

From: [J.Hameister](#)
To: [Bower, Bryan](#)
Cc: [Maira Maloney](#); [Martin Krentz](#); [Zintars Zadins](#); [Lynette Bennett](#); [Dhananjay Rawal](#); [Bill Logue](#); [Ben Underwood](#); [Thomas H. Attridge](#); [Paul J. Bemba](#); [Alita M. Dueringer](#); [David A. Munro](#); [Lee M. Gordon](#)
Subject: November QPM Agenda
Date: Sunday, October 14, 2012 8:35:51 PM

Bryan,

We would like to see CSAP on the agenda for the November QPM. While the revision (dated June 2011) does provide more detail than the original presentation by Argonne Labs, we think that the cart still is before the horse regarding site characterization, particularly since the SMEs already have begun their studies. Our concern, of course, is that site data from the NRC DP process - particularly the CSAP pre-cleanup characterization data - would be of help to the SMEs before they finalize their own reports. From our point of view, we do need and are entitled to know what's what and how the pieces and studies should fit together in regard to the progression to Phase 2 of both the NRC and the EIS processes.

We are disappointed that the CSAP will concentrate mostly on the characterization of only WM1 and WM2. Further, it seems that biased background levels are to be taken from a Project Premises "reference area" and these then will be used to 'adjust' the CGs. WV has been radiologically 'operational' for 42 years; this 'background' level could be significant and should not be used for CGs. The selection of a legitimate background area containing legitimate background levels is crucial if one is to assert a valid cleanup.

The Erosion SME should be apprised of streambed characterization and that should be considered part of the Phase 1 CSAP.

CSAP deserves more than a mere update at the QPM and we would appreciate a more dedicated opportunity for discussion of our concerns.

Thank you.
Joanne Hameister
CWVNW