NOV 1 9 1990

URFO: ROG Docket No. WM-64 040WM064840E

Mark Matthews, Project Manager Uranium Mill Tailings Project Office U. S. Department of Energy P. O. Box 5400 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115

Dear Mr. Matthews:

We have completed our review of your February 1989 final Remedial Action Plan and Site Design (fRAP) for the proposed Remedial Action at Lakeview, Oregon. The fRAP was provided with a letter dated March 28, 1989. Our review is documented in the enclosed Final Technical Evaluation Report (fTER).

Based on our review of the fRAP, we conclude that all open issues identified in our Draft Technical Evaluation Report (dTER) have been resolved except for the concerns related to deferral of ground-water cleanup. Although we consider the deferral to be acceptable, it precludes us from being able to fully concur in the proposed remedial action at this time.

In our letter dated June 9, 1986, we provided conditional concurrence, in the form of a signed signature page, on the remedial action plan proposed at that time. Until such time as you address the ground-water issues, that concurrence will remain conditional.

As you are aware, there have been many changes to the Lakeview Remedial Action Plan since we prepared the dTER in February 1986. Most of those changes however, were not included in your fRAP. For example, your fRAP did not include any drawings and the specifications were identical to those which you had previously provided in a letter dated April 1, 1986. Without plans and current specifications it was not clear exactly what our review should address. Therefore, after considerable discussion with your staff, it was mutually agreed that our fTER would address only the open items identified in our February 1986 dTER; that is, we should consider your fRAP to be a pre-construction document.

PM:URFO ROGonzales/db

PM: URFO PM: URFO DLJacoby CRKonwinski

DD: URFO EFHawkins ///9/90 D: URFO: RIV REHall

9012100235 901119 PDR WASTE WM-64 PDR drong

Please be aware that by assuming your fRAP to be a pre-construction document, all of the changes to the Remedial Action Plan that occurred during construction will not be addressed in our fTER. For example, during construction, rock specification revisions were approved and the bedding was made coarser to minimize ponding on the pile top. Another change involved the installation of a drain along the northern edge of the disposal cell to intercept seepage moving into the cell. Since your fRAP was not revised to reflect these and other changes which occurred during construction, and you did not provide current plans and specifications, we addressed in the provide current plans and specifications, we addressed in our dTER. Changes made during construction will be addressed in our review of the Final Completion Report. Accordingly, you are cautioned not to consider our concurrence as approval of the constructed disposal cell.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact us at FTS 776-2805.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By: R. E. HALL

Ramon E. Hall Director

Enclosure: Final Technical Report

Case Closed: 040WM064840E

cc:

F. Miera M. Abrams, DOE S. Hamp, DOE

bcc:

Docket File No. WM-64 PDR/DCS URFO r/f ABBeach, RIV LLO Branch, LLWM ROGONZAIES DLJacoby GRKONWINSKI RParis, RCPD, OR WM-64/840E/ROG/90/11/16/L