

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY  
ROCKETDYNE WORKGROUP MEETING  
DECEMBER 11, 2002

Meeting held Wednesday, December 11, 2002,  
from 6:30 p.m. to 10:35 p.m., at the Grand Vista Hotel,  
Grand Ballroom, 999 Enchanted Way, Simi Valley,  
California, before Mark S. Patterson, Certified  
Shorthand Reporter, Certificate No. 12432.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY  
ROCKETDYNE WORKGROUP MEETING  
DECEMBER 11, 2002

Meeting held Wednesday, December 11, 2002,  
from 8:30 p.m. to 10:35 p.m., at the Grand Vista Hotel,  
Grand Ballroom, 999 Enchanted Way, Simi Valley,  
California, before Mark S. Patterson, Certified  
 shorthand Reporter, Certificate No. 12432.

1 VICKI ROSEN: Good evening. Let's go ahead and get  
 2 started. My name is Vicki Rosen. I am with the U.S.  
 3 EPA. I am a community event coordinator. I am not a  
 4 public relations person, that is a different part of the  
 5 EPA. A community event coordinator is someone who works  
 6 with technical people and communities who are affected  
 7 by contaminated sites. And I help the communities deal  
 8 with those issues and make them part of the clean-up  
 9 process and the decision-making process. So that's just  
 10 a little bit about my background.

11 My job at this event is to facilitate the  
 12 Workgroup meeting, and so that's what I will be doing  
 13 here tonight. Many of you might have received a notice  
 14 about this meeting for the first time. The reason for  
 15 that is that our friends at the State of California  
 16 Department of Toxic Substances Control did some  
 17 excellent outreach in the Simi Valley area and were able  
 18 to expand the mailing list so that more people will get  
 19 notices of these Workgroup meetings, which actually  
 20 happen on a fairly regular basis and have been going on  
 21 for a long time. They are generally held quarterly. So  
 22 if this is your first Workgroup meeting, we welcome you  
 23 and hope that you will find it interesting.

24 The purpose of the Workgroup is to -- it's  
 25 kind of threefold. First, it's to coordinate the

1 activities as related to the site between the various  
 2 regulatory agencies. It's also to exchange information  
 3 among the agencies, as well as community  
 4 representatives. And, in addition, it's to inform the  
 5 public about what's going on and to hear questions and  
 6 concerns from the public so the agencies hear what you  
 7 are thinking so, ultimately, we have a better cleanup,  
 8 and we have a better environmental response to the  
 9 problems.

10 Now, EPA's role in these meetings -- we are  
 11 getting -- we chair the Workgroup, we coordinate, and we  
 12 facilitate the Workgroup meetings. Now, the meeting  
 13 that we're having here tonight is not like a typical  
 14 public meeting that you might be used to attending.  
 15 It's a working body. And as I said, we have been  
 16 meeting for a long time. So there may be some  
 17 discussion that you might not easily understand. We are  
 18 going to try and make it as understandable to you as  
 19 possible. But please keep in mind that we have been  
 20 working together for a long time and it might take you a  
 21 little while to get up to speed on what it is we're  
 22 talking about, but we'll do our best to try and clarify  
 23 things for you. And if you continue to come to these  
 24 meetings, it won't take you long to really get up to  
 25 speed on the various terms and what's going on at the

1 site. So be patient with us.

2 We also -- in the future, we might hold more  
 3 public meetings where we will have a limited agenda so  
 4 we can concentrate on a couple of items. And in doing  
 5 that, we would be presenting things more directly to the  
 6 public rather than as a Workgroup. So that just kind of  
 7 explains a little bit of the difference in this type of  
 8 meeting.

9 As you see by the agenda, we have a lot to  
 10 cover. We have specific presentations that -- and each  
 11 presentation is then followed by a public  
 12 question-and-answer comment period. The length of that  
 13 period will depend on how much time it takes us to get  
 14 through those various discussions. But I'm figuring  
 15 maybe 10 or 15 minutes for public discussion following  
 16 each presentation. And then we have set aside time  
 17 later in the evening for just general public discussion.  
 18 So what that means is we -- when the public comment part  
 19 comes after each topic, if you could speak directly  
 20 about that topic, we'd appreciate that. And if not,  
 21 then if you would please hold additional questions and  
 22 comments until the part later on in the agenda where we  
 23 can cover that, we would appreciate that.

24 Another thing that I'd like to request is that  
 25 you save your questions and comments until the public

1 period and not interrupt during the presentation, with  
 2 one exception: If you need something to be clarified,  
 3 for instance, if somebody at the table uses a term that  
 4 you don't understand and you need to have that clarified  
 5 in order to be able to better understand what's being  
 6 discussed, please raise your hand and I will call on  
 7 you. Otherwise, please keep your questions until the  
 8 end of that presentation.

9 In the past, we have had some great difficulty  
 10 in covering everything that's been on the agenda. As a  
 11 matter of fact, we get way behind and don't get to cover  
 12 the full agenda. We think that we have a lot of  
 13 interesting topics on tonight's agenda that you, as the  
 14 public, would like to hear about. So I'm going to ask  
 15 your help in trying to stay on schedule so that you are  
 16 able to hear all the discussion. And I note that we may  
 17 want to talk about things longer than we have actually  
 18 got time set aside for. In that case, I'm sure that  
 19 many of us from the agencies will be happy to stay  
 20 around after the meeting for a little while to talk to  
 21 you further, or I can help arrange for you to talk  
 22 additionally to agency personnel at another time if you  
 23 have got specific issues that you would like to discuss  
 24 further. So we'll try to accommodate you further one  
 25 way or another. But we hope to get everything covered

1 and so be patient with us.  
 2 We also -- in the future we might hold more  
 3 public meetings where we will have a limited agenda so  
 4 we can concentrate on a couple of items. And in doing  
 5 that we would be presenting things more directly to the  
 6 public rather than as a Workshop. So that just kind of  
 7 explains a little bit of the difference in this type of  
 8 meeting.  
 9 As you see by the agenda we have a lot to  
 10 cover. We have specific presentations that -- and each  
 11 presentation is then followed by a public  
 12 question-and-answer comment period. The length of that  
 13 period will depend on how much time it takes us to get  
 14 through those various discussions. But I'm figuring  
 15 maybe 10 or 12 minutes for public discussion following  
 16 each presentation. And then we have set aside time  
 17 later in the evening for that general public discussion.  
 18 So what that means is we -- when the public comment part  
 19 comes after each topic, if you could speak directly  
 20 about that topic, we'd appreciate that. And if not,  
 21 then if you would please hold additional questions and  
 22 comments until the part later on in the evening where we  
 23 can cover that, we would appreciate that.  
 24 Another thing that I'd like to request is that  
 25 you save your questions and comments until the public

1 period and not interrupt during the presentation, with  
 2 one exception. If you need something to be clarified,  
 3 for instance, if somebody in the table uses a term that  
 4 you don't understand and you need to have that clarified  
 5 in order to be able to better understand what's being  
 6 discussed, please raise your hand and I will call on  
 7 you. Otherwise, please keep your questions until the  
 8 end of the presentation.  
 9 In the past, we have had some great difficulty  
 10 in covering everything that's been on the agenda -- it's a  
 11 matter of fact, we get way behind and don't get to cover  
 12 the full agenda. We think that we have a lot of  
 13 interesting topics on tonight's agenda that you as the  
 14 public would like to hear about. So I'm going to ask  
 15 you help in trying to stay on schedule so that you are  
 16 able to hear all the discussion. And I note that we want  
 17 want to talk about things longer than we have normally  
 18 for time set aside for. In that case, I'm sure that  
 19 many of us from the agencies will be happy to stay  
 20 around after the meeting for a while while to talk to  
 21 you further, or I can help arrange for you to talk  
 22 additionally to agency personnel at another time if you  
 23 have got specific issues that you would like to discuss  
 24 further. So we'll try to accommodate you further one  
 25 way or another. But we hope to get everything covered

1 MICHAEL ROSEN: Good evening. Let's go ahead and get  
 2 started. My name is Mike Rosen. I am with the U.S.  
 3 EPA. I am a community event coordinator. I am not a  
 4 public relations person. That is a different part of the  
 5 EPA. A community event coordinator is someone who works  
 6 with technical people and committees who are affected  
 7 by environmental issues. And I help the communities deal  
 8 with those issues and make them part of the clean-up  
 9 process and the decision-making process. So that's just  
 10 a little bit about my background.  
 11 My job at this event is to facilitate the  
 12 Workshop meeting, and so that's what I will be doing  
 13 tonight. Many of you might have received a notice  
 14 about this meeting for the first time. The reason for  
 15 that is that our friends at the State of California  
 16 Department of Toxic Substances Control did some  
 17 excellent outreach in the San Joaquin area and were able  
 18 to expand the mailing list so that more people will get  
 19 notices of these Workshop meetings, which actually  
 20 happen on a fairly regular basis and have been going on  
 21 for a long time. They are generally held quarterly. So  
 22 if this is your first Workshop meeting, we welcome you  
 23 and hope that you will find it interesting.  
 24 The purpose of the Workshop is to -- it's  
 25 kind of the old, that it's to coordinate the

1 activities as related to the site between the various  
 2 regulatory agencies. It's also to exchange information  
 3 among the agencies, as well as community  
 4 representatives. And in addition, it's to inform the  
 5 public about what's going on and to hear questions and  
 6 concerns from the public so the agencies hear what you  
 7 are thinking so, ultimately, we have a better cleanup  
 8 and we have a better environmental response to the  
 9 problems.  
 10 Now EPA's role in these meetings -- we are  
 11 getting -- we chair the Workshop, we coordinate, and we  
 12 facilitate the Workshop meetings. Now, the meeting  
 13 that we're having here tonight is not like a typical  
 14 public meeting that you might be used to attending.  
 15 It's a working body. And as I said, we have been  
 16 meeting for a long time. So there may be some  
 17 discussion that you might not easily understand. We are  
 18 going to try and make it as understandable to you as  
 19 possible. But please keep in mind that we have been  
 20 working together for a long time and it might take you a  
 21 little while to get up to speed on what it is we're  
 22 talking about, but we'll do our best to try and clarify  
 23 things for you. And if you continue to come to these  
 24 meetings, it won't take you long to really get up to  
 25 speed on the various terms and what's going on at the

1 on schedule so that you will all be better served.  
 2 Just a couple of basic ground rules that I  
 3 would like to talk about. Number one, please hold your  
 4 questions until the end of each presentation, and I will  
 5 just ask for common courtesy from everybody. Sometimes  
 6 we disagree a great deal about some of the issues being  
 7 discussed. There is a lot of debate going on, but we  
 8 can agree to disagree in a courteous manner if that's  
 9 the case. So I would just like to request that of  
 10 everybody.

11 Please, if one person could speak at a time  
 12 not only would we appreciate it, but the court reporter,  
 13 who is sitting right here in front, would appreciate it  
 14 so he can get down all of the proceedings. And, by the  
 15 way, this transcript from the meeting will be available  
 16 in the information repositories for anybody who would  
 17 like to read about it again.

18 Now, issues that don't fit into any specific  
 19 topic that we're discussing we are going to defer either  
 20 to the part of the agenda toward the end where we open  
 21 it up to anything, or we're going to defer it to another  
 22 meeting so that we can adequately cover what's on the  
 23 agenda.

24 And with that, I would like to ask that each  
 25 of the Workgroup members state their name, who they work

1 for, and what they do, especially as specifically  
 2 related to the Santa Susana site. And so we will start  
 3 down at this end with Gerard.

4 GERARD ABRAMS: Good evening. My name is  
 5 Gerard Abrams for the Department of Toxics. I'm a  
 6 project manager for corrective action for the Rocketdyne  
 7 site.

8 PAULINE BATARSEH: I'm Pauline Batarseh, Department  
 9 of Toxics. I'm a supervising engineer, and I work on  
 10 the cleanup at Rocketdyne.

11 RICK MOSS: I'm Rick Moss, and I'm with the DTSC.

12 MARY GROSS: Hi. I'm Mary Gross from the U.S.  
 13 Department of Energy, and I'm the deputy division  
 14 director for the Oakland Environmental Programs Division  
 15 for our ETEC site.

16 ROGER GEE: Good evening. I'm Roger Gee from the  
 17 Department of Energy in Oakland.

18 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm Mike Lopez. I'm the DOE  
 19 environmental restoration project manager for the  
 20 ETEC site.

21 MIKE BROWN: I'm Mike Brown, division director for  
 22 Oakland Environmental Programs Division, Oakland  
 23 operations office, and I am -- the DOE is responsible  
 24 for the ETEC cleanup.

25 BARBARA JOHNSON: Hello. I'm Barbara Johnson, a

1 public member of the Rocketdyne Cleanup Coalition, and  
 2 I've been doing this for quite a few years.

3 SHELDON PLOTKIN: Shell Plotkin, Southern  
 4 California Federation of Scientists, one of the  
 5 community representatives.

6 JONATHAN PARFREY: Jonathan Parfrey, executive  
 7 director of Physicians for Social Responsibility in  
 8 Los Angeles.

9 JOHN BEACH: I'm John Beach with the U.S.  
 10 Environmental Protection Agency. I'm the EPA project  
 11 officer for the Santa Susana Field Laboratory facility.

12 LARRY BOWERMAN: I'm Larry Bowerman, and I'm  
 13 manager of the Workgroup Corrective Action Office at  
 14 EPA's office in San Francisco.

15 ARLENE KABEL: Hi. Arlene Kabel, also with U.S.  
 16 EPA San Francisco, and the associate director of the  
 17 waste management division there.

18 DICK HOPPER: Good evening. I'm Dick Hopper. I'm  
 19 with the Radiation and Indoor Environments Laboratory in  
 20 Las Vegas, and I'm the deputy lab director.

21 DAVID WESLEY: I'm Dave Wesley with the California  
 22 Department of Health Services. I'm in charge of the  
 23 materials licensing and similar operations at the ETEC  
 24 site.

25 STEVE HSU: I'm Steve Hsu. I'm also with the

1 Department of Health Services, senior health services,  
 2 involved in the Boeing ETEC cleanup activities.

3 ROBERT GREGER: Good evening. My name is  
 4 Robert Greger. I'm with the California Department of  
 5 Health Services, and my involvement is with licensed  
 6 operations under the Boeing license that is issued by  
 7 the Department of Health Services, and my particular  
 8 interest is in inspection and enforcement of that  
 9 license.

10 VICKI ROSEN: Okay. Thank you, all. And I just  
 11 would like to say that Dick Hopper is taking  
 12 Greg Dempsey's place from the Las Vegas laboratory for  
 13 those of you who have been to these meetings before and  
 14 remember Greg.

