

REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT: BLM Red Devil Mine

DOCUMENT: Draft EE/CA (12/2013)

DATE: 1/7/2014

REVIEWER: Anne Marie Palmieri

PHONE: (907) 766-3184

Item No.	Location (page, par., sen.)	COMMENTS	Contractor Response
1.	Introduction	Perhaps there could be a short paragraph included which gives a description of the process and where we are, i.e., site has been characterized (RI), full-scale cleanup alternatives are being discussed, early action will address a continuing release while the bigger cleanup is planned and funding is secured, etc. This could also be a place to discuss community involvement.	This information is presented in the added Executive Summary.
2.	Page 1-1, para 1	Suggest revising the description of the petroleum contaminated soil – most of the PCS has been excavated and is being landfarmed on-site.	Agreed. The text was appropriately modified.
3.	Page 1-1, para 2, and throughout	BLM also needs to coordinate with ADF&G, especially since Red Devil Creek is an anadromous fish stream. Include them as an agency here as well as in other locations where they need to be mentioned.	ADF&G reference has been incorporated throughout the text.
4.	Section 2.2	Remove much of this section, because: 1) many of these investigations did not pertain to the area of the site which is the focus of the early action, and 2) many of the sample locations/results are no longer relevant (were altered during removal and monofill construction). There are the RI, past creek and river water quality monitoring reports, and the geophysical study which should be included.	Section 2, in general, has been greatly reduced/edited.
5.	Section 2.2.3, para 2	Remove this information as it is old and does not give different conclusions from the RI. Given that the early action involves the creek, this data should be pretty general.	Section 2, in general, has been greatly reduced/edited.
6.	Section 2.4.2, para 3	It would be helpful to include some photographs of the steep sidewalls and sloughing material. Many of the people that will be at the public meetings will not have been to the site recently, if ever – photos could help people understand the issue better.	A photo has been added.
7.	Section 2.4.5, line 2, and Section 2.5	Remedial goals/cleanup levels for the site have not been agreed to by EPA and the State. This early action is not based on removal of soil or sediment to meet a cleanup level. Therefore, I suggest that you remove all of the references to cleaning up to remedial goals and cleanup levels from this document. The cleanup levels that are agreed to can be included in the removal action work plan to use for comparison with the sample results. I realize that there needs to be a number which gives the reader a basis for sample result comparison – we should talk about what number to use....can we resolve the issue of site cleanup levels before the EE/CA goes out for public review? Let's discuss.	The text has been modified to remove references to meeting cleanup/remedial goals.

REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT: BLM Red Devil Mine
DATE: 1/7/2014

REVIEWER: Anne Marie Palmieri

DOCUMENT: Draft EE/CA (12/2013)
PHONE: (907) 766-3184

Item No.	Location (page, par., sen.)	COMMENTS	Contractor Response
8.	Section 2.4.5, para 1	I question as to whether the volume of contaminated soil is even an issue which needs to be addressed. The early action extent is not based on contaminant concentrations, but rather physical and locational criteria of the area. Suggest deleting lines 1-6 (through ... 'Section 3.')	Agreed. Section 2 has been revised accordingly.
9.	Section 2.5	I believe that a lot of this information is more detailed and complicated than it needs to be for the EE/CA, especially since extent of the material addressed by the removal action is not based on contaminant concentration. This section should describe why the eroding material and contaminated sediments pose a risk and shouldn't be allowed to migrate to the Kuskokwim River. I think that this can be done in a manner which is more concise and does not include standard risk assessment components such as uncertainties, ecological assessment endpoints, and different screening levels for different pathways. This section should be simplified so that people can easily understand why there is a risk and why the early action is needed. The current version includes too much unnecessary technical information which dilutes the message.	Agreed. Section 2 has been revised accordingly.
10.	Table 2-2	I think that the inclusion of the screening level information and whether or not it is a COPC is unnecessary. Include only those constituents that exceed the cleanup levels (when we agree on them).	Agreed. Table 2-2 has been revised accordingly.
11.	Table 2-3	a) There are no surface water samples from the Kuskokwim River; rename table so that it is only Red Devil Creek. b) Why are the soil cleanup levels included on a table for surface water? c) See comment #9.	Table 2-3 has been deleted.
12.	Tables 2-5 and 2-6	Remove these tables. The only reason to include the cleanup levels is to provide a basis for comparison for the sample results, and the only media to include should be soil, sediment, and surface water and this information could be included on Tables 2-2 and 2-3. If the risk-based cleanup levels for different pathways are included, then those would have to be discussed. All of this information is in the risk assessment and can simply be referenced.	Agreed. The tables have been removed.
13.	Section 3-2	It would be helpful to include the primary RAO as a bullet to highlight its importance.	Agreed. This change has been made.

REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT: BLM Red Devil Mine

DOCUMENT: Draft EE/CA (12/2013)

DATE: 1/7/2014

REVIEWER: Anne Marie Palmieri

PHONE: (907) 766-3184

Item No.	Location (page, par., sen.)	COMMENTS	Contractor Response
14.	Section 3-2, para 2	This paragraph is confusing considering the discussion in Section 2 about cleanup levels. I understand what is trying to be said, but disagree that cleanup levels ‘ <i>may</i> be incorporated during full-scale remediation’.	The text has been modified accordingly.
15.	Section 3.4	I suggest revising this section to include a sentence about the public comment period. The last line states that “BLM will select a contractor to execute the preferred alternative”. This sentence could be interpreted in a way which suggests that BLM is not going to seriously consider public comments.	A reference to the public comment period has been added.
16.	Section 4.1.4	It should be included in this section that samples will be collected following the excavation of sediment and pulling back the sidewalls. I could only find this included on page 5-9.	Post construction sampling has been added, including sampling of Red Devil Creek following completion of the early action to document effectiveness.
17.	Section 5, page 5-2, and throughout.	State, EPA, and community acceptance should be discussed under Administrative Feasibility (see EPA EE/CA guidance, section 2.6, page 42).	State, EPA, and community acceptance has been incorporated into the text.
18.	All Alternatives, and 6.1.2	Compliance with ARARs – this action is not trying to meet chemical-specific ARARs. Could it be stated that even though they aren’t met during the NTCRA, they will be met during the final cleanup -- therefore, it is more important that the action-specific and location-specific ARARs identified for these alternatives are met? – this is an attorney discussion.	Chemical-specific ARARs has been removed and appropriate text addressing future work is incorporated into the text.
19.	All Alternatives, and 6.1.4	Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume – the key part of this criteria is “Through Treatment”, which has been deleted from the heading. None of the alternatives meet this criteria which is fine. The sections need to be revised to say that it is not met – period. Some of the text in these sections could be moved under a different criteria as some good points are made, but it is not appropriate to have it here.	“Through treatment” has been incorporated and the discussion expanded.
20.	All Alternatives	ADF&G should be added to the list of agencies that BLM will work with regarding administrative concerns.	Reference to ADF&G has been added to the text as appropriate.
21.	Page 5-10, para 4, line 5	‘dissipation pool’ should be ‘sediment trap’.	The wording change was made.
22.	Section 6.1.3	It is stated that the early action is not designed to be permanent; but it would be beneficial to include in this section that Alternatives 2 and 3 would require that the concrete cloth and culvert were removed during the full-scale cleanup. #4 gives more flexibility with the future cleanup.	The text was appropriately modified.

REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT: BLM Red Devil Mine

DOCUMENT: Draft EE/CA (12/2013)

DATE: 1/7/2014

REVIEWER: Anne Marie Palmieri

PHONE: (907) 766-3184

Item No.	Location (page, par., sen.)	COMMENTS	Contractor Response
23.	Section 6.1.5	One piece that should be added to the discussion about short-term effectiveness is how long will it take the remedy to effectively meet the RAOs. All of these alternatives will be effective immediately upon completion.	Each of the action alternatives has been assumed to be able to be completed within a single construction season.
24.	Table B-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) See comment 18 for recommendation for chemical-specific ARARs.b) 18 AAC 75 is applicable, not TBCc) Alaska Drinking Water Standards are ARARs to the site, but not this action.d) NAGPRA, EO 11990, and EO 11988 don't seem to be applicable.e) Alaska Historic Preservation Requirement isn't applicable as no actions will occur on state lands.f) ADF&G regulations governing anadromous fish streams should be included as Red Devil Creek is anadromous.	See response to Comment 18. Concur with the remaining comments B through F and the text and tables have been appropriately changed.
25.		--end--	