-13 (As noted in Appendix A, the ability of NRF-13 to monitor the Effluent System has been questioned.)

Local Downgradient Group

NRF-8 through 12 and USGS-102

Regional Downgradient Group

USGS-97, -98, and -99

Note: Table constituents are arranged by metals, salts, and then nutrients.

Averages are for the period 1989 to present for wells USGS-12, 97, 98, 99, and 102; 1991 to present for NRF-6 and 7; and 1996 to present for NRF-8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Table 6 4 Comparison of MCL, Background, Individual Wells, and Well Groups (Cont.)

Constituent Units	Zinc ppb	Calcium ppb	Potassium ppb	Magnesium ppb	Sodium ppb	Chloride ppb	Sulfate ppb	NO ₂ ppb	NO ₂ + NO ₃ ppb
MCL	5000 (a)	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)	250000 (a)	250000 (a)	1000	10000
Background	14 ± 17	45159 ± 18649	2482 ± 566	15005 ± 5505	11456 ± 3060	17135 ± 13300	22655 ± 8976	8 ± 4	1102 ± 659
NRF 6	10 ± 7	124130 ± 23825	4860 ± 748	33437 ± 5000	110209 ± 36901	264963 ± 100118	156146 ± 65434	6 ± 4	1782 ± 246
NRF 7	17 ± 18	25912 ± 3721	3016 ± 398	9266 ± 802	8833 ± 1007	5065 ± 479	14412 ± 3001	6 ± 4	518 ± 279
NRF 8	9 ± 6	68724 ± 4123	2253 ± 217	22305 ± 1306	15041 ± 948	33111 ± 3690	33662 ± 2114	6 ± 4	1911 ± 222
NRF 9	9 ± 5	72543 ± 4373	2441 ± 263	22722 ± 1347	17668 ± 1306	43757 ± 3764	42814 ± 4057	6 ± 4	2216 ± 472
NRF 10	10 ± 8	68575 ± 5440	2465 ± 391	22189 ± 1571	15244 ± 1165	41075 ± 3649	39422 ± 3492	6 ± 4	1783 ± 176
NRF 11	10 ± 6	69089 ± 4627	2506 ± 224	22062 ± 1437	18254 ± 1151	42108 ± 3595	41016 ± 4365	7 ± 4	1997 ± 462
NRF 12	9 ± 5	71603 ± 6248	2595 ± 312	22597 ± 2038	20786 ± 2543	50536 ± 9103	48081 ± 8826	7 ± 4	1903 ± 242
NRF 13	16 ± 13	71943 ± 8786	4089 ± 573	21766 ± 2692	12582 ± 8422	63944 ± 6297	74190 ± 8377	8 ± 10	861 ± 139
USGS 12	10 ± 5	61938 ± 5643	2017 ± 226	19862 ± 1894	13838 ± 2230	27671 ± 9656	30113 ± 5326	8 ± 4	1630 ± 414
USGS 97	113 ± 35	69208 ± 5912	2179 ± 317	22626 ± 1351	14989 ± 1691	33273 ± 3798	34181 ± 2620	8 ± 3	1962 ± 291
USGS 98	144 ± 44	49913 ± 7580	2074 ± 260	19197 ± 3216	9537 ± 1109	14898 ± 2077	21838 ± 3171	8 ± 3	1171 ± 267
USGS 99	113 ± 28	61782 ± 2958	1817 ± 212	21850 ± 782	13579 ± 1614	21878 ± 3036	26822 ± 3119	8 ± 7	1662 ± 144
USGS 102	12 ± 8	68182 ± 4789	2227 ± 539	21971 ± 1485	14055 ± 1792	32431 ± 3846	33553 ± 3168	7 ± 4	1879 ± 291
Regional Upgradient	14 ± 17	45159 ± 18649	2482 ± 566	15005 ± 5505	11456 ± 3060	17135 ± 13300	22655 ± 8976	8 ± 4	1102 ± 659
System Effluent	13 ± 11	97474 ± 31339	4455 ± 757	27469 ± 7019	68628 ± 55461	180535 ± 123233	123276 ± 64861	7 ± 8	1399 ± 500
Local Downgradient	10 ± 7	69776 ± 5193	2413 ± 366	22305 ± 1553	16547 ± 2822	39636 ± 8030	39092 ± 6942	6 ± 4	1942 ± 350
Regional Downgradient	123 ± 39	60301 ± 9840	2024 ± 305	21242 ± 2507	12736 ± 2745	23486 ± 8168	27675 ± 5876	8 ± 4	1605 ± 405

Constituent Units	TKN ppb	TOX ppb	P as P ppb	TOC ppb	Strontium-90 pCi/L	Cesium-137 pCi/L	Gross Alpha pCi/L	Gross Beta pCi/L	Tritium pCi/L
MCL	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)	8 (c)	200 (c)	15	(c)	20000 (c)
Background	460 ± 297	19 ± 13	49 ± 65	686 ± 500	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.7	2.0 ± 1.0	4.1 ± 1.5	29 ± 31
NRF 6	543 ± 347	14 ± 11	87 ± 59	1023 ± 841	0.1 ± 0.2	0.2 ± 0.9	3.1 ± 1.8	7.2 ± 3.0	69 ± 22
NRF 7	491 ± 397	7 ± 3	62 ± 87	684 ± 641	0.1 ± 0.2	0.1 ± 0.5	1.5 ± 0.8	4.4 ± 1.4	3 ± 9
NRF 8	428 ± 151	7 ± 4	55 ± 42	1053 ± 1117	0.1 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.6	2.4 ± 1.1	4.6 ± 2.2	49 ± 12
NRF 9	456 ± 154	14 ± 19	51 ± 39	754 ± 335	0.1 ± 0.2	0.1 ± 0.5	3.1 ± 0.9	4.7 ± 1.8	92 ± 26
NRF 10	433 ± 145	12 ± 15	67 ± 56	830 ± 331	0.1 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.4	2.6 ± 0.9	4.8 ± 1.8	122 ± 29
NRF 11	429 ± 144	12 ± 14	53 ± 51	1010 ± 752	0.1 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.5	3.0 ± 1.1	5.0 ± 1.8	171 ± 77
NRF 12	417 ± 153	13 ± 13	50 ± 47	894 ± 494	0.1 ± 0.4	0.2 ± 0.7	2.6 ± 1.1	5.0 ± 1.9	56 ± 12
NRF 13	443 ± 119	11 ± 6	153 ± 179	827 ± 349	0.0 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.8	2.9 ± 1.3	6.8 ± 3.6	35 ± 9
USGS 12	413 ± 164	14 ± 16	58 ± 115	754 ± 585	0.1 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.3	2.5 ± 1.0	3.7 ± 1.6	55 ± 14
USGS 97	431 ± 139	12 ± 17	44 ± 35	686 ± 522	0.1 ± 0.2	0.2 ± 0.8	2.8 ± 1.2	4.1 ± 1.8	51 ± 16
USGS 98	433 ± 140	14 ± 22	42 ± 33	782 ± 1898	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.7	1.9 ± 0.7	3.4 ± 1.5	17 ± 7
USGS 99	433 ± 132	9 ± 5	40 ± 25	746 ± 645	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.2	3.7 ± 2.0	29 ± 7
USGS 102	423 ± 193	8 ± 5	47 ± 48	799 ± 940	0.1 ± 0.1	0.4 ± 0.7	2.9 ± 1.2	4.4 ± 2.0	50 ± 14
Regional Upgradient	460 ± 297	19 ± 13	49 ± 65	686 ± 610	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.7	2.0 ± 1.0	4.1 ± 1.5	29 ± 31
System Effluent	493 ± 261	12 ± 9	118 ± 133	946 ± 500	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.8	3.0 ± 1.6	7.1 ± 3.2	53 ± 24
Local Downgradient	431 ± 156	11 ± 12	54 ± 47	878 ± 758	0.1 ± 0.2	0.2 ± 0.6	2.8 ± 1.1	4.7 ± 1.9	89 ± 58
Regional Downgradient	432 ± 135	12 ± 16	42 ± 31	738 ± 1180	0.1 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 1.0	2.4 ± 1.1	3.7 ± 1.8	33 ± 18

(a) Secondary MCL
(b) MCL not determined
(c) Individual nuclides have a pCi/L MCL for drinking water which will give a dose of 4 mrem/yr

Between 1 and 2 std. dev. greater than background
Between 2 and 3 std. dev. greater than background
Greater than 3 std. dev. from background

Group Configuration –

Regional Upgradient Group
Effluent System Group

USGS-12 and NRF-7
NRF-6 and NRF-13 (As noted in Appendix A, the ability of NRF-13 to monitor the Effluent System has been questioned.)

Local Downgradient Group
Regional Downgradient Group

NRF-8 through 12 and USGS-102
USGS-97, -98, and -99

Note: Table constituents are arranged by metals, salts, and then nutrients. Averages are for the period 1989 to present for wells USGS-12, 97, 98, 99, and 102; 1991 to present for NRF-6 and 7; and 1996 to present for NRF-8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

6.3.2.3 Organic Data Review

NRF groundwater samples are analyzed for selected volatile and semi-volatile compounds once each year (refer to Table 4-1). Most of these organic compounds are not detected in NRF water samples. Those that were detected occurred at very low concentrations and were likely due to some form of cross-contamination (e.g., laboratory contaminants, exhaust fumes, or from plastic tubing used during sampling) or were detected below laboratory reporting limits (uncertain detection). Of the compounds analyzed, two compounds, chloroform and tetrachloroethylene, were consistently present in NRF-6 from 1997 to 2001 and 1997 to 2004, respectively. Chloroform is a potential degradation product of carbon tetrachloride, which was used in the past at NRF. Tetrachloroethylene is a solvent used in industry. The reason for their presence in NRF-6 is unknown, but they may have been inadvertently disposed of in drains connected to the IWD. The concentrations of these two compounds were well below any Federal drinking water standards. Neither compound was detected in 2005. There is no evidence of a pattern of consistent or wide-spread contamination of the aquifer associated with organic compounds. Table 6-5 shows the occurrence and concentration of various organic compounds in NRF-6.

Table 6 5 Occurrence of Organic Compounds Detected in NRF 6 from 1997 to Present								
	MDL	NRF-6 (Concentrations in ppb)						
		1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2003	2004
Acetic Acid ¹	NA							2.3
Bromocil ¹	0.1		0.3		0.2			
Chloroform	0.1	0.27	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.18		
Methylene Chloride	0.2					0.23		
Tetrachloroethene	0.2	0.47	0.5	0.3		0.22	0.23	0.23
1,1,1 Trichloroethane	0.2		0.1					
Di(2 ethylhexyl)phthalate	0.6					2.4		
		Condition occurred above MDL						
		Condition occurred at MDL						

¹ - Found in laboratory library search. These constituents are not included in the standard analytical method list.

Table 6-6 Comparison of MCLs and Well Group Averages

Constituent Units		Aluminum ppb	Calcium ppb	Chromium ppb	Iron ppb	Manganese ppb	Nickel ppb	Sodium ppb	Chloride ppb	Cesium-137 pCi/L
MCL		200 (a)	(b)	100	300 (a)	50 (a)	100	(b)	250000 (a)	200 (c)
2001 to 2005	Regional Upgradient	78 ± 102	43909 ± 18256	9 ± 4	151 ± 262	4 ± 4	8.5 ± 4.6	11156 ± 2441	13700 ± 9227	0.1 ± 0.3
	System Effluent	1137 ± 1112	100224 ± 36220	54 ± 32	1380 ± 1194	22 ± 23	21.9 ± 16.9	72203 ± 71819	206032 ± 175008	0.0 ± 0.4
	Local Downgradient	96 ± 145	66768 ± 3402	13 ± 6	195 ± 284	4 ± 5	6.8 ± 5.3	16786 ± 1937	36822 ± 5780	0.1 ± 0.4
	Regional Downgradient	59 ± 122	59014 ± 8668	6 ± 1	140 ± 254	3 ± 3	1.7 ± 0.5	13794 ± 2860	23024 ± 6873	0.1 ± 0.3
1996 to 2000	Regional Upgradient	119 ± 126	44468 ± 18698	9 ± 3	240 ± 341	8 ± 6	5.9 ± 3.4	11853 ± 3325	15090 ± 12598	0.2 ± 0.4
	System Effluent	2562 ± 4465	95138 ± 26759	51 ± 53	2925 ± 4376	47 ± 70	21.0 ± 16.4	57025 ± 45865	142978 ± 82240	0.3 ± 1.1
	Local Downgradient	171 ± 464	72348 ± 5044	12 ± 6	239 ± 453	6 ± 10	10.7 ± 11.0	17203 ± 2949	43526 ± 8226	0.3 ± 0.7
	Regional Downgradient	48 ± 96	61810 ± 10576	6 ± 2	207 ± 666	4 ± 6	1.8 ± 1.2	13226 ± 2756	23902 ± 9117	0.2 ± 1.4

(a) Secondary MCL

(b) MCL not determined

(c) Individual nuclides have a pCi/L MCL for drinking water which will give a dose of 4 mrem/yr

Group Configuration -

Regional Upgradient Group

USGS-12 and NRF-7

Effluent System Group

NRF-6 and NRF-13 (As noted in Appendix A, the ability of NRF-13 to monitor the Effluent System has been questioned.)

Local Downgradient Group

NRF-8 through 12 and USGS-102

Regional Downgradient Group

USGS-97, -98, and -99

6.3.2.4 Data Trends

Table 6-6 compares water quality averages for the four well groups for ten key constituents (a total of 40 comparisons) for the period 1996 through 2000 and 2001 through 2005. This table shows that mean concentrations for many constituents have dropped since 2000. In total, the mean concentrations for 24 comparisons have declined, eight have increased, and eight have remained unchanged. Where increases occurred they were relatively small with the exception of chromium in the Effluent System well group. The increase is due primarily to increased chromium levels in NRF-13 (as noted in Appendix A, this is likely due to sedimentation). In the Regional Downgradient Group, all selected constituent mean concentrations were statistically equivalent (chromium, cesium-137, and sodium) or declined. Overall, this table shows that the relative magnitude of mean constituent concentrations is nearly the same as those described in the 2001 Five-Year Review.

Data for ten selected key constituents (discussed above) were evaluated for all NRF groundwater monitoring wells for individual trends. A majority of the key constituents are stable or trending downward in the individual NRF groundwater monitoring wells. Sodium, calcium, chromium, and chloride appear to be trending upward in some NRF wells. Sodium, calcium, and chloride are major ions originating from site water softening and deionization activities. Of the few NRF wells where chromium appears to be trending upward, the most noticeable is in NRF-13. The issues associated with well NRF-13, are discussed in Appendix A.

A more in-depth trend analysis was performed for chromium, chloride, and tritium. These three constituents were chosen because they exemplify various aspects of NRF operations and are thus considered to be key constituents. Chromium, a contaminant that is known to have been released in wastewater prior to 1980, is consistently detected in both soil and groundwater and is the main constituent of concern in NRF-13. Chloride was also released in quantity at NRF in the past (primarily at the IWD in the form of the ionic salt sodium chloride). Tritium was released at NRF in the past at the S1W Leaching Bed/Pits and its flow path is different than for chloride (different source location). Chloride and tritium generally do not interact with the aquifer and therefore are suitable indicators of dispersion and groundwater flow paths.

Figure 6-1 shows the time versus concentration graphs for chromium in the NRF wells. Appendix B provides plots for each individual well along with trending lines. Chromium is a naturally occurring constituent in both groundwater and soil. Past hydrogeological investigations demonstrate that sediments beneath the IWD associated with historic discharges are the primary source for the limited chromium detected in some downgradient monitoring wells at levels above background but significantly below the MCL. The amounts of chromium currently detected in the IWD effluent are comparable to the background level. Chromium concentration is trending upward in three of thirteen wells; refer to Appendix B for graphs of these trends. Wells that have increasing trends include NRF-10; NRF-7, and NRF-13. For comparison, the chromium concentration has been decreasing in NRF-6 and in NRF-12. The concentration in the regional wells (USGS-12, 97, 98, and 99) remained relatively flat. The trends in the remaining wells represent small changes in chromium concentrations and are probably more reflective of changes in local flow directions than changes in the amount of chromium being released to the aquifer.

The highest chromium levels are found in wells NRF-6 and NRF-13. NRF-6 is located immediately downgradient of the IWD. The downward trend observed in this well likely reflects decreased discharge to the IWD. Since leaching of chromium is a limited process due to solubility, the amount of chromium entering the aquifer is sensitive to net infiltration. NRF-13

has historically contained elevated metal concentrations primarily due to sedimentation in the well and not necessarily from the IWD. For an in-depth discussion of chromium and its presence in NRF-13, see Appendix A.

Concentration data that were considered to be extreme outliers both with respect to the overall trend of the well and in comparison with trends in other wells were excluded from Figure 6-1. Outliers were considered to be values that are significantly different from the remainder of the data set. Specifically, values greater than three times the well average were removed (with the exception of NRF-13 that considered the outliers with values above the MCL).




Figure 6-1 Chromium Concentration in NRF Wells

Concentration versus time graphs for chloride are shown for the NRF wells in Figure 6-2. Appendix B provides plots for each individual wells along with the trending line. Chloride, which is also a naturally occurring constituent in groundwater, is a good tracer because it is relatively unaffected by common retardation mechanisms associated with the aquifer system, thus allowing flow path and contaminant distribution analyses to be performed. Chloride concentrations are trending downward in all but two NRF wells. NRF-6 is generally higher in chloride concentration than the other NRF wells due to the influence of the IWD as discussed in Appendix A. The largest decreasing trends are in NRF-12 and USGS-12 falling 46% each. Trends in NRF-9, NRF-13, USGS-97, 98, and 99 were generally small.




Figure 6-2 Chloride Concentrations in NRF Wells

Figure 6-3 shows the tritium concentration vs. time plots for the NRF wells. In most NRF wells, the tritium concentration is trending downward, while the tritium concentration has stabilized in the remaining wells. The tritium levels in NRF-10 and NRF-11, although decreasing significantly, are elevated with respect to background concentrations, though the concentrations in these wells are still significantly lower than MCLs. These wells are located downgradient of the S1W Leaching Beds/Pit. It is therefore likely that residual contamination from historical tritium releases to this site is responsible for these elevated concentrations, as water with trace amounts of tritium has not been released from NRF since 1978. A residual perched water zone, which is releasing small quantities of water to the aquifer, is suspected as the mechanism causing the current elevated tritium activities. The current downward trends in tritium activities are expected given normal decay.

Extreme outliers that were more than three times as large as well averages were excluded for wells NRF-13 and USGS-98. In addition, tritium concentrations measured for the third sample date in 1998 were excluded for wells NRF-6, NRF-7, NRF-8, NRF-9, NRF-10, NRF-12, NRF-13, USGS-12, USGS-98, and USGS-102, as most of these values were approximately twice the well average. The tritium concentrations were significantly greater than the well average in the cases of USGS-98 (nearly ten times the well average) and NRF-7 (nearly 19 times the well average).




Figure 6-3 Tritium Concentrations in NRF Wells

Most chromium, chloride, and tritium concentrations are stable or trending downward, but each for different reasons. Chromium concentration decreases are probably related to two causes; decreased wastewater discharges to the IWD (result in less potential migration of historical chromium in sediments) and localized changes in flow patterns. The few wells showing increasing chromium concentrations are likely from a natural source, since chromium is no longer discharged to the IWD in significant amounts. The overall current chloride concentration decreases may be attributed to two possibilities: 1) the lower chloride concentration in the regional upgradient groundwater (as seen in USGS-12) that flows past NRF and/or 2) much less effluent to IWD thus less total chloride discharged. As previously mentioned, the current downward trends in tritium activities are expected given normal decay.

Overall, past and present activities at NRF have had no significant impact on water quality. Most measured contaminants are trending downward. Samples representing regional upgradient and regional downgradient water quality are statistically similar, thus, indicating no significant impact to groundwater quality from NRF operations. Although some individual chromium results from NRF-13 have exceeded the Federal MCL, these results were shown to be anomalous (i.e., not reflective of actual groundwater quality). As mentioned previously, Appendix A provides a more in-depth discussion of issues related to NRF-13.

6.3.3 Soil Gas

6.3.3.1 Analysis of Soil Gas Data

Soil gas monitoring data collected from monitoring probes around the perimeter of the three NRF Inactive Landfill Areas were analyzed by an off-site laboratory. The following are the VOCs that were consistently detected above the reporting limit during 1997 through 2005: dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12); trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11); 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (Freon 113); 1,1,1-trichloroethane; chloroform; trichloroethylene; and tetrachloroethylene. Freon 11 and tetrachloroethylene were the two most frequently detected constituents at all of the sites. The initial Five-Year Review presented data for the period from 1997 through 1999. This Five-Year Review includes additional data obtained through 2005.

The statistical review presented in this section centers on comparison of monitoring results to two different benchmarks. These benchmarks are the baseline concentrations obtained from the October 1996 initial sampling event (baseline data for each individual probe) and the overall maximum concentrations obtained during the Track 2 Investigations for these three landfill areas (the overall maximum data occurring at NRF-53). Such a comparison also presents a relative risk picture associated with NRF landfills. Ultimately, the results of these comparisons are used to re-evaluate risk associated with the selected remedies and to determine the overall effectiveness of the remedies. In addition, comparisons between the data collected from 1997 through 1999 during the initial Five-Year Review and subsequent data collected through 2005 will also be made where appropriate. A summary of data collected from 1997 through 2005 and baseline data are presented in Table 6-7, Table 6-8, and Table 6-9.

6.3.3.2 Statistical Review

6.3.3.2.1 Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12)

Freon 12 was detected at only one site (NRF-1), and was consistently above the reporting limit at only one sample location (MW1-4), at a maximum concentration of 43 parts per billion on a volumetric basis (ppbv) or 212.2 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). This maximum concentration, detected in June 2001, exceeds the baseline concentration of 5.3 ppbv ($26.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$); however, the levels detected since June 2001 are less than the maximum level. Freon 12 was detected only twice above the reporting limit at MW1-3, at a maximum concentration of 5.1 ppbv ($25.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), in December 2001. Freon 12 was not detected at any of the three landfill areas during the Track 2 Investigations. However, the concentrations observed recently are relatively low in comparison with other halogenated organic compounds detected at these three landfill areas.

6.3.3.2.2 Trichlorofluoromethane (Freon 11)

Freon 11 was detected at all three sites. Freon 11 was detected fairly consistently above the reporting limit at NRF-1 at sample locations MW1-3, MW1-4, and at both replacement probe locations (MW1-1, MW1-2). During the 1997-2005 sampling period, the overall maximum concentration detected at NRF-1 was 7.1 ppbv ($39.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW1-3 in 2000. This level is less than the baseline concentration of 8.5 ppbv ($47.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

Freon 11 was detected at all four sample locations at NRF-51 fairly consistently above the reporting limit. During the 1997-2005 sampling period, Freon 11 was detected at NRF-51 at an overall maximum concentration of 15 ppbv ($84 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW51-2 in 1997.

However, the overall maximum Freon-11 concentration for the 2000-2005 sampling period was 12 ppbv ($67.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected in 2000. Both of these concentrations are less than the baseline concentration of 16 ppbv ($89.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

At NRF-53, Freon 11 has been detected occasionally above the reporting limit only at locations MW53-2 and MW53-4. During the 2000-2005 sampling period, Freon-11 was detected below the reporting limit but above the method detection limit at the remaining NRF-53 locations. At NRF-53, the maximum concentration detected was 3.5 ppbv ($19.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at MW53-2, which is less than the baseline concentration of 6.7 ppbv ($37.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

The overall maximum concentration detected at all three sites during the 2000-2005 sampling period was 12 ppbv ($67.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which is just above the maximum concentration of 10 ppbv ($56.1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected during the Track 2 Investigation but below the baseline concentration of 16 ppbv ($89.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). These concentrations are low in comparison with other halogenated organic compounds detected at the three landfill areas.

6.3.3.2.3 1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (Freon 113)

Freon 113 was only detected at NRF-1 and at only one sample location, MW1-4. The overall maximum concentration of 3.9 ppbv ($29.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) was detected in 1999. The overall maximum Freon 113 concentration for the 2000-2005 sampling period was 3.5 ppbv ($26.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected in 2000. Both of these levels were greater than the baseline concentration of 2.2 ppbv ($16.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), but less than the maximum concentration of 5.3 ppbv ($40.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected during the Track 2 Investigation. For the 2002-2005 period, most of the levels detected were below the reporting limit.

6.3.3.2.4 Chloroform

Chloroform was consistently detected at NRF-1 and NRF-51. Chloroform was not detected at NRF-53 above the reporting limit. During the 1997 through 2005 sampling period, chloroform was mainly detected at sample locations MW1-1 (replacement probe location) and MW1-3 at NRF-1. Chloroform was detected at maximum concentrations of 7.6 ppbv ($37.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at the replacement probe location MW1-1 (from data available after construction in 2003) and 5.3 ppbv ($25.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at MW1-3. During the 1997 through 2005 sampling period, chloroform was only detected seven times above the reporting limit at MW1-4 at a maximum concentration of 4.7 ppbv ($22.9 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

Chloroform was detected above the reporting limit at NRF-51 at three out of four sample locations. Chloroform was detected above the reporting limit only four times at both MW51-1 and MW51-4 during the 1997-2005 sampling period. During the other sampling quarters, chloroform was typically detected at levels below the reporting limit but above the method detection limit. Chloroform was detected fairly consistently at sample location MW51-2 above the reporting limit during 1997-2002. From 2003-2005 most of the levels detected were below the reporting limit. The overall maximum concentration detected at NRF-51 was 2.9 ppbv ($14.1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW51-2 in 1997. This level was slightly greater than the baseline concentration of 2.3 ppbv ($11.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for this location.

The overall maximum chloroform concentration detected for all sites during this sampling period was 7.6 ppbv ($37.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which is less than the overall maximum concentration of 19 ppbv ($92.6 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected during the Track 2 Investigation.

Table 6-7 Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-1

Site	Sample Location	Statistical Parameter	Freon 12		Freon 11		Freon 113		Chloroform		1.1.1 Trichloroethane		Tetrachloroethylene		Trichloroethylene	
			(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3
Overall Maximum Track 2 Data			ND	ND	10.0	56.1	5.3	40.5	19.0	92.6	83.0	452.0	1400.0	9477.1	16.0	85.8
NRF 1	MW1 1	Baseline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	<2.2	<12.1	ND	ND	5.7	27.8	ND	ND	7.0	47.4	202.2	1084.6
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	0.4	2.0	ND	ND	1.1	5.4	ND	ND	5.7	38.7	44.7	239.5
		Maximum	ND	ND	2.6	14.6	ND	ND	7.6	37.0	ND	ND	20.0	135.4	250.0	1340.8
		Minimum	ND	ND	1.5**	8.4**	ND	ND	4.3	21.0	ND	ND	ND	ND	130.0	697.2
		Confidence	ND	ND	0.2	1.1	ND	ND	0.6	2.9	ND	ND	3.1	21.1	24.3	130.2
NRF 1	MW1 2	Baseline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	2.9	16.1	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	5.2	35.0	ND	ND
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	0.3	1.5	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	2.5	16.8	ND	ND
		Maximum	ND	ND	3.4	19.1	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	11.0	74.5	ND	ND
		Minimum	ND	ND	2.4	13.5	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	2.1	14.2	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	0.1	0.8	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.4	9.1	ND	ND
NRF 1	MW1 3	Baseline	ND	ND	8.5	47.7	ND	ND	4	19.5	ND	ND	580	3926.2	29	155.5
		Mean	<<	<<	<3.8	<21.6	ND	ND	<2.6	<12.6	<2.2	<12.1	376.4	2547.7	20.8	111.3
		Std Dev.	<<	<<	1.8	9.9	ND	ND	1.1	5.6	1.0	5.3	117.1	792.9	4.8	25.7
		Maximum	5.1	25.2	7.1*	39.8*	ND	ND	5.3	25.8	4.0	21.8	616.0	4169.9	30.0	160.9
		Minimum	ND	ND	1.4**	7.9**	ND	ND	0.9**	4.4**	ND	ND	120	812.3	9.2	49.3
		Confidence	<<	<<	1	5.4	ND	ND	0.6	3.0	0.5	2.9	63.7	431.0	2.6	14.0
NRF 1	MW1 4	Baseline	5.3	26.2	1.7**	9.5**	2.2	16.8	ND	ND	ND	ND	120	812.3	2.9	15.6
		Mean	13.0	64.3	<2.1	<11.6	<1.9**	<14.3**	<<	<<	ND	ND	213.4	1444.5	<4.2	<22.3
		Std Dev.	10.0	49.5	0.9	5.1	1.1	8.2	<<	<<	ND	ND	80.8	546.9	1.3	6.8
		Maximum	43.0	212.2	4.3	24.1	3.9	29.8	4.7	22.9	ND	ND	360.0	2437.0	7.5	40.2
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	72.0	487.4	1.9**	10.2**
		Confidence	5.5	26.9	0.5	2.8	0.6	4.4	<<	<<	ND	ND	43.9	297.3	0.7	3.7

** = Estimated quantities, * = Excludes Baseline Data, ND = Not Detected at or above the reporting limit
< = Mean includes estimated values below the Reporting Limit, << = Most values below Reporting Limit thus no calculations were performed

Table 6-8 Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-51

Site	Sample Location	Statistical Parameter	Freon 12		Freon 11		Freon 113		Chloroform		1,1,1 Trichloroethane		Tetrachloroethylene		Trichloroethylene	
			(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3
Overall Maximum Track 2 Data			ND	ND	10.0	56.1	5.3	40.5	19.0	92.6	83.0	452.0	1400.0	9477.1	16.0	85.8
NRF 51	MW51 1	Baseline	ND	ND	15	84.1	ND	ND	2.7	13.2	6.3	34.3	22	148.9	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	7.5	42.0	ND	ND	<1.3**	<6.1**	<3.3	<17.8	14.6	98.7	ND	ND
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	3.4	19.1	ND	ND	0.7	3.6	1.5	8.4	5.6	37.8	ND	ND
		Maximum	ND	ND	14*	78.5*	ND	ND	2.7	13.2	7.8	42.5	29.0	196.3	ND	ND
		Minimum	ND	ND	2.8	15.7	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.0**	5.4**	6.8	46.0	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	1.9	10.4	ND	ND	0.4	1.94	0.8	4.5	3.0	20.6	ND	ND
NRF 51	MW51 2	Baseline	ND	ND	16	89.7	ND	ND	2.3	11.2	6.6	35.9	23	155.7	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	<7.8	<43.5	ND	ND	<1.8**	<9.0**	<3.8	<20.9	14.9	100.8	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	3.5	19.7	ND	ND	0.7	3.3	1.6	8.9	4.7	31.8	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	15*	84.1*	ND	ND	2.9	14.1	8.4	45.7	23.0	155.7	10	53.6
		Minimum	ND	ND	1.7**	9.5**	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.0**	5.4**	3.2	21.7	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	1.9	10.7	ND	ND	0.4	1.80	0.9	4.9	2.6	17.3	<<	<<
NRF 51	MW51 3	Baseline	ND	ND	13	72.9	ND	ND	ND	ND	4.8	26.1	19	128.6	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	4.7	26.1	ND	ND	ND	ND	<2.0	<11.0	<9.9	<66.7	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	2.9	16.2	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.2	6.7	4.5	30.7	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	11*	61.7*	ND	ND	ND	ND	5.7	31.0	21	142.2	4	21.5
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	1.6	8.8	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.7	3.7	2.5	16.7	<<	<<
NRF 51	MW51 4	Baseline	ND	ND	16	89.7	ND	ND	2.6	12.7	6	32.7	26	176.0	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	<6.3	<35.1	ND	ND	<1.2**	<5.8**	<2.8	<15.0	13.5	91.4	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	3.4	18.9	ND	ND	0.7	3.5	1.5	8.4	5.4	36.4	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	14*	78.5*	ND	ND	2.6	12.7	7.0	38.1	24*	162.5*	94	504.1
		Minimum	ND	ND	1.3**	7.3**	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	1.8	10.3	ND	ND	0.4	1.91	0.8	4.6	2.9	19.8	<<	<<

