

AUG 23 1990

URFO:DLJ  
Docket No. WM-006  
040WM0006020E

State of Colorado  
Colorado Department of Health  
ATTN: Patricia C. Martinek  
Acting UMTRA Technical Manager  
Hazardous Materials and Waste  
Management Division  
4210 East 11th Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80220-3716

Dear Ms. Martinek:

Attached are our comments and suggestions on the draft Restricted Use Permit application prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation for the Durango UMTRA processing site. Two topics identified in our comments are currently under policy review by the Commission. These are recovered ground-water discharge and sludge disposal. As policy is established in these areas, it will be forwarded to you.

Also, our review of the existing ground-water data indicates that there is little or no concern associated with the ground water at the proposed site of the Bureau of Reclamation project. The construction and dewatering activities will most likely result in a cleanup of the area with the hazardous constituents being concentrated in the treatment sludges.

PM:URFO  
DJacoby  
08/21/90

PM:URFO  
GKonwinski  
08/22/90

DD:URFO  
EHawkins  
08/22/90

AD:URFO:RJV  
LAYandell  
08/22/90

00003

9009040037 900823  
PDR WASTE  
WM-6 PDC

DF02  
11

AUG 23 1990

State of Colorado

2

If our office can be of any further assistance or if you have any questions, please contact D. L. Jacoby of my staff on (303) 236-2805.

Sincerely,

/s/

L. A. Yandell  
Acting Director

Attachment:  
As stated

bcc:  
PDR/DCS  
URFO r/f  
ABBeach, RIV  
LLO Branch, LLWM  
DJacoby  
GKonwinski  
RCPD, CO

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT APPLICATION FOR  
RESTRICTED USE OF THE DURANGO PROCESSING SITE

1. There are two topics considered in the proposed application which are currently under policy review by the NRC.
  - a. Recovered Ground-Water Discharge: Current NRC policy is that recovered ground water from NRC licensed mill sites is byproduct material and therefore cannot be discharged to the environment. This interpretation is currently being discussed with NRC headquarters, and a policy determination should be forthcoming shortly.
  - b. Sludge Disposal: Sludge resulting from treatment of recovered ground water is also considered byproduct material. On this basis, it would require disposal in either an existing mill tailings facility or in an approved disposal site authorized to accept byproduct material.
2. Should excavation result in recovery of contaminated earth above normal acceptance limits, dilution by blending with outside sources should not be considered permissible. If a localized deposit of contaminated material is mixed with other material from the same excavation and the resulting contamination level is below acceptable limits, that would be consistent with normal site cleanup criteria. Concentration of contaminated material in one central location should be avoided.
3. Under the heading "Environmental, Health, and Safety Considerations": Provisions are included for monitoring for the possible spread of contamination during site construction. It states that an Industrial Hygienist would be onsite. It is suggested that this section should be strengthened to require that a Health Physicist, trained and experienced in radiological protection, be available to monitor excavated materials and to perform personnel surveys of potentially contaminated site workers as necessary.

Even though not explicitly stated in this section, it is assumed that normal construction site security will be in place. This should be sufficient for prevention of uncontrolled site access and the potential for undetected contamination of intruders. To assure that there is no undetected contamination of site workers, routine exit surveys may be necessary should excavation result in exposure of contaminated soils. This kind of data may prove useful if there are any future questions related to the potential for contamination of site workers.

Frequencies for radiation protection and health and safety training should be defined. The scope of personnel to be so trained should also be

stated. Training may include identification of possibly contaminated material. The applicability of the State of Colorado's equivalent of 10 CFR 19 and 10 CFR 20 regulations applicable to this site may bear emphasis.

4. Under the heading "Handling Ground Water," the application should indicate that some water associated with raffinate disposal will be encountered.
5. To be consistent with UMTRCA, 1978, the phrase "contaminated materials" should be changed to "residual radioactive materials."