

**Subject: Re: Another WWIS problem**

**Date:** Fri, 26 Jan 2001 07:14:53 -0700

**From:** Don Hancock <sricdon@earthlink.net>

**To:** Steve\_Zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us

*Handwritten scribbles*

Steve,

Yes, it's the PR people doing the release. However, on previous January shipments the release didn't show that the entire shipment was mixed waste, and the number of drums the release showed were mixed corresponded to the WWIS information. So I appreciate your checking it out. When there's inconsistent information, it needs to be fixed, whether the problem is with the WWIS (and we know there have been some) or with the PR folks (where we also know there have been some problems).

*1/29/01*

*DON -  
As requested.*

Now that we're past "emplacement" day, I'd like to get the WWIS information on the shipments since 1/17 and the shipment and receipt dates for RF10006, for which you've given me the Shipment Summary Report.

*Steve*

Thanks for your help.

*Handwritten arrows pointing to 1/19/01 and 1/20/01*

As an aside, you will be getting some comments about the DAC modification in the next few days by the end of the comment period. We do need the 60-day comment period since some of the referenced documents are hard to get and there are other things that the public needs to do besides read those documents.

At 02:28 PM 01/25/2001 -0700, you wrote:

>Don -

>

>Judging by the fax you sent me, this notice from INEEL you mentioned is  
>issued by Stacey Francis from their Waste Management Communication  
>group. I have no idea where she gets her information from, what level of  
>verification she goes through to ensure her information is correct, etc.  
>I called just now but left her a message because she is out of the  
>office today. I have cc'd her on this memo in hopes that she can respond  
>to both of us regarding your question. Because the waste type  
>information in the WWIS is container specific (i.e., waste stream  
>profile name, mixed vs. non-mixed designation) and is entered into the  
>database before the shipment is assembled, I would tend to believe the  
>WWIS in this case, particularly when it comes to identifying mixed vs.  
>non-mixed on the basis of EPA codes. However, true verification would  
>require reconciliation with the shipping manifest, available at the WIPP  
>site and at INEEL.

>

>Not to belittle PR people, but I don't usually consider them to be  
>ultimate source of reliable information. However, your skepticism and  
>concern regarding this discrepancy is noted.

>

010133



**Subject: Re: Another WWIS problem**

**Date:** Fri, 26 Jan 2001 07:14:53 -0700

**From:** Don Hancock <sricon@earthlink.net>

**To:** Steve\_Zappe@nmenv.state.nm.us

Steve,

Yes, it's the PR people doing the release. However, on previous January shipments the release didn't show that the entire shipment was mixed waste, and the number of drums the release showed were mixed corresponded to the WWIS information. So I appreciate your checking it out. When there's inconsistent information, it needs to be fixed, whether the problem is with the WWIS (and we know there have been some) or with the PR folks (where we also know there have been some problems).

Now that we're past "emplacement" day, I'd like to get the WWIS information on the shipments since 1/17 and the shipment and receipt dates for RF10006, for which you've given me the Shipment Summary Report.

Thanks for your help.

As an aside, you will be getting some comments about the DAC modification in the next few days by the end of the comment period. We do need the 60-day comment period since some of the referenced documents are hard to get and there are other things that the public needs to do besides read those documents.

At 02:28 PM 01/25/2001 -0700, you wrote:

>Don -

>

>Judging by the fax you sent me, this notice from INEEL you mentioned is  
>issued by Stacey Francis from their Waste Management Communication  
>group. I have no idea where she gets her information from, what level of  
>verification she goes through to ensure her information is correct, etc.

>I called just now but left her a message because she is out of the  
>office today. I have cc'd her on this memo in hopes that she can respond  
>to both of us regarding your question. Because the waste type  
>information in the WWIS is container specific (i.e., waste stream  
>profile name, mixed vs. non-mixed designation) and is entered into the  
>database before the shipment is assembled, I would tend to believe the  
>WWIS in this case, particularly when it comes to identifying mixed vs.  
>non-mixed on the basis of EPA codes. However, true verification would  
>require reconciliation with the shipping manifest, available at the WIPP  
>site and at INEEL.

>

>Not to belittle PR people, but I don't usually consider them to be  
>ultimate source of reliable information. However, your skepticism and  
>concern regarding this discrepancy is noted.

>

>I am still awaiting written feedback from the WWIS folks on the  
>incorrect receipt dates for the three shipments (RF010005, IN010031, and  
>IN010032) previously identified: the basis for the original dates, the  
>justification for changing the dates, and implementation of any measures  
>to prevent this from happening again.  
>  
>Steve  
>  
>  
>Don Hancock wrote:  
>>  
>> Steve,  
>>  
>> Thanks for the response and fax.  
>>  
>> One mistake was mine -- I thought the 1/11 and 1/18 repository reports were  
>> the same as to Rocky Flats, and as you pointed out, they're not. I also  
>> didn't realize that Thursday is "emplacement day" so that explanation  
> helps.  
>>  
>> I still want to know about the discrepancies on the shipping receipt dates.  
>>  
>> And I now have another question.  
>>  
>> This year INEEL has started a new praactice, which is to do a notice of  
>> each shipment to WIPP. The notice provides the shipment number, time and  
>> date it leaves INEEL, number of drums of waste, limits (i.e., why not 42  
>> drums), number of mixed waste drums, cumulative cubic meters for the fiscal  
>> year, and cumulative cubic meters to date.  
>>  
>> For shipments 31, 32, and 33, the INEEL info corresponds to the WWIS  
>> information. For example, INEEL says that shipment 33 has 28 drums, 19 are  
>> mixed. The WWIS information shows 28 drums, and hazardous waste codes for  
>> 19. However, for shipment 34, INEEL says all 34 drums are mixed  
>> waste. But the WWIS information shows hazardous waste codes for only 25  
>> drums. Why the discrepancy?  
>>  
>> I'd appreciate any insight into this new matter, as well as what you find  
>> out about the receipt dates, especially for INEEL 10031. Also, why was the  
>> receipt date for RF10005 initially wrong?  
>>  
>> \*\*\*\*\*  
>> Don Hancock  
>> Southwest Research and Information Center  
>> PO Box 4524  
>> Albuquerque, NM 87106  
>> 505-262-1862  
>> fax: 505-262-1864  
>> www.sric.org

\*\*\*\*\*

Don Hancock  
Southwest Research and Information Center  
PO Box 4524  
Albuquerque, NM 87106  
505-262-1862  
fax: 505-262-1864  
[www.sric.org](http://www.sric.org)