** = Estimated quantities, * = Excludes Baseline Data, ND = Not Detected at or above the reporting limit
< = Mean includes estimated values below the Reporting Limit, << = Most values below Reporting Limit thus no calculations were performed

Table 6-9 Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-53

Site	Sample Location	Statistical Parameter	Freon 12		Freon 11		Freon 113		Chloroform		1,1,1 Trichloroethane		Tetrachloroethylene		Trichloroethylene	
			(ppbv)	(g/m3)	(ppbv)	(g/m3)	(ppbv)	(g/m3)	(ppbv)	(g/m3)	(ppbv)	(g/m3)	(ppbv)	(g/m3)	(ppbv)	(g/m3)
Overall Maximum Track 2 Data			ND	ND	10.0	56.1	5.3	40.5	19.0	92.6	83.0	452.0	1400.0	9477.1	16.0	85.8
NRF 53	MW53 1	Baseline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	5.2	35.2	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	<2.0	<13.7	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	0.8	5.6	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	2.6	14.2	4.4*	29.8*	3.5	18.8
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.5**	3.4**	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	0.5	3.1	<<	<<
NRF 53	MW53 2	Baseline	ND	ND	6.7	37.6	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	24	162.5	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	<1.9**	<10.8**	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	<17.1	<115.8	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	1.0	5.9	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	5.2	35.1	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	3.5*	19.6*	ND	ND	ND	ND	2.1	11.4	27.0	182.8	2.3	12.3
		Minimum	ND	ND	0.8**	4.5**	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.1**	7.4**	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	0.6	3.2	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	2.8	19.1	<<	<<
NRF 53	MW53 3	Baseline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Maximum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
NRF 53	MW53 4	Baseline	ND	ND	2.1	11.8	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	3.6	24.4	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	<<	<<	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	<2.4	<15.9	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	<<	<<	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	1.1	7.4	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	2.2	12.3	ND	ND	ND	ND	4.6	25.1	5.1	34.5	6.5	34.9
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.7**	4.7**	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	<<	<<	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	0.6	4	<<	<<

** = Estimated quantities, ND = Not Detected at or above the reporting limit

* = Excludes Baseline Data

< = Mean includes estimated values below the Reporting Limit

<< = Most values below Reporting Limit thus no calculations were performed

Table 6-9 Soil Gas Data Summary for Site NRF-53 (Continued)

Site	Sample Location	Statistical Parameter	Freon 12		Freon 11		Freon 113		Chloroform		1,1,1 Trichloroethane		Tetrachloroethylene		Trichloroethylene	
			(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3	(ppbv)	g/m3
Overall Maximum Track 2 Data			ND	ND	10.0	56.1	5.3	40.5	19.0	92.6	83.0	452.0	1400.0	9477.1	16.0	85.8
NRF 53	MW53 5	Baseline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	6	40.6	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<2.7	<18.0	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.2	8.5	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	5.9*	39.9*	7.2	38.6
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.0**	6.8**	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.7	4.6	<<	<<
NRF 53	MW53 6	Baseline	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	9.9	67.0	ND	ND
		Mean	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	<5.4	<36.3	<<	<<
		Std Dev.	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	2.2	15.0	<<	<<
		Maximum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	29	157.9	11.0	74.5	45	241.4
		Minimum	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.9**	12.9**	ND	ND
		Confidence	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	<<	<<	1.2	8.1	<<	<<

** = Estimated quantities

ND = Not Detected at or above the reporting limit

* = Excludes Baseline Data

< = Mean includes estimated values below the Reporting Limit

<< = Most values below Reporting Limit thus no calculations were performed

6.3.3.2.5 1,1,1-Trichloroethane

1,1,1-Trichloroethane was consistently detected at NRF-1 at only one sample location, MW1-3. The maximum concentration for MW1-3 was 4.0 ppbv (21.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in 2000. During 2002-2005 most of the levels detected were below the reporting limit. 1,1,1-trichloroethane was not detected during the baseline sampling evolution.

1,1,1-Trichloroethane was consistently detected at NRF-51 at all sample locations. The maximum concentration for this site was 8.4 ppbv (45.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected at MW51-2 in 1997. This level is greater than the baseline concentration of 6.6 ppbv (35.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). However, the maximum 1,1,1-trichloroethane concentration for the 2000-2005 sampling period was 5.7 ppbv (30 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected at MW51-2 in 2000.

1,1,1-Trichloroethane was detected only four times above the reporting limit at NRF-53, at sample locations MW53-1, MW53-2, MW53-4, and MW53-6. The overall maximum concentration for this chemical was 29 ppbv (157.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), detected at NRF-53 at sample location MW53-6 in 2001. However, this was the only occurrence at this location above the reporting limit. Also, since this was the only occurrence at this location, this value can be considered an outlier.

The highest maximum concentration (not including the 29 ppbv outlier in MW53-6) for all three sites was 8.4 ppbv. This concentration is less than the overall maximum concentration of 83 ppbv (452.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected during the Track 2 Investigation.

6.3.3.2.6 Tetrachloroethylene

Tetrachloroethylene was the most commonly detected constituent above the reporting limit at all three sites. Tetrachloroethylene was also detected at the highest concentration (excluding the outliers identified in other sections) at all three sites. The overall maximum concentration detected during the 1997-2005 sampling period was 616 ppbv (4170 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which occurred at NRF-1 at sample location MW1-3 in 1998. This level was slightly greater than the baseline concentration of 580 ppbv (3926 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected at MW1-3. However, the overall maximum tetrachloroethylene concentration for the 2000-2005 sampling period was 560 ppbv (3790.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in 2001, which is less than the baseline concentration. Regarding the rest of NRF-1, at sample location MW1-4 tetrachloroethylene was detected at a maximum concentration of 360 ppbv (2437 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in 2004. At sample location MW1-1, tetrachloroethylene was detected at a maximum concentration of 20 ppbv (135.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in 1999. However, at the replacement probe location for MW1-1 during the 2003-2005 sampling period, the maximum concentration detected was 8.8 ppbv (59.6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). At the other replacement probe location MW1-2, tetrachloroethylene was detected at a maximum concentration of 11 ppbv (74.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) during the 2003-2005 sampling period.

Tetrachloroethylene was consistently detected above the reporting limit at all four sample locations at NRF-51, and was at roughly consistent levels at all probe locations. The overall maximum concentration was detected in 1997 at 29 ppbv (196.3 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW51-1, followed by a concentration of 25 ppbv (169.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in 2000 and 2001 also at MW51-1. These values are slightly greater than the baseline concentration of 22 ppbv (148.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The maximum concentration detected at sample location MW51-2 was 23 ppbv (155.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The maximum concentration detected at sample location MW51-3 was 21 ppbv (142.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), and at sample location MW51-4 it was 24 ppbv (162.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

Tetrachloroethylene was fairly consistently detected above the reporting limit at NRF-53 at five out of six sample locations. The overall maximum concentration detected at NRF-53 during this sampling period was 27 ppbv (182.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW53-2 in 2002. This level was only slightly greater than the baseline concentration of 24 ppbv (162.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for this sample location. About half of the sample results at sample location MW53-1 were above the reporting limit, with a maximum concentration of 4.4 ppbv (29.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in 2003. Over half of the sample results for sample location MW53-4 were above the reporting limit, where the maximum concentration was 5.1 ppbv (34.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The maximum concentration detected at sample location MW53-5 was 5.9 ppbv (39.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The maximum concentration detected at sample location MW53-6 was 11 ppbv (74.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

The overall maximum tetrachloroethylene concentration detected during this sampling period was 616 ppbv (4170 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which is less than the overall maximum concentration of 1400 ppbv (9477 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected during the Track 2 Investigation.

6.3.3.2.7 Trichloroethylene

Trichloroethylene was detected predominately at NRF-1 and only occasionally at NRF-51 and NRF-53. Trichloroethylene was detected at an overall maximum concentration of 250 ppbv (1341 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at the replacement sample probe location MW1-1 at NRF-1 in 2004 and again in 2005 (probe replaced in 2003). Trichloroethylene was also detected at sample location MW1-3 at a maximum concentration of 30 ppbv (160.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and at sample location MW1-4 at a maximum concentration of 7.5 ppbv (40.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

At NRF-51, trichloroethylene was detected only twice at sample probe location MW51-4 and once at sample probe locations MW51-2 and MW51-3 at or above the reporting limit. The maximum concentration detected at NRF-51 was 94.0 ppbv (504.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW51-4. Since the concentration of 94.0 ppbv (504.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected at MW51-4 is significantly greater than the concentration of 2 ppbv (10.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected for the other occurrence, the higher value appears to be an outlier.

At NRF-53, trichloroethylene was detected only once at all sample probe locations at or above the reporting limit with the exception of MW53-3 where trichloroethylene was not detected. The maximum concentration detected at NRF-53 was 45.0 ppbv (241.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) at sample location MW53-6. Since the concentration of 45.0 ppbv (241.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected at MW53-6 is only a single occurrence and significantly greater than the levels detected at the other locations, the concentration of 45.0 ppbv (241.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) appears to be an outlier.

Trichloroethylene is a natural degradation product of tetrachloroethylene. The overall maximum trichloroethylene concentration detected during this sampling period was 250 ppbv (1341 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which is greater than the overall maximum concentration of 16 ppbv (86 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) detected during the Track 2 Investigation. However, the concentrations of trichloroethylene are considered low in comparison with tetrachloroethylene detected at all three landfill areas.

6.3.3.3 Trend Analysis

The baseline and 1997-2005 analytical data were plotted as concentration versus sample collection date to evaluate any specific patterns, trends, or anomalies. The graphical representation of the data is included in Appendix C. Trends were established by analyzing the concentration of constituents over the entire sample collection period (1997-2005). The analysis of the trends was a qualitative assessment used to identify acceptable trends (stable or decreasing) or future potential problems (increasing).

With reference to specific patterns in the graphical representation of the soil gas data, coincident peaks or dips may be attributed to one or more of the following factors: seasonal events (i.e., changes in precipitation or increased infiltration of water from snowmelt), effects of water infiltration within the periphery of the cover on contaminant migration, significant variations in barometric pressure, chemical-specific characteristics affecting migration patterns, or attainment of a new equilibrium within the contaminant/containment system. In order to explain the dissimilarity in trends between NRF-1 soil gas data and data from the other two sites, some of the factors that will be explored in this section, specific to NRF-1, are the attainment of a new equilibrium, infiltration of water within the periphery of the cover, and contaminant migration.