15 Thank you, Dick, for coming tonight.

16 DICK HOPPER: I would just like to make an  
 17 announcement. Most of you know Greg Dempsey. He is  
 18 stepping down as a manager at EPA at his request. Greg  
 19 has taken on a lot of added responsibility. He is our  
 20 emergency response coordinator, but also now with  
 21 Homeland Security. He will still be an active  
 22 participant here at the meetings. He had a conflicting  
 23 meeting tonight. He is in Hawaii this week. So I fully  
 24 intend for him to be back here at the next meeting. And  
 25 as long as he is at the Las Vegas laboratory, he will

Page	Page
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25

Page	Page
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25

1 play a part in this project here. Thank you.  
 2 VICKI ROSEN: Thank you, Dick.  
 3 Are there any people who are going to be  
 4 taking videotape of tonight's proceedings in the  
 5 audience? Okay.  
 6 I'd also like to ask if there are any elected  
 7 officials in the audience. And if so, would you like to  
 8 introduce yourself, identify yourselves? Anybody here?  
 9 Yes, ma'am.  
 10 SPEAKER: I'm Janice Lee. I'm a City Councilmember  
 11 and former mayor of the city of Calabasas.  
 12 VICKI ROSEN: Hello.  
 13 Anyone else?  
 14 SPEAKER: I'm Laura Plotkin here representing  
 15 State Senator Sheila Kuehl.  
 16 VICKI ROSEN: Thank you.  
 17 SPEAKER: Jeremy (inaudible) representing  
 18 Supervisor Judy Mikels' office.  
 19 VICKI ROSEN: Okay. Anybody else?  
 20 Thank you very much.  
 21 And now we're going to begin our presentations  
 22 with the Department of Energy. Is it going to be Mike  
 23 or Roger first? Okay. It's going to be Roger.  
 24 ROGER GEE: Again, I would like to echo Vicki's  
 25 welcome to you all this evening. I know it's a

1 commitment on your part to be here, and we all  
 2 appreciate that.  
 3 I'd like to start off our presentation to give  
 4 you an idea of what is going on in our headquarters  
 5 because I feel this is going to be important for you to  
 6 understand our processes for decision-making. And this  
 7 is something new, so I want to bring everybody up to  
 8 speed. Let me just explain this new group that's being  
 9 formed at headquarters.  
 10 Let me start by saying that the incoming  
 11 administration, they had initiated a top to bottom  
 12 review of our agency, which was -- began, like, in the  
 13 February time frame. One of the items that came out of  
 14 that is that small sites, of which ETEC was defined as  
 15 one of those sites, had not received or could have  
 16 gotten more help or attention in the way that we need to  
 17 have to move forward. As a result of that, the  
 18 assistant secretary for the environment created a focus  
 19 team for these small sites called the National Focus  
 20 Project. That was around June of this past year.  
 21 Twenty-three sites were identified under this project.  
 22 In late October, they made their first visit to the  
 23 first site on their list. Fortunately for us, ETEC was  
 24 that site.  
 25 So I bring this up because there may be some

1 issues later on or discussion about how decisions are  
 2 made or what's being considered that this will come up  
 3 against, so I want to at least get this out so that you  
 4 understand the process going out of our headquarters.  
 5 I would like to cover two particular things in  
 6 my part of the presentation. The first is the draft of  
 7 the Environmental Assessment. The Department of Energy  
 8 in Oakland is waiting for the approval of the final  
 9 release of the Environmental Assessment.  
 10 Now, we have reported to you the status in the  
 11 past and that hasn't changed. But what has changed is  
 12 the draft EA is also within the scrutiny and the  
 13 assessment of this focus team. The draft EA was briefed  
 14 to this focus team, and so this is where we are at right  
 15 now. We're still waiting for our headquarters and the  
 16 focus team for their concurrence in the final release of  
 17 the environmental -- draft Environmental Assessment.  
 18 The next item I would like to cover is FY03  
 19 budget. Now, our budget year in the Department of  
 20 Energy begins October 1st, this would be 2002, and will  
 21 extend to September 30, 2003. We're already in that  
 22 particular fiscal year. The budget that was planned for  
 23 the current fiscal year is roughly \$17 million. Because  
 24 we're under the continuing resolution, we will -- it was  
 25 basically a situation where Congress is currently

1 working on a budget, so a continuing resolution allows  
 2 the government to function until the time they adopt a  
 3 new budget. That resolution is effective until  
 4 January 2003.  
 5 Now, right now we don't know if there will be  
 6 a budget before then or whether our continuing  
 7 resolution will continue and extend beyond that January  
 8 time frame.  
 9 Right now the budget that we have from  
 10 headquarters allows us to continue to work at a rate  
 11 roughly equivalent to about \$12 million a year. What  
 12 that does is that it lets us continue to work to safely  
 13 manage the materials that remain on site right now.  
 14 And I'd like to now pass it on to  
 15 Mr. Michael Lopez, who will talk about the projects we  
 16 have ongoing.  
 17 MIKE LOPEZ: Okay. I was asked to give an overview  
 18 of the D&D status at the site, so I'm going to talk  
 19 about the status of our radiological D&D.  
 20 VICKI ROSEN: Excuse me, Mike. I'm sorry to  
 21 interrupt. But could you please tell us what D&D is?  
 22 MIKE LOPEZ: Oh. I'm sorry. Thank you.  
 23 Decontamination and decommission, or demolition, as the  
 24 case may be.  
 25 Just for those of you who may be new to these

1 wants later on or discussion about how decisions are  
 2 made or what's been considered that this will come up  
 3 against so I want to at least get this out so that you  
 4 understand the process going out of our headquarters  
 5 I would like to cover two particular things in  
 6 my part of the presentation. The first is the draft of  
 7 the Environmental Assessment. The Department of Energy  
 8 in Oakland is waiting for the approval of the final  
 9 release of the Environmental Assessment.  
 10 Now, we have reported to you the status in the  
 11 past and that hasn't changed. But what has changed is  
 12 the draft EA is also within the scrutiny and the  
 13 assessment of the focus team. The draft EA was related  
 14 to the focus team and so this is where we are at right  
 15 now. We're still waiting for our headquarters and the  
 16 focus team for their concurrence in the final release of  
 17 the environmental - draft Environmental Assessment.  
 18 The next item I would like to cover is FY 03  
 19 budget. Now, our budget year in the Government of  
 20 Energy begins October 1st this would be 2003 and will  
 21 extend to September 30, 2003. We're already in that  
 22 particular fiscal year. The budget that was planned for  
 23 the current fiscal year is roughly \$17 million. Because  
 24 we're under the continuing resolution we will -- it is  
 25 basically a situation where Congress is currently

1 working on a budget, so a continuing resolution allows  
 2 the government to function until the time they adopt a  
 3 new budget. That resolution is effective until  
 4 January 2003.  
 5 Now, right now we don't know if there will be  
 6 a budget before then or whether our continuing  
 7 resolution will continue and extend beyond that January  
 8 time frame.  
 9 Right now the budget that we have from  
 10 headquarters allows us to continue to work at a rate  
 11 roughly equal to about \$12 million a year. What  
 12 that does is that it lets us continue to work to safely  
 13 manage the materials that remain on the right now.  
 14 And I'd like to now pass it on to  
 15 Mr. Michael Lopez, who will tell about the projects we  
 16 have ongoing.  
 17 MIKE LOPEZ: Okay. I was asked to give an overview  
 18 of the D&D sites in the site, so I'm going to talk  
 19 about the status of our radiological D&D.  
 20 NICK ROSEN: Excuse me, Mike. I'm sorry to  
 21 interrupt. But could you please tell us what D&D is?  
 22 MIKE LOPEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you.  
 23 Decontamination and decommissioning or demolition, as the  
 24 case may be.  
 25 Just for those of you who may be new to this

1 play a part in this project here. Thank you.  
 2 NICK ROSEN: Thank you, Dick.  
 3 Are there any people who are going to be  
 4 making videotape of tonight's proceedings in the  
 5 audience? Okay.  
 6 I'd also like to ask if there is anybody elected  
 7 officials in the audience. And if so, would you like to  
 8 introduce yourself, identify yourselves? Anybody here?  
 9 Yes, yes.  
 10 SPEAKER: I'm James Lee. I'm a City Council member  
 11 and former mayor of the city of Calabasas.  
 12 NICK ROSEN: Hello.  
 13 Anyone else?  
 14 SPEAKER: I'm Laura Plotkin here representing  
 15 State Senator Sheila Kuehl.  
 16 NICK ROSEN: Thank you.  
 17 SPEAKER: Jeremy (phonetic) representing  
 18 Supervisor Judy Mitchell, office.  
 19 NICK ROSEN: Okay. Anybody else?  
 20 Thank you very much.  
 21 And now we're going to begin our presentations  
 22 with the Department of Energy. Is it going to be Mike  
 23 or Roger first? Okay. It's going to be Roger.  
 24 ROGER GEE: Again, I would like to echo Nick's  
 25 welcome to you all this evening. I know it's

1 comment on your part to be here, and we all  
 2 appreciate that.  
 3 I'd like to start off our presentation to give  
 4 you an idea of what is going on in our headquarters  
 5 because I feel this is going to be important for you to  
 6 understand our processes for decision-making. And this  
 7 is a changing news, so I want to bring everybody up to  
 8 speed. Let me just explain this new group that's being  
 9 formed at headquarters.  
 10 Let me start by saying that the incoming  
 11 administration, they had initiated a top to bottom  
 12 review of our agency, which was -- began, like in the  
 13 previous time frame. One of the items that came out of  
 14 that is that small sites, of which ETEC was defined as  
 15 one of those sites, had not received or could have  
 16 gotten more help or attention in the way that we need to  
 17 have to move forward. As a result of that, the  
 18 assistant secretary for the environment created a focus  
 19 team for those small sites called the National Focus  
 20 Project. That was around June of this past year.  
 21 Two or three sites were identified under this project.  
 22 In late October, they made their first visit to the  
 23 first site on their list. Fortunately for us, ETEC was  
 24 that site.  
 25 So I bring this up because there may be some



1 meetings, I want to show you the site. On the left-hand  
2 photo we show Santa Susana Field Lab as it relates to  
3 Simi Valley and Woodland Hills. And then on the right  
4 is the Santa Susana Field Laboratory in a little bit  
5 greater detail. It's divided into four areas. DOE is  
6 strictly within Area IV in approximately that little  
7 blue oval. So we occupy only about 90 acres out of the  
8 2700-odd acres that comprise the Santa Susana Field  
9 Laboratory.

10 Just another way to look at the site now.  
11 This is Area IV, the DOE area in the foreground, and the  
12 San Fernando Valley in the background.

13 And now a closeup shot, SSFL Area IV. In the  
14 foreground is where we used to have the hot cell  
15 laboratory. 1998 is important for us because that's  
16 when we started our current contract.

17 **SPEAKER:** What is a hot cell laboratory?

18 **MIKE LOPEZ:** It was a facility for handling some  
19 irradiated fuels, spent fuel and some --

20 **SPEAKER:** What kind of fuels?

21 **MIKE LOPEZ:** It was all nuclear fuels.

22 Originally, we had 28 nuclear facilities at  
23 ETEC. Over the years, we have decontaminated,  
24 demolished most -- or a number of them. We have done  
25 cleanup on 25 of the 28. And I want to walk you through

1 **MIKE LOPEZ:** We comply with the existing  
2 regulations for buildings. There is a DOE order that  
3 applies to the buildings, and there's a NRC regulatory  
4 guide that governs the buildings. That is in the  
5 purview of the State Department of Health Services. EPA  
6 does not have its own regulations for surface  
7 contamination in buildings.

8 **SHELDON PLOTKIN:** May I interject that from the  
9 community standpoint, we have been objecting for 13  
10 years during the whole approach of this thing, and we  
11 object because we are cut out of the process. And I'm  
12 not going to argue about it. I just want to make sure  
13 the record shows that the community objects to all of  
14 these released buildings. They may have been cleaned  
15 and so forth, but we are not sure about that. We  
16 haven't been allowed into the process.

17 **MIKE LOPEZ:** Well, the EPA is doing surveys of  
18 buildings, and these are the buildings that they have  
19 conducted their own surveys on.

20 **SHELDON PLOTKIN:** And there are objections to that  
21 too.

22 **MIKE LOPEZ:** I know.

23 **BARBARA JOHNSON:** We could have been much more  
24 responsive to this had we gotten this information before  
25 the meeting. I know that on the 2nd, we got a very

1 the process we use.

2 After we finish our  
3 decontamination/decommissioning work, Rocketdyne does a  
4 survey. Then we have a -- we have the Oakridge  
5 Institute for Science and Education, which is out of the  
6 DOE contract out of headquarters, they come and do a  
7 confirmatory survey. The State Department of Health  
8 Services does surveys now. They did not in the  
9 beginning, but they have been for the last seven years  
10 or so. And then most recently, the Environmental  
11 Protection Agency has done yet another survey on the  
12 facilities that were not released. And I will give you  
13 a little more detail on those in a minute.

14 I just want to show you another way of looking  
15 at the fact that we have done most of the  
16 decontamination work on our radioactive facilities. The  
17 ones in green are the ones that are done; the ones in  
18 red are the ones that still remain. There are only  
19 three red ones: Building 59 on the left, the bottom,  
20 which houses the snap reactor; Building 24 did some of  
21 the same work; and then the radioactive materials  
22 handling facility, which is the big red block.  
23 Everything else has been completed.

24 **BARBARA JOHNSON:** Mike, can I ask you to what  
25 standard do you say they're completed or done?

1 skinny report from you that -- you didn't have this  
2 information available on the 2nd of December?

3 **MIKE LOPEZ:** Yes. As a matter of fact, I just  
4 pulled this stuff together this week, Barbara.

5 **VICKI ROSEN:** I was just going to say that we don't  
6 want to have too much of a debate here -- if we could do  
7 this as soon as his presentation is over. I understand  
8 the value of doing this. Believe me, I do. But I think  
9 we have got to try and find a time when we can talk a  
10 little more productively about that.

11 Jonathan, did you want to say something?

12 **JONATHAN PARFREY:** I just know that there was an  
13 agreement that there would be materials that would be  
14 disseminated so that community representatives would have  
15 an opportunity to be able to review the material that's  
16 being submitted so we could have an intelligent  
17 response. This is the first step. We are seeing Mike's  
18 presentation.

19 **VICKI ROSEN:** And for the public's benefit, we did  
20 try and work this out prior to this meeting where  
21 everybody could get materials in advance of the meeting.  
22 So that's what this part of the discussion is about.

23 **MIKE LOPEZ:** This is just an overview. It's not  
24 much detail.

25 Okay. I just wanted to show you a few of the

1 MIKE LOPEZ: We comply with the existing  
 2 regulations for buildings. There is a DON order that  
 3 applies to the buildings and there's a DOE regulatory  
 4 guide that governs the buildings. That is in the  
 5 review of the State Department of Health Services. EPA  
 6 does not have its own regulations for surface  
 7 contamination in buildings.  
 8 SHELDON BLOTTIN: What I intended that from the  
 9 community standpoint we have been objecting for 18  
 10 years during the whole approach of the thing and we  
 11 object because we are cut out of the process. And I'm  
 12 not going to argue about it. I just want to make sure  
 13 the record shows that the community objects to all of  
 14 these released buildings. They may have been cleaned  
 15 and so forth but we are not sure about that. We  
 16 haven't been allowed into the process.  
 17 MIKE LOPEZ: Well, the EPA is doing surveys of  
 18 buildings and these are the buildings that they have  
 19 conducted their own surveys on.  
 20 SHELDON BLOTTIN: And there are objections to that  
 21 too.  
 22 MIKE LOPEZ: I know.  
 23 BARBARA JOHNSON: We could have been in there more  
 24 responsive to this had we known this information before  
 25 the meeting. I know that on the 2nd we got a very

1 the process we use  
 2 After we finish out  
 3 decontamination/decommissioning work, Rockledge does a  
 4 survey. Then we have a -- we have the Oakridge  
 5 meeting for Science and Education, which is out of the  
 6 DOE contract out of headquarters, they come and do a  
 7 contamination survey. The State Department of Health  
 8 does their surveys now. They did not in the  
 9 beginning but they have been for the last seven years  
 10 doing. And then most recently the Environmental  
 11 Protection Agency has done yet another survey on the  
 12 facilities that were not released. And I will give you  
 13 a little more detail on those in a minute.  
 14 I just want to show you another way of looking  
 15 at the fact that we have done most of the  
 16 decontamination work on our radioactive facilities. The  
 17 ones in green are the ones that are done; the ones in  
 18 red are the ones that still remain. There are only  
 19 three red ones. Building 29 on the left, the dormitory  
 20 which houses the shop reactor, Building 24 the same of  
 21 the same work and then the radioactive materials  
 22 handling facility which is the big red block.  
 23 Everything else has been completed.  
 24 BARBARA JOHNSON: Mike, can I ask you to what  
 25 standard do you say they're completed or done?

