

---

**From:** Douglas Mandeville  
**Sent:** Friday, August 08, 2008 4:20 PM  
**To:** Betty Garrett  
**Subject:** Add to ADAMS  
**Attachments:** Response to NRC Questions re: Sale of Canonsburg Tract 117-E

Betty -

Please place the following email (and the document attached to it) into ADAMS.

Doug

Received: from HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov ([148.184.44.79]) by TWMS01.nrc.gov  
([148.184.200.145]) with mapi; Fri, 8 Aug 2008 16:20:14 -0400  
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary  
From: Douglas Mandeville <Douglas.Mandeville@nrc.gov>  
To: Betty Garrett <Betty.Garrett@nrc.gov>  
Date: Fri, 8 Aug 2008 16:20:12 -0400  
Subject: Add to ADAMS  
Thread-Topic: Add to ADAMS  
Thread-Index: Acj5lCmMPOB5koRKQ0mgIjU8ZoOiCQ==  
Message-ID:  
<3E54A9B051CAB64F8DA8BE1178BC8D376BF30CE6CB@HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov>  
Accept-Language: en-US  
Content-Language: en-US  
X-MS-Has-Attach: yes  
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
<3E54A9B051CAB64F8DA8BE1178BC8D376BF30CE6CB@HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

## Betty Garrett

---

**From:** Craig, Jack [Jack.Craig@lm.doe.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 06, 2008 10:40 AM  
**To:** Douglas Mandeville  
**Cc:** Pauling, Tom; Bahrke, Cheri; Miller, Michele; Schiesswohl, Steve; Teer, Bill  
**Subject:** Response to NRC Questions re: Sale of Canonsburg Tract 117-E  
**Attachments:** Mandeville Response July 08.doc

Doug:

Attached word document provides response to questions you asked in two e-mail messages (July 21 and July 23).

I think that some minor changes to the draft LTSP are needed, and I will be evaluating that over the next few weeks. I consider that such changes are not a prerequisite for the sale of Tract 117-E, and appreciate your assistance in working towards a timely disposition of this property.

Please contact me after you have reviewed the attached information so that we can discuss how to proceed.

Sincerely,  
Jack

Office: 412-386-4754  
Cell: 240-252-8506

E-Mail of 7/21/2008

1. Does DOE currently inspect Area C as part of the LTSP?

Response: DOE inspects Area C: well 424 is sampled; stream bank is inspected to determine that additional erosion is not taking place; visual observation of Area C to ensure that deed restrictions and institutional controls are being followed as well as a general site overview. These requirements are either specific or implied in both the 1995 and 2008 LTSP.

2. Does DOE currently inspect the portion of tract 117 that you'd like to sell?

Response: There are currently no inspection differences between Area C and Tract 117-East, as they are adjacent, with no fence or other obvious boundary. Well 414 is sampled and there is a general overview of the property to ensure that no changes have been made, including excavation. A small point of Tract 117-E includes the stream bank, which is visually inspected. These requirements are either specific or implied in both the 1995 and 2008 LTSP.

3. Would this portion of tract 117 continue to be inspected after the property is sold?

Response: Tract 117-E will include the same deed restrictions and inspection requirements as that of Area C when it is sold.

4. Is tract 117 within the disposal site boundary? (Page A-4 of the original LTSP dated 11/15/1995 indicates that the portion of tract 117 that they want to sell is outside of the disposal site boundary, this is not mentioned in the Jan 2008 LTSP)

Response: Tract 117-E is outside of the disposal site boundary. There is no fence or other boundary markers for Tract 117-E, it is surrounded by: railroad property, Strabane Avenue, Area C, and Chartiers Creek. Although not specifically marked, this small triangle of land is clearly shown on Figure 2-2 of the January 2008 LTSP.

E-Mail of 7/23/08

The NRC has a role in two aspects of the Title I program: (1) concurring in the selection and performance of the remedial action; and (2) licensing the sites for long term care through the general license in 40 CFR Part 20.27 and the individual long term surveillance plans (LTSPs). The NRC concurred on the completion of remedial action at Canonsburg on August 14, 1995 (ADAMS Accession number 9508250189). Our involvement now would be through the LTSP.

Given that framework and based on our internal discussion related to Tract 117, I have a couple of questions related to the March 2008 LTSP.

1. Appendix B contains the legal description of the long term care boundary. Does the portion of Tract 117 east of Strabane Avenue lie within this long term care boundary?

Response: Yes. The first paragraph of the Legal Description defines the point where Tract 117-E intersects Chartiers Creek. Additionally the last five paragraphs of this description define remaining boundaries of this tract.

2. Would the sale of the Tract 117 property result in any changes to the LTSP (discussion of transects, site access, inspection procedures, reporting, etc.)?

Response: Some minor changes to the LTSP may be necessary, and we will evaluate this over the next few weeks. If possible, I would prefer that any future changes to the 2008 LTSP not affect disposition of Tract 117-E. Changes to the LTSP might include: institutional controls inspections, general site boundaries, etc. I did note some minor changes that would clarify the LTSP during research to answer your questions.

3. The last paragraph of Section 2.1 (Site History) talks about remedial action at 163 vicinity properties. Appendix B refers to 16 additional "non-designated" properties, including Tract 117. What is the difference between a vicinity property and a non-designated property? Is the portion of tract 117 east of Strabane Avenue considered a vicinity property or a non-designated property?

Response: It is my understanding that "vicinity properties" (as mentioned in Section 2.1) are those that were not part of real property acquisitions (or Area C), and typically private property in the vicinity of the site. The use of "designated" or "non-designated" seems to refer to properties that were found to have contamination and were included in the remedial effort, but within the site boundary. In any event, all contamination was addressed, and remediated. Perhaps these descriptions are too "dated" for continued reference in the LTSP.