

**From:** Owens, Kirk W.  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2005 8:00 PM  
**To:** Antizzo, Karen B.; Roles, Gary W.  
**Subject:** FW: FW: 260 Outfall

**Attachments:** SWEIS comments hickmott 12\_05.doc

**Kirk Owens**

SAIC  
(301) 601-5611 (voice)  
(301) 428-0145 (fax)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** hth@lanl.gov [mailto:hth@lanl.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2005 5:31 PM  
**To:** ewithers@doeal.gov  
**Cc:** kirk.w.owens@saic.com; isaacson@lanl.gov; sradz@lanl.gov; dfarley@lanl.gov; dhickmott@lanl.gov  
**Subject:** FW: FW: 260 Outfall

Attached are SWEIS comments regarding Outfall 260.

---

**From:** Don Hickmott [mailto:dhickmott@lanl.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 09, 2005 2:49 PM  
**To:** Todd Haagenstad  
**Subject:** Re: FW: 260 Outfall

Todd, Attached are comments on the portions of the SWEIS that deal with the 260 outfall (and any other errors I noted while paging through the document). there certainly are a lot of errors .... Mostly not too big in the case of the 260 outfall. You are going to consolidate ER comments and provide them to Isacson? Don

At 10:46 AM 12/1/2005, you wrote:

Don,

As promised (thanks to Nathan), here is the SWEIS review piece on Outfall 260 you requested. Again, keep in mind this is not intended to be absolutely inclusive, rather, a tool to get you at the bulk of reference to 260. Hope it helps.

Todd

---

**From:** Nathan G. Knoche [mailto:knoche@lanl.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 01, 2005 10:27 AM  
**To:** 'Todd Haagenstad'  
**Subject:** 260 Outfall

#### **260 Outfall**

- Page 8, Line 135
- Page 102, Line 1795
- Page 104-106, Lines 1867-1915
- Page 205, Lines 4665-4672
- Page 206, Line 4687
- Page 231, Line 3499

- [Page 232, Lines 3520-3529](#)
- [Page 235, Line 3657](#)
- [Page 243, Line 3898](#)
- [Page 245, Lines 3957-3963, 3967](#)
- [Page 252, Lines 4184-4188](#)
- [Page 255, Line 4281](#)
- [Page 260, Lines 4417-4422](#)
- [Page 261, Lines 4444-4448](#)

---

**From:** Todd Haagenstad [<mailto:htth@lanl.gov>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 01, 2005 8:11 AM  
**To:** 'Don Hickmott'  
**Cc:** [knoche@lanl.gov](mailto:knoche@lanl.gov)  
**Subject:** RE: Resources for reviewing the LANL SWEIS -- first phase

I'll have something for you ASAP. Todd

**From:** Don Hickmott [<mailto:dhickmott@lanl.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2005 5:25 PM  
**To:** Todd Haagenstad  
**Subject:** Re: Resources for reviewing the LANL SWEIS -- first phase

Todd, What about the 260 outfall? Can you ID the pages where it is discussed as well? Don

At 05:16 PM 11/30/2005, you wrote:  
All –

Attached is an “index” for weaving your way through the SWEIS review. We have put together a MDA-specific list of where individual SME’s may find the vast majority of references to their MDA (by SWEIS page and line). This is **not an all inclusive list**, but should capture the majority of references.

In addition, I recommend you take a look at the ER overview piece at the beginning of Attachment I to get the broader context for how the analysis is presented. This piece can be found on pages I-1 through I-8 (lines 1-195). I would also suggest you take a look at Tables I-47, 48, 50, 51, and 55. I am continuing to work a strategy for assisting you with reviewing other sections of the SWEIS (e.g., the impact section Appendix H, and the accident section).

I just heard from NNSA LASO today, and they emphasized how important it is to conduct a solid MDA review in particular – so our effort is timely.

Thanks for your time and effort.

Todd  
5-2936

## Comments on SWEIS – Appendix I, 260 Outfall

It appears that the line number identifiers are not unique.

- 1) On page 8 (Line 135) in Table 1-4 the SWMU for the 260 outfall should be 16-021(c)-99 not 21-014.
- 2) Line 1875 (page 104-106) is punctuated incorrectly. Should read “EPA permitted the outfall in the late 1970s. The ....”
- 3) In Line 1909 (page 104-106) I’m not sure the 2004 reference for the Phase III RFI is correct, unless this is referencing the NOD response and revised RFI.
- 4) In Line 1913 (page 104-106) (h)-99 should be 16-010(h)-99.
- 5) In Line 1915 (page 104-106) 17-008(a)-99 should be 16-008(a)-99
- 6) I’m not sure why MDA-P is included in this SWEIS (see section I.2.7.4) inasmuch as all activities at this site have been completed.
- 7) Line 3629, 3631 – These tables assume that MDAs Q and R will be capped. Current baseline assumptions for both are that there will be removal but no capping. This may be true for other MDAs in these tables that I am not familiar with.
- 8) Lines 4665 & 3499 (p. 231), 3525 (p. 232), 3898 (p. 241) - 16-21(c) -99 should be 16-021(c)-99.
- 9) Line 3656 (p. 235) change most to ‘some’
- 10) Line 3816 change VIC to VOC and tetrachloroetene to tetrachloroethene
- 11) Line 3193. I don’t think MDA-F is fenced unless fencing has been installed during the last couple of years.
- 12) Lines 4187 and 4188. Delete last sentence and replace with “The historic process building is located approximately 400 meters south of MDA-R and the 260 outfall.”
- 13) Line 4281: The blank for MDA-R should say K-Site Road. For both MDA-R and 260 outfall this road intersects Anchor Ranch Road, not R Site Road.
- 14) Lines 4417 and 4418 (p. 260). Delete the sentence stating “Remediating the 260 outfall ....”. Replace it with a sentence stating: “Remediating the 260 outfall will result in no changes in land use; TA-16 is anticipated to remain the Laboratory’s HE processing facility, with attendant security restrictions”. I would then delete the rest of the sentences in this paragraph.