1 meetings. I want to show you the site. On the left-hand  
 2 photo we show Santa Susana Field Lab as it relates to  
 3 San Valley and Woodland Hills. And then on the right  
 4 is the Santa Susana Field Laboratory in a little bit  
 5 greater detail. It's divided into four areas. DOE is  
 6 mainly within Area IV in approximately that little  
 7 line oval. So we occupy only about 90 acres out of the  
 8 2700-acre area that comprises the Santa Susana Field  
 9 Laboratory.  
 10 Just another way to look at the site now.  
 11 This is Area IV, the DOE area in the foreground and the  
 12 San Fernando Valley in the background.  
 13 And now a closer shot. SEE Area IV in the  
 14 foreground is where we used to have the hot cell  
 15 laboratory. 1988 is important for us because that's  
 16 when we started our current contract.  
 17 SPEAKER: What is a hot cell laboratory?  
 18 MIKE LOPEZ: It was a facility for handling some  
 19 irradiated fuels, spent fuel and some --  
 20 SPEAKER: What kind of fuels?  
 21 MIKE LOPEZ: It was all nuclear fuels.  
 22 Originally, we had 28 nuclear facilities.  
 23 Over the years, we have decommissioned  
 24 demolished most -- or a number of them. We have done  
 25 cleanup on 22 of the 28. And I want to walk you through

1 skiny report from you that -- you didn't have this  
 2 information available on the 2nd of December?  
 3 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes. As a matter of fact I just  
 4 pulled this stuff together this week, Barbara.  
 5 VICKI ROSEN: I was just going to say that we don't  
 6 want to have too much of a debate here -- it would do  
 7 this as soon as his presentation is over. I understand  
 8 the value of doing that. It gives me I do. But I think  
 9 we have got to try and find a time when we can talk a  
 10 little more productively in our time.  
 11 Jonathan, did you want to say something?  
 12 JONATHAN BARRETT: I just know that there was an  
 13 agreement that there would be a meeting that would be  
 14 determined so that community representatives would have  
 15 an opportunity to be able to review the material that's  
 16 being submitted so we could have an intelligent  
 17 response. This is the first step. We are seeing Mike's  
 18 presentation.  
 19 VICKI ROSEN: And for the public's benefit, we did  
 20 try and work this out prior to the meeting, where  
 21 everybody could get materials in advance of the meeting.  
 22 So that's what the part of the discussion is about.  
 23 MIKE LOPEZ: This is just an overview. It's not  
 24 much detail.  
 25 Okay. I just wanted to show you a few of the

1 buildings we have worked on in the past. This is the  
2 hot cell laboratory, the way it looked a number of years  
3 ago.

4 And this is the facility, the bare spot is  
5 where -- what it looks like today basically.

6 SHELDON PLOTKIN: Can you tell us where you shipped  
7 that radioactive concrete?

8 MIKE LOPEZ: The radioactive concrete, the waste  
9 was -- would have been shipped to -- I believe to the  
10 Nevada test site.

11 This is the former sodium disposal facility  
12 after remediation. It is the area on the other side of  
13 that road after it's been -- after we removed all the  
14 soil, we backfilled it with clean soil from the site,  
15 and then revegetated it, planted a lot of native grasses  
16 and some trees.

17 SPEAKER: Do you know how much of the soil you  
18 removed?

19 MIKE LOPEZ: All told out of the two campaigns, two  
20 separate activities, we removed approximately  
21 22,000 cubic yards.

22 SPEAKER: Upper layers or --

23 MIKE LOPEZ: Essentially we excavated it down to  
24 bedrock.

25 SPEAKER: Which is how many feet?

1 benefit if you could go to the microphone because it's a  
2 large room.

3 SPEAKER: On the green and red map, when was the  
4 green completed and when was the red completed?

5 MIKE LOPEZ: The green areas occurred over time  
6 from the 1970s up through the late 1990s. The red areas  
7 are within the next five years maybe, somewhat dependent  
8 upon funding.

9 SPEAKER: I actually have two questions. Has --  
10 after the exterior of Building 4059 was surveyed and  
11 released, you indicated that all of the contamination  
12 was below grade.

13 Was there a hundred-year logic  
14 characterization made of the site in terms of anything  
15 that might have existed as seismic, or did you test any  
16 of the ground water, and at what depth?

17 SHELDON PLOTKIN: While you're waiting for them --  
18 the ground water is completely contaminated for the  
19 whole site, and it goes down to the aquifer. We have  
20 been fighting about that for a long time. It doesn't  
21 have to do with just the one building; it's the whole  
22 site. The problems we have with the decontamination and  
23 so on and so forth is that we are cut out of the loop  
24 most the time. And once in a while, when we get in, we  
25 sometimes discover things that are kind of extreme. I

1 MIKE LOPEZ: It kind of -- the depth varied because  
2 it was not a level area. I don't know. Maybe the  
3 deepest -- Gerard? Ten feet?

4 GERARD ABRAMS: 22,000 cubic yards' worth. It  
5 varies in depth.

6 MIKE LOPEZ: The area was about six acres, perhaps  
7 a little bit more.

8 And then this is my last one. One of our  
9 three remaining radioactive contaminated facilities.  
10 The building itself has actually been cleaned up and  
11 surveyed and it's released. It is one of the things we  
12 will start working on once the EA is done. The  
13 contamination is all below grade on this building.

14 And that's it for me.

15 VICKI ROSEN: So is that the extent of the  
16 Department of Energy's presentation?

17 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes, it is.

18 VICKI ROSEN: What I would like to do is open the  
19 floor to public questions about what you just heard or  
20 anything related to these types of activities. If  
21 anybody -- and you are welcome to just get up in place  
22 if people can hear you. Otherwise, we have a microphone  
23 here in the center of the room, so just line up or  
24 whatever works easiest for you.

25 Actually, I think it might be to everyone's

1 don't know if you want to hear details.

2 SPEAKER: Yes, we would.

3 SHELDON PLOTKIN: Well, on my own, you know, I have  
4 been up there only a couple of times. The last time the  
5 snap reactor building that was being monitored by the  
6 EPA, the EPA was coming in and doing the monitoring  
7 because the public had objected to Rocketdyne DOE being  
8 in charge of monitoring the building and taking  
9 measurements, et cetera. We have had experience that --  
10 sad experience for us in the past, so EPA was doing it.

11 Well, they were kind enough to invite us in.  
12 So it turns out that in that snap reactor -- a snap  
13 reactor is a space nuclear auxiliary power, something  
14 like that, it's a nuclear power reactor designed to be  
15 put into space. The building is pretty much a  
16 rectangular building with flat concrete floors, except  
17 there's a big steel plate in the middle. The steel  
18 plate is about 12 or 15 feet in diameter. And below  
19 that plate is a pit that goes down into the ground. I  
20 don't remember exactly how far, but it's something like  
21 25 or 30 or 35 feet or so. And when I asked what that  
22 was for, well, that's where the reactor goes when they  
23 do the testing.

24 So EPA at the time was meticulously -- with  
25 their contractor, was meticulously going over every

1 buildings we have worked on in the past. This is the  
 2 hot cell laboratory, the way it looked a number of years  
 3 ago.  
 4 And this is the facility, the base spot is  
 5 when -- what it looks like today basically.  
 6 SHELDON PLOTKIN: Can you tell us when you shipped  
 7 that radioactive concrete?  
 8 MIKE LOPEZ: The radioactive concrete, the waste  
 9 was -- would have been shipped to -- I believe to the  
 10 Nevada test site.  
 11 This is the former sodium disposal facility  
 12 after remediation. It is the area on the other side of  
 13 that road after its been -- after we removed all the  
 14 soil, we backfilled it with clean soil from the site  
 15 and then revegetated it, planted a lot of native grasses  
 16 and some trees.  
 17 SPEAKER: Do you know how much of the soil you  
 18 removed?  
 19 MIKE LOPEZ: All told out of the two campaigns, two  
 20 separate campaigns, we removed approximately  
 21 22,000 cubic yards.  
 22 SPEAKER: Upper layers or --  
 23 MIKE LOPEZ: Essentially we excavated it down to  
 24 bedrock.  
 25 SPEAKER: Which is how many feet?

1 MIKE LOPEZ: It kind of -- the depth varied because  
 2 it was not a level area. I don't know, maybe the  
 3 deposit -- General Tom's feet.  
 4 GERRARD ABRAHAM: 22,000 cubic yards, worth it  
 5 varies in depth.  
 6 MIKE LOPEZ: The area was about six acres, perhaps  
 7 a little bit more.  
 8 And then this is my last one. One of our  
 9 other remaining radioactive contaminated facilities  
 10 The building itself has actually been cleaned up and  
 11 surveyed and it's released. It is one of the things we  
 12 will start working on once the EA is done. The  
 13 contamination is all below grade on this building.  
 14 And that's it for me.  
 15 MICHAEL ROSEN: So is that the extent of the  
 16 Department of Energy's presentation?  
 17 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes it is.  
 18 MICHAEL ROSEN: What I would like to do is open the  
 19 floor to public questions about what you just heard on  
 20 anything related to these types of activities. If  
 21 anybody -- and you are welcome to just get up in place  
 22 if people can hear you. Otherwise, we have a microphone  
 23 here in the center of the room, so just line up or  
 24 write or e-mail easiest for you.  
 25 Amazing, I think it might be to everyone's

1 benefit if you could go to the microphone because it's a  
 2 large room.  
 3 SPEAKER: On the green and red map, when was the  
 4 green completed and when was the red completed?  
 5 MIKE LOPEZ: The green areas occurred over time  
 6 from the 1970s up through the late 1990s. The red areas  
 7 are within the next five years maybe, somewhat dependent  
 8 upon financing.  
 9 SPEAKER: I actually have two questions. The --  
 10 after the action of building data was surveyed and  
 11 released, you indicated that all of the contamination  
 12 was below grade.  
 13 Was there a hundred-year logic  
 14 characterization made of the site in terms of anything  
 15 that might have existed as a risk or did you test any  
 16 of the ground water, and at what depth?  
 17 SHELDON PLOTKIN: While you're waiting for them --  
 18 the ground water is completely contaminated for the  
 19 whole site and it goes down to the aquifer. We have  
 20 been fighting about that for a long time. It doesn't  
 21 have to do with just the one building, it's the whole  
 22 site. The problems we have with the decontamination and  
 23 so on and so forth is that we are out out of the loop  
 24 most the time. And once in a while, when we get in, we  
 25 sometimes discover things that are kind of external.

1 don't know if you want to hear details.  
 2 SPEAKER: Yes, we would.  
 3 SHELDON PLOTKIN: Well, on my own, you know, I have  
 4 been up there only a couple of times. The last time the  
 5 snap reactor building that was being mentioned by the  
 6 EPA, the EPA was coming in and doing the monitoring  
 7 because the public had objected to Rockyfling DOE being  
 8 in charge of monitoring the building and taking  
 9 measurements, et cetera. We have had experience that --  
 10 and experience for us in the past, so EPA was doing it.  
 11 Well, they were kind enough to invite us in.  
 12 So it turns out that in that snap reactor -- a snap  
 13 reactor is a space nuclear reactor, power, something  
 14 like that, it's a nuclear power reactor designed to be  
 15 put into space. The building is pretty much a  
 16 rectangular building with flat concrete floors, except  
 17 there's a big steel plate in the middle. The steel  
 18 plate is about 12 or 15 feet in diameter. And below  
 19 that plate is a pit that goes down into the ground. I  
 20 don't remember exactly how far, but it's something like  
 21 25 or 30 or 35 feet or so. And when I asked what that  
 22 was for, well, that's where the reactor goes when they  
 23 do the testing.  
 24 So EPA at the time was meticulously -- it is  
 25 their concern was meticulously going over every

1 square foot of wall, a number of floor samples were  
2 being taken, a concrete core being drilled, et cetera.

3 And I asked what are you doing at the bottom  
4 of the pit?

5 Well, nothing. Rocketdyne had already done  
6 it. And they said it was okay. So we're not doing  
7 that.

8 Well, the one place in the building that might  
9 have radioactive contamination would be the bottom of  
10 the pit. In fact, if the bottom of the pit was clean,  
11 then there would be no reason to be doing the rest of  
12 the building because that's where the reactor was.  
13 That's where the source of the radioactive contamination  
14 would have been.

15 So I -- I did the best I could to encourage  
16 them to monitor and take samples, et cetera, at the  
17 bottom of that pit. And I was told various reasons,  
18 which I won't go into, but they didn't do it, wouldn't  
19 do it. And as far as I know, they haven't done it.

20 Now, the question I have is that the -- well,  
21 if that's what happened in the one place that I got to  
22 look at, how about all these buildings that have been  
23 decommissioned already? They've got -- you saw  
24 89 percent of the buildings have been set up and been  
25 said to be clean and ready for unrestricted use. And

1 the impression now from the letter from the Secretary of  
2 Energy that the Calabasas landfill may have been a  
3 recipient of some of the disposal materials. That is  
4 ongoing. But the County sanitation provided me with a  
5 copy of a geologic study done just in the last two  
6 years, I think in 1999, which does identify in the  
7 landfill itself several fault zones, which up until this  
8 year were categorically denied that they existed. Now  
9 I'm seeing them.

10 And I want to know if Rocketdyne is similarly  
11 going to do it if they have not done it; and if not,  
12 will you ask for it?

13 MIKE BROWN: What you are talking about is the  
14 entire Santa Susana Field Laboratory site, not just the  
15 ETEC site?

16 SPEAKER: Specifically, the ETEC site. We're  
17 talking, what, 2,600 acres here?

18 MIKE BROWN: Well, but the ETEC site is only  
19 90 acres. And there is a site hydrogeologic model based  
20 on the works of the ground water contamination at the  
21 entire site. But I will refer you to -- we have a small  
22 portion of that ground water contamination that I would  
23 refer you to the documents. And I think the Department  
24 of Toxic Substances Control would that have -- talk to  
25 that larger hydrogeologic model.

1 I'm not so sure that they're really that clean and  
2 things have been cleaned up properly. And then there's  
3 a question of where the contaminated material goes. All  
4 of those things have to be looked at.

5 SPEAKER: I just wanted to clarify. The one  
6 question that really provoked me to stand up had to do  
7 with what characterizations beneath the work at the ETEC  
8 site has been done addressing fault zones? And if there  
9 is any information, has it been documented, and is it  
10 available to my city as a matter of public record?

11 VICKI ROSEN: Mike, do you want to address that?

12 MIKE LOPEZ: Well, I don't know what has been done  
13 about the seismic zones. We could ask Rocketdyne about  
14 that.

15 As far as the ground water goes, there are a  
16 lot of wells around the site, around Building 59 in that  
17 area, monitoring wells. There is no radiological ground  
18 water contamination associated with Building 59.

19 SPEAKER: That's not -- pardon me. That's not the  
20 focus -- I guess the question is very simple. Has there  
21 ever been, since any of these agencies, state or  
22 federal, has there ever been a study to characterize  
23 fault lines or fault zones on the entirety of the  
24 property of the ETEC site?

25 And I ask that question because we are under

1 SPEAKER: The point I'm trying to make here is that  
2 clearly the site lies between the Santa Susanas and the  
3 Santa Monica Mountains, and it is tectonically active.  
4 Rocketdyne sits between the two. And it would be almost  
5 unbelievable to think that you have been doing cleanup  
6 efforts without having done any type of investigation  
7 about the seismic activity. And if you have not, my  
8 task force has -- tonight wants to make a recommendation  
9 to you that you employ global positioning systems across  
10 Rocketdyne. We would also like to see it across  
11 Ahmanson and the Calabasas landfill. This is a  
12 technology that is good science. It is current. It is  
13 being used by the U.S. Geologic Survey in 250 monitoring  
14 stations across the state of California to determine  
15 seismic activity, and it can detect ground movement as  
16 little as six centimeters.

17 If we have a tectonically active area  
18 seismically, and after the Northridge earthquake we know  
19 that the Las Virgenes bridge directly -- southward from  
20 this site dropped eight inches and there was moderate  
21 damage at the landfill, that if the Rocketdyne site sits  
22 on an aquifer and we are now finding contaminants in a  
23 site between Rocketdyne and the landfill, and the site  
24 of the landfill is producing plumes of the same  
25 chemical, TCE, that we were finding at Rocketdyne, we

Page 22

1 the impression now from the letter from the Secretary of  
 2 Energy that the Calcasieu landfill may have been a  
 3 recipient of some of the displaced material. That is  
 4 ongoing. But the County auditor provided me with a  
 5 copy of a geologic study done just in the last two  
 6 years. I think in 1999, which does identify in the  
 7 landfill itself several fault zones which up until this  
 8 year were categorically denied that they existed. Now  
 9 I'm seeing them.  
 10 And I want to know if Ricketts has a standard  
 11 going to do it if they have not done it and if not  
 12 will you ask for it?  
 13 MIKE BROWN: What you are talking about is the  
 14 entire Santa Susana Field Laboratory site, not just the  
 15 ETEC site?  
 16 SPEAKER: Specifically, the ETEC site. We're  
 17 talking about 2,000 acres here?  
 18 MIKE BROWN: Well, but the ETEC site is only  
 19 90 acres. And there is a site hydrogeologic model based  
 20 on the works of the ground water contamination at the  
 21 entire site. But I will refer you to -- we have a small  
 22 portion of that ground water contamination that I would  
 23 refer you to the document. And I think the Department  
 24 of Toxic Substances Control would that have -- talk to  
 25 that larger hydrogeologic model.

