

LANL

TA 73 AIRPORT LANDFILL
5 AUG 02

Subject: Re: FW: Airport Landfill, IM, Conference Call

Date: Mon, 05 Aug 2002 15:42:24 -0600

From: Vickie Maranville <vickie_maranville@nmenv.state.nm.us>

To: "Gregory, David R." <dgregory@doeal.gov>

CC: "Terry Rust" <trust@lanl.gov>, "Trollinger, Everett" <etrollinger@doeal.gov>,
'Bret Lucas' <bret_lucas@nmenv.state.nm.us>

BCC: James Bearzi <james_bearzi@nmenv.state.nm.us>

David,

Thank you for the recap of our telephone conversation, however I would like to clarify a few points. NMED sent official correspondence to the co-permittees explaining compliance status for the Airport Landfill drainages. NMED expects a plan detailing a path forward for debris removal at the site. NMED would be happy to review and discuss a memo, however NMED views a memo as informal. The email is unclear as to what exactly will be submitted to NMED on August 7, 2002. I trust DOE intends to submit a formal plan and response to NMED.

Item #2 of the attached email is unclear. Is the memo being referred to the formal DOE request for an extension of time for submittal of the IM Plan, and is the "alternative for execution of this work" using an alternative contractor to RRES-ER?

If possible, please clarify the above items and I can print a copy of the email and response for the record. Thank you.

Vickie

"Gregory, David R." wrote:

- > Vickie/Terry
- > FYI on the highlights of our conversation this morning. Call or email if
- > you have any questions/comments.
- > Thanks
- > David
- >
- > > This is a recap of this morning's tele-com between NMED, DOE and RRES-ER
- > > to discuss a path-forward regarding the subject project and specifically
- > > the response from DOE/U.C. to NMED's memo of July 24, 2002.
- > > The conference call included Vickie Maranville (NMED), Terry Rust
- > > (RRES-ER) and David Gregory.
- > >
- > > The most time critical aspect of the July 24 memo from Ms. Maranville to
- > > Everett and John Browne was NMED's request for submission of a revised
- > > plan and accelerated schedule by August 7, 2002.
- > > DOE stated that DOE would not be submitting a revised plan by the Aug 7
- > > request but rather DOE/UC would respond with a memo stating the following:
- > > 1. Options for final remedy for this project have been narrowed to two,
- > > helicopter or crane.
- > > 2. DOE is considering an alternative for execution of this work (as
- > > discussed briefly in memo to NMED, June 18, 2002) and that a determination
- > > will be made in the next few days.
- > > 3. That depending on which execution alternative DOE selects a final
- > > remedy and schedule will be furnished to NMED;
- > > a. If execution remains with U.C. then remedy and schedule will be
- > > submitted by August 28, 2002.
- > > b. If execution is through an inter-agency agreement with another
- > > government agency then final remedy and schedule will follow contract
- > > procurement as part of a contractor deliverable, by November 9, 2002.



4870

Re: FW: Airport Landfill, IM, Conference Call

> > 4. *NMED recommended that we including as much detail in the response*
> > *letter back to NMED as possible.*
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >