

Petty, Harold L.

From: Petty, Harold L.
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2003 7:42 AM
To: 'Stone, Sam'; Petty, Harold L.; Smith, Daniel R.
Cc: Tockstein, Carl; Nofal, Mohamed; Tant, Ray; Minghini, Cherie M.
Subject: RE: Kingston FP - Proposed Scrubber Stack/Disposal Area Investigation

Sam:

I will not be able to attend this Wednesday. Cherie Minghini will be there and I will cc her on this e-mail and ask her to let you know a location for the meeting. Yes, I have received a copy of your cost estimate. We are just holding it till after the meeting in case the scope of your work changes during the course of discussions.

With regard to the density testing task. I will check on the status of the issued TAO. We turned in two Bear Creek TAO's and the Kingston TAO on the same day (12-19-02). I suspect they are mired up in the switch to the new contract.

Thanks,
Lynn
H. L. Petty, PE
1101 Market Street
LP 2G-C
423-751-6704
423-751-7094 (fax)
423-838-1741 (mobile)

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

From: Stone, Sam [mailto:SStone02@kennesaw.lawco.com]
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2003 5:00 PM
To: Petty, Lynn; Smith, Dan
Cc: Tockstein, Carl; Nofal, Mohamed; Tant, Ray
Subject: Kingston FP - Proposed Scrubber Stack/Disposal Area Investigation

Lynn and Dan

Is the meeting still scheduled at the site for 10 AM , Wednesday, January 15 ? Can you provide a meeting room location, etc.? I understand there will be a field walkdown/inspection of the proposed waste site? I presume both of you have received our cost estimate for the investigation.

Also, Lynn, has TVA issued a TAO for Law to perform on-call density testing, etc., for the Kingston Dredge Cell? We have sent an engineer or technician to the site on at least a couple of occasions as requested by the plant. We need a TAO to establish a project number for our timesheets, etc. If you have already sent us a TAO please excuse me because it may have arrived and I am not aware of it.

Thanks

Sam

Samuel D. Stone, P.E.
Corporate Consultant - Geotechnical
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
Phone - 865-588-8544
Fax - 865-588-6677
e mail - sstone02@lawco.com

25 years 500,000 tons/yr

70 acre footprint
7H/1V for water

3:1 w/15'	9,297,560
3:1 w/ truncated	8,919,715
4:1 w/15'	7,505,859

@ slough → 100' from waste
↳ inside edge of dike

10th mtg @ site
10 a.m.

Dry Stack vs. Wet Stack
Difference in capacity?

Expand access rd 10'-25'

2nd analysis
other slough - @ 3:1
100' to waste from W.S.

10 am KIF
15th
Peller (Karst)
Law - Sam & Carl
Parsons
EA
Eng.

10,000,000 cy (w/cap)

(wanted 6-10 mill cy)

3:1

15' benches

every 30' high

180' high (as high as it will go)

Look at 4:1 w/benches

truncated top

2 PM → meet w/DAN

(send Dan email on MON.)

ALSO w/OUT SLEW
OR OTHER IDEAS

Use RANDY CALLOWAY → for GPS survey

robbiemont@
wmconnect.com

Minghini, Cherie M.

From: Smith, Daniel R.
Sent: Monday, December 23, 2002 11:57 AM
To: Petty, Harold L.
Cc: Minghini, Cherie M.
Subject: KIF Proposed Gypsum Stack - geo investigation

I met briefly with Carl Tockstein and Sam Stone. We discussed it in general terms. I'm probably not going to give them specifics regarding exact number of holes, etc. For an overall view, at least five borings (as an absolute minimum) would be needed within the area boxed out. I would also want to take some borings (couple) in potential borrow areas, as well as the hillside to the west of the facility location (geoprobe and/or boring combination - to get depth to bedrock). I think what Sam and Carl thought was that they could get a geoprobe in there and punch a bunch of holes to identify depth to rock. We also discussed the karst geology/topography. They would then go back and auger drill/sample over selected geoprobe locations in order to "ground truth". That sounded like a good strategy to me. Carl thought that karst features tend to "line up", and this may influence the boring locations somewhat. I have a pretty good idea from the topography where potential features are likely to exist. I will prepare a figure for them and will email it showing in general what we want.

