54A

7

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
KANSAS CITY DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
700 FEDERAL BUILDING
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64106-2896

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

April 21, 1987

Superfund Branch
Engineering Division

22199

RECEIVED
APR 24 1987
REMD SECTION

Mrs. Alice Fuerst
Regional Site Project Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region VII
726 Minnesota Avenue
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

Dear Mrs. Fuerst:

Enclosed (per your March 30, 1987 request) are some technical review comments, along with your three draft copies, on the Draft Work Plan entitled "Operable Unit Feasibility Study (OUFS) for the Galena Subsite Groundwater", dated March 25, 1987. Also included are comments on the Final Work Plan, "Site Wide Water Supply Inventory Document on the Cherokee County Site", dated March 6, 1987. These are the same comments that were telecopied to you on April 8, 1987. Due to the limited review time, it was impossible to receive comments from all applicable reviewers at that time. Therefore, additional comments will be forwarded as they are received.

S00023016
SUPERFUND RECORDS

The OUFS document identifies several supplemental work plans that will be submitted to U.S. EPA, Region VII around mid April 1987, by the zone contractor (CH2M Hill). The supplemental work plans, to be submitted in mid April 1987, include two tasks: geophysical tests and characterization of mining wastes that need to be reviewed in conjunction with the OUFS. It is important that the Corps of Engineers (CE) receives a copy of these and other plans and be allowed to provide input since the CE is expected to receive the Remedial Design on this project. The CE strongly believes that the sooner we are involved in a project, the smoother the transition will be into the next phase (remedial design). Therefore, we request that a current schedule of events and submittals be provided periodically to reflect the project status. This will help us to plan our manpower resources and be more responsive to your requests.

Finally, we request that the review documents be submitted to us as soon as possible in order to provide

the U.S. EPA with an adequate review. Again, it is difficult to provide comments on such short notice. In general, a minimum of two weeks review time is needed provided we are aware that the documents are coming. Depending on their scope, size, and complexity, some documents may require more time for review. Therefore, if possible, please coordinate the review time with us so we can assist your agency in an efficient and productive manner.

If you have any questions concerning the comments or any part of this letter, please contact Mr. Arthur Collins, of my staff, at (816) 374 5806 or FTS 758 5806.

Sincerely,

Paul D. Barber
Chief, Engineering Division

Enclosures

☐ MRD
☐ MRK District

CORPS OF ENGINEERS
ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS

TO: ED S

PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS AND/OR DESIGN REPORT: ☐ PRELIM ☐ FINAL ☐ AS-ADV.

DESIGNED BY: ☐ AE ☐ DIST

PROJECT: Draft Work Plan Galena Subsite OU FS

LOCATION OR BASE: Cherokee Co. Ks.

INVITATION NO.:

BID OPENING DATE:

COMMENTS BY: Meier

BRANCH OR SECTION: ED-F

DATE: 4/6/87

DRAWING NUMBER OR PARAGRAPH NUMBER	ITEM NUMBER	COMMENTS SHEET 1 OF 1	PHONED TO: (Name/Date)
		This operable unit feasibility Study identifies several supplemental work plans still to be submitted. These supplemental work plans will address the connection between the shallow and deep aquifer using water level recorders and chemical analysis, and delineation of water levels and zones of oxidation in the old mine workings using geophysical methods. Because these supplemental work plans will address the issues that are the responsibility of ED-F, comments on this work plan are not appropriate at this time, but review of the supplemental plans will be critical. These plans should be submitted to ED-F for review and comment.	

MRD FORM 1 AUG 75 0691 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM WILL BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTED

☐ MRD
☐ _____ District

CORPS OF ENGINEERS
ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS

TO:

PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS AND/OR DESIGN REPORT ☐ PRELIM ☐ FINAL ☐ AS-ADV.

DESIGNED BY: ☐ AE ☐ DIST

PROJECT: Cherokee Co.

LOCATION OR BASE:

INVITATION NO.

BID OPENING DATE:

COMMENTS BY: M. Mackey

BRANCH OR SECTION:

DATE:

DRAWING NUMBER OR PARAGRAPH NUMBER	ITEM NUMBER	COMMENTS SHEET 2 OF 2	PHONED TO: (Name/Date)
		QA samples at a frequency of one per 20	
		shall be collected. However, CLP protocols	
		also say one per batch, whichever results	
		in the higher number of QA samples. Since it	
		is doubtful that 20 groundwater samples will be	
		collected in one day, the generation of several	
		batches of groundwater samples seems more than	
		likely and will result in a larger number of	
		QA samples than a frequency of "one per twenty"	
		will give. The text should therefore expand	
		on the number of QA samples.	
23	4	If sample cannot be taken ahead of water	
		treatment unit during well sampling, it is	
		suggested that a sample be taken from the	
		well of another owner until the 25% figure	
		for well sampling has been reached.	

MRD FORM 1 AUG 75 0691 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM WILL BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTED

☐ MRD ☐ _____ District	CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENGINEERING REVIEW COMMENTS	TO: Art Collins

PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS AND/OR DESIGN REPORT ☐ PRELIM ☐ FINAL ☐ AS-ADV.	DESIGNED BY: ☐ AE ☐ DIST	PROJECT: Cherokee Co. Site Survey
LOCATION OR BASE: Cherokee Co., Kansas	INVITATION NO.	BID OPENING DATE:
COMMENTS BY: R. Medary	BRANCH OR SECTION: MRKED-SD	DATE: 4/3/87

DRAWING NUMBER OR PARAGRAPH NUMBER	ITEM NUMBER	COMMENTS SHEET 1 OF 2	PHONED TO: (Name/Date)
21	1	In second Paragraph. Mercury has been	
		excluded because it has not been found in	
		problem concentrations in the past. This	
		implies that all of the other metals have	
		shown up in problem concentrations, otherwise	
		they would have been eliminated as well.	
		Although this reviewer has not seen the	
		groundwater analytical results, all of the	
		other metals exceeding local and federal	
		standards seems highly unlikely. Also, if	
		CLP is to be used, there is no cost saving	
		by eliminating Hg.	
22	2	EPA memoranda 14 and 15 recommend total	
		recoverable metals to be run on groundwater,	
		the reason being that results of analyses on	
		dissolved metals is unreliable. It is	
		suggested that a reevaluation be taken on	
		running a dissolved metals. It might be a	
		waste of time and money.	
23	3	It is mentioned in the second paragraph that	

MRD FORM 1 AUG 75 0691 PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM WILL BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTED