4B100

1 of 15

Woodward-Clyde

FAX TRANSMITTAL

4582 South Ulster Street
Denver, Colorado 80237
Return FAX Number is (303) 740-2705

000064244

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

The information contained in this FAX is confidential and/or privileged. This FAX is intended to be reviewed initially by the individual named below. If the reader of the TRANSMITTAL is not the intended recipient or a representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination or copying of the FAX or the information contained herein is prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone and return this FAX to the sender at the above address. Thank you.

For Immediate Delivery

TO: Neil Holsteen
Company: EG&G
Phone Number: 966-6987
FAX Number: 966-8704

FROM: Pat Westphal
Total Pages (including Cover Sheet): 11
Date: 9/21/94
Phone Number: 740-3859

Message: Responses to COC TM EG&G/DOE comments.

Rotha was sent original.

Tox TM responses - I need to spend more time assuring they're OK - will try to do this afternoon.

Pat

If you do not receive all of the pages transmitted or have any

Reviewed for Classification/UCNI
By: Janet Nesheim, Derivative Classifier
DOE, EMCBC
Date: 10-14-08
Confirmed Unclassified, Not UCNI

Woodward-Clyde Federal Services

1/5

ADMIN RECORD

A-OU06-000562

REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Time Spent on Review _____ hrs

Return to

FAX	Name	Ext	Location
8575	ROTHA A RANDALL	X6924	080/533

If questions on content, please call the SME

Name	Ext
N A HOLSTEEN	X6987

Please review the attached procedure _____ Number _____ Rev _____ Draft Tech Memorandum No. 4, Chemicals of Concern, HHRA Walnut Creek Priority Drainage OU No 6

Comment Due Date _____

☐ Internal Review ☒ Parallel Review ☐ Verification ☐ Validation ☐ Revalidation

General (G) comments require resolution but do not require resolution acceptance Mandatory (M) comments require resolution and resolution acceptance
1-A03-PPG-004 provides complete definitions of General and Mandatory comments

TYPE G or M	PAGE	SECTION OR LINE #	COMMENT	DISPOSITION	Disposition Accepted INIT/DATE
G	1-1	2-2	HHRA - What list will be used for EERA? Need summary list of COCs by media up front	Summary provided in Exec. Sum. EERA does separate coc selection.	
	2-2	1	"Table 2-3" was this list agreed to by EPA/CDH? If so, cite the reference	Workplan cited in text.	
	2-2		"Surficial Soil" (First sentence) Site reference	Numerous SOPs apply to the field sampling programs - for all media. It is considered sufficient to cite the OU6 Workplan.	
	2-2	IHSS 141	Second sentence, "Samples were analyzed " What was analyte list based on?		
	2-5	Para 3	"Pond Sediments" RFP site-wide surface " Reference to SOP		
	2-6	1	"Pond Surface Water" "The RFP site-wide surface water " reference SOP		
	2-6	5	" five of the inlet " feet?	Corrected.	
	2-6		"Data used to evaluate OU-6 "This does not reflect yearly cycle, seems like a data gap	Text clarified (samples for use in OU6 RI/RFI were from one-time sampling)	
	2-6		First sentence, last paragraph " results as of January 15, 1994, will be included "	Report is in preparation; present tense retained for future readers.	
	2-12	2	" somewhat less than " vague, give range	Text revised.	
	2-13	2 9	Identification of Chemicals of Concern Why is this here	Deleted.	

POC/Reviewer (Comments not signed by POC/Reviewer will be considered unofficial and not subject to resolution)

n No Comments

n This procedure revision has no impact or relevance to our discipline or organization and we waive need to concur

Name	Signature	
PAUL SINGH		

Ext./Pager/Fax	Bldg./Dept./AGM	Date
X3490	DOE-RFFO	8/3/94

Resolutions Accepted

Initials _____ Date _____

NOTE These reviews are completed by qualified reviewers in accordance with 1-A03-PPG-004 in concert with 1-A01-PPG-001 and 1-A02 PPG 003

RF 47947 (5/93)

2

REVIEW COMMENT SHEET (continued)

Review comments for document: Tech Memorandum No. 4, Chemicals of Concern, HHRA Walnut Creek Priority Drainage, OU No 6 | Number | Rev | Draft

TYPE G or M	PAGE	SECTION OR LINE #	COMMENT	DISPOSITION	Disposition Accepted INIT/DATE
	3-1	3 1	"The Old Outfall " Need more explanation If exclusion of 143 has been officially proposed to EPA, and CDH, cite reference	More explanation provided.	
	3 2	3 2	" rejected as potential OU wide chemicals of concern" based on background comparison?	Approach and text revised.	
	3 2	3 3	"OU-wide chemicals of concern" add for surface soils	Done	
	3 3		"OU-wide Chemicals of Concern Surface Soil Can professional judgement reasoning from OU1 be used to eliminate some of these?	Mercury and nickel deleted (< 1% total risk factor).	
		Table 3-6	Don't need a table	Maybe not- kept for consistency.	
	5 2	5 3	"All but four metals " which ones? not clear	List added.	
	5 2		"Presence of naturally occurring zones of " This needs more technical backup	Technical backup is far from Mary Siders, as cited on p. 5-2. Information will be presented in 1994 Backgnd Geochemical Report.	
	5 4		Last sentence "data not shown" Why not? This type of data should be presented	Data Included.	
	5 5	5 4	Last sentence "Chemicals of concern" add for groundwater	Done.	
	7 2	7 3	"OU-Wide Chemicals of Concern Pond Surface Water" How do you get these VOCs in surface water?	Discussion added.	

