

START

0024350

Page 1 of

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE MEMORANDUM

Company: WHC Address: H4-55
 [] INCOMING [x] OUTGOING DATE: 10/30/92 TIME: 12:45pm
 WITH: S. Cross OF: Ecology PHONE: 206/459-6675
 WITH: OF: PHONE:

Copies to:	Name	Address
	Henckel, RP	H4-55
	Goller, E	A5-19
	100-NR-1 File	H4-55
	EDMC <i>H4-22</i>	

Subject: Disposition of comments on 100-NR-1 Work Plan

100 Area RI Alan D. Krug 6-5634
 Department AD Krug Telephone #

Summary of Conference

I phoned S. Cross to discuss a FAX (attached) which he had transmitted on 10/29/92, relating to the disposition of 100-NR-1 work plan comments. The following summarizes the discussion on each comment:

24. Change agreed to, comment closed.

25 a & b. Golder is to check into the Connelly report and make the correct change. Comment closed.

29a. Change agreed to, comment closed.

29b. Steve clarified his comment to read - "The rate of release of the liquid effluent to the trenches is a data gap which should be included in Section 4.1.2.1." Change agreed to, comment closed.


30. Comment closed as per comment 25.

63. Golder will check on the best location to put the sentence and do it. Comment closed.

69. It was agreed to change the reference from Draft D to Rev 0. Comment closed.

71. Comment closed as per comment 69.

113. Steve would like to include the comment response discussion history in with the final dispositions. I suggested that this was not necessary, since they traced the history of the agreement and were available in the record as a separate document. We have not been doing this for other OU work plans. I asked him to highlight the parts of the



9 3 1 9 9 0 1 2 0 4

discussion which he thought needed to become part of the disposition. I also indicated that I would see if there was any problem to include these. This item was not resolved at this time.

93129001205

TO: Allen Krug

FROM: Steve Cross

Comment Disposition Status For 100-NR-1 Draft B Work Plan

(After WHC text and explanation dated 10/92)

The final Responses should include your latest dispositions. All comments not mentioned below may be considered resolved.

24 The agreement was not reached over the telephone, but was reached in a meeting between Cross, Cline, and Vukelich.

25 a The table should be headed "Cumulative Inventory as of January 1, 1988."

b Connolly did not use the one-year half life criteria for inclusion in the table.

29 a See # 24.

b Mention vadose modeling needs as potential data gap in section 4.1.2.1.

30 See #25.

63 There must be a suitable statement in the formal response for to consider the comment closed. As previously stated:

Simply removing the statement concerning N-Springs from this work plan does not constitute an acceptance of Ecology's comment. Since the statement that would be removed referenced a proposal to conduct an N-Springs FRA, deletion of the statement is an unexplained step backwards. Where will this statement be moved?

The fourth sentence of draft B NR-1 work plan section 4.0 should be transferred to the new draft B NR-2 section 3.1.4.2.1.

69 Use the following, as agreed to in the B. Green July 24 fax.

Response: Some of the particulars of this section are speculative. The qualitative risk assessment methodology soon to be developed by the Risk Assessment Working Group will supersede this section, upon acceptance by all parties. USDOE suggests that, to maintain homogeneity among work plans, the generic text appearing in draft D of the NR-1 work plan be used in the NR-1 work plan without correction.

Status: Closed.

71 Add the comment 69 Response to the existing "threshold" Response.

113 In the Response, state: "The current plan is to . . . state this in the work plan."

NR\RCOMDIS6

9 0 6 1 0 0 6 2 1 9 6