Subject: RE: Acid Canyon Storm Water results/Other Fire-Related Data
Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 17:17:03 -0700
From: "Taylor, Theodore" <ttaylor@doeal.gov>
To: "Vozella, Joseph" <jvozella@doeal.gov>, pratt_a@lanl.gov, gallaher@lanl.gov, stevenrae@lanl.gov, syanicak@lanl.gov, "'Bob Enz'" <benz@enzinc.com>
CC: ralph_fordschmid@nmenv.state.nm.us, "'agogino'" <kagogino@doeal.gov>

Thanks, Bob,

To ALL, I believe we should prepare a memorandum (informal, as AIP's was informal) and send it to AIP. The memo should (1) provide a summary of our understanding of the AIP results [Bob already made a stab at this], (2) confirm or deny the regulatory interpretations, (3) summarize our plans for SFAC, and (4) indicate any interim actions, i.e., BMPs, we are considering.

Bob, would you work with Al Pratt to get this done? JULIE, is it OK for Bob to work directly with Al on this one?

KAREN, this seems to have implications for the SWAT. Would you check with Steve Veenis?

Let's "huddle" on this one in the near future.

Ted

> ----------
> *From: Bob Enz[SMTP:benz%enzinc.com@internet.al.gov]*
> *Sent: Monday, March 12, 2001 5:07 PM*
> *To: Taylor, Theodore; Vozella, Joseph; pratt_a%lanl.gov@internet.al.gov;*
> *gallaher%lanl.gov@internet.al.gov; stevenrae%lanl.gov@internet.al.gov;*
> *syanicak%lanl.gov@internet.al.gov*
> *Cc: ralph_fordschmid%nmenv.state.nm.us@internet.al.gov*
> *Subject: Fwd: Acid Canyon Storm Water results/Other Fire-Related Data*
>
> *<<File: Vozella_Acid_Canyon_storm_water_2000.doc>><<File: Acid*
> *Canyon(storm water).xls>>*
> *I interviewed Ralph Ford Schmid, this afternoon, re: the analytical data*
> *from stormwater samples collected from Acid Canyon (AC) and the South Fork*
> *of Acid Canyon (SFAC). The samples were collected using 1.8 liter,*
> *single-stage samplers which were fastened to re-bar that was hammered down*
> *into the sides of the stream channels. One sampler was set to collect*
> *sample at a water depth of 6-7" from the bottom of SFAC, another sampler*
> *was set to collect sample at a water depth of 10" from the bottom of SFAC*
> *just upstream of the first sampler, and a third sampler was located in AC*
> *and set to collect sample from a water depth of 10" from the bottom of*
> *AC. This 3rd sampler (i.e., AC set at 10") did not collect sample from*
> *the rain event (i.e., water depths weren't high enough). Exact location*
> *information for the samplers was not collected during the interview.*
>
> *The suspended sediment was separated from the water phase, and each phase*
> *was sent separately to the analytical lab. Thus, results are reported for*
> *the dissolved phase, the suspended sediment, and in some cases a*
> *composited suspended-sediment sample for two days when insufficient*
> *suspended-sediment sample was available from a single day's event. If*
> *sufficient volume was not available, a sample was not submitted with the*
> *exception of the composited sediment sample previously described. No*
> *duplicates, field blanks, trip blanks, or spikes were sent to EnviroTest*
> *of Wyoming by the OB.*
>
> *Regulatory implications are as follows:*

HSWA LANL 04/1049/WJC-00-004

TL


7525

> 1. Some of the values exceed the gross alpha standard for livestock watering.
> 2. Some of the values imply the potential for impact or continued impact to groundwater based on the dissolved phase detects. For example, dissolved phase samples 9078-01 and 010090-09 both show Sr90 values above the MCL of 7.0 pCi/L. The suspended sediment values imply that a source in SFAC is still moving downstream. Contaminated sediment is still being mobilized. The dissolved phase from a SFAC source is still being sourced to the groundwater.
> 3. OB believes the hazardous waste permit has language calling for control of contaminant migration. The stormwater samples collected from the SFAC might indicate that actions are needed to prevent future exceedances of standards and future releases. For example, the 16.4 pCi/L of Pu239/240 exceeds the 15.0 pCi/L gross alpha standard without looking at the other alpha emitters. Stabilization or removal of the source, believed to be in the lower third of the canyon, might be warranted actions to prevent further releases to the groundwater.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> X-Sender: syanicak@beasley.lanl.gov
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2
> Date: Mon, 12 Mar 2001 10:55:25 -0600
> To: benz@enzinc.com, ttaylor@doeal.gov
> From: Stephen Yanicak
> Subject: Fwd: Acid Canyon Storm Water results/Other Fire-Related Data
>
> Bob and Ted---As per Vozella's request---We are sitting on this data for the time being-- until LA County is briefed---yak
>
>
>
>
>
> Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 13:50:24 -0600
> To: vozella joe LAAO
> From: Stephen Yanicak <syanicak@beasley.lanl.gov>
> Subject: Acid Canyon Storm Water results/Other Fire-Related Data
> Cc: taylor ted LAAO, parker john OB, michael tim OB
>
> Joe---Just as a reminder---this Acid Canyon Storm Water data (attachment) that I sent you (and Reneau) in January (01/18/01) should have been run by Los Alamos county by now (as per our DOE OB, LA County, and DOE operating protocol for groundwater and soil data--see Bob Enz)---I think that Ted was assigned our POC for all transmittals--and he would bring such matters up at his monthly ER meetings with the county. Anyway, DOE is supposed to sort out and transmit to LA County all OB LA County-specific data (Acid Canyon definitely is!)-------I don't think this has gone public yet on our end, or if anybody has requested it----but as a reminder to what happened last year--when LASG took our public data and went to the paper with it---and we got blamed for going to the press!! The last thing I (we) need is another situation like that without the County being in the loop----followed by Fred Brueggeman--or whoever--sending me another nasty-gram that NMED can't be trusted to inform the County before going to the press etc.-----Anyway, let me know if you need me to do anything else on my end here with the County---thanks---yak

> ps--We also have other Cerro Grande fire-related data (some of specific concern to LA County) that Ralph is now preparing for release simultaneously to DOE and RAC (includes PCBs in storm water runoff)---Our concern about the fire data is that the RAC wants all our data now (before DOE gets their 30-day look-see)--which might conflict with the language in the AIP concerning data release to the public. What is your (DOE's) view on this (Matt Johansen brought this up at last weeks RAC meeting in Santa Fe)---please advise (looking for a real simple solution)----thanks---yak

****
Steve Yanicak, State Government Worker
New Mexico Environment Department
Department of Energy Oversight Bureau
P.O. Box 1663 MS J993 TA-00-1313
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545
email: syanicak@lanl.gov
(505) 672-0448
(505) 672-0466 FAX
(505) 672-0443 Office Secretary

External Mail/Package Address:

New Mexico Environment Department
DOE Oversight Bureau
134 State Road 4, Suite A, Room 1
White Rock, New Mexico 87544
****