With reference to the graphical representation of the data for NRF-1, the data for sample location MW1-3 exhibit a fairly steady decreasing trend during the 1997 through 2005 sampling period for all constituents in general. Sample location MW1-4 exhibited an increasing trend for tetrachloroethylene and to a lesser extent trichloroethylene. For this location, Freon 12 initially exhibited an increasing trend from 1997 through 2002 but now appears to be stabilizing. However, Freon 11 and Freon 113 exhibited a decreasing trend (these two constituents exhibited an increasing trend in the previous Five-Year Review). The limited data for trichloroethene, Freon 11, and chloroform from December 2003 through December 2005 for the new replacement soil gas probe MW1-1 (replaced in 2003) appear to exhibit a generally flat to a decreasing trend. The combined tetrachloroethylene data for the original and replacement soil gas probe MW1-1 appear to exhibit an overall decreasing trend. The limited data available for replacement soil gas probe MW1-2 (replaced in 2003) appear to exhibit an increasing trend for tetrachloroethylene and a slight decreasing trend for Freon 11. NRF-1 is the only site that experienced an overall increasing trend for tetrachloroethylene and trichloroethylene at some locations during the 1997 through 2005 sampling period.

At NRF-1, a perched water zone that appeared briefly in the region of sample location MW1-4 may have had an impact on the data. The perched water was a result of standing water (see Section 5.2.1.6) adjacent to the cover (not related to the cover itself). The last observation of such an occurrence was in 2002. Percolating water may have laterally entered the waste layer from the periphery of the cover. Percolating water from natural precipitation may acquire soluble organic components that have been immobilized by adsorption in the soil or that are contained by the waste by processes of desorption and/or dissolution. These organic compounds can be transported a certain distance away from the original source and then become immobilized again (Everett, 1984); the organic compounds can then evaporate and become a new source for soil gases or supplement an existing source.

The depth to the top of the basalt in the general area of NRF-1 appears to increase from northeast to southwest along the southern portion of NRF-1. Thus, contaminants within the waste layer, if mobilized, could migrate toward MW1-4. From historical reviews of documents, photos, and old drawings, the bulk of the waste is located on the southern half of NRF-1 (just to the northwest of MW1-3, which is the closest of the probes to the waste). Because of the location of the bulk of the waste and the subsurface features, it is possible for some migration to occur in the direction of MW1-4. The above discussion would explain the increasing trends in tetrachloroethylene and trichloroethylene at this location. However, the combined chart for tetrachloroethylene for NRF-1 in Appendix C indicates that the tetrachloroethylene concentrations at MW1-3 (where a decreasing trend is exhibited) and MW1-4 (where an increasing trend is exhibited) have been essentially equal over the past two years (possibly having attained equilibrium). With regard to trichloroethylene, the concentration at MW1-4 is significantly lower than at sample locations MW1-1 and MW1-3.

The graphical representation of the data in Appendix C for all the constituents detected at NRF-51, in general, exhibit similar patterns amongst the probes. The similarities are in the general shape of the curves and the occurrences of the peaks and valleys for each constituent at each sample location. For the 1997 through 2005 sampling period at NRF-51, the data for all constituents detected exhibit a decreasing trend in concentration over time.

The graphical representation of the data in Appendix C for the two constituents detected (Freon 11 and tetrachloroethylene) at NRF-53 exhibit a pattern of change in concentration over time for each of the individual soil gas locations similar to that observed at NRF-51. At NRF-53, the data exhibit an overall decreasing trend with the exception of MW53-4, where the data exhibit a flat to slight increasing trend (refer to the graphical representation of the data in Appendix C).

In summary, NRF-51 and NRF-53 appear to exhibit either stable or decreasing trends (both indicating that the covers are functioning as designed). On occasion, slightly increasing trends at NRF-1 (indicating possible limited contaminant migration) were observed. This will be tracked by the ongoing monitoring program.

6.3.3.4 Comparison to Groundwater Data

Of the VOCs detected under the current soil gas and groundwater monitoring programs, only chloroform and tetrachloroethylene were detected under both monitoring programs. Organic compounds detected in groundwater samples at some of the monitoring well locations occurred at only trace levels, indicating that organic compounds are not significantly migrating from the landfill sites at this time.

6.3.4 Soil Moisture Monitoring

6.3.4.1 Soil Moisture Monitoring Results

Soil moisture measurements were initiated in 2005. A discussion of the soil moisture data from measurements obtained from neutron access tubes located at the OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites is presented below.

6.3.4.2 Analysis of Soil Moisture Data

Soil moisture content within the engineered cover at each site is estimated by obtaining measurements from a neutron probe via access tubes that were installed on the three engineered cover areas during their construction in 2004. The soil moisture data is used to assess the effectiveness of the covers in mitigating water infiltration to the contaminant zone. This is accomplished by evaluating the covers' water storage capacity; specifically, by monitoring the depth of the wetting front attributed to percolating water from precipitation. The soil moisture measurement data raw counts, obtained from the neutron probe instrumentation, have been converted to volumetric water content in percent.

For 2005, soil moisture measurements were taken in June through October. The soil moisture data obtained during this period are presented in graphs in Figure 6-4. May 2005 was the wettest month of the year; therefore, the soil moisture measurements taken in June should reflect the effects of precipitation that occurred in May and earlier (provided all of the moisture within each cover is due to precipitation and not residual moisture from the cover construction process). Little to no precipitation fell during July and August. Therefore, the soil moisture measurements in September reflect the effects of this dry period (indicated by a decrease in moisture content within the cover). Slightly above normal precipitation occurred during

September and October. Soil moisture measurements taken in October show the effects of entering into a wet period, after most of the vegetation on the covers had dried out. The graphs show that soil moisture content (measured in percent) decreased from June to September and increased slightly in October for all monitoring probes. The graphs also show that percolating water from precipitation did not migrate beyond the subsurface layer (as evidenced by low moisture content below 1.4 meters or 4.5 feet), and therefore did not migrate into the contaminant layer.

Data in future years will further refine any trends regarding moisture penetration.

6.4 Review of ARARs

The selected remedies for the OU 8-05/06 and 8-08 Sites were designed to meet substantive aspects of the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) identified in the ROD. The following are the pertinent ARARs that were defined for the selected remedies, and which were reviewed for changes that could affect protectiveness:

- 40 CFR 61.92, NESHAPS for Emissions of Radionuclides Other than Radon, (Applicable)
- IDAPA 58.01.01.585 & .586, Toxic Air Pollutants, Non-Carcinogenic and Carcinogenic, (Applicable to work where potential release of these substances exists)
- IDAPA 58.01.11.200.01(a), Idaho Groundwater Quality Standards, (Relevant and Appropriate)
- IDAPA 58.01.05.006.01(40 CFR 262.1), Standards Applicable to Generators of Hazardous Waste, (Applicable to work generating hazardous waste)
- IDAPA 58.01.05.005 (40 CFR 261), Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste, (Applicable to work generating hazardous waste)
- IDAPA 58.01.05.011 (40 CFR 268.7, .9, .40, .45, .48) Land Disposal Restrictions, (Applicable to work generating hazardous waste)
- IDAPA 58.01.01.651, Rules for Control of Fugitive Dust, (Applicable)
- IDAPA 58.01.05.008 (40 CFR 264.309(a), 40 CFR 264.310(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), and .310.(b)(1)(4)(5)(6)), Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage and Disposal Facilities (Surveying, Closure, and Post Closure Care for Landfills), Relevant and Appropriate
- 40 CFR 300.440, Procedures for Planning and Implementing Off-site Response Actions (Applicable to work that involves off-site transfer of CERCLA waste)
- 16 USC 470, National Historic Preservation, (Applicable to any site where cultural, historical artifacts are found)

These ARARs have not become more stringent since the signing of the ROD.

NRF Five-Year Review
December 2006




Figure 6-4 Soil Moisture Curves for OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites

6.5 Risk Information Review

Based on the EPA five-year review guidance, risk parameters (toxicity values) used in the risk assessment at the time of the remedy selection should be reviewed for changes to determine whether the selected remedy is still protective. Therefore, an evaluation of the toxicity data was conducted to see whether any changes had occurred and whether the changes were significant to affect the remedy selection.

Toxicity values (slope factors and reference doses) were reviewed for any updated values that may have been published since the time the remedy selection was implemented. The original toxicity values were compared to the newest values available from approved sources (e.g., Integrated Risk Information System, the Health Effects Assessment Summary Table).

For this review, the toxicity data for all of the contaminants of concern were evaluated. There were significant changes in toxicity data for some of the contaminants of concern. However, only the contaminants of concern that were the primary risk drivers for remedial actions are discussed since the other contaminants of concern (e.g., plutonium-238, uranium-235, etc.) were found in insignificant quantities or not detected during site cleanup operations. These primary contaminants included cesium-137 and strontium-90, the primary radionuclides of concern for OU 8-08 sites, and tetrachloroethylene (found in much greater concentrations and in more locations than other contaminants) for the inactive landfill areas.

For strontium-90, there is currently a published external exposure slope factor that was not available for the original risk assessment. However, strontium-90 was remediated above the 10-foot depth where contaminated soil was excavated and was placed at a site where an engineered containment structure was constructed preventing external exposure to strontium-90. For cesium-137, the latest inhalation and external exposure slope factors decreased compared to the slope factors used in the original risk calculations; however, the soil ingestion slope factor increased slightly compared to the one used in the original risk calculations (from $3.16\text{E-}11$ to $4.33\text{E-}11$ Risk/pCi). The risk-based soil concentration for the soil ingestion pathway was 24,860 pCi/g (WEC, 1998). The slight increase in the slope factor would not substantially reduce the soil ingestion risk-based concentration and, since soil was remediated to below 16.7 pCi/g (within the upper 10 feet of soil) due to the external exposure pathway, this would have no impact on remedy protection. For tetrachloroethylene, latest oral and inhalation slope factors increased by about one order of magnitude compared to the ones used in the original risk calculations. However, the sources of tetrachloroethylene reside under three engineered containment structures constructed over the three inactive landfill areas, which prevents potential exposure to this contaminant. Therefore, these changes to the toxicity values would not significantly impact the protectiveness of the remedy.

7.0 Data Assessment

7.1 Conditions External to the Remedy

Certain conditions external to a selected remedy can have a far-reaching influence on the applicability and the ultimate success of a chosen remedy. These conditions are discussed below.

7.1.1 Changes in Land Use or Projected Land Use

NRF does not anticipate that the land area within WAG 8 will be subject to leasing or property transfer through at least the year 2095 (100 years from initial risk assessments performed at NRF).

ICs are required as long as land use or access restrictions are necessary to maintain protection of human health and the environment. The adequacy of, and need for, the continued use of ICs for each controlled area will be evaluated during the annual inspections and the Five-Year Review process. ICs will not be changed or terminated unless NR/IBO, IDEQ, and EPA have concurred.

