

2195

G-000-1001.117

FOLLOW-UP RESPONSES TO COMMUNITY MEETING QUESTIONS/CONCERNS

09/13/1991

PARSONS
9
LETTER

DOE-FSO

Follow-Up Responses to Community Meeting Questions/Concerns

2195

1. Inform FRESH about recommendations on \$150,000 for Supplemental Environmental Projects

Response--On September 6, PARSONS gave Teresa Kwiatkowski a compilation of the suggestions received. Key questions are, "How, and when, will these suggestions (and a final recommendation) be presented to the EPA and FRESH?" and "Who will decide what recommendation(s) will be implemented?"

2. Provide breakdown on cost of new signs and name change activities to Lisa Crawford.

Response--Teresa Kwiatkowski said she wanted a breakdown of costs for tent rental; bus rental; food; and signs. According to Paul Mohr, these costs were:

Tents -	\$4,072.80
Buses -	400.00
Food -	1,566.15
<u>Signs -</u>	<u>11,000.00</u>

Total = \$17,038.95

3. Did the DOE raise radiation limits in other restrooms after the Plant 4 restroom was closed due to contamination?

Response--Lynn St. Clair has been in contact with Stu Hennefeld about this issue. To date, he has not informed her of his findings.

4. Did an ASI/IT employee design removal actions for a waste pit area without having ever visited the area?

Response--John Martin of ASI has provided the following response:

In preparing the Waste Pit Stormwater Run-off Control Removal Action Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), it is possible that some technical or professional staff did not actually visit the waste pit area at the FEMP. It is customary for the supervising engineer to be familiar with the specific site, but not the entire design staff. It is possible to design or evaluate portions of a project based on engineering data such as maps, borings, geotechnical test results, and drawings without actually having visited the site. To further involve any design staff would be cost and time-prohibitive.

5. Has the site hired "tons" of interns and summer workers when the site already has people not doing any work?

Response--Chris Hertz spoke with Bill Winn about this issue. He informed Chris that as part of the DOE and WEMCO's community outreach programs (designed in part to educate and involve the young, the disadvantaged and the general community), the following numbers and types of people were hired for the summer:

- 4 - high school teachers
- 7 - college graduate assistants
- 12 - summer interns
- 12 - co-ops (worked on site as part of their college curriculum)
- 16 - students from Historically Black Colleges and Universities
- 1 - "Inroads" intern

2195

The above 52 people worked in a variety of fields ranging from radiological monitoring and regulation compliance/safety to environmental monitoring.

6. Is the DOE planning on hiring 50 to 100 new people? Why are these people needed?

Response--Gerry Westerbeck told Chris Hertz that DOE needs to expand its FEMP office staff in order to become more self-sufficient and less reliant on Oak Ridge and Headquarters. Such staff additions can only help to expedite clean up.

7. Site employees travel to out-of-town seminars and stay in "nice places". Wouldn't it be cheaper to bring trainers to the site?

Response--Lynn St. Clair spoke with Paul Poulos, who coordinates training class attendance at the FEMP (Paul is not responsible for employee attendance at technical conferences). Paul's office is currently evaluating technical training classes site employees have requested to attend off-site to see if it's economically feasible (and possible) to bring the courses on-site.

Concerning Lisa Crawford's comment on technical conferences attended off-site, the following might be a reasonable reply:

Technical conferences are usually conducted for two purposes: 1) to inform persons who work in the field of new technologies and methods for implementing their work, and 2) for technical people to exchange information with their peers. The type of exchange that occurs at these meetings would be difficult to replicate by bringing the speakers to the FEMP. Additionally, these conferences usually have up to six speakers per day. The economic comparison of sending four to six employees to one of these conferences, versus bringing a host of speakers to the FEMP for one-hour presentations, is obvious.

Unfortunately, the DOE has little, if any control over the location of the technical conferences, and by nature, they are held in desirable places to attract more attendees. DOE employees, as well as other government employees, receive government rates for hotel accommodations which are substantially less than the standard rate. Furthermore, the DOE has little control over what activities, such as golf, that employees chose to engage in during "free" time at these conferences.

8. What's the status of the efforts to prevent materials from the active fly ash pile blowing off-site?

2195

Response--At present, site employees are "wetting down" the active fly ash pile on a regular basis to mitigate airborne emissions. The Operable Unit team is currently working on a Removal Site Evaluation for a removal action to mitigate both airborne emission and potential runoff from the fly ash pile (The Removal Site Evaluation is the document required by CERCLA which evaluates the necessity for immediate action).

A Removal Action Workplan is due to EPA in March 1992. Several alternatives are being discussed at present, including earthen berms around the pile with a geofabric cover to stabilize the ash. No specific removal action has yet been determined.

9. What contaminants do the inactive and active fly ash areas contain?

Response--Catherine McCord said at the Community Meeting there may have been some materials that were improperly disposed of in the inactive fly ash area. Well data from the vicinity of the inactive fly ash area indicates that pesticides and PCBs may be present in the inactive fly ash area. Sampling of these area (both inactive and active fly ash) was completed in August. Results from sample analyses will provide a more complete characterization of the active and inactive fly ash areas.

