

NY 42



Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20545

MA.4 MA.2
PA.33
PA.3
PA.12
PA.11
CT.15
CT.2
CT.6
OH.16
OH.26
OH.33

1/6/88

OCT 28 1985

Mr. Andrew Wallo
The Aerospace Corporation
Suite 4000
955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

Dear Andy:

The comments and authority decision from the following sites are set out below. No additional comments are included; therefore, a careful editorial review of these documents should be made when the documents are finalized.

IL.11
IL.12
IL.5

✓ 1. Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, MA

Although building 421 was used for AEC operation under contract #AT(30-1)-956, there is insufficient evidence that DOE has the authority to conduct remedial action at this site. Buildings 34, 41, and the GSA site are not, nor were they, the responsibility of the DOE. Therefore, based on the evidence noted in the authority review, it is determined that there is no authority to conduct remedial action at these Watertown sites. Due to the fact that there is contamination at these sites, please prepare the appropriate draft letters of notification to the EPA and State.

2. Ore Storage Site, Palmertown, PA

It appears from the evidence in the Authority Reviews that there may be authority to conduct remedial action at this site. However, there is not enough radiological data to substantiate a decision on the need for remedial action and therefore a radiological survey of the site should be made to determine if the site meets the FUSRAP criteria for authority or inclusion into the FUSRAP.

3. Superior Steel Corporation, Carnegie, PA

It appears from the records that although the radioactive contamination remaining at this site may have been from DOE predecessor agencies (MED/AEC), there is no recorded evidence that the AEC had responsibility for the personal health of the workers or public at this site or for decontamination of the site after the work had been completed. Therefore, it is determined that the DOE has no authority for remedial action at this site. Please prepare the appropriate draft correspondence to notify the EPA and the State of Pennsylvania.

4. Metal Fabrication Contractor Sites

American Chain and Cable Co., Bridgeport, OH
 Baker Brothers, Inc., Toledo, OH
 B&T Metals Co., Columbus, OH
 Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, PA
 Cooperwell Steel Co., Warner, OH
 William E. Pratt Mfg. Co., Joliet, IL
 Quality Hardware & Machine Co., Chicago, IL
 C. H. Schnoor & Co., Springdale, PA

There is sufficient contractual evidence to indicate that the DOE has authority to conduct remedial action at these sites. However, there is not sufficient radiological data to include these sites in the FUSRAP. Therefore, it is decided to conduct initial visits and/or designation surveys at these sites, except for McKinney Tool & Mfg. Co., to see if remedial action is required under the FUSRAP. The initial visit to the McKinney Tool and Mfg. Co. indicated little, if any, radioactivity above normal background. Therefore, a survey at this site is not required and the site can be eliminated from the FUSRAP.

5. Ventron Division of Thiokol Corporation, Beverly, MA

The information in the authority review indicates there is authority for the DOE to conduct remedial action at this site and based on the survey conducted by ORNL in 1982, the site will be designated for remedial action. It has been decided that the survey results obtained by ORNL be compiled in a suitable report for appropriate use as soon as possible.

6. Electro-Metallurgical Co., Niagara Falls, NY

The data presented in the authority review precludes remedial action at this site; therefore, there is no authority for remedial action. As far as can be determined by the information in the authority review, the site should be eliminated from the FUSRAP. Therefore, eliminate the site from the FUSRAP and prepare the draft correspondence notifying the EPA and the State of the site condition.

7. National Guard Armory, Chicago, IL

From the data furnished in the authority review, there is sufficient evidence that this site can be included in the FUSRAP for remedial action and that the DOE has authority to conduct the remedial action. When the final documentation is received, this site will be designated for remedial action in the FUSRAP. Verbal comments were given to you by me on October 2, 1985.

8. Bridgeport Brass, Seymour, CT

From the information in the authority review, the DOE has authority to conduct remedial action at this site. All the surveys indicate


remedial action is required, although at a low-level priority due to the location of the contamination in the floor drain. The site will be designated based on the ORNL report.

9. Bridgeport Brass, Havens Laboratory, Bridgeport, CT

The data from the ORNL preliminary survey report indicates that this site can be eliminated from the FUSRAP; therefore, include this site in the list for elimination from the FUSRAP.

If there are any questions, please call me on 353-5439.

Sincerely,



Arthur J. Whitman
Division of Facility and Site
Decommissioning Projects
Office of Nuclear Energy

cc:
S. Miller, GC-11