Page 23

1 STEAKER: The point I'm trying to make here is that  
 2 clearly the site lies between the Santa Susana and the  
 3 Santa Monica Mountains, and it is technically active.  
 4 Ricketts site between the two. And it would be unusual  
 5 unbelievable to think that you had been doing cleanup  
 6 efforts without having done any type of investigation  
 7 about the seismic activity. And if you have not any  
 8 task force has -- tonight wants to make a recommendation  
 9 to you that you employ global positioning systems across  
 10 Ricketts. We would also like to see it across  
 11 Alhambra and the Calcasieu landfills. This is a  
 12 technology that is good science. It is currently  
 13 being used by the U.S. Geological Survey in 250 monitoring  
 14 stations across the state of California to determine  
 15 seismic activity, and it can detect ground movement as  
 16 little as six centimeters.  
 17 If we have a technically active area  
 18 seismically, and after the Ricketts earthquake we know  
 19 that the Las Vegas bridge directly -- some 100 feet from  
 20 this site dropped eight inches and there was moderate  
 21 damage at the landfill, that if the Ricketts site are  
 22 on an upper and we are now finding contaminants in a  
 23 site between Ricketts and the landfill, and the site  
 24 of the landfill is producing plumes of the same  
 25 chemical, TCE, that we were finding at Ricketts, we

Page 21

1 square foot of wall, a number of floor samples were  
 2 being taken, a concrete core being drilled, et cetera.  
 3 And I asked what you were doing at the bottom  
 4 of the pit?  
 5 Well, nothing. Ricketts had already done  
 6 it. And they said it was okay. So we're not doing  
 7 that.  
 8 Well, the one risk in the building that might  
 9 have radioactive contamination would be the bottom of  
 10 the pit. In fact, if the bottom of the pit was clean,  
 11 then there would be no reason to be doing the rest of  
 12 the building because that's where the reactor was.  
 13 That's where the source of the radioactive contamination  
 14 would have been.  
 15 So I -- I did the best I could to encourage  
 16 them to monitor and take samples, et cetera, at the  
 17 bottom of that pit. And I was told various reasons  
 18 which I would not go into, but they didn't do it. I would  
 19 do it. And as far as I know, they haven't done it.  
 20 Now, the question I have is that the -- well,  
 21 if that's what happened in the one place that I got to  
 22 look in -- about all these buildings that have been  
 23 decommissioned already, they've got -- you saw  
 24 80 percent of the buildings have been set up and been  
 25 said to be clean and ready for unrestricted use, and

Page 24

1 I'm not so sure that they're really that clean and  
 2 things have been cleaned up properly. And then there's  
 3 a question of where the contaminated material goes. All  
 4 of those things have to be looked at.  
 5 STEAKER: I just wanted to clarify. The one  
 6 question that really provoked me to stand up and to do  
 7 with what characterizations between the work at the ETEC  
 8 site has been done addressing fault zones? And if there  
 9 is any information that has been documented, and is it  
 10 available to my city as a matter of public record?  
 11 TERRY ROBERT: Mike, do you want to address that?  
 12 MIKE ROBERT: Well, I don't know what has been done  
 13 about the seismic zones. We could ask Ricketts about  
 14 that.  
 15 As far as the ground water goes, there are a  
 16 lot of wells around the site around Building 20 in that  
 17 area monitoring wells. There is no radiological ground  
 18 water contamination associated with Building 20.  
 19 STEAKER: That's not -- pardon me, I didn't not the  
 20 focus -- I guess the question is very simple. Has there  
 21 ever been since any of these agencies, state or  
 22 federal, has there ever been a study to characterize  
 23 fault lines or fault zones on the entirety of the  
 24 property of the ETEC site?  
 25 And I ask that question because we are under

1 have to know in a global sense how to piece the pieces  
2 of these puzzles together to see what we are really  
3 dealing with.

4 I would urge you, if you have an interest in  
5 following the recommendation of my task force, I would  
6 be happy to give you the name of the company that does  
7 this. They are out of Utah, and they are willing to  
8 come here as quickly as possible to set up a system that  
9 will give you an hourly, daily, weekly, realtime  
10 reading, and we can finally, once and for all, determine  
11 what is happening in the mountains and those valleys and  
12 on and underneath and perhaps even giving us an  
13 understanding of what is happening at depth, not just at  
14 the landfill and the areas that have been breached with  
15 contaminants, but at Rocketdyne itself. And that would  
16 be my recommendation.

17 VICKI ROSEN: Thank you, Ms. Lee.

18 Is there anybody else at the table who would  
19 like to address the seismic issue?

20 MIKE LOPEZ: I just want to say one thing on that.  
21 I do know that after the Northridge Earthquake, there  
22 was no damage at the site from the earthquake. For  
23 discussion of the fault zones, perhaps we could have  
24 Boeing discuss that because I don't know what it is.

25 SPEAKER: I just want to point out that after the

1 the Pacific Ocean. And if we have an aquifer that is in  
2 a seismic area and what it's showing us is that  
3 symptomatically there are problems, why aren't we  
4 investigating that first to see what we are really  
5 dealing with? We have the technology to do that. I  
6 urge you to do it. And frankly, if I don't have any  
7 assurance tonight that you are going to do it, then I  
8 will ask our task force to insist on it being done.

9 VICKI ROSEN: Thank you. We are going to let some  
10 of the others --

11 SPEAKER: I just want to make sure there is no  
12 mischaracterization here. We are very concerned about  
13 this. Our whole city is concerned about this. And  
14 these are -- all three sites have detected contaminants.  
15 They all sit on seismicity. There are agencies that are  
16 supposed to oversee it for the public health. They're  
17 not taking the most obvious action, apparently, from  
18 what I'm hearing tonight, and that troubles me deeply.  
19 And I'm not going to allow anyone to tell me that I  
20 don't know the information, because I have been working  
21 on this for 10 years.

22 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm sorry. I wasn't trying to imply  
23 that.

24 SPEAKER: I understand. Sir, I am asking this  
25 panel tonight, I am asking you to give me a certainty

1 1994 earthquake, I walked a pattern across an area that  
2 roughly follows the front of our Las Virgenes  
3 Metropolitan Water District office on Las Virgenes Road,  
4 across through a steeplechase, which is an area of our  
5 city that was completely red-tagged, through an area of  
6 Saratoga Hills, where entire walls of houses came off  
7 foundations, and then it leapfrogged. And on the other  
8 side of the landfill, which we were not privy to get  
9 onto, it continued across into and through driveways.  
10 And from an aerial perspective, the line drawn went  
11 directly through the southwest corner of the Calabasas  
12 landfill. And it coincided with -- two years later,  
13 within the two areas of the landfill where the two  
14 plumes of TCE were breaching concrete subsurface  
15 barriers.

16 I would pose to you that I probably am seeing  
17 a lot more than you are about the obvious. And I would  
18 like to insist that this be explored in this entire  
19 global area because I believe we are not looking at the  
20 global picture here. The reason I raise that is because  
21 our landfill has 650,000 tons estimated, probably  
22 underestimated, of toxins that were buried on permeable  
23 soil without bedliners. And this all sits --  
24 Rocketdyne, Ahmanson, and the Calabasas Landfill all sit  
25 at the top of the Malibu Creek watershed, and it goes to

1 that you will follow through and do a seismic study.  
2 And I am giving you the tool to do it with. And however  
3 the funding is required, my city is prepared to step  
4 forward and participate in the funding. So you cannot  
5 use funding as a reason not to do it. The public safety  
6 is too great. And this is an area that has been left  
7 without an answer, and it is the greatest answer that  
8 needs answering. And with that information, you will  
9 have a tool to detect much more than just earth  
10 movement. You will know where to look for the  
11 contaminants. And that, to me, seems like the most  
12 logical place to start. And after all these years of  
13 cleanup and all the questions and concerns of the  
14 community, I would suggest to you that if this is not a  
15 reasonable approach, then perhaps we have to start over  
16 again with the program that we are talking about  
17 tonight.

18 VICKI ROSEN: Ms. Lee, could you talk after the  
19 meeting tonight with myself and John Beach about this  
20 issue? Thank you.

21 SPEAKER: My name is Bonnie Klee. In 1963 I worked  
22 in Building 59 on the snap reactor program, and I  
23 subsequently developed bladder cancer, and Rocketdyne  
24 denied that my job could have given me the exposure.

25 I'd like to know how would you assess worker

1 have to know in a global sense how to piece the pieces  
 2 of these puzzles together to see what we are really  
 3 dealing with.  
 4 I would urge you, if you have an interest in  
 5 following the recommendation of my task force, I would  
 6 be happy to give you the name of the company that does  
 7 this. They are out of Utah, and they are willing to  
 8 come here as quickly as possible to set up a system that  
 9 will give you an hourly, daily, weekly, monthly  
 10 reading, and we can finally, once and for all, determine  
 11 what is happening in the mountains and those valleys and  
 12 in the mountains and perhaps even giving us an  
 13 understanding of what is happening at depth, not just at  
 14 the landfill and the areas that have been breached with  
 15 containers, but at Rockledge's itself. And that would  
 16 be my recommendation.  
 17 MICHEL ROSEN: Thank you, Mr. Lee.  
 18 Is there anybody else at the table who would  
 19 like to address the seismic issue?  
 20 MR. LOREN: I just want to say one thing on that.  
 21 I do know that after the Northridge earthquake, there  
 22 was no damage at the site from the earthquake. For  
 23 discussion of the fault zones, perhaps we could have  
 24 something done that because I don't know what it is.  
 25 SPEAKER: I just want to point out that after the

1 1991 earthquake, I walked a pattern across an area that  
 2 roughly follows the front of our Las Vegas  
 3 Mountain Water District office on Las Vegas Road,  
 4 across through a steeply sloped, which is an area of  
 5 rock that was completely re-graded, through an area of  
 6 Canyon Hills, where entire walls of houses came off.  
 7 Conditions, and then it collapsed. And on the other  
 8 side of the landfill, which we were not happy to get  
 9 into, it continued across into and through ditches.  
 10 And from an aerial perspective, the line between  
 11 through through the corner of the Chinasso  
 12 landfill, and it correlated with -- two years later,  
 13 within the two areas of the landfill where the two  
 14 phases of TCE were breaching concrete substance  
 15 barriers.  
 16 I would hope to you that I probably am seeing  
 17 a lot more than you are about the options. And I would  
 18 like to state that this has been explored in the entire  
 19 global area because I believe we are not looking at the  
 20 global picture here. The reason I raise that is because  
 21 our landfill has 600,000 tons estimated, probably  
 22 undisturbed, of toxins that were buried on pentacaps  
 23 and without barriers. And this all sits --  
 24 Rockledge, Amerson, and the Chinasso Landfill all sit  
 25 at the top of the Altitude Creek watershed, and it goes to

1 the Pacific Ocean. And if we have an aquifer that is in  
 2 a seismic area and what it's showing us is that  
 3 symptomatically there are problems with areas we  
 4 investigating that to see what we are really  
 5 dealing with. We have the technology to do that. I  
 6 urge you to do it. And frankly, if I don't have any  
 7 assurance tonight that you are going to do it, then I  
 8 will ask our task force to insist on it being done.  
 9 MICHEL ROSEN: Thank you. We are going to let some  
 10 of the others --  
 11 SPEAKER: I just want to make sure there is no  
 12 mischaracterization here. We are very concerned about  
 13 this. Our whole city is concerned about this. And  
 14 these are -- all three sites have detected contaminants  
 15 They all sit on seismicity. There are agencies that are  
 16 supposed to oversee it for the public health. They're  
 17 not taking the most obvious action, apparently, from  
 18 what I'm hearing tonight, and that troubles me deeply.  
 19 And I'm not going to allow anyone to tell me that I  
 20 don't know the information, because I have been working  
 21 on this for 10 years.  
 22 MIKE LOREN: I'm sorry, I was trying to imply  
 23 that.  
 24 SPEAKER: I understand. Sir, I am asking the  
 25 panel tonight, I am asking you to give me a certain

1 that you will follow through and do a seismic study.  
 2 And I am giving you the tool to do it with. And however  
 3 the funding is required, my site is prepared to step  
 4 forward and participate in the funding. So you cannot  
 5 use funding as a reason not to do it. The public safety  
 6 is too great. And this is an area that has been hit  
 7 without an answer, and it is the greatest answer that  
 8 needs answering. And with that information you will  
 9 have a tool to detect much more than just earth  
 10 movement. You will know where to look for the  
 11 containers. And that to me, seems like the most  
 12 logical place to start. And after all these years of  
 13 cleanup and all the questions and concerns of the  
 14 community, I would suggest to you that it has to be a  
 15 reasonable approach, then perhaps we have to start  
 16 again with the program that we are talking about  
 17 tonight.  
 18 MICHEL ROSEN: Mr. Lee, would you talk after the  
 19 meeting tonight with myself and John Beach about this  
 20 issue? Thank you.  
 21 SPEAKER: My name is Bonnie Klein. In 1983 I worked  
 22 in Building 22 on the state reactor program, and I  
 23 subsequently developed bladder cancer and Rockledge's  
 24 denied that my job could have given me the exposure  
 25 I'd like to know how would you assess worker



1 exposure who was in that building in those years in  
2 light of the fact that that building is so contaminated  
3 that it has contaminated the ground water down to the  
4 bedrock?

5 MIKE LOPEZ: At this time, I don't think I could  
6 address your question about exposure, worker exposures  
7 during that time because I don't know the details of it.  
8 As far as I know, there is no radiological contamination  
9 of the ground water there.

10 SPEAKER: Under Building 59? You just said there  
11 was.

12 MIKE BROWN: Soil contamination. Soil was removed  
13 down to a level of 20 feet.

14 SPEAKER: I have a report at home that said the  
15 ground water was contaminated, and the ground water came  
16 back up and contaminated the building.

17 How would I get more information on that?

18 MIKE LOPEZ: On the contamination associated with  
19 the building?

20 SPEAKER: Well, why is that one of the last  
21 buildings to be removed?

22 MIKE LOPEZ: It's just the order of the  
23 decontamination and decommission.

24 SPEAKER: How can I find out more information?

25 MIKE LOPEZ: I will see if the survey report is

1 SPEAKER: My name is Elizabeth (inaudible). A  
2 couple of questions for the Department of Energy,  
3 please.

4 I wanted to find out more about the reasons  
5 why these last three buildings are the last ones on your  
6 list. You say that the order of buildings is just how  
7 they fall in terms of the things that you prioritize.

8 But were these left to the last. Is there any  
9 difference between these last three why you are taking  
10 more time? Why are we discussing these now? You  
11 decommissioned all of the other ones without the  
12 supervision. What is about these that got them to the  
13 end of your list, and why are we unable to do it until  
14 now? And a follow-up question too.

15 MIKE LOPEZ: Well, we started a number of years ago  
16 working with the State Department of Health Services and  
17 the EPA on the lease of the buildings. One of the  
18 facilities is still operational, and that is where we  
19 handle the radioactive waste that we do have. It's just  
20 a matter of completing the others that went before them.  
21 And there is nothing extraordinary about these buildings  
22 except one that is still operational.

23 SPEAKER: What about the building with the core,  
24 the reactor core that was being referenced earlier? Has  
25 that been decommissioned? Is that going to be cleaned?

1 available.

2 VICKI ROSEN: Thank you.

3 LARRY BOWERMAN: (Inaudible) -- were observed. And  
4 the 30-foot deep reactor pit is -- the access to that is  
5 very difficult. There is no current exposures because  
6 nobody is getting anywhere near that reactor pit. At  
7 least as of this time, there are no current plans to  
8 demolish that building.

9 SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Christina Walsh. I sit  
10 on the board of directors for the West Hills Property  
11 Owners Association.

12 And my question is basically to ask the EPA  
13 for comment on the diagram shown where we have the green  
14 buildings and the red buildings. And does the EPA  
15 consider those buildings that were marked in green as  
16 fully remediated? And also, further characterization of  
17 those buildings that have not yet been cleaned up, what  
18 is left on those buildings? What are they? Are -- is  
19 that the former reactor that had some problems, shall we  
20 say?