10. Has the DOE provided a copy of the "vault report" to the PEIC and Lisa Crawford?

Response--According to Mike Crowwait, a copy of this report is now in the Administrative Record. However, it may be as long as a month before it's submittal to the PEIC due to current submittal schedules. Perhaps Teresa Kwiatkowski might want to contact Mike to expedite the submittal of this document to the PEIC.

Also, Teresa may want to contact Lisa and see if submission of this document into the PEIC meets Lisa's expectations/wants.

11. Has a copy of the groundwater map used at the Crosby Township meeting been made available to FRESH?

Response--Amy Engler has Ken Broberg's map and will show it to Teresa Kwiatkowski. Teresa can then determine if she wants to give it to FRESH.

12. Were work plans for treatability studies placed in the PEIC by the end of August?

Response--According to Jack Craig, OU's 1, 2 and 4 are complete and in the PEIC. Treatability study materials for OU's 3 and 5 are still in progress.

13. Has the study of the geology of the South Plume been placed in the Reading Rooms?

Response-- Paul Mohr and Janie Crowwait indicated this information is in the EE/CA for the South Plume. This EE/CA is in the PEIC.

14. FRESH wants to be informed about the status of the public water supply situation.

2195

Response--Greg Ossmann contacted Rob Kniep who said he had no update on the situation. Rob promised to get back to Greg if he receives any information about the impending consultant's report.

15. Are the Initial Screening of Alternatives report for OU 2 and a removal action work plan for the Plant 1 Pad in the Administrative Record?

Response--Both documents are in the PEIC, according to Janie Crowait.

16. What's the status of the GAO visit to the site for asbestos inspections?

Response--Behram Shroff has been contacted by Lynn St. Clair but has provided no update as of September 8.

17. During the July 16 Community Meeting, an August 1991 timeframe was mentioned for completion of the sampling for the sanitary landfill and the Southfield area. Is this work on schedule?

Response--Jack Craig informs Chris Hertz that this work is now complete.

18. Various K-65 sampling activities were supposed to be completed by the end of August 1991. Has this occurred?

Response--According to Dennis Nixon, the slant borings were completed in August on schedule.

19. During the July 16 Community Meeting, Jack Craig alluded to a Plant 8 facility coming on-line by July 24. Did this happen?

Response--The facility did come on-line. However, according to Mike Crowait, there is no letter confirming a "Plant 8 treatment facility" in the Administrative Record.

20. It was unclear whether Ray Hansen was talking solely about uranium when he mentioned that 57,000,000 pounds of material are to be moved off-site.

Response--Greg Ossmann talked to Ray about this issue. According to Ray, the 57,000,000 pounds includes uranium metal, uranium tetrafluoride and uranium tri-oxide.

21. Tom Winston of OEPA spoke about some "national legislation" that Governor Voinovich was working on to "institutionalize and enhance the DOE's cleanup effort?" What does this entail?

Response--Chris Hertz spoke with Jack Craig who was uncertain about what Winston was talking about. A suggestion: Someone from the DOE might call Winston to find out more about this legislation.

22. Tom Winston mentioned a "funding mechanism" started by Admiral Watkins which would give more money to the states. What is this "funding mechanism?"

Response--Jack Craig took this to mean the DOE's providing \$500,000 per year to the OEPA to cover document review costs. This is part of the Consent Decree.

2195

23. Is anything being done about litigation costs not being taken out of the DOE's cleanup budget?

Response--Gerry Westerbeck told Chris Hertz that although litigation gets paid for out of the DOE's budget, Congress can appropriate more money for litigation, if required. Therefore, litigation money may not necessarily detract from clean up funds.

24. What's been done on boiler conversion from coal to gas?

Response--Ray Hansen informs Greg Ossmann that WEMCO is still looking into site boiler conversion. In addition, WEMCO is looking into the possibility of building a new gas fired unit "outside the fence."

25. Are EM's new contamination reports going to be released to the public beginning in September?

Response--Lynn St. Clair spoke to Ray Hansen about this issue. Ray had no information on the new report but promised to pursue the issue. Teressa Kwiatkowski might want to check with DOE HQ about these reports and inform Lisa Crawford about how such reports may reach her.

26. Has Lisa Crawford received Mike Smith's phone number and the names of other employees in the regional office of the Inspector General?

Response--Gerry Westerbeck informed Chris Hertz that Mike Smith's number is 738-6238. Chris, though, is uncertain about whether anyone from the DOE has given this to Lisa Crawford. Perhaps Teressa Kwiatkowski should check with Gerry Westerbeck about what information, if any, on this matter has reached Lisa.

27. During the Community Meeting, Leo Duffy promised an "unidentified speaker" (per the transcript) a copy of the South Plume EE/CA. Was the person given the document?

Response--Apparently no copies were given to anyone immediately after the meeting. In reality, the "unidentified speaker" could get this document via the PEIC.

28. Lisa Crawford requests a cost breakdown per Operable Unit. Has she received this?

Response--We have no evidence that Lisa has received any such breakdown. Lynn St. Clair and Bob Glenn asked John Chew for some breakdowns and what he provided is attached. Please note Pat Hopper's comments.