7.1.2 New Contaminants, Sources, or Pathway

New contaminants have not been observed in groundwater since the 2001 Five-Year Review.

Climatic changes (e.g., more or less precipitation) and changes in local discharge contribute to changing groundwater flow paths beneath NRF. For example, reduced flow to the IWD may be contributing to a reduction in elevation of a local groundwater high east of NRF, which was identified in past hydrogeological investigations. These changes could potentially impact groundwater flow paths; however, if any of these changes lead to new contaminant pathways, the current groundwater monitoring network should be capable of detecting them.

7.2 Remedy Implementation and System Operations

7.2.1 Access and Institutional Controls

Access to NRF remedial action areas is restricted from the general public as enforced by the INL security program (e.g., badges required for site access). Furthermore, NRF security personnel monitor access within the NRF fence and monitor actions in nearby areas outside the fence. A number of the NRF CERCLA sites, which are located both inside and outside the NRF fenced compound, are contained within specific fenced areas with locked gates. Other sites are marked by warning signs. Excavation controls are enforced by use of formal excavation permits which are required before any excavation at NRF may begin. These permits require the review and formal approval of Environmental Personnel prior to performing the excavation.

ICs used at NRF preserve the underlying assumptions of RI/FSs developed for WAG 8 that will protect human health and the environment. The ICs are selected remedies for the NFA Sites, and are part of the selected remedies for the NRF Inactive Landfill Areas and the RA Sites. ICs are reviewed annually and the results of the reviews are documented in the ICMR. Table 7-1 summarizes ICs applicable to the NRF CERCLA sites. Institutional Controls are discussed in more detail in Attachment E to the NRF OU 8-08 Remedial Action Report.

Table 7-1 Summary of Institutional Controls at NRF

CERCLA Sites					
Site	Description	Objectives	Exposure Threat	Land Restrictions	Controls
Group 1 (Inactive Landfill Areas)					
NRF 1	Field Area North of S1W	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	VOC, metal leachate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 51	West Refuge Pit #4	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	VOC, metal leachate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 53	East Refuge Pit and Trenching Area	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	VOC, metal leachate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
Group 2 (No Further Action Sites)					
NRF 2	Old Ditch Surge Pond	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 16	Radiography Building Collection Tank Area	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing fence also within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Inspections
NRF 18A	S1W Spray Pond #1 and Portions of the Fire Protection System	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Elevated chromium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area • Signs • Excavation Controls • Inspections
NRF 22	A1W Painting Locker French Drain	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Lead, mercury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area also Beneath Existing Structure • Excavation Controls • Inspections
NRF 23	Sewage Lagoons	Prevent unauthorized excavation	VOC, metals, low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Fencing • Signs • Excavation Controls

Table 7-1 Summary of Institutional Controls at NRF

CERCLA Sites					
Site	Description	Objectives	Exposure Threat	Land Restrictions	Controls
Group 2 (No Further Action Sites) - Continued					
NRF 42	Old Sewage Effluent Ponds	Prevent unauthorized excavation	VOC, metals, low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excavation Controls Signs Inspections
NRF 43	Seepage Basin Pumpout Area	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excavation Controls Signs Inspections
NRF 61	Old Radioactive Materials Storage and Laydown Area	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excavation Controls Signs Inspections
NRF 66	Hot Storage Pit	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within NRF Fenced Area Signs Excavation Controls Inspections
NRF 81	A1W Processing Building Area Soil	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within NRF Fenced Area Excavation Controls Signs Inspections
NRF 82	Evaporator Bottoms Tank Release	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within NRF Fenced Area Excavation Controls Signs Inspections
NRF 83	ECF Hot Cells Release Area	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within NRF Fenced Area Excavation Controls Inspections
Group 3 (Remediated Radiological Sites)					
NRF 11	S1W Tile Drainfield and L Shaped Sump	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within NRF Fenced Area Excavation Controls Signs Inspections
NRF 12A	Underground Piping to Leaching Pit	Prevent unauthorized	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Lease Restriction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portion within NRF Fenced Area Excavation Controls

Table 7-1 Summary of Institutional Controls at NRF

CERCLA Sites					
Site	Description	Objectives	Exposure Threat	Land Restrictions	Controls
		excavation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signs • Inspections
Group 3 (Remediated Radiological Sites) – Continued					
NRF 14	Underground Piping to Leaching Bed	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 17	S1W Retention Basin	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 19	Underground piping to A1W Leaching Bed	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 21A	Underground piping to Old Sewage Basin	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 21B	Sludge Drying Bed	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections
NRF 80	A1W/S1W Radioactive Line near Butler Building 19	Prevent unauthorized excavation	Low-level radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within NRF Fenced Area • Excavation Controls • Signs • Inspections

Table 7-1. Summary of Institutional Controls at NRF (continued)

CERCLA Sites					
Site	Description	Objectives	Exposure Threat	Land Restrictions	Controls
Group 4 (8-08 Engineered Cover Sites)					
NRF 12B	S1W Leaching Pit	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	Radioactivity, lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions • Radiologically Controlled Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Engineered Cover • Signs • Inspections
NRF 14	S1W Leaching Beds	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	Radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions • Radiologically Controlled Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Engineered Cover • Signs • Inspections
NRF 19	A1W Leaching Bed	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	Radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions • Radiologically Controlled Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Engineered Cover • Signs • Inspections
NRF 21A	Old Sewage Basin	Prevent unauthorized access and excavation	Radioactivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial • Lease Restriction • Transfer Restrictions • Radiologically Controlled Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing • Excavation Controls • Engineered Cover • Signs • Inspections

7.2.2 Remedy Performance

7.2.2.1 Landfill Covers

The performance of the landfill covers was indirectly measured in several ways. First, visual inspections confirmed the physical integrity of the covers. These inspections were intended to identify the following problems: occurrence of soil erosion, establishment of adequate and appropriate vegetative cover, penetration of the cover by various burrowing animals, or formation of cracks in the cover due to temperature extremes, drought, or subsidence. The results of past inspections showed that the integrity of the landfills was maintained, thus indicating that the covers were performing as designed. Minor deficiencies are occasionally noted, as identified in ICMRs, such as inadequate vegetative cover at NRF-1, and rodent holes and/or anthills at all three sites. Deficiencies related to the landfill covers are addressed in more detail in Section 8.2.

The second measure of performance was gauged by results of surface soil gas monitoring. If the landfill covers are working as designed, then little or no organic vapors will be detected at the surface of the landfill covers. A number of soil gas surface emissions surveys have been performed since the construction of the landfill covers. No VOCs have been detected, thereby indicating the landfill covers are performing as designed.

Finally, several other indirect indicators were used to assess the performance of landfill covers. The soil gas monitoring probes measure the concentration of soil gas at the bedrock interface adjacent to the covers. The concentrations of soil gas constituents are essentially stable in all soil gas monitoring probes. To date, no unusual levels of organic compounds have been detected in soil gas probes, and no appreciable concentrations of organic compounds have been detected in groundwater samples. Based on survey, soil gas and groundwater monitoring results contained in the annual ICMRs, this Review concludes that the landfill covers are functioning as designed.

7.2.2.2 Groundwater Monitoring System

Four aspects of the groundwater monitoring system are assessed to determine its overall performance. These aspects include fitness of the wells, monitoring network fitness, constituents monitored, and sampling frequency. The data collected by the NRF groundwater monitoring program are used to assess remedy performance of all remedial actions at NRF and insure that these remedies remain protective of human health and the environment.

7.2.2.2.1 Well Fitness

NRF has 13 wells in its groundwater monitoring network. Nine of these wells have been constructed within the past 20 years. Installation of these newer wells incorporated modern drilling and construction techniques. They were built with environmentally inert materials and were designed to target the upper 50 feet of the aquifer. The other four wells are older (i.e., constructed between 1950 and 1980) and still provide usable data; however, they are not optimally constructed for specifically monitoring the upper 50 feet of the aquifer (wells USGS-12, -97, -98, and -99). Additionally, problems such as inadequate grouting and carbon steel in contact with aquifer water may be encountered. As previously discussed, well USGS-98 was refurbished in 2005, which addressed some of these problems.

Water samples from one well, NRF-13, contain higher than expected concentrations of chromium (and other metal constituents, e.g., aluminum, iron, and nickel). The causes for this are discussed in Appendix A.

Wells NRF-7 and NRF-13 can only sustain pumping rates of less than two gallons per minute, which is substantially less than other NRF wells which produce approximately 30 gallons per minute. Conditions present in wells NRF-7 and NRF-13 while collecting samples may promote entrainment of sediments, which may create anomalous results.

Well NRF-6 was refurbished in 2004. As noted previously, the problem with the well's motor appears to have been related to silting around the pump/motor assembly. As a result, this assembly was raised by five feet in the well when it was replaced. Although there currently is ample water over the pump intake, with falling water levels in the SRPA, care must be taken so that this well does not go dry in the future. Furthermore, additional care must be taken to ensure that any signs of future silting around the pump/motor assembly are noted and responded to as needed. Signs may include muddy purge water, over-ampage indications at the generator while running the motor, or abnormal or erratic sample results.

USGS-12 is located approximately three miles north of NRF (i.e., not ideally located in proximity to NRF), was constructed in 1950, and is cased with carbon steel to a depth of 563 feet. The total depth of the USGS-12 borehole was recorded at 692 feet; however geophysical logging information is only recorded to 564 feet. It is not clear whether the borehole was partially or completely back-filled 130 feet, or if logging was prematurely terminated. Information that was gathered during an INL site-wide well fitness survey indicated that the well was open from 585 to 692 feet or over a 107 foot interval. The submersible pump is located at 358 feet below land surface (bls). Hydrographs from the well indicate water level has varied from approximately 313 feet to 326 feet bls.

NRF routinely inspects the NRF wells and performs required maintenance. Since 2001, NRF has refurbished four wells. Currently, NRF plans to inspect and refurbish wells on a routine basis. This includes pulling well hardware from the well and observing its condition, and generally using a video camera to observe the condition of the well casing and screen. Refurbishment may include replacing worn or inoperative parts (e.g., riser pipe, pump, motor, etc.), pulling and cleaning well screens, adjusting pump intake depth, or deepening the well. The regulatory agencies will be notified whenever significant modifications appear appropriate, such as deepening wells or changing the intake depth.

7.2.2.2 Network Fitness

The locations of the Local Downgradient wells, NRF-8, -9, -10, -11, and -12, exclusive of USGS-102 (in place prior to construction of other wells), which are the core of the NRF groundwater monitoring network, were designed using computer based modeling. Groundwater results as well as hydrogeologic evidence collected over the past several years indicate these wells adequately and effectively monitor for potential groundwater contaminants. For example, these wells have detected contamination (below MCLs) in locations where it is logical to do so (e.g., low levels of tritium in NRF-10 and -11, which are downstream of OU 8-08 sites). Also, the results from the Regional Downgradient wells (USGS-97, -98, and -99) substantiate the results from the Local Downgradient wells (NRF-8, -9, -10, -11, -12, and USGS-102).