21 Those are my questions.

22 JOHN BEACH: If I could defer the answer to that  
23 until I make my presentation, I will speak to some of  
24 these issues.

25 SPEAKER: Thank you.

1 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm sorry. The reactor core? The one  
2 Sheldon was referring to?

3 SHELDON PLOTKIN: That was a pit that they set the  
4 reactor in. They were testing the reactor. The reactor  
5 being there would contaminate things around it.

6 SPEAKER: Right. Has that building been cleaned?

7 MIKE LOPEZ: That building has been cleaned.

8 SPEAKER: With any oversight by the EPA?

9 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes. EPA did the survey.

10 SPEAKER: And how much longer is the radioactive  
11 materials handling facility going to be in operation?

12 MIKE LOPEZ: It will be in operation a few more  
13 years until we decontaminate the other facilities. And  
14 then that will be the last one we get to.

15 SPEAKER: Is the EPA overseeing your  
16 decontamination/decommissioning of the other buildings  
17 that you are working on besides the --

18 MIKE LOPEZ: They have actually already done the  
19 survey on Building 59.

20 SPEAKER: Are the standards going to be followed?

21 MIKE LOPEZ: We are following DOE/DHS standards on  
22 decontamination of buildings.

23 SPEAKER: Is the EPA overseeing the decontamination  
24 and decommissioning? Because, again, it always gets two  
25 different levels, acceptable levels, EPA versus DOE.

1 response who was in that building in those years in  
 2 light of the fact that that building is so controversial  
 3 that it has contaminated the ground water down to the  
 4 bedrock?  
 5 MIKE LOPEZ: At this time, I don't think I could  
 6 answer your question about exposure without exposure  
 7 during that time because I don't know the details of it.  
 8 As far as I know, there is no radiological contamination  
 9 of the ground water there.  
 10 SPEAKER: Under Building 20? You just said there  
 11 was.  
 12 MIKE BROWN: Soil contamination. Soil was removed  
 13 down to a level of 20 feet.  
 14 SPEAKER: I have a report in hand that said the  
 15 ground water was contaminated, and the ground water came  
 16 back up and contaminated the building.  
 17 How would I get more information on that?  
 18 MIKE LOPEZ: On the contamination associated with  
 19 the building?  
 20 SPEAKER: Well, why is that one of the last  
 21 buildings to be removed?  
 22 MIKE LOPEZ: It's just the order of the  
 23 decontamination and decommissioning.  
 24 SPEAKER: How can I find out more information?  
 25 MIKE LOPEZ: I will see if the survey reports

1 available  
 2 VICKI ROSSER: Thank you.  
 3 LARRY ROYBERMAN: (Inaudible) -- were observed, and  
 4 the 50-foot or so reactor pit is -- the access to that is  
 5 very difficult. There is no current exposure because  
 6 nobody is going any where near that reactor pit. At  
 7 least as of this time, there are no current plans to  
 8 demolish that building.  
 9 SPEAKER: My name is Christina Walsh. I sit  
 10 on the board of directors for the West Hills Property  
 11 Owners Association.  
 12 And my question is basically to ask the EPA  
 13 for comment on the diagram shown where we have the green  
 14 buildings and the red buildings. And does the EPA  
 15 consider those buildings that are marked in green as  
 16 fully decontaminated? And also, further characterization of  
 17 those buildings that have not been cleaned up, what  
 18 is left on those buildings? What are they? Are -- is  
 19 that the former reactor that had some problems with it  
 20 says.  
 21 Those are my questions.  
 22 JOHN BEACH: (I) could defer the answer to that  
 23 until I make my presentation. I will speak to some of  
 24 those issues.  
 25 SPEAKER: Thank you.

1 SPEAKER: My name is Elizabeth (inaudible). A  
 2 couple of questions for the Department of Energy,  
 3 please.  
 4 I wanted to find out more about the reasons  
 5 why these last three buildings are the last ones on your  
 6 list. You say that the order of buildings is just how  
 7 they fall in terms of the things that you prioritize.  
 8 But were these left to the last, is there any  
 9 difference between these last three why you are taking  
 10 more time? Why are we discussing these now? You  
 11 decontaminated all of the other ones without the  
 12 exception. What is about these that got them to the  
 13 end of your list, and why are we unable to do it now,  
 14 now? And a follow-up question too.  
 15 MIKE LOPEZ: Well, we started a number of years ago  
 16 working with the State Department of Health Services and  
 17 the EPA on the lease of the buildings. One of the  
 18 facilities is still operational, and that is where we  
 19 handle the radioactive waste that we do have. It's just  
 20 a matter of completing the others that went before them.  
 21 And there is nothing extraordinary about these buildings  
 22 except one that is still operational.  
 23 SPEAKER: What about the building with the core,  
 24 the reactor core that was being returned earlier. Has  
 25 that been decommissioned? Is that going to be cleaned?

1 MIKE LOPEZ: (Inaudible). The reactor core. The one  
 2 Sheldon was referring to.  
 3 SHELDON BLOTNIK: That was a pit that they set the  
 4 reactor in. They were testing the reactor. The reactor  
 5 being there would contain the things around it.  
 6 SPEAKER: Right. Has that building been cleaned?  
 7 MIKE LOPEZ: That building has been cleaned.  
 8 SPEAKER: With my oversight by the EPA?  
 9 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes. EPA did the survey.  
 10 SPEAKER: And how much longer is the radioactive  
 11 materials handling facility going to be in operation?  
 12 MIKE LOPEZ: It will be in operation a few more  
 13 years until we decommission the other facilities. And  
 14 then that will be the last one we get to.  
 15 SPEAKER: Is the EPA overseeing your  
 16 decontamination/decommissioning of the other buildings  
 17 that you are working on besides the --  
 18 MIKE LOPEZ: That has actually already done the  
 19 survey on Building 20.  
 20 SPEAKER: Are the standards going to be followed?  
 21 MIKE LOPEZ: We are following DOE/DHS standards on  
 22 decontamination of buildings.  
 23 SPEAKER: Is the EPA overseeing the decontamination  
 24 and decommissioning? Because, again, it always gets two  
 25 different levels acceptable to both EPA versus DOE.

1 From what I understand, please correct me if I'm wrong,  
2 is that these other properties have been decontaminated  
3 and decommissioned based on the Department of Energy's  
4 standards and protocol, yeah?

5 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes. EPA does not have their own  
6 standards for the decontamination -- surface  
7 contamination of buildings.

8 JOHN BEACH: That is correct. And it is DOE's  
9 authority -- they have that authority to oversee that  
10 cleanup, and EPA does not.

11 SPEAKER: Would the EPA have different standards?  
12 If you guys were in charge, would you have different  
13 standards from what they apply?

14 JOHN BEACH: We would use a different approach.  
15 And -- so I guess that infers, yes, different standards.  
16 We approach things in a different way. We don't select  
17 a standard the way they do. And as I said, it's a  
18 different approach.

19 SPEAKER: I understand you start with the lower  
20 goal and work towards that.

21 JOHN BEACH: That's correct.

22 SPEAKER: So is the EPA going to have any oversight  
23 in the decontamination and decommissioning of these last  
24 buildings? Will the public have oversight and at least  
25 access to comment?

1 VICKI ROSEN: Thank you, Steve.

2 SPEAKER: My name is Tom Slauson. I'm a homeowner  
3 in Simi. A couple of quick questions.

4 You were talking about the contamination of  
5 the soil and how that was taken out. But what about the  
6 bedrock? Was any of that contaminated? Was the bedrock  
7 taken out and tested?

8 And the area -- the same for the sodium  
9 disposal facilities. Was the bedrock tested for any of  
10 that? You basically said soils were removed, and I'm  
11 just trying to find out how deeply you went down.

12 MIKE LOPEZ: We basically excavated down to  
13 bedrock. But perhaps Gerard could talk in greater  
14 detail since that activity was under his regulatory  
15 jurisdiction.

16 GERARD ABRAMS: Yeah. In fact, I'm going to talk a  
17 little bit about the remediation activity at the sodium  
18 burn pit, what was done there. The excavation of the  
19 soils were removed down into the -- through the weather  
20 bedrock into the more consolidated bedrock. And the  
21 bedrock was sampled following that excavation activity.

22 JONATHAN PARFREY: Gerard, was that true for all of  
23 the facilities and not just the sodium burn facility --  
24 all the remediated facilities? We were talking about  
25 how many cubic yards of soil were removed, and we were

1 MIKE LOPEZ: I am sure the EPA will be involved in  
2 the release of the buildings.

3 SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Steve (inaudible). I'm  
4 the division director for Safety, Health, and  
5 Environmental Affairs at Boeing's Rocketdyne facility.  
6 I just wanted to respond to and appreciate Ms. Lee's  
7 comments from the city of Calabasas.

8 Boeing Company has done a lot of fracture  
9 mapping, geological mapping, fault line mapping. And  
10 because the site is so complex, if the Workgroup would  
11 like a briefing at either a special meeting or another  
12 meeting, we would certainly go forward and present that  
13 data. It's been built into the ground-water  
14 characterization that we're working on with the  
15 regulatory agencies with the Department of Toxic  
16 Substances, et cetera. We have got a tremendous amount  
17 of data. We have surveyed several hundred wells with  
18 the GPS system. In fact, Rockwell Company, the previous  
19 owner of Rocketdyne, invented the GPS systems and built  
20 the satellites and put them into space. So we do  
21 utilize that technology. We have a lot of data. We  
22 spent millions and millions of dollars. We know what  
23 faults and fractures in the mapping looks like. If you  
24 would like to have a special Workgroup meeting to  
25 discuss that, we could set that up.

1 talking about the sodium burn pit and the bedrock there.  
2 But I think that the question was has other contaminated  
3 sites on the property, have they also -- has there been  
4 investigations as to removing soil that goes into the  
5 bedrock itself?

6 GERARD ABRAMS: Well, the burn pit was the last  
7 facility that we were involved with. And I've been on  
8 this project for four years. So I -- I can't talk about  
9 some of the other removal activities that occurred under  
10 the Water Board oversight and other agency oversights.

11 JONATHAN PARFREY: So perhaps DOE could answer that  
12 question.

13 If the soil was removed down to bedrock,  
14 what -- at other locations, did they go deeper than  
15 that? Since this area is seismically active, a lot of  
16 joints, fractures, whatever, and that's where the  
17 materials would have been moving along, were there tests  
18 taken along those areas as compared with the random  
19 tests within the consolidated bedrock?

20 The other question was kind of knowing that  
21 the design was of a critical facility, I imagine there  
22 wasn't a lot of damage to the buildings after the  
23 earthquake in 1994. But having done earthquake review  
24 in Simi and San Fernando and around, that doesn't mean  
25 that there wasn't an actual cracking or disturbance to

1 MICHAEL ROSEN: Thank you, Steve.  
 2 STEPHEN: My name is Tom Hansen. I'm a former  
 3 in that. A couple of great questions.  
 4 You were talking about the contamination of  
 5 the soil and how that was taken out. But what about the  
 6 bedrock? Was any of that contaminated? Was the bedrock  
 7 taken out and tested?  
 8 And the area -- the same for the sodium  
 9 disposal facilities. Was the bedrock tested for any of  
 10 that? You basically said soils were removed, and I'm  
 11 just trying to find out how deeply you went down.  
 12 MIKE LOPEZ: We basically excavated down to  
 13 bedrock. But perhaps Gerard could talk in greater  
 14 detail since that activity was under the regulatory  
 15 jurisdiction.  
 16 GERARD ABRAMS: Yeah. In fact I'm going to take a  
 17 little bit about the remediation activity of the sodium  
 18 dump pit. What was done there. The excavation of the  
 19 soils were removed down into the -- through the weather  
 20 bedrock into the more consolidated bedrock. And the  
 21 bedrock was sampled following that excavation activity.  
 22 JONATHAN PARRY: Gerard, was that true for all of  
 23 the facilities and not just the sodium dump facility --  
 24 and the remediated facilities? We were talking about  
 25 how many cubic yards of soil were removed, and we were

1 talking about the sodium dump pit and the bedrock there.  
 2 But I think that the question was not other contaminated  
 3 areas on the property, have they also -- has there been  
 4 investigations as to removing soil that goes into the  
 5 bedrock itself?  
 6 GERARD ABRAMS: Well, the dump pit was the last  
 7 facility that we were involved with. And it's been on  
 8 this project for four years. So I -- I can't talk about  
 9 some of the other removal activities that occurred under  
 10 the Water Board oversight and other agency oversight.  
 11 JONATHAN PARRY: So perhaps DOE could answer that  
 12 question.  
 13 If the soil was removed down to bedrock,  
 14 what -- as other facilities did -- go deeper than  
 15 that? Since this area is seismically active, a lot of  
 16 some fractures, whatever, and that's where the  
 17 materials would have been moving along, were there tests  
 18 taken along those areas as compared with the random  
 19 tests within the consolidated bedrock?  
 20 The other question was kind of knowing that  
 21 the design was of a critical facility, I imagine there  
 22 wasn't a lot of damage to the building after the  
 23 earthquake in 1994. But having done earthquake review  
 24 in that and San Fernando and around, that doesn't mean  
 25 that there wasn't an actual cracking or disturbance to

1 From what I understand, please correct me if I'm wrong,  
 2 is that these other properties have been decontaminated  
 3 and decommissioned based on the Department of Energy's  
 4 standards and protocol, yeah?  
 5 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes. EPA does not have their own  
 6 standards for the decontamination -- standard  
 7 contamination of buildings.  
 8 JOHN BEACH: That is correct. And it is DOE's  
 9 authority -- they have that authority to oversee that  
 10 cleanup, and EPA does not.  
 11 SPEAKER: Would the EPA have a different standard?  
 12 If you guys were in charge, would you have different  
 13 standards from what they apply?  
 14 JOHN BEACH: We would use a different approach.  
 15 And -- so I guess that what, yes, different standards.  
 16 We approach things in a different way. We don't select  
 17 a standard the way they do. And as I said, it's a  
 18 different approach.  
 19 SPEAKER: I understand you start with the lower  
 20 goal and work towards that.  
 21 JOHN BEACH: That's correct.  
 22 SPEAKER: So is the EPA going to have any oversight  
 23 in the decommissioning and decontamination of those last  
 24 buildings? Will the people have oversight and at least  
 25 access to community.

1 MIKE LOPEZ: I am sure the EPA will be involved in  
 2 the release of the buildings.  
 3 SPEAKER: My name is Steve (unintelligible). I'm  
 4 the division director for Safety, Health, and  
 5 Environmental Affairs at Boeing's Rockwell facility.  
 6 I just wanted to respond to and appreciate the  
 7 comments from the city of Galveston.  
 8 Boeing Company has done a lot of work  
 9 mapping geological mapping, fault line mapping. And  
 10 because the site is so complex, if the Workgroup would  
 11 like a meeting at either a special meeting or another  
 12 meeting, we would certainly go forward and present that  
 13 data. It's been built into the ground water  
 14 characterization that we're working on with the  
 15 regulatory agencies with the Department of Toxic  
 16 Substances, of course. We have got a tremendous amount  
 17 of data. We have surveyed several hundred wells with  
 18 the GPS system. In fact, Rockwell Company, the services  
 19 owner of Rockwell, invested the GPS system and built  
 20 the satellites and put them into space. So we do  
 21 utilize that technology. We have a lot of data. We  
 22 spent millions and millions of dollars. We know what  
 23 faults and fractures in the mapping look like. If you  
 24 would like to have a special Workgroup meeting to  
 25 discuss that, we would set that up.

1 the earth. The buildings probably had nothing. Again,  
2 if there was going to be a reactor, I hope they were  
3 designed for earthquakes.

4 **MIKE LOPEZ:** As far as our removal actions, we  
5 removed all the waste that was above the release  
6 criteria, you know, for radiological facilities. For  
7 the chemical contamination, there is still some solid  
8 waste management units that are under Gerard's control,  
9 and they are still in process.

10 **SPEAKER:** But was there testing of the bedrock?  
11 Because you primarily said soils. I'm just trying to  
12 see if the bedrock was tested and removed also.

13 **MIKE LOPEZ:** We removed the soils.

14 **MIKE BROWN:** If I may. The general strategy in a  
15 D&D removal like this is you take samples to determine  
16 if there's contamination, take out the contaminated  
17 media, and then you go back and take another sample. So  
18 you are going down, and laterally.