They assured me that they can plug and abandon the geoprobe locations. TN Rule has specific minimum requirements, and I think I included these in the SOW.

I spoke to Cheri a few minutes ago. She hasn't had a chance to review the draft SOW for MacTech, but said she would look at it next Monday. We agreed to just send it to MacTech as Carl is going to be in the office Dec 26-27 and can get you a proposal for this work. When you get back from the holidays, you can decide what, if any, needs to be tweaked.

I'll forward them a copy of the 1 in = 200 topo dwg also.

We sent the proposal (PR-0637) Friday for your review and approval whenever you get a chance.

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Daniel R. (Dan) Smith, P.E.
Parsons E & C
633 Chestnut St, Suite 400
Chattanooga, TN 37932
Daniel.R.Smith@parsons.com

Phone: (423) 757-8088
Fax: (423) 266-0922
Cell: (423) 364-1679

Email:

Minghini, Cherie M.

From: Smith, Daniel R.
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2002 9:52 AM
To: Petty, Harold L.; Minghini, Cherie M.
Cc: Yogesh Shah; Dennis Gallino; Smith, Amos L
Subject: DRAFT SOW for MacTech Geotech Investigation for gypsum stack at TVA KIF



KIF DRAFT Geotech
Invest SOW f...

Attached is a word file that was put together very quickly. I will polish it up a bit next week.

If anyone has any thoughts or comments, please provide them.

I'll get this over to Law by 12/26 so that they can get a proposal out to TVA by early January.

One particular area of concern is the karst. The TN regs spell out what is needed to satisfy. While we don't want to spend a lot of bucks trying to characterize the site for hydrogeo at this time, we need to identify any fatal flaws. I have a blurb in there citing the specific regulatory requirement regarding karst geology. It shouldn't go to MacTech that way, but I would like some input from TVA (Amos Smith et. al) whether we need anything from MacTech in this investigation related to the possibility of groundwater transmission from karst features to groundwater. In other words, is there any connection from the pond to the lake? Not sure if this is easy to do at this time, but water level measurements may be an indicator. Or, if Amos is working with PELA on this one, and has enough data, that's fine. If there is nothing that Mactech needs to do, that's fine, I'll take it out. It needs revision anyway because it is too vague as written. Its in there as a placeholde!
r.

Yogesh, I'll try to call you this morning.

Daniel R. (Dan) Smith, PE
Parsons E&C
633 Chestnut St., Suite 400
Chattanooga, TN 37450
Email: Daniel.R.Smith@parsons.com

Phone: (423) 757-8088
Fax: (423) 266-0922
Cell: (423) 364-1679

scope

Tues
Wed
Thurs

LA Study to
exam possibility

SHEET

Geoprobe
OF

Right hand
@ 100'

100' clean

COMPUTED

DATE

CHECKED

DATE

Fatal
flow

89m-11-

2 scenarios

- use slough (pond)

Buffer in area 1 ->

of
glow

200' from
Normal pool
(change of
depth)

stay away
from slough

stay away
from slough

with
equipment
staying
sed. pond

-> look @ several sites

for major show signs (cultural)

- Volume calc (3-4 weeks)

(wet stack vs.
dry stack)

for
prob.
vol. inc.

Class II permit

Develop
Soil Borings - Plan

for COP permit ->

eng. plan
access IDs
in
phase 1B

Ph 1B - March - Sept

31-10-6
(no liner)

Combustion
coproducers

700
March 1

4/15
1B
4/16

Footprint in phase (50 acre -
50)

- equiv. to
COF
w/ probably
need a liner

Coordinate w/ state, EA
TDEC Glen Pugh - Mar 5th
2007 use 2002 EIS plan - division

300,000 tons/yr
185,000 tons/yr

10, million cy
20% capacity

Area on slough
& use other for
sediment and
boundaries