The upgradient groundwater quality relative to NRF is not well defined. This condition is unchanged since the ROD for the OU 8-08 sites. At NRF, upgradient water samples are

collected primarily from USGS-12, with additional data coming from NRF-7, a well not physically upgradient of the facility (although it has a geochemical signature consistent with upgradient (background) water). Water samples from USGS-12 may be collected from depths that are not reflective of background conditions at NRF. The mean concentrations for many constituents in NRF-7 are lower than those found in USGS-12. NRF has averaged NRF-7 data with the data collected from USGS-12, and has referred to this data as “Regional Upgradient” in the NRF Environmental Monitoring Report. Using the NRF-7 data (which is generally lower than USGS-12 data) is more conservative than using only the USGS-12 data since the mean concentration for “Regional Upgradient” data is lower. The likely effect of not having adequate upgradient groundwater information is to potentially overstate the impact that NRF operations may have had on the aquifer.

7.2.2.2.3 Adequacy of Monitored Constituents

The NRF groundwater monitoring system is designed to search for constituents that potentially could be released to the environment because of operations at NRF. This monitoring network also searches for constituents that are characteristic groundwater indicators (e.g., calcium and chloride) or provide valuable predictive data (e.g., tritium). All constituents that are believed to be potential contaminants to the environment or provide valuable predictive or characteristic data are currently monitored by NRF.

Based on groundwater monitoring results over the past five years, it is evident that the occurrence of organic compounds in the groundwater is a relatively rare occurrence. Total Organic Halogens (TOX) is an analytical method that detects gross halogenated substances in a sample. At NRF, it is used as a screening tool for the presence of organic compounds in the groundwater. Over the past five years, TOX results have been near the method detection limit in all wells, thus future collection of TOX may not be warranted.

7.2.2.2.4 Adequacy of Sampling Frequency

The current trimester sampling frequency meets and appears to exceed the level of groundwater monitoring required at NRF. All individual programmatic goals of accounting for short-term fluctuations in groundwater flow direction, short-term variations in local recharge, and longer-term trends due to known or unknown factors have likewise been met or exceeded. Furthermore, the current trimester sampling frequency is more than adequate in providing near-term data that can be used for assessing the effectiveness of the remedial actions completed in 2004 at the OU 8-08 RA Sites. Based on these observations, the current sampling frequency appears to exceed the NRF groundwater monitoring needs at this time. A decrease in sampling frequency from triannual to biannual would meet future monitoring needs.

7.2.2.3 Soil Gas Monitoring System

The current list of analytes and analytical methods used for the soil gas monitoring program includes all of the potential organic chemicals of concern, with adequate minimum detection levels.

7.2.2.4 No Further Action Sites

The primary remedy selected for the OU 8-08 NFA Sites is ICs. These controls are intended to prevent unauthorized intrusion and excavation and to control land use and transfer. Annual inspections are performed to ensure that conditions at the sites remain the same and to ensure

that ICs are effective. As discussed in Section 5.2, inspections provide evidence that the remedy is performing as intended.

7.2.2.5 Remedial Action Sites

The selected remedies (e.g., removal actions, construction of the covers) for the OU 8-08 RA Sites have only recently been completed and appear to be functioning as expected. Formal annual inspections have not yet been performed; however, pre-final and final inspections by the agencies were performed in 2004 and 2005. Based on analysis of the data presented in the OU 8-08 RA Report, inspections of the various sites, and groundwater monitoring results, the selected remedies for the RA Sites appear to meet performance standards.

Specific requirements to maintain cover integrity against erosion, and to monitor for the potential release of contaminants from the sites, are identified in the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan, the current revision of which is a part of the RA Report. The current revision of the Institutional Control Plan, which discusses ICs for limiting land use and access, is also part of the RA Report.

7.2.2.6 Operation and Maintenance Costs

7.2.2.6.1 Groundwater Monitoring Costs

Since the signing of both Record of Decisions for the NRF inactive landfill areas and the OU 8-08 sites, the groundwater monitoring system has consisted of thirteen wells, each sampled by the USGS four times per year between 1996 and 2002, then changed to three times per year in 2003. During each sampling period, one blank sample and one duplicate sample are collected and analyzed with the routine samples. Samples are analyzed by the contracted laboratories. Once received by NRF, sample results are sent to an independent contractor for data validation. At NRF, a representative coordinates the collection, analysis, validation, and interpretation of all groundwater samples. The breakdown of the actual costs from 2001 through 2005 associated with the groundwater monitor portion of the selected remedies for the inactive landfills and the OU 8-08 sites are summarized in Table 7-2. The total cost is higher (\$549,150) than the expected cost (\$521,000), which was based on the previous Five-Year review. This is due to the higher cost for the maintenance of three wells (about \$20,000 higher due to more extensive work and parts replacement) and a slight increase in the analytical costs (about \$8,000 higher due to the renegotiation of costs for contract renewal).

Time Period	Analysis Costs	Validation Costs	Maintenance	Yearly Total
2001	\$105,000	\$7,900	0	\$112,900 ¹
2002	\$110,000	\$7,900	\$8,800	\$126,700 ¹
2003	\$94,500	\$6,150	\$8,800	\$109,450 ²
2004	\$92,500	\$6,150	\$8,800	\$107,450 ²
2005	\$86,500	\$6,150	0	\$92,650 ²
Subtotal	\$488,500	\$34,250	\$26,400	
			Five Year Total	\$549,150

1-Based on a quarterly sampling schedule

2-Based on a trimesterly sampling schedule

7.2.2.6.2 Soil Gas Monitoring Costs

The specific O&M activities associated with soil gas monitoring of the three inactive landfill cover areas includes sampling a total of fourteen soil gas monitoring probes (13 probes prior to November 2003), analytical costs, data validation, and any maintenance costs. The soil gas monitoring probe locations are sampled on a quarterly basis. This includes samples from all of the soil gas monitoring probes, one duplicate, one field air blank, and one field equipment blank. The samples are sent off-site and analyzed by the contract laboratory. The analytical results are then submitted for data validation. After the results are validated, NRF evaluates the data for any problems and for trends. The breakdown of the costs from 2001 through 2005 associated with the soil gas monitoring tasks is tabulated in Table 7-3. The total cost (\$146,900) is higher than the expected cost (\$112,900), which was based on the previous Five-Year review. This is due to the replacement costs (listed under maintenance costs) for two soil gas monitoring probes in 2003 and a slight increase in data validation costs.

Time Period	Analysis Costs	Validation Costs	Maintenance	Yearly Total
2001	\$21,000	\$2,400	\$0	\$23,400
2002	\$21,000	\$2,400	\$0	\$23,400
2003	\$21,000	\$2,400	\$29,900	\$53,300
2004	\$21,000	\$2,400	\$0	\$23,400
2005	\$21,000	\$2,400	\$0	\$23,400
Subtotals	\$105,000	\$12,000	\$29,900	
			Five Year Total	\$146,900

7.2.2.6.3 Soil Moisture Monitoring Costs

The specific O&M activities associated with soil moisture monitoring of the three OU 8-08 engineered cover areas includes obtaining soil moisture measurements from a total of six access tubes and any maintenance costs. Soil moisture measurements are obtained by subcontractor personnel (currently S. M. Stoller Corp.) with coordination and observation by NRF personnel. The soil moisture measurements from these access tube locations are obtained up to 12 times per year from early spring through the fall. NRF personnel evaluate the data for any problems (e.g., water infiltrating below the engineered cover). 2005 was the first year soil moisture measurements have been obtained at an annual cost of \$4800. This cost is expected to remain the same over the next four years and may change after that when the contract is renegotiated.

7.2.2.7 Assessment Summary

In the EPA guidance for Five-Year Reviews, the EPA provided three questions to aid in assessing remedy performance. These questions and their answers are summarized in Table 7-4 below.

Table 7-4 Answers to Guidance Questions

Questions:	Location	Answer	Location	Answer	Location	Answer	Location	Answers:	
	Inactive Landfill Areas		No Further Action Sites		Remediated Radiological Sites		OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites		
A: Is the remedy functioning as intended by the decision documents?	NRF-1 NRF-51 NRF-53	Yes	NRF-2 NRF-16 NRF-18A NRF-22 NRF-23 NRF-42 NRF-43 NRF-61 NRF-66 NRF-81 NRF-82 NRF-83	Data reviews and site inspections indicate that the remedies are functioning as intended.	NRF-11 NRF-12A NRF-14 NRF-17 NRF-19 NRF-21A NRF-21B NRF-80	These remedies were performed in accordance with the Phase I Work Plan. Relevant data, ARARs presented in the OU 8-08 ROD, and site inspections (pre-final and final by the agencies) indicate that the remedies are functioning as intended, and thus protective of human health and the environment.	NRF-12B NRF-14 NRF-19 NRF-21A	These remedies were performed in accordance with the Phase II Work Plan. A review of the relevant data and ARARs presented in the OU 8-08 ROD, and site inspections (pre-final and final by the agencies) indicate that the remedies were constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Remedial Design, and that the remedies are protective of human health and the environment.	
B: Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and remedial action objectives (RAOs) used at the time of the remedy still valid?		Yes		Yes					Yes
C: Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?		No		No					No

8.0 Deficiencies

8.1 Overview

A review of prior site inspection results and data presented in the preceding sections shows only minor deficiencies associated with the NRF Inactive Landfills, NFA Sites, Remediated Radiological Sites, or OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites. The following sections summarize the identified deficiencies in greater detail.

8.2 Landfill Covers

The only deficiencies identified in the annual inspections included problems with sparse vegetation areas (including the presence of some weeds) and animal intrusion (anthills and holes caused by small rodents such as mice and voles). These deficiencies are considered minor. Areas that showed evidence of sparse vegetation were re-seeded in 2004, and are showing evidence of new growth. Animal intrusion is limited to the upper clean layers of the covers where a gravel layer is present for the purpose of preventing further intrusion into the covers. Therefore, these intrusions were not deep enough to expose buried contaminants. These deficiencies did not affect the integrity of the landfill covers.

8.3 Groundwater Monitoring Network

Over the past five years, several deficiencies were identified with the Groundwater Monitoring Network and wells. Most of the deficiencies were corrected shortly after their identification. The following list discusses current deficiencies.

- 1) The results for selected metal constituents from NRF-13 show an upward trend and periodically have been above Federal MCLs. Potential causes for these anomalies are being investigated.
- 2) Both NRF-13 and NRF-7 are low producing wells, which may promote poor and possibly unrepresentative sample quality.
- 3) The NRF-6 well has shown signs of active siltation as shown in March 2004 when the pump/motor was replaced.