19 So in the case of this particular removal  
20 action is you would go down to the point where you don't  
21 find anything anymore and that is where you stop. That  
22 is the approach taken. And my understanding is that in  
23 no cases did we get to the point where the bedrock was  
24 contaminated.

25 **SPEAKER:** Was there testing in the reactor pit that

1 have their own standards for surface contamination of  
2 buildings.

3 **SPEAKER:** CERCLA EPA standards --

4 **LARRY BOWERMAN:** I think there may be a bit of  
5 confusion here. There are really two different kinds of  
6 standards. One would be for contamination in soils,  
7 that's what the 1995 agreement refers to in the 1995  
8 policy. With regard to demolition of buildings, there  
9 is a separate standard that has to do with surface  
10 activity limits. And what we're talking about there is  
11 the EPA does not have separate standards for  
12 decontamination of building surface areas.

13 **SPEAKER:** So your responses were more in regards to  
14 demolition of buildings rather than soil?

15 **LARRY BOWERMAN:** Yes.

16 **SPEAKER:** Okay. Because my understanding is EPA  
17 standards would be used regardless of whether or not  
18 they're enforceable.

19 **ARLENE KABEL:** As it applies to soils?

20 **SPEAKER:** As it applies to soils.

21 **VICKI ROSEN:** We will take these next two people --  
22 questions from the next two people. We are running a  
23 little over. Maybe we can shorten the next  
24 presentation. But perhaps we can finish with you people  
25 over there and then move on to the next presentation.

1 was discussed earlier?

2 **MIKE BROWN:** That, I would have to go back and  
3 check. Steve, from Boeing, may know. But that's the  
4 general approach that is taken is you stop when you no  
5 longer exceed the regulatory limit. And then -- that's  
6 the general strategy for all of these types of removal  
7 actions.

8 **SPEAKER:** I just want to make sure I didn't  
9 misunderstand something with regards to the standards.  
10 Although EPA doesn't have authority over the site, my  
11 understanding is that we are using EPA standards based  
12 on the 1995 MOU. Is that correct, or did I  
13 misunderstand your responses?

14 **MIKE BROWN:** We are following DOE standards and  
15 they're consistent with the NRC standards. We are also  
16 working with EPA with respect to the strategy and the  
17 cleanup at the site. EPA is not setting standards for  
18 this cleanup.

19 **SPEAKER:** Do you know -- well, then, can you  
20 explain to me what was the purpose of the 1995 MOU?

21 **MIKE LOPEZ:** You are talking about the memo that  
22 was signed by EPA and --

23 **SPEAKER:** (Inaudible.)

24 **MIKE LOPEZ:** It required us to be consistent with  
25 CERCLA. And as we were discussing earlier, EPA does not

1 **SPEAKER:** I'm Laura Plotkin from State Senator  
2 Sheila Kuehl's office. I was just wondering if any of  
3 the EPA staff people were at the meeting at the  
4 California League of Conservation Voters leadership  
5 forum with Christine Whitman a couple of weeks ago?  
6 Were any of you there? Because the Senator asked about  
7 using the higher EPA standards for cleanup of  
8 radioactive material at the Rocketdyne site,  
9 specifically because she was concerned about the  
10 cleanup. And she got assurances that they would be  
11 used. So I'm kind of confused.

12 **JOHN BEACH:** As we indicated, none of us were at  
13 that meeting, so we can't speak to what was said there.  
14 However, we have stated that we would like to see the  
15 '95 MOU implemented and the CERCLA process be used to  
16 develop a remedy for the facility. We do recognize,  
17 however, that it is the Department of Energy's decision  
18 and authority to implement that or to exercise their  
19 authority under the Atomic Energy Act, which is what  
20 they are currently doing.

21 **SPEAKER:** Well, we would certainly hope that the  
22 higher standard could be used if at all possible. And I  
23 am sure that Senator Kuehl will probably have some kind  
24 of correspondence regarding the comments made.

25 **VICKI ROSEN:** We would like to find out more about

1 the earth. The buildings probably had nothing. Again.  
 2 If there was going to be a reactor, I hope they were  
 3 designed for earthquakes.  
 4 MIKE LOPEZ: As far as our removal actions we  
 5 removed all the waste that was above the release  
 6 criteria you know for radiological facilities. For  
 7 the chemical contamination, there is still some solid  
 8 waste management units that are under Gerda's control  
 9 and they are still in process.  
 10 SPEAKER: But was there testing of the bedrock?  
 11 Because you previously said so. I'm just trying to  
 12 see if the bedrock was tested and removed also.  
 13 MIKE LOPEZ: We removed the soils.  
 14 MIKE BROWN: If I may, the general strategy in a  
 15 DOE removal like this is you take samples to determine  
 16 if there's contamination, take out the contaminated  
 17 media and then you go back and take another sample. So  
 18 you are going down and laterally.  
 19 So in the case of this particular removal  
 20 action is you would go down to the point where you don't  
 21 find anything anymore and that is where you stop. That  
 22 is the approach taken. And my understanding is that in  
 23 no case did we get to the point where the bedrock was  
 24 contaminated.  
 25 SPEAKER: Was there testing in the reactor pit that

1 was discussed earlier?  
 2 MIKE BROWN: That I would have to go back and  
 3 check. Steve from Boeing may know. But that's the  
 4 general approach that is taken is you stop when you no  
 5 longer exceed the regulatory limit. And then -- that's  
 6 the general strategy for all of these types of removal  
 7 actions.  
 8 SPEAKER: I just want to make sure I didn't  
 9 misunderstand something with regards to the standards.  
 10 Although EPA doesn't have authority over the site, my  
 11 understanding is that we are using EPA standards based  
 12 on the 1992 MOU. Is that correct or did I  
 13 misunderstand your response?  
 14 MIKE BROWN: We are following DOE standards and  
 15 they're consistent with the NRC standards. We are also  
 16 working with EPA with respect to the strategy and the  
 17 cleanup at the site. EPA is not setting standards for  
 18 this cleanup.  
 19 SPEAKER: Do you know -- well, then, can you  
 20 explain to me what was the purpose of the 1992 MOU?  
 21 MIKE LOPEZ: You're talking about the memo that  
 22 was signed by EPA and --  
 23 SPEAKER: (Inaudible)  
 24 MIKE LOPEZ: It required us to be consistent with  
 25 GERDA. And as we were discussing earlier, EPA does not

1 have their own standards for surface contamination of  
 2 buildings.  
 3 SPEAKER: CORRECT. EPA standards --  
 4 LARRY BOWBRMAN: I think there may be a bit of  
 5 confusion here. There are really two different kinds of  
 6 standards. One would be for contamination in soils.  
 7 That's what the 1992 agreement refers to in the DOE  
 8 policy. With regard to demolition of buildings, there  
 9 is a separate standard that has to do with surface  
 10 activity limits. And what we're talking about here is  
 11 the EPA does not have separate standards for  
 12 documentation of building surface areas.  
 13 SPEAKER: So your response was more in regard to  
 14 demolition of buildings rather than soils?  
 15 LARRY BOWBRMAN: Yes.  
 16 SPEAKER: Okay. Because my understanding is EPA  
 17 standards would be used regardless of whether or not  
 18 they're enforceable.  
 19 ANNE KADIEL: As it applies to soils.  
 20 SPEAKER: As it applies to soils.  
 21 VICKI ROSEN: We will take these next two people --  
 22 questions from the next two people. We are running  
 23 time over. Maybe we can shorten the next  
 24 presentation. But perhaps we can finish with you people  
 25 over there and then move on to the next presentation.

1 SHEAKER: For Laura Holton from State Senator  
 2 Sheila Kuehl's office. I was just wondering if any of  
 3 the EPA staff people were at the meeting at the  
 4 California League of Conservation Voters leadership  
 5 forum with Christine Johnson a couple of weeks ago?  
 6 Were any of your names? Because the Senator asked about  
 7 using the higher EPA standards for cleanup of  
 8 radioactive material at the Rockaway site.  
 9 Specifically, because she was concerned about the  
 10 cleanup. And she got concerned that they would be  
 11 used. So I'm kind of confused.  
 12 JOHN BEACH: As we indicated, none of us were at  
 13 that meeting so we can't speak to what was said there.  
 14 However, we have stated that we would like to see the  
 15 DOE MOU implemented and the CERCLA process be used to  
 16 develop a remedy for the facility. We do recognize,  
 17 however, that it is the Department of Energy's decision  
 18 and authority to implement that or to exercise their  
 19 authority under the Atomic Energy Act, which is what  
 20 they are currently doing.  
 21 SPEAKER: Well, we would certainly hope that the  
 22 higher standard could be used if it is possible. And I  
 23 am sure that Senator Kuehl will probably have some kind  
 24 of correspondence regarding the comments made.  
 25 VICKI ROSEN: We would like to find out more about

1 what was said and when. And if you could communicate  
2 with us -- or your office sometime soon, we would like  
3 to know the details of that.

4 **SPEAKER:** Okay.

5 **JONATHAN PARFREY:** Was there a transcript of that?

6 **SPEAKER:** I don't know if it was recorded or not.  
7 There were about, I guess, 30 people around a big table  
8 just talking about issues and asking questions. And  
9 that was a question that Senator Kuehl asked.

10 **ARLENE KABEI:** I just want to clarify that EPA is  
11 prepared to go forth with the survey that we believe  
12 needs to be done at the site. We're still awaiting some  
13 details on the DOE funding. Roger defined the process  
14 that his agency is going through to assure the funding  
15 for the site. But provided that that money comes in, we  
16 are -- we have been working with DOE on a work plan to  
17 get that survey going to initiate that survey according  
18 to the process that EPA would like to see happen. I --  
19 there's no question about what EPA is prepared to do on  
20 this. I just want to make that clear. So  
21 Governor Whitman did not misspeak. And we are all on  
22 the same page with that. But there is a very real issue  
23 about funding that would support the EPA survey.

24 And just a little bit of clarification, as  
25 well. You referred to it as an EPA standard versus the

1 the argument is. We, in the community, would like the  
2 safest possible, and there has been considerable  
3 argument here over that.

4 **ARLENE KABEI:** I am really sorry, but I need to  
5 clarify.

6 EPA does not have a ten to the minus six  
7 standard. We do have a process that starts at that  
8 lower risk level. But through a thorough site  
9 investigation, we go through the process of saying this  
10 is the appropriate risk level for this site and for its  
11 use in the future. Is that a ten to the minus six  
12 number or a ten to the minus five number or a four  
13 number?

14 DOE's number is within that range. It's  
15 coming out at a ten to minus four number. And they  
16 would say that that's --

17 **SHELDON PLOTKIN:** That's not true. Some of the  
18 risks are much lower than that, far lower. It's been  
19 presented to this group that way. And the ten to the  
20 minus four number you are talking about, you would have  
21 to present some pretty stringent rationale to justify  
22 going to the lower level. You have to show that the  
23 cost would be truly excessive for that particular  
24 situation, et cetera. The goal is ten to the minus six.  
25 And the minimum you can possibly accept is ten to the

1 DOE standard, and EPA would want to clarify that.

2 We are not there yet about arguing our  
3 standard versus their standard. We are saying that  
4 there is a process and approach for investigating the  
5 site that will give us data upon which an appropriate  
6 EPA standard should be derived. Our standard, I will  
7 put it out there, could end up very similar to what the  
8 DOE has selected according to their own guidelines and  
9 their own policies. But EPA cannot -- we are not  
10 prepared to say we agree or disagree with that number  
11 until we go through this process. And we're prepared to  
12 go through the process.

13 **SPEAKER:** Well, we hope you will go through the  
14 process.

15 **SHELDON PLOTKIN:** I think we need to point out that  
16 there has been considerable discussion here regarding  
17 the standards you're talking about has to do with a risk  
18 that one is willing to tolerate. And the risk of  
19 that -- the EPA standard is ten to the minus six, one in  
20 a million, and you clean up to some level. Whereas DOE  
21 says we clean up to some level and that will produce a  
22 certain kind of risk.

23 Well, in many cases, it is ten to the minus  
24 six. And then in other cases, one extreme example that  
25 was presented was one in a hundred. And so that's where

1 minus four if all the rationale, et cetera, and behind  
2 them.

3 **ARLENE KABEI:** I agree with that.

4 **SPEAKER:** Well, we just look forward to the use of  
5 the highest standard. Thank you.

6 **VICKI ROSEN:** Next speaker, please.

7 **SPEAKER:** I will try to make this quick. I am  
8 Michael Collins from the L.A. Weekly and VCR Reporter in  
9 Ventura. I wanted to come back to Shell's comments  
10 about Building 59, the snap reactor.

11 I was fortunate enough to be able to attend a  
12 session watching people inspect that reactor. I was  
13 accompanied by Dan Beck and Phil Rutherford of  
14 Rocketdyne, who kindly allowed me onto the site to see  
15 this inspection.

16 I brought with me my own geiger counter, and  
17 we looked at test results of borings in the walls to see  
18 if my geiger counter would match Rocketdyne's geiger  
19 counters and EPA's geiger counters to see if it was  
20 accurate. And it was.

21 I noticed that 25-foot in diameter metal plate  
22 that you mentioned, Shell, and I noticed that there were  
23 no test markings on it. And I went and put my geiger  
24 counter next to it and it started to really hum. It was  
25 obviously very hot. I pointed this out to several of

1 what was said and when. And if you could communicate  
 2 with us -- our office sometimes soon, we would like  
 3 to know the details of that.  
 4 DON WATKINS: Okay.  
 5 DON WATKINS: Was there a transcript of that?  
 6 SPEAKER: I don't know. If it was recorded or not.  
 7 There -- I guess, I guess 30 people around a big table  
 8 just talking about issues and asking questions. And  
 9 that was a question that Senator Kashi asked.  
 10 ARLENE KASHE: I just want to clarify that EPA is  
 11 prepared to go forward with the survey that we believe  
 12 needs to be done in the field. What we still want some  
 13 details on the DOE funding. Roger defined the process  
 14 that the agency is going through to assure the funding  
 15 for the site. EPA provided that that money comes in --  
 16 we -- we have been working with DOE on a work plan to  
 17 get that money going to finance the survey according  
 18 to the process that EPA would like to see happen. I --  
 19 there's no question about what EPA is prepared to do on  
 20 this. I just want to make that clear.  
 21 Governor Whitman did not misspeak. And we are all on  
 22 the same page with that. But there is a very real issue  
 23 about funding that would support the EPA survey.  
 24 And just a little bit of clarification as to  
 25 well. You referred to it as an EPA standard versus the

1 DOE standard, and EPA would want to clarify that.  
 2 We are not there yet about signing on  
 3 to include versus their standard. We are saying that  
 4 there is a process and approach for investigating the  
 5 site that will give us the data upon which an appropriate  
 6 EPA standard should be derived. Once established, I will  
 7 put it out there, could end up very similar to what the  
 8 DOE has selected according to their own guidelines and  
 9 their own policies. But EPA cannot -- we are not  
 10 prepared to say we agree or disagree with that number.  
 11 And we go through this process. And we're prepared to  
 12 go through the process.  
 13 DON WATKINS: Well, we hope you will go through the  
 14 process.  
 15 SHELDON BLOTTIN: I think we need to point out that  
 16 there has been considerable discussion here regarding  
 17 the standards you're talking about has to do with a risk  
 18 that one is willing to tolerate. And the risk of  
 19 that -- the EPA standard is ten to the minus six, one in  
 20 a million and you clean up to some level. When the DOE  
 21 standard is clean up to some level and that will produce a  
 22 certain kind of risk.  
 23 Well, in many cases, it is ten to the minus  
 24 six. And then in other cases, one extreme example that  
 25 was presented was one in a hundred. And so that's where

1 the argument is. We, in the community, would like the  
 2 safest possible, and there has been considerable  
 3 argument here over that.  
 4 ARLENE KASHE: I am really sorry, but I need to  
 5 clarify.  
 6 EPA does not have a ten to the minus six  
 7 standard. We do have a process that starts at that  
 8 lower risk level. But through a thorough site  
 9 investigation, we go through the process of saying that  
 10 is the appropriate risk level for this site and for this  
 11 case in the future. It can be ten to the minus six  
 12 number or a ten to the minus five number or a ten  
 13 number.  
 14 DOE's number is within that range. It's  
 15 coming out of a ten to minus four number. And they  
 16 would say that that's --  
 17 SHELDON BLOTTIN: That's not true. Some of us  
 18 have a much lower than that in lower. It's been  
 19 presented to this group that way. And the ten to the  
 20 minus four number you are talking about you would have  
 21 to present some pretty stringent rationale to justify  
 22 going to the lower level. You have to show that the  
 23 cost would be truly excessive for that particular  
 24 situation et cetera. The goal is ten to the minus six.  
 25 And the minimum you can possibly accept is ten to the

1 comes from if all the rationale, et cetera, and defining  
 2 that.  
 3 ARLENE KASHE: I agree with that.  
 4 SPEAKER: Well, we just look forward to the use of  
 5 the highest standard. Thank you.  
 6 DON WATKINS: Next speaker, please.  
 7 SPEAKER: I will try to make this quick. I am  
 8 Michael Collins from the EPA. Weekly and MCR Report in  
 9 Vermont. I wanted to come back to Shell's comments  
 10 about Building 29, the east reactor.  
 11 I was fortunate enough to be able to attend a  
 12 session watching people inspect that reactor. I was  
 13 accompanied by Dan Beck and Tim Richardson of  
 14 Rockledge, who kindly allowed me onto the site to see  
 15 this inspection.  
 16 I brought with me my own geiger counter, and  
 17 we looked at test results of counts in the walls to see  
 18 if my geiger counter would match Rockledge's geiger  
 19 counter and EPA's geiger counters to see if it was  
 20 accurate. And it was.  
 21 I noticed that 25-foot in diameter metal plate  
 22 that you mentioned, Shell, and I noticed that there were  
 23 no test markings on it. And I went and put my geiger  
 24 counter next to it and it started to really hum. It was  
 25 obviously very hot. I pointed this out to several of



1 the inspectors, who joked that, what, the L.A. Weekly is  
2 now doing the inspections? But I asked Dan Hirsch the  
3 significance of what I was finding. And he said the  
4 significance is that we're testing in the wrong spots.

