



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

February 23, 2011

Mr. Rick Brausch
Santa Susana Field Laboratory Project Director
Department of Toxic Substances Control
1001 "I" Street
P.O. Box 806
Sacramento, CA 95812-0806

Re: Path forward for RCRA Feasibility Investigation Reports

Dear Rick:

As DOE implements the requirements of the 2010 Administrative Order on Consent for Remedial Action (Docket No. HSA-CO 10/11-037), DOE and DTSC staff have discussed the status of the four RCRA Feasibility Investigation Reports (RFI) related to Area IV of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL). DOE had total or partial responsibility for what was called Groups 5, 6, 7, and 8.

As the 2010 Order implements a different process, DOE developed an approach to characterization and investigation for each of these groups, discussed it with DTSC and then with stakeholders on February 10, 2011. Each group's status and recommended path forward is described below:

- **Group 5**

There are three RFI sites within Group 5 that are in Area III and there is one RFI site that includes a building that is half in Area IV and half in Area III. DTSC and public comments have been received on the Group 5 RFI Report. The proposed path forward is for Boeing to take responsibility for the Group 5 RFI sites in Area III. DOE will include the one RFI site that is partially in Area IV in its analysis for chemical co-located sampling. DOE will use all previous RFI sampling data, DTSC and public comments to inform co-located chemical sampling.

- **Group 6**

There was an additional sampling event that was conducted in RFI Group 6 beginning in September 2010. This sampling event was based upon DTSC and public comment received on the Group 6 RFI Report and the Group 6 RFI Sampling and Analysis Plan. The proposed path forward is for a technical memorandum to be prepared providing the results of the sampling event held in 2010. DOE proposes to use the previous RFI sampling data (including the recent event's data), DTSC and public comments to inform the chemical co-located sampling.



- **Group 7**
The RFI report for Group 7 was the last RFI report submitted to DTSC by DOE. DTSC is in the process of reviewing this report. DOE proposes that DTSC complete this review and use the draft comments as discussion points when DTSC and DOE meet to make chemical co-located sampling decisions for this sub-area. DOE also proposes to use all previously collected RFI sampling data and public comment to inform the chemical co-located sampling.
- **Group 8**
DTSC and the public have reviewed the Group 8 RFI report and a draft sampling and analysis plan. DOE proposes that DTSC use its RFI report comments and draft SAP review comments and public comments as discussion points when DTSC and DOE meet to make chemical co-located sampling decisions for this sub-area. DOE also proposes to use all previously collected RFI sampling data and public comments to inform the co-located chemical sampling.

DOE requests DTSC's concurrence on the path forward for each RFI Group. As documented in the 2010 Order, DOE will continue to conduct chemical co-located sampling, step out sampling, data gap analysis and additional sampling as needed, thus constituting the requirements of the Order and notes that no further work other than that described in this letter will be done with any of DOE's RFI Group reports.

Sincerely,



Richard Schassburger,
Federal Project Director

cc: Mark Mallnowski, DTSC
Laura Rainey, DTSC
Stephie Jennings, DOE
Craig Cooper, USEPA
John Wondolleck, CDM
Tom Gallacher, Boeing
Art Lennox, Boeing
Ravnesht Amar, Boeing