POC/Reviewer (Comments not signed by the POC/Reviewer will be considered as unofficial comments)

PAUL SINGH (Name) | Signature | 8/3/94 (Date)

Resolutions Accepted: Initials | Date

RF 47947A (5/93)

3

3

REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Time Spent on Review _____ hrs

Return to

FAX	Name	Ext.	Location
8575	ROTHA A RANDALL	X6924	080/533

If questions on content, please call the SME

Name	Ext.
N A HOLSTEEN	X6987

Please review the attached procedure _____ Number _____ Rev _____ Draft Tech Memorandum No. 4, Chemicals of Concern, HHRA Walnut Creek Priority Drainage OU No 6

Comment Due Date _____

☐ Internal Review ☒ Parallel Review ☐ Verification ☐ Validation ☐ Revalidation

General (G) comments require resolution but do not require resolution acceptance Mandatory (M) comments require resolution and resolution acceptance
1-A03-PPG-004 provides complete definitions of General and Mandatory comments

TYPE G or M	PAGE	SECTION OR LINE #	COMMENT	DISPOSITION	Disposition Accepted INIT/DATE
G	1-1	2-2	HHRA - What list will be used for EERA? Need summary list of COCs by media up front	Summary provided in Exec. Sum. EERA does separate coc selection.	
	2-2	1	"Table 2-3" was this list agreed to by EPA/CDH? If so, cite the reference	Workplan cited in text.	
	2-2		"Surficial Soil" (First sentence) Site reference	Numerous SOPs apply to the field sampling programs - for all media. It is considered sufficient to cite the OU6 Workplan.	
	2-2	IHSS 141	Second sentence, "Samples were analyzed " What was analyte list based on?		
	2-5	Para 3	"Pond Sediments" RFP site-wide surface " Reference to SOP		
	2-6	1	"Pond Surface Water" "The RFP site-wide surface water " reference SOP		
	2-6	5	" five of the inlet " feet?	Corrected.	
	2-6		"Data used to evaluate OU-6 "This does not reflect yearly cycle, seems like a data gap	Text clarified (samples for use in OU6 RI/RFI were from one-time sampling)	
	2-6		First sentence, last paragraph " results as of January 15, 1994, will be included "	Report is in preparation; present tense retained for future readers.	
	2-12	2	" somewhat less than " vague, give range	Text revised.	
	2-13	29	Identification of Chemicals of Concern Why is this here	Deleted.	

POC/Reviewer (Comments not signed by POC/Reviewer will be considered unofficial and not subject to resolution)

n No Comments

n This procedure revision has no impact or relevance to our discipline or organization and we waive need to concur

Name	Signature
PAUL SINGH	

Ext./Pager/Fax	Bldg./Dept./AGM	Date
X3490	DOE-RFFO	8/3/94

Resolutions Accepted

Initials	Date

NOTE These reviews are completed by qualified reviewers in accordance with 1-A03-PPG-004 in concert with 1-A01 PPG-001 and 1-A02-PPG-003

RF 47947 (5/93)

4

REVIEW COMMENT SHEET (continued)

Review comments for document: Tech Memorandum No. 4, Chemicals of Concern, HHRA Walnut Creek Priority Drainage, OU No 6 | Number | Rev | Draft

TYPE G or M	PAGE	SECTION OR LINE #	COMMENT	DISPOSITION	Disposition Accepted INIT/DATE
	3 1	3 1	"The Old Outfall " Need more explanation If exclusion of 143 has been officially proposed to EPA, and CDH, cite reference	More explanation provided.	
	3 2	3 2	" rejected as potential OU-wide chemicals of concern" based on background comparison?	Approach and text revised.	
	3 - 2	3 3	"OU wide chemicals of concern" add for surface soils	Done	
	3 3		"OU-wide Chemicals of Concern Surface Soil" Can professional judgement reasoning from OU1 be used to eliminate some of these?	Mercury and nickel deleted (< 1% total risk factor).	
		Table 3-6	Don't need a table	Maybe not - kept for consistency.	
	5 2	5 3	"All but four metals " which ones? not clear	List added.	
	5 - 2		"Presence of naturally occurring zones of " This needs more technical backup	Technical backup is far from Mary Sidors, as cited on p. 5-2. Information will be presented in 1994 Background Geochemical Report.	
	5 4		Last sentence "data not shown" Why not? This type of data should be presented	Data included.	
	5 - 5	5 4	Last sentence "Chemicals of concern" add for groundwater	Done.	
	7 2	7 3	"OU-Wide Chemicals of Concern Pond Surface Water" How do you get these VOCs in surface water?	Discussion added.	

POC/Reviewer (Comments not signed by the POC/Reviewer will be considered as unofficial comments)

PAUL SINGH (Name) | Signature | 8/3/94 (Date)

Resolutions Accepted

Initials | Date

RF 47947A (5/93)

5/5

9