5 So my question is fairly simple. If you did  
6 dig out the soil down to the bedrock and you removed the  
7 radioactive contaminants and the bedrock was not hot,  
8 why would the metal plate read hot? Was it because it  
9 was the old plate that was over the material before and  
10 it sort of soaked up the radiation? And if the plate  
11 was hot and it was clean underneath, does that mean  
12 something else? I am confused.

13 SHELDON PLOTKIN: It's a big hole under there.  
14 It's concrete lined. It's not dirt. There's not dirt  
15 under there. It's a big sunken concrete-lined area.  
16 And the reactor, then, is lower down. There is a big  
17 overhead crane to lower the reactor and anything else.  
18 Workers could easily be put on the -- for example,  
19 monitors easily be put on the platform, lowered down, do  
20 the monitoring down below, et cetera. It's not a big  
21 deal.

22 SPEAKER: My question is if that plate was hot, is  
23 that plate still there? If it's not there, where did it  
24 go? And what is the source of contam -- why is that  
25 plate hot? Why was it hot? And did it end up being

1 There was partial melting of some of the fuel  
2 assemblies. The amount of radioactivity released to the  
3 environment was only five curies. It was diluted and,  
4 you know, and -- according to the current accepted  
5 practice. And the additional radiation was  
6 equivalent -- that went to the environment was  
7 equivalent to 15 seconds of background radiation.

8 SPEAKER: What happened at the site? When that  
9 went down, it went down, apparently, quite a ways.

10 So did anybody dig it up?

11 MIKE LOPEZ: It -- well, the facility has been  
12 removed. The radiation was all contained within the  
13 system.

14 SPEAKER: Where was it removed?

15 MIKE LOPEZ: Where was it shipped?

16 SPEAKER: Yes.

17 MIKE LOPEZ: That was before my time. I think  
18 maybe Hanford, and possibly Nevada. I would have to go  
19 back and look up the report. I don't recall exactly.

20 SPEAKER: The idea is you are taking radioactive  
21 material and -- and how is it shipped?

22 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm sorry. I don't have that readily  
23 available. That was a --

24 SPEAKER: Let me just guess it was probably trucked  
25 out of there on our streets and highways and it's

1 tested?

2 MIKE LOPEZ: The plate is still there. Now, not  
3 having been around when you were there with Phil and  
4 Dan Beck, I don't know the particulars of your visit.  
5 We could certainly have Phil at the next meeting or in  
6 some other forum respond to your comment. I just wanted  
7 to point out that -- to make it clear to everybody that  
8 the reactor is not there in the building now.

9 SPEAKER: Yes.

10 MIKE LOPEZ: Okay.

11 SPEAKER: And I just want to make one final  
12 comment. When we were standing there discussing what I  
13 had found, Phil said, you know, why don't we step away  
14 from this plate. And he said, you know, Michael, ALARA,  
15 which is an acronym for as low as reasonably achievable,  
16 meaning let's not stand on this plate. So, yes, I would  
17 appreciate if we could follow up on that.

18 SPEAKER: My name is Dave Einhorn, E-i-n-h-o-r-n.  
19 I was an employee of Tonix (phonetic) International in  
20 1960. I am aware of a report that there was a partial  
21 meltdown in 1959 at the site.

22 Has that been investigated?

23 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes, it was investigated. And  
24 contrary to common opinion, it was -- notice of the  
25 incident was reported in the newspapers at the time.

1 radioactive.

2 MIKE LOPEZ: But there are protections that are  
3 taken according to the -- you know, the Department of  
4 Transportation has their regulations and we have ours  
5 regarding the shipping of radioactive material.

6 SPEAKER: That's well and good, but it's not good  
7 enough.

8 VICKI ROSEN: Sir? Sir? This is a very  
9 interesting topic. I wonder if we could continue to  
10 talk about this issue later on in the evening when we  
11 have an open forum for extra topics. We are running  
12 very far behind already.

13 SPEAKER: Well, I just have a few more general  
14 items. They are very short.

15 VICKI ROSEN: Okay.

16 SPEAKER: Apparently -- well, my understanding is  
17 you get liquid sodium that's used in the reactors. You  
18 said that a great amount of the sodium was buried under  
19 about 10 to 12 feet of dirt, is that right?

20 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm not sure I referred to the amount  
21 of sodium. The facility was below surface level.

22 SPEAKER: Well, you said "sodium."

23 Well, anyway, my point is, again, it's got to  
24 be radioactive. And who knows what's going to happen  
25 over a period of time?

1 the inspectors, who looked that when the A. W. Webb is  
 2 now doing the inspection. But I asked Dan Felt the  
 3 significance of what I was finding. And he said the  
 4 significance is that water coming in the wrong spots  
 5 is the question is fairly simple. If you did  
 6 get the hole down to the bedrock and you came out the  
 7 hole the water and the bedrock was not there.  
 8 You could have had the hole. Was it because it  
 9 was the hole that was over the ground before and  
 10 it got of soaked up the radiation? And if the plate  
 11 was not out it was clean underneath. How the water  
 12 came in, I am confused.  
 13 SHELDON TOLIN: It's a big hole under the  
 14 concrete floor. It's not out. There's not that  
 15 under there. It's a big sink concrete floor area  
 16 and the water, that is lower down. There is a big  
 17 hole in the concrete to lower the reactor and anything else  
 18 that could easily be put on the platform level down to  
 19 the monitoring down below of water. It's not a big  
 20 hole.  
 21 SPEAKER: My question is if the plate was not in  
 22 the plate still there? If it's not there, where did it  
 23 go? And what is the source of water -- a big hole in the  
 24 plate that was a hole? And did it end up being

1 reactor.  
 2 MIKE LOREN: The plate is still there. Now, not  
 3 having been around when you were there with Phil and  
 4 Dan back, I don't know the particular of your visit.  
 5 We could certainly have had in the next meeting or in  
 6 some other format respond to your comment. I just wanted  
 7 to point out that -- to make it clear to everybody that  
 8 the reactor is not there in the building now.  
 9 SPEAKER: Yes.  
 10 MIKE LOREN: Okay.  
 11 SPEAKER: And I just want to make one final  
 12 comment. When we were standing there discussing what  
 13 had happened, Phil said you know, why don't we step away  
 14 from this place. And he said you know, Michael, ALARA,  
 15 which is an acronym for as low as reasonably achievable,  
 16 meaning let's not stand on this plate. So yes, I would  
 17 appreciate if we could follow up on that.  
 18 SPEAKER: My name is Dave Linton, E-R-N-E-R.  
 19 I was an employee of Union (phonetic) International in  
 20 1968. I am aware of a report that there was a partial  
 21 meltdown in 1959 at the site.  
 22 Has that been investigated?  
 23 MIKE LOREN: Yes, it was investigated. And  
 24 contrary to common opinion, it was -- notice of the  
 25 incident was reported in the newspapers at the time.

1 There was partial melting of some of the fuel  
 2 assemblies. The amount of radiation released to the  
 3 environment was only a few times. It was a big  
 4 you know, and -- according to the current accepted  
 5 practice. And the additional radiation was  
 6 equipment -- that went to the environment was  
 7 equivalent to 15 seconds of background radiation.  
 8 SPEAKER: What happened in the site? When the  
 9 went down it went down apparently quite a ways.  
 10 So did anybody dig it up?  
 11 MIKE LOREN: It -- well, the drilling has been  
 12 removed. The radiation was all contained within the  
 13 system.  
 14 SPEAKER: Where was it removed?  
 15 SPEAKER: Where was it shipped?  
 16 SPEAKER: Yes.  
 17 MIKE LOREN: It was before my time, I think  
 18 maybe Hamburg, and possibly Nevada. I would have to go  
 19 back and look up the record. I don't recall exactly.  
 20 SPEAKER: The idea is you are taking radiation  
 21 material and -- and how is it shipped?  
 22 MIKE LOREN: I'm sorry, I don't have the reading  
 23 available. That was a --  
 24 SPEAKER: Let me just guess it was probably loaded  
 25 out of there on our street and highways and it's

1 radioactive  
 2 MIKE LOREN: But there are protections that are  
 3 taken according to the -- you know, the Department of  
 4 Transportation has their regulations and we have our  
 5 regarding the shipping of radioactive material.  
 6 SPEAKER: That's well and good, but it's not good  
 7 enough.  
 8 YACKI ROSEN: Sir, this is a very  
 9 interesting topic. I wonder if we could continue to  
 10 talk about this issue later on in the evening when we  
 11 have an open forum for extra topics. We are running  
 12 very far behind already.  
 13 SPEAKER: Well, I just have a few more general  
 14 items. They are very short.  
 15 YACKI ROSEN: Okay.  
 16 SPEAKER: Apparently -- well, my understanding is  
 17 you get typical sodium data used in the reactor. You  
 18 said that a great amount of the sodium was leaked under  
 19 about 10 to 12 feet of dirt is that right?  
 20 MIKE LOREN: I'm not sure I referred to the amount  
 21 of sodium. The facility was below surface level.  
 22 SPEAKER: Well, you said "amount".  
 23 What, anyway, my point is, again, it's got to  
 24 be radioactive. And who knows what's going to happen  
 25 over a period of time?

1 MIKE LOPEZ: Sir, none of that facility still  
 2 remains at the site.  
 3 SPEAKER: I'm not talking about that. I'm talking  
 4 about what you have buried under the ground.  
 5 MIKE LOPEZ: When the site was decontaminated and  
 6 demolished, all of the radioactive material was removed  
 7 at the time.  
 8 SPEAKER: Well, that's not what I heard.  
 9 The last thing I wanted to say is that  
 10 apparently either Rocketdyne or Tonix International had  
 11 a license by the City or County for runoff going down  
 12 toward -- we used to have a dam down below.  
 13 And my question is was that water checked in  
 14 terms of the radiation it would bring down from the hill  
 15 to the dam?  
 16 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm sorry. I was talking to my  
 17 coworker.  
 18 The question is what routine monitoring is  
 19 done?  
 20 SPEAKER: I don't think you necessarily have to  
 21 answer it. I think it probably would be over on this  
 22 side as far as the Health Services.  
 23 MIKE LOPEZ: Whoever would like to.  
 24 Certainly, we do routine monitoring of surface  
 25 water runoff.

1 we're still waiting for that work plan to be submitted  
 2 to DTSC. And then we will.  
 3 VICKI ROSEN: One more question.  
 4 SPEAKER: What are the acceptable levels for  
 5 cleanup from, say, like the 1959 spill, the '73, as  
 6 compared to what is being accepted now? I mean, if it  
 7 was cleaned up by 1959 standards, what were the  
 8 acceptable cleanup levels back then?  
 9 VICKI ROSEN: Is this something that you guys can  
 10 answer quickly?  
 11 MIKE LOPEZ: I don't think so.  
 12 VICKI ROSEN: Okay. Who is the best one to answer  
 13 this question? And should we defer this to another  
 14 time? Or do you want to speak directly to this  
 15 gentleman another time? How do you want to answer this?  
 16 MIKE LOPEZ: I will just make one quick remark.  
 17 It was in the mid-'80s that sodium was  
 18 released as Steve talked about. And the building  
 19 cleanup levels at that point were -- have been around  
 20 for a number of years, for about 25 years.  
 21 SPEAKER: Are they more than today's or less than  
 22 today's --  
 23 MIKE LOPEZ: Same as today's.  
 24 SPEAKER: That was in the '80s. But what about in  
 25 the '60s or '59? Is that a -- was there a level back

1 SPEAKER: I'm talking about a license. I thought  
 2 maybe they would want to address it.  
 3 STEVE HSU: My understanding of the radioactivity  
 4 that was identified in the MPDES sampling, I guess --  
 5 the MPDES permit requires certain type of sampling and  
 6 they identify mercury in that surface water runoff area.  
 7 I need to consult with someone here.  
 8 So they identified mercury that probably came  
 9 from the SRE facility, which was released back in 1983  
 10 or '85 by DOE. But then there was no mentioning of  
 11 radioactivity being identified, only mercury. But then  
 12 later on, they went in and then did some survey, Boeing  
 13 did some survey of the area called north and west  
 14 drainage area. They identified some areas that have  
 15 residual cesium 137 contamination, and they then removed  
 16 it and disposed -- put it in the radioactive waste  
 17 containers stored in the radioactive handling  
 18 facilities. That's where it stands as of now.  
 19 SPEAKER: I see. But mercury, you have to admit,  
 20 is a dangerous thing to have coming down off the water.  
 21 STEVE HSU: That facility is -- currently the  
 22 SKE mercury contaminated area is currently being  
 23 overseen by DTSC, and we are working with DTSC and  
 24 expect to receive a work plan which would include some  
 25 sampling procedures or plan for that specific area. And

1 then?  
 2 JONATHAN PARFREY: There was a cleanup of the  
 3 partial meltdown in 1959.  
 4 MIKE LOPEZ: I'm sorry. I can't speak to that  
 5 right now.  
 6 VICKI ROSEN: You are asking how thorough a  
 7 cleanup; is that right?  
 8 SPEAKER: Absolutely. It would seem to be very  
 9 important the level of cleanup back in '59.  
 10 VICKI ROSEN: So if we did it today, would it be  
 11 better today than it was when we did it back then?  
 12 SPEAKER: Right. Or worse? Somebody must have  
 13 some kind of data on how well it was cleaned up back  
 14 then and to what level.  
 15 VICKI ROSEN: Is there anybody that can talk in  
 16 greater detail about this?  
 17 MIKE BROWN: The point that Mike was making was  
 18 there was a partial cleanup, and then the final cleanup  
 19 was executed in the 1980s to the current standards.  
 20 SPEAKER: I understand that.  
 21 MIKE BROWN: So that it basically has been cleaned  
 22 up although it may be in step function to existing  
 23 standards.  
 24 VICKI ROSEN: Okay.  
 25 BARBARA JOHNSON: I have a quick question for Mike.

