

9A100



United States Department of the Interior

TAKE
PRIDE IN
AMERICA

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
BOX 25046 M.S. 415
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
DENVER, COLORADO 80225
Water Resources Division
Colorado District

IN REPLY REFER TO:

February 4, 1993



000061792

Rocky Flats Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 928
Golden, CO 80402-0928

Attention: Robert H. Birk

Dear Mr. Birk,

The suggestions for topics to be covered by the USGS sediment characterization work in reservoirs near Rocky Flats that were provided by Ralph Lindberg and Michael Guillaume, at our meeting on January 21, 1993, can be broken down into two groups, those in the original SOW, and proposed new topics. The objectives of the original SOW were: 1) sample reservoir sediments, compare results to earlier published reports, and evaluate the usability of previous work, and 2) sample reservoir water, and evaluate water quality. Specific topics that we propose covering to fulfill our obligations under the original SOW include:

- 1) Summarize historical data on reservoir sediments.
- 2) Describe the relevant physical conditions in reservoir water and sediments, such as temperature and dissolved oxygen content of reservoir water, water depth and stratification, and geologic descriptions of sediments.
- 3) Report analyte levels measured in water and sediments, and evaluate them statistically to determine concentration ranges, intra- and intersite variance, as well as variance between the reservoirs.
- 4) Compare historical data to this data set, and evaluate differences and similarities.
- 5) Describe the redox environment of the reservoir sediments, and evaluate the potential for contaminant mobilization.

We agreed to consider a list of proposed new topics. In general, the new topics involved identification of sources for contaminant radionuclides and trace metals. In meetings with several colleagues, several problems were identified that may preclude our ability to address the proposed new topics.

A major roadblock is the difficulty in answering questions using a data set that was designed for another purpose. It is unlikely that either historical data, or the data collected in this study are appropriate for statistical analysis of possible sources. Sample collection density was probably not sufficient near reservoir inflows to unambiguously establish concentration patterns in inflow sediments.

A second problem is the lack of good data for Clear Creek sediments near the study reservoirs. Data for samples collected above Golden are probably not useful because of possible changes in redox environment between the sampling site and the study reservoirs. Trace metal mobility is drastically affected by local redox conditions.

If identification of trace metal and radionuclide sources is deemed essential for DOE, and EG&G, it is suggested that a separate study be undertaken that includes additional sampling of potential sediment sources and near inflow reservoir sediments. This would allow careful design of a sampling scheme that would provide a much better chance of success.

ADMIN RECCRD

1/4

We welcome your response to these comments concerning the scope of the interpretive report on the water and sediment quality of the three off-site reservoirs so that we can initiate the compilation of the report.

Sincerely,

David A. Johncox

cc: Michael Guillaume, EG&G
Zelda Bailey, USGS
Dave Clow, USGS
Bob Williams, USGS



United States Department of the Interior



GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
BOX 25046 M.S. 415
DENVER FEDERAL CENTER
DENVER, COLORADO 80225

IN REPLY REFER TO:

Water Resources Division
Colorado District

March 31, 1994

Rocky Flats Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 928
Golden, CO 80402-0928

Attention: Robert H. Birk

Dear Mr. Birk,

I have attempted numerous times over the last couple of weeks to contact you and the EG&G Program Manager by phone regarding several concerns we have in connection with the completion of the Standley Lake sediment characterization report. However, attempts to communicate by phone have failed and this letter is meant to bring the status of the USGS study to your attention and to request a meeting of all parties to clarify the content and timing of deliverables.

The program has been delayed extensively due to the extremely slow turnaround by the contracted laboratories and sub-contracted data verification firms. As a result of these delays, the USGS has not received the needed chemical data in its entirety. The DOE/USGS Interagency Agreement, DE-A134-91RF00012 clearly states that "The completion of the draft report shall not exceed six (6) months from receiving laboratory analysis data and the final shall not exceed four (4) months from completion of EG&G review of the draft report. The USGS Statement of Work states "All laboratory analysis of data must be completed and returned to the contractor to ensure that the draft report is available six months later..." "Delays beyond the contractors control may necessitate a revision of the Work Schedule." At this writing, all of the data has not been received by the USGS. Dave Clow (USGS) has been in telephone contact with Amy Lang (CH2M Hill). Ms Lang has informed us that the complete dataset will be sent to the USGS in electronic form on April 11, 1994. If the complete database is physically received by the USGS sometime the week of April 11, the official "timeclock" for the draft copy of the USGS report would extend to about the middle of October 1994.

DOE and EG&G have provided no guidance or oversight in the latter stages of project completion. Michael Guillaume (although still a contractor to DOE) has departed from EG&G and the new EG&G OUS Program Manager (Mark Buddy) had not been briefed on the USGS's involvement in the reservoir studies. Mark Buddy was under the impression that the USGS provided the field sampling support only and he had no knowledge of the deliverables (the interpretive report) required by the USGS. Mr. Buddy had not even seen a copy of the IAG or the USGS's Statement of Work.

After describing the respective interpretive reports via telephone (D. Clow, USGS and Amy Lang, CH2M HILL), it became apparent that CH2M HILL is working on a report that is basically identical in content to the one we were contracted to write. Ms. Lang also referred to a recent DOE (?EG&G?) directive on data handling. The USGS would like to receive an official copy of this directive from DOE or EG&G before we commence our data interpretation.

This letter constitutes an official request for a meeting of all the "players" so everyone will know where they stand in regards to the Standley Lake (OU3) sediment characterization study. The list of "players" should include: Bob Birk, DOE; Michael Guillaume, Geary Engineering; Mark Buddy, EG&G, Amy Lang, CH2M HILL, Holly Wolaver (possibly), EG&G; Zelda Bailey, USGS; David Clow, USGS; David Johncox, USGS. Without this meeting, we will consider the "timeclock" for completion of the report to be on hold because proceeding without guidance from DOE and EG&G will not be possible.

We request that this meeting be scheduled in early to mid April 1994 We are anxious to hear from you, because our highest priority is to fulfill the contract by providing you the best technical results possible. Please coordinate with other attendees and telephone either David Johncox at 236-4882 ext. 236 or Zelda Bailey at ext. 256 to finalize arrangements for the meeting.

Sincerely,



David A. Johncox

cc: Mark Buddy, EG&G
Michael Guillaume, Geary Engineering
Zelda Bailey, USGS
Dave Clow, USGS
David Johncox, USGS

D

4/4