Teressa Kwiatkowski may want to consult with Gerry Westerbeck and DOE HQ about what material should be provided. Also, she may want to check with Lisa Crawford concerning what she expects to receive.

SEP 13 '91 13:42

Date: 28-Aug-91 11:21
From: ERAJPH (J. Pat Hopper)
To: ERAJRC
Subject: re: COMMUNITY MEETING
Message-id: 2887BB2801AEAEAE
In-reply-to: A382BB2801AEAEAE

P.8/10

2195

>Date: 28-Aug-91 11:01
>From: ERAJRC (John R. Chew)
>To: ERAJPH (J. Pat Hopper)
>Subject: COMMUNITY MEETING

>
>I GOT A CALL A FEW MINUTES AGO FROM GLENN. LYNN ST. CLAIR (RMP COMMUNITY
>RELATIONS) HAS AN ACTION ITEM FROM DUFFY/FRESH TO GIVE FRESH COST BY
>OPERABLE UNIT. TRERSSA K. SAID GIVE 'EM THE FY-92 COST BY OPERABLE UNIT.
>NEITHER GLENN OR I THINK THAT'S RIGHT. WE THINK IT'S THE OVERALL COST BY
>OU. IF SO WHAT NUMBER? BASED ON THE 2.2 BILLION? YOU WERE THERE, WHAT DO
>YOU REMEMBER??? WHAT SHOULD THE NUMBERS BE?

>JOHN

* get numbers from sue. give Teresa both. the total ou cost and the 92 portion broke out. use the 2.2 with a caveat that it does not include the site d&d

} Pat's
Response

o FIVE YEAR Plan should be out by 9/5
o Site Specific Plan - should be out by 9/6

* Includes ADS,

o Numbers include those Approved/Issued to the O&DE,

John

TABLE 1

2195

ERA PROJECT COST SUMMARY
(dollars in thousands)

A. Procurement and Construction:	\$1,732,261	
Operable Unit 1		416,750
Operable Unit 2		112,123
Operable Unit 3		564,610
Operable Unit 4		100,520
Operable Unit 5		112,900
Engineered Storage Facility		339,000
Engineered Treatment Packaging & Storage Facility		44,000
Removal Actions		42,358
B. R&D related to construction	\$ 23,551	
C. RMI Facility	\$ 120,494	
D. Other Project Costs	\$ 322,018	
RI/FS		79,139
Project Management		114,144
Preliminary Engineering		66,353
RMI/Fields Brook		15,615
Non-DOE Activities (OEPA Oversight)		22,916
Startup/Expenses		23,851
Total Operating Expenses	\$2,198,324	

TIME: 07:58:32

2195

Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
Activity Data Sheet Summary Report
SUMMARY FUNDING BY E & R - RESTRUCTURED CASE 1

PAGE 1

TITLE	91	92	93	94	95	96	97
	26,442	9,411	9,006	8,000	5,000	0	0
SUBTOTAL	26,442	9,411	9,006	8,000	5,000	0	0
501	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
3,830	18,040	5,429	69,932	23,100	23,800	73,865	101,301
1,307	10,475	11,043	23,100	23,800	22,528	400	146,415
3,828	20,108	24,355	64,600	116,400	137,422	1,134	1,134
5,841	3,027	8,500	14,400	52,100	12,254	16,783	16,783
38,969	23,971	5,455	26,237	34,377	33,133	0	0
0	0	2,500	2,000	0	0	79,911	46,564
2,005	14,738	2,445	94,713	91,578	360,613	312,097	312,097
SUBTOTAL	56,281	91,859	222,227	296,482	390,620	360,613	312,097
2010	23,337	26,959	7,128	13,480	14,424	15,822	16,850
18,540	16,738	1,560	19,766	19,382	19,388	20,093	20,093
10,582	24,723	808	35,997	38,744	38,927	39,346	39,346
SUBTOTAL	52,459	68,420	9,496	69,243	72,550	74,137	76,249
9EW2010	5,633	15,820	6,488	13,758	11,783	11,785	11,785
45,039	38,878	9,742	45,472	36,458	22,227	21,201	21,201
353	7,585	1,016	12,866	7,466	1,552	1,561	1,561
SUBTOTAL	51,025	62,283	17,246	72,096	55,707	35,564	34,547
+39EW2010	0	50,901	0	0	0	0	0
12,000	12,540	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100
18,316	39,477	55,213	49,456	35,788	31,277	31,862	31,862
SUBTOTAL	30,316	102,918	68,313	62,556	48,888	44,377	44,962
10+39EW2010	178,288	508,377	572,765	514,691	467,855	467,855	467,855
GRAND TOTALS	216,523	334,891	782,227	1,008,964	1,353,547	1,353,547	1,353,547

ASSESSMENT ADS'S
ACTIVITY PACKAGES

CASE 1 - ADS'S

ER - CERCIA
ASSESSMENT ADS'S
CLEANUP ADS'S

Note: all #'s are in thousands.