



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10 HANFORD PROJECT OFFICE
712 SWIFT BOULEVARD, SUITE 5
RICHLAND, WASHINGTON 99352

0038691

June 15, 1993

Eric D. Goller
100 Area RL Monitor
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A5-19
Richland, Washinton 99352

Re: Reminder of Overdue Items.

Dear Mr. Goller:

This letter is written to request that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) transmit or respond to seven items that are detailed below. For the first four of these items, this letter repeats earlier written and oral requests for a DOE response. This is our first written reminder to DOE of the overdue status of the last three items. The outstanding items are the following:

- 1) Transmittal of Revision 1 of the M-30-01 document "Sampling and Analysis of 100 Area Springs". We understand that this document was printed in May of 1992. We need this document transmitted to us and the administrative record, as it is important information that will be considered in the Record of Decisions for the 100 area operable units. Please note that there are two versions of revision 1 of this document, and that DOE should transmit the newer version.
- 2) Provide responses to our comments on the M-30-01 document. These comments were provided to DOE on April 2, 1992. Responses to these comments were due May 2, 1992.
- 3) Provide a written response to our letter dated June 24, 1992 entitled "COLUMBIA RIVER BANK SPRINGS DATA FOR THE 100 AREA". This letter raised a number of significant issues that DOE needed to resolve, and the letter requested a written response.
- 4) Provide a transmittal of your responses to our comments on the M-30-04 that we transmitted to DOE on November 24, 1992. Those comment responses were due to us December 24, 1992. Fortunately the DOE contractor has been responsive to our comments, and an understanding regarding the technical issues has been reached between us and the DOE contractor. However, by DOE not being involved in the interactions on this milestone via the established official channels, the administrative record fails to document the issues and their resolution.

9413293.4168



Printed on Recycled Paper

5) Provide a transmittal of responses to our comments on draft B of the "Columbia River Impact Evaluation Plan". These comments were provided to DOE on March 3, 1993. Responses were due to us on April 2, 1993. Like item number 4 above, the DOE contractor has been responsive and we have been able to have discussions with the contractor based on draft internal responses. But again, by DOE not being involved in the interactions via the established official channels, the administrative record fails to document the issues and their resolution. Revision 0 of this document goes out to public comment next week, yet we have not received transmittal of DOE's responses to comments on the previous draft.

6) On April 8, 1993 we sent you a "Don't Say it" (DSI) requesting clarification of some data issues in the document WHC-SD-EN-TI-134, Revision 0. This document is entitled "Validation Reports 100-KR-4: Data Validation Report for the 100-KR-4 Operable Unit Groundwater Drilling". Although DOE is not specifically obligated to provide a response within a certain time period, two months have lapsed without a response. Because this DSI specifically asked questions regarding data that will form a basis for the Record of Decision for this operable unit, DOE should feel that it is important to respond to the questions raised in the DSI. DOE's response needs to go to the administrative record to complement the DSI that I have sent there.

7) On April 21, 1993, you signed a Tri Party Agreement form regarding the 100 Area Feasibility Study Phases 1 and 2. In this agreement it states that "DOE also agrees to formally transmit the revised meeting minutes, under cover letter, on or about May 5, 1993". It is now about six weeks past that date yet we have not received transmittal of this item.

It is unfortunate that we need to write letters to DOE that illustrate non-responsiveness to our concerns. We try to work cooperatively as partners with DOE on Hanford issues but the above seven items illustrate the unfortunate side effect of this approach -- that DOE may fail to seriously consider and be responsive to our concerns. I would hope that DOE would write the seven letters needed to respond to and bring closure to the above issues. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (509) 376-9884.

Sincerely,

Laurence E. Gadbois
 Laurence E. Gadbois
 Environmental Scientist

cc Julie Erickson, DOE
 Steve Wisness, DOE

Roger Stanley, Ecology
 Administrative Record (100 Area)

9113293 416