8.4 Soil Gas Monitoring Probes

As discussed in Section 6.2.1.6, MW1-1 and MW1-2 were replaced in 2003. No further problems were encountered with these two probes. No problems were encountered with any of the other soil gas monitoring probes, with the exception of MW-1-4 in which water has been found on occasion. Data collection from this location has been unaffected by the water. The source of the water is believed to be related to seasonal precipitation. The NRF storm water system is being upgraded to allow for adequate drainage of storm water away from this probe location.

8.5 Soil Moisture Monitoring Probes

IDEQ and EPA performed a pre-final inspection of the OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Areas in 2004 and a final inspection in 2005. The pre-final inspection noted that the access tubes needed to be mounded with soil so that water would be shed radially away from

the access tubes, followed by seeding the soil mound. The soil mounding was performed during the latter part of 2004. The seeding of the mounds was performed in 2005. During the final inspection, IDEQ and EPA noted the deficiencies were corrected.

8.6 Deficiencies Summary

Table 8-1 includes a summary of deficiencies observed during this Five-Year Review and whether they affect current and/or future protectiveness.

Table 8 1 Summary of Deficiencies			
	Deficiency	Does this Deficiency Currently Affect Remedy Protectiveness?	Will this Deficiency Affect the Future Protectiveness of the Remedy?
Landfill Covers	Sparse vegetation at NRF-1	No	No
	Ant hills and evidence of small burrowing animals at all covers. Localized to near surface layers.	No	No, reseeding in 2004 appears successful
Groundwater Monitoring Network	Results from well NRF-13 are trending upward and have periodically tested above the Federal MCL	No, the elevated chromium is believed to be due to high levels of suspended sediments in water samples	No, evidence collected in the future is expected to continue to show that trends are due to non-anthropogenic sources
	NRF-13 and NRF-7 are low producing wells and may produce unrepresentative results	No	No, these wells do not appear to be impacted by the IWD (see Appendix A) and do not monitor sites that require remedies.
Groundwater Monitoring Network	Signs of active siltation are present in NRF-6	No	No, maintenance work has corrected the immediate problem. NRF will closely watch this well, NRF-6 does not monitor sites requiring remedies
	Upgradient water quality is not well defined at NRF	No, the conservative nature of the upgradient water quality currently used by NRF, leads to decisions that tend to be over protective	No, the upgradient monitoring data does not impact remedy effectiveness. Monitoring data is expected to continue to be conservative.
Soil Gas Monitoring Probes	Two probes were plugged and thus not operating correctly	No, these probes were replaced and are now working correctly	No, the soil gas probes are expected to function as designed in the future

9.0 Recommendations and Required Actions

9.1 Overview

The purpose of this section of the Five-Year Review is to evaluate the overall performance of the remedies, including the deficiencies discussed in Section 8.0, and make recommendations regarding what actions, if any, may be appropriate to correct a deficiency or to improve the overall effectiveness of remedies.

9.2 Landfill Covers

With regard to the OU 8-05/06 landfill covers, no immediate actions are recommended. The sparse growth areas at NRF-1 and the minor sparse area at NRF-51 were re-seeded and will continue to be monitored to ensure the new growth observed in the last inspection continues to flourish and fill in these areas. In addition, if adverse weather conditions interfere with natural germination and propagation of the vegetative cover at any of the landfill areas, NRF will take action as appropriate in accordance with the O&M Plan.

9.3 Groundwater Monitoring Network

Based on data presented in this review, specifically the relatively infrequent occurrence of organic compounds in the NRF Groundwater Monitoring Network, the collection of TOX no longer appears necessary. This Review proposes that analysis for TOX be discontinued at the beginning of 2007. Details supporting this proposed change will be incorporated as part of the 2006 ICMR.

Beginning in 2007, NRF will reduce the sampling frequency of all wells from three times per year to twice per year. Reducing sampling frequency should not affect NRF's ability to monitor potential changes to aquifer water quality. NRF will assess the effectiveness of the recently completed OU 8-08 remedial actions and propose future recommendations to the agencies as appropriate.

The analysis presented in Appendix A indicates that the probable cause for elevated metal constituents in NRF-13 is suspended solids; evidence does not preclude an impact by corrosion of well components. This impact, if present, is expected to be minor. Although DOE NR/IBO believes the probable cause of elevated metals in NRF-13 has been identified, NRF will continue to assess the elevated chromium in NRF-13 by taking the following specific actions:

- 1) NRF will continue to collect filtered and unfiltered samples from NRF-13 until a decision is made to discontinue.
- 2) The pump, motor, riser pipe, and measuring line will be pulled from NRF-13 and inspected for signs of corrosion or malfunction. This work has been scheduled with the USGS for November 2006.
- 3) The internal condition of the well will be inspected for signs of corrosion and chemical precipitation using a borehole video camera (Included in the work scheduled with the USGS for November 2006).
- 4) The depth to bottom of the borehole will be determined. This depth will be compared to well construction information to determine if siltation has occurred. (Included in the work scheduled with the USGS for November 2006)
- 5) A meeting with the regulatory agencies will be held to determine the best course of action and potential future actions after items 2 through 4 are performed.

The adequacy of USGS-12 to continue to be used as an upgradient well, and whether a new upgradient well needs to be constructed will be discussed with IDEQ and EPA pending the outcome of the field inspection and assessment of NRF-13 discussed above.

Finally, NRF will continue to monitor NRF-6 for signs of silting, and if this condition persists, the well may be reconditioned.

9.4 Soil Gas Monitoring Probes

No problems exist concerning the soil gas monitoring probes (regarding functionality and physical defects). Even though water is sometimes present in one probe, this problem does not affect functionality. The concentrations of soil gas constituents are essentially stable in all soil gas monitoring probes, with overall decreasing trends at most sample locations. The main exception is one location at NRF-1, where two constituents exhibit increasing trends. However, the concentrations of these two constituents are still below the levels detected in the Track 2 Investigation. Soil gas monitoring on a quarterly basis no longer appears to be necessary because of the lack of variability exhibited by the data and the generally low concentrations found to date; therefore, the sampling frequency will be reduced to semiannual beginning in 2007. NRF will reduce sampling frequency to annual after three years of additional sample collection provided the data supports this change.

9.5 Soil Moisture Monitoring Probes

No recommendations or required actions are necessary at this time, since only one year's worth of data has been obtained with no anomalies observed.

9.6 Recommendations Summary

Table 9-1 includes a summary of recommendations that have been identified for this Five-Year Review along with any follow-up actions necessary. Table 9-1 also identifies the responsible party for implementation of the recommendations, the agency with oversight authority, the milestone date for implementation and completion, and the impact, if any, on protectiveness.

Table 9 1 Summary of Recommendations and Follow up Actions

Deficiency Issue	Recommendation/ Follow up Actions	Responsible Party	Oversight Agency	Milestone Date	Affects Protectiveness? (Y/N)	
					Current	Future
Sparse vegetation	Re-seed covers	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Complete in 2004	NO	NO
Animal burrows	Continue to inspect sites to see if the number of holes increase from the occasional hole observed and/or the holes compromise cover integrity; remove pest if necessary and make necessary repairs	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	As necessary	NO	NO
Ant hills	Inspect covers to ensure that hills do not compromise cover integrity	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Periodic Inspections	NO	NO
Monitoring constituents	Discontinue the collection of TOX if data continue to support this action	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Tentatively in 2007	NO	NO
Reduce monitoring frequency	Reduce monitoring frequency to biannual for groundwater	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Begin in 2007	NO	NO
Elevated metal results from NRF 13	Collect filtered and unfiltered samples from the well	NRF/USGS	IDEQ/EPA	Began in March 2006	NO	NO
	Pull hardware from well and inspect both hardware and well borehole for problems	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	November 2006	NO	NO
	Hold follow-up meeting between NRF and regulatory agencies to determine best course of action.	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Prior to March 2007	NO	NO
Siltation in NRF 6	Watch wells for signs of sediments in samples. Recondition well if necessary	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	As necessary	NO	NO
Reduce monitoring frequency	Reduce monitoring frequency to biannual for soil gas	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Begin in 2007	NO	NO
Reduce monitoring frequency	Reduce monitoring frequency to annual for soil gas beginning in 2010 if supported by data	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Begin in 2010	NO	NO
Plugged Probes	Replace probes	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	Complete in 2004	NO	NO
Water in some probes	Watch for negative effects on probe efficiency	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	During quarterly sampling	NO	NO
Low production in NRF 13 and NRF 7	Continue to monitor results from wells	NRF	IDEQ/EPA	As necessary	NO	NO

10.0 Protectiveness Statements

The protectiveness of the remedies selected for the areas discussed in this NRF Five-Year Review for the OU 8-05/06 Inactive Landfill Areas and OU 8-08 Remedial Action Sites are summarized in Table 10-1.

Table 10 1 Summary of Protectiveness Statements for NRF CERCLA Sites		
Area	Protectiveness Determination	Protectiveness Statement
OU 8 05/06 Landfill Covers	Protective	The remedy at OU 8-05/06 Landfill Covers is protective of human health and the environment. The analytical data shows that the covers are effective at containing contaminants. The covers and direct contact with contaminated soils and landfill wastes are being controlled by institutional controls.
OU 8 08 “No Further Action” Sites	Protective	The remedy at OU 8-08 No Further Action Sites is protective of human health and the environment because the remedy has been effective in limiting unauthorized access and excavation. The data also indicates that activities at NRF have not adversely affected the groundwater, thereby supporting the No Further Action designation of the sites.
OU 8 08 Remediated Radiological Sites	Protective	The remedy at OU 8-08 Remediated Radiological Sites is protective of human health and the environment. The OU 8-08 Remedial Action (RA) report indicates that pipe removal and consolidation of contaminated soil has been successful in achieving remedial action objectives (RAOs). The data also indicates that activities at NRF have not adversely affected the groundwater, thereby supporting the protectiveness statement for the sites.
OU 8 08 Engineered Cover Sites	Protective	The remedy at OU 8-08 Engineered Cover Sites is protective of human health and the environment. The OU 8-08 RA report indicates that the construction of an engineered earthen cover has been successful in achieving RAOs. Exposure pathways that could result in unacceptable risks are being controlled by institutional controls. The data also indicates that activities at NRF have not adversely affected the groundwater, thereby supporting the protectiveness statements for the sites.

10.1 Summary

In summary, because the individual remedies at each site are protective of human health and the environment, collectively the selected remedies for the NRF remediated CERCLA sites are protective.

11.0 Next Review

NRF is a statutory site that requires ongoing Five-Year Reviews. The next review will be conducted within five years of this Five-Year Review, and is therefore scheduled for 2011. All subsequent NRF Five-Year Reviews will continue to address both the OU 8-05/06 Inactive Landfill Areas and the OU 8-08 Remedial Action Site.

This Page Intentionally Blank