1 MIKE LOPEZ: But none of that facility still  
 2 remains in the site.  
 3 SPEAKER: I'm not talking about that. I'm talking  
 4 about what you had a permit under the ground.  
 5 MIKE LOPEZ: When the site was decontaminated and  
 6 demolished, all of the radioactive material was removed  
 7 in the time.  
 8 SPEAKER: Well, that's not what I heard.  
 9 The last thing I wanted to say is that  
 10 apparently either Rockaway or Toxic Industrial had  
 11 a license by the State or County for runoff going down  
 12 toward -- we need to have a dam down below.  
 13 And my question is was that water checked in  
 14 terms of the radiation it would bring down from the hill  
 15 to the dam?  
 16 MIKE LOPEZ: In sorry, I was talking to you  
 17 speaker.  
 18 The question is what remains monitoring is  
 19 going?  
 20 SPEAKER: I don't think you necessarily have to  
 21 answer it. I think it probably would be over on the  
 22 same as far as the Health Services.  
 23 MIKE LOPEZ: Whoever would like to  
 24 continue, we do continue monitoring of surface  
 25 water runoff.

1 SPEAKER: I'm talking about a license. I thought  
 2 maybe they would want to address it.  
 3 STEVE HULL: My understanding of the radioactivity  
 4 that was identified in the MPEIS sampling, I guess --  
 5 the MPEIS permit requires certain type of sampling and  
 6 they identify mercury in that surface water runoff area.  
 7 I need to consult with someone here.  
 8 So they identified mercury that probably came  
 9 from the SKE facility, which was released back in 1983  
 10 as far as I know. But then there was no monitoring of  
 11 radioactivity being identified, only mercury. But then  
 12 later on, they went in and then did some survey, Boeing  
 13 and some survey of the area called north and west  
 14 drainage area. They identified some areas that have  
 15 residual cesium 137 contamination, and they then removed  
 16 it and disposed -- put it in the radioactive waste  
 17 containers stored in the radioactive handling  
 18 facilities. That's where it stands as of now.  
 19 SPEAKER: I see. But anyway, you have to admit,  
 20 is a dangerous thing to have coming down off the water.  
 21 STEVE HULL: That facility is -- currently the  
 22 SKE mercury contaminated area is currently being  
 23 assessed by DTSC, and we are working with DTSC and  
 24 respect to receive a work plan which would include some  
 25 sampling procedures or plan for that specific area. And

1 we're still waiting for that work plan to be submitted  
 2 to DTSC. And then we will.  
 3 MIKE ROSEN: One more question.  
 4 SPEAKER: What are the acceptable levels for  
 5 cleanup from say, like the 1979 until the '70s as  
 6 compared to what is being accepted now? I mean, if it  
 7 was cleaned up by 1979 standards, what were the  
 8 acceptable cleanup levels back then?  
 9 MIKE ROSEN: Is this something that you guys can  
 10 answer directly?  
 11 MIKE LOPEZ: I don't think so.  
 12 MIKE ROSEN: Okay. This is the best one to answer  
 13 this question. And should we defer this to another  
 14 name? Or do you want to speak directly to this  
 15 gentleman another time? How do you want to answer this?  
 16 MIKE LOPEZ: I will just make one more remark.  
 17 I was in the middle of the cleanup work  
 18 released as Steve talked about. And the building  
 19 cleanup levels at that point were -- how many times  
 20 for a number of years for about 25 years.  
 21 SPEAKER: Are they more than today's or less than  
 22 today's --  
 23 MIKE LOPEZ: Same as today's.  
 24 SPEAKER: That was in the '80s, that right about in  
 25 the '80s or '90s, is that a -- was there a level back

1 then?  
 2 TOMATHAN PARKER: There was a cleanup of the  
 3 partial restoration in 1989.  
 4 MIKE LOPEZ: In sorry, I can't speak to that  
 5 right now.  
 6 MIKE ROSEN: You are asking how thorough a  
 7 cleanup is that right?  
 8 SPEAKER: Absolutely. It would seem to be very  
 9 important the level of cleanup back in '89.  
 10 MIKE ROSEN: So if he did it right, would it be  
 11 better today than it was when he did it back then?  
 12 SPEAKER: Right. Or worse. Somebody might have  
 13 some kind of rain on how well it was cleaned up back  
 14 then and to what level.  
 15 MIKE ROSEN: Is there anybody that can talk in  
 16 greater detail about that?  
 17 MIKE BROWN: The point that Mike was making was  
 18 there was a partial cleanup and then the final cleanup  
 19 was executed in the 1990s to the current standard.  
 20 SPEAKER: I understand that.  
 21 MIKE BROWN: So that it basically had been cleaned  
 22 up through it may be in step function to what they  
 23 standards.  
 24 MIKE ROSEN: Okay.  
 25 BARBARA JOHNSON: I have a quick question for Mike

1 You were saying, Mr. Lopez, that when the  
2 meltdown occurred it was contained. On what do you base  
3 that? At that time there apparently were not the  
4 standards that there are today.

5 MIKE LOPEZ: It isn't an issue of standards. It's  
6 an issue of the data collected that documented what was  
7 released to the environment. And most of it was  
8 contained within the cooling system, I think it was. It  
9 was just a little bit of krypton and argon gas released  
10 in the environment.

11 VICKI ROSEN: Okay. We're going to go on to the  
12 next presentation. And as you can see, we are already  
13 way behind where we're supposed to be. I know these  
14 discussions are really interesting, and I hate to cut  
15 them off, but I really need to try and stay more to the  
16 schedule so we can cover everything tonight. So I am  
17 just going to ask your help to please keep your  
18 questions geared directly toward the presentation and  
19 hold the extra questions until a little bit later in the  
20 agenda. Thank you.

21 And now John Beach is going to present from  
22 EPA.

23 JOHN BEACH: Okay. Thank you.

24 I'm John Beach with the EPA. Some of my  
25 colleagues have already gone through a good deal of some

1 it's CERCLA process. CERCLA is the acronym for the  
2 SuperFund law and it's implementing regulations. We  
3 stated that we felt that that process should be  
4 implemented. We also commented that the scope, purpose,  
5 and context of the document wasn't really clear, and  
6 that the selection of the cleanup level is premature, as  
7 Arlene said, because the process had not been followed.  
8 And specifically, that the cleanup level selected was  
9 not consistent with CERCLA.

10 We also felt that the range of alternatives  
11 evaluated was inadequate and very incomplete and that we  
12 felt that an alternative that better represented the  
13 CERCLA remedy should have been evaluated. We also  
14 identified some procedural issues we identified under  
15 the National Environmental Policy Act, which is the law  
16 that describes how the Environmental Assessments are  
17 conducted.

18 The second major area of activity that we  
19 undertook was work on our building D&D survey  
20 confirmation work. Again, we spoke to that to a certain  
21 extent. We performed those surveys in responding -- we  
22 started in 1996 in response to community requests. And  
23 the purpose was to verify the previous surveys. Again,  
24 you know that several surveys had been performed and  
25 questions -- you have heard the questions that have

1 of the background stuff that's important for you to  
2 know, but I will give you an update of the EPA's  
3 activities since the last Workgroup meeting.

4 Since the last Workgroup meeting, our efforts  
5 have focused in three areas. One is providing comments  
6 on DOE's Environmental Assessment that Mike and Roger  
7 spoke of earlier. We have also done some work on  
8 building status surveys. I will speak to that a little  
9 bit. And also we have been working to move forward with  
10 our Area IV soil radiation survey. When I say "survey,"  
11 I mean going out and taking measurements in the field  
12 and locations and that sort of thing.

13 The first item that we worked on was our  
14 comments on DOE's draft Environmental Assessment.  
15 You -- Mike has already told you about the number of  
16 buildings and that sort of thing.

17 DOE published the Environmental Assessment in  
18 January. And we provided comments in the formal comment  
19 period in April. And we shared those comments with  
20 members of the Workgroup. And copies are available if  
21 you want to have a look at those. But because of that,  
22 it's been a while, and I'm trying to make up some time  
23 here. I'll keep my comments brief in an overview.

24 As I stated -- as we stated before, EPA has a  
25 different process than the D&D process that DOE uses and

1 arisen about the accuracy of the surveys. If you look  
2 in the right places, were the measurements accurate? So  
3 that was the purpose of those surveys.

4 We originally committed to doing surveys of  
5 three buildings. We actually ended up redoing the  
6 documents on 11 buildings, and we actually did the  
7 survey work on eight of them. And the -- that was in  
8 two phases.

9 The status is -- well, I'm going to keep this  
10 brief because we can go on and on and it's really the  
11 subject of its own presentation and it's not quite ready  
12 to be -- we don't have all the words and everything is  
13 not complete. So we are going to be -- we are deferring  
14 detailed discussion of it until a later meeting when we  
15 will discuss it in detail. But the document review is  
16 complete. The field surveys are complete. And the  
17 reports are almost complete. And we do want you to know  
18 that through the whole course of everything, we tracked  
19 the results as they were coming in because we wanted to  
20 make sure if people were being exposed to unsafe levels  
21 of radioactivity, that we could intercede if that was  
22 appropriate. We did not need to do that. We did not  
23 find that.

24 We expect to send the -- our reports to the  
25 Workgroup in January, pretty soon here. That's next

1 You were saying Mr Lopez that when the  
 2 meltdown occurred it was contained. On what do you base  
 3 that? At that time there apparently were no hot  
 4 steamers that there are today.  
 5 MR. LOPEZ: It isn't an issue of standard. It's  
 6 an issue of the data collected that documented what was  
 7 released to the environment. And most of it was  
 8 contained within the cooling system. I think it was  
 9 what you had a lot of lightning and again the release  
 10 in the environment.  
 11 MR. BEACH: Okay. What's going to go on to the  
 12 next presentation. And as you can see we're already  
 13 wrapping up where we're supposed to be. I know these  
 14 presentations are really interesting and I have to run  
 15 late. But I really need to try and stay close to the  
 16 schedule so we can cover everything tonight. So I am  
 17 just going to ask you help to please keep your  
 18 questions geared closely toward the presentation and  
 19 that the extra questions that I think will be in the  
 20 general. Thank you.  
 21 And now John Beach is going to present the  
 22 EPA.  
 23 JOHN BEACH: Okay. Thank you.  
 24 Mr John Beach from the EPA. Some of my  
 25 colleagues have already gone through a good deal of some

1 of the background that's important for you to  
 2 know but I will give you an update of the EPA's  
 3 activities since the last Workgroup meeting. Our efforts  
 4 since the last Workgroup meeting, our efforts  
 5 have focused in three areas. One is providing comments  
 6 on DOE's Environmental Assessment that Mr. Lopez and Roger  
 7 spoke of earlier. We have also done some work on  
 8 building status surveys. I will speak to that a little  
 9 bit. And also we have been working to move forward with  
 10 our status IV and building survey. When I say "survey,"  
 11 I mean going out and taking measurements in the field  
 12 and actions and that sort of thing.  
 13 The first that that we worked on was our  
 14 comments on DOE's Environmental Assessment.  
 15 You -- I think has already told you about the number of  
 16 findings and that sort of thing.  
 17 DOE published the Environmental Assessment in  
 18 January. And we provided comments in the formal comment  
 19 period in April. And we think those comments with  
 20 numbers of the Workgroup. And copies are available if  
 21 you want to have a look at those. But because of that  
 22 the DOE's a while and trying to make up some time  
 23 here. I keep my comments brief in an overview.  
 24 As I stated -- as we stated before, EPA has a  
 25 different process than the TSCA process that DOE uses and

1 the CERCLA process. CERCLA is the acronym for the  
 2 Superfund law and its implementing regulations. We  
 3 stated that we felt that the process should be  
 4 implemented. We also commented that the scope, purpose,  
 5 and content of the document wasn't really clear and  
 6 that the selection of the cleanup level is premature, as  
 7 Acheson said, because the process had not been followed.  
 8 And specifically that the cleanup level selected was  
 9 not consistent with CERCLA.  
 10 We also felt that the range of alternatives  
 11 considered was inadequate and very incomplete and that we  
 12 felt that an alternative that better represented the  
 13 CERCLA remedy should have been evaluated. We also  
 14 identified some procedural issues we identified under  
 15 the National Environmental Policy Act which is the law  
 16 that controls how the Environmental Assessments are  
 17 conducted.  
 18 The second major area of activity that we  
 19 undertook was work on our building TSCA survey  
 20 continuation work. Again, we spoke to that in a certain  
 21 extent. We performed that survey in response to -- we  
 22 stated in TSCA in response to community requests. Again,  
 23 the purpose was to verify the previous surveys. Again,  
 24 you know that several surveys had been performed and  
 25 questions -- you have heard the questions that have

1 when about the accuracy of the surveys. If you look  
 2 in the right places, were the measurements accurate. So  
 3 that was the purpose of those surveys.  
 4 We originally committed to doing surveys of  
 5 three buildings. We actually ended up visiting the  
 6 buildings on 11 buildings and we actually did the  
 7 surveys work on eight of them. And the -- that was in  
 8 two phases.  
 9 The surveys -- well, I'm going to keep this  
 10 brief because we can go on and on and it's really the  
 11 subject of the next presentation and it's not quite ready  
 12 to be -- we don't have all the words and everything is  
 13 not complete. So we are going to be -- we are definitely  
 14 decided discussion of it until a later meeting when we  
 15 will discuss it in detail. But the document review is  
 16 complete. The field surveys are complete. And the  
 17 reports are almost complete. And we do want you to look  
 18 that through the whole course of everything we tracked  
 19 the results as they were coming in because we wanted to  
 20 make sure if people were being exposed to unsafe levels  
 21 of radioactivity that we could take care of that with  
 22 appropriate. We did not need to do that. We did not  
 23 find that.  
 24 We expect to send the -- our report to the  
 25 Workgroup in January. Probably soon here. I don't know

1 month I guess. And as I said, we will discuss it in detail at a future meeting.

3 The third area that we were -- in which we were active is our Area IV survey. EPA committed to perform the survey several years ago. We had stated that previous surveys were not adequate to support a remedial decision when using the CERCLA process. We produced a scoping document to describe what we felt needed to be done, and that included the performance of the survey based on the methods that are described in the Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual, called MARSSIM. That's a consensus document prepared by the Department of Energy and EPA along with the Department of Defense and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

16 The MARSSIM process, the process described in that manual, includes planning steps, historical site assessment, surveys, confirmation or verification of those surveys. As you have heard, we go back and resurvey things to make sure that we didn't miss something; that an independent review would find the same thing. There is analysis of the numbers, what do the numbers mean. And then there is the report preparation.

25 We're currently in the first two steps right

1 need to make; how those decisions will be made; and then what kind of information we need to make those decisions. So it's a formal process. It's essentially thinking it through real carefully so we can identify the right data to collect in our survey. We need to know what to look for, what radionuclides. There are a lot of different radionuclides to look for. We don't want to expend energy unnecessarily on things that probably aren't there. We want to focus on what's important. We need to think about where to look. We need to think about how certain we need to be. We can't be absolutely certain about the levels everywhere, so we want to make sure we know how certain we need to be and where the most likely places are to look.

15 It also goes to sensitivity. In order to support a decision criterion that starts at ten to the minus six, you have to measure certain levels. You can't always have those levels. You have to think about how sensitive you need to be so we can end up where we need to be.

21 So where are we in this process? We're working with DOE. We put together a draft statement of work so they can give us money and we can say we're going to do some work. The statement of work says what that is. The Department of Energy -- we will enter into

1 now. We are preparing to do the historical site assessment. That is part of the planning steps. And the historical site assessment is part of the planning for the rest of the surveys.

5 Some people have told us why not just go out and survey? We have read enough reports and heard enough people talking and we need to get out there and start measuring things.

9 Well, the reason for that is we need to plan and we need to know where we are going. Because if you don't know where you are going, you are liable to end up somewhere else. So we're in the process of planning this -- we are -- the historical site assessment, the HSA that we're proposing is needed to plan the survey. We need to properly design what we do when we go out in the field so we measure the right things. I can't tell you the number of times that good investigators have come to me with boxes and boxes of data and I looked at them and I have had to tell them that was good. But if you had thought about it beforehand, you would have gotten a little -- some more key information, some key information that would have made the decision process a lot easier and a lot more precise and certain.

24 So HSA asked what do we need to know -- or what we know and what we don't know; what decisions we

1 a mutual agreement with them so that they can fund us.

2 The draft statement of work will be circulated to Workgroup members. We were hoping to do it next week. It may be delayed a little bit. We have had some hang-ups. It will be soon. We will have comments from the Workgroup members; we will ask for that. And then once we can incorporate comments, we should be able to move forward with the survey and have it funded.

9 So that's about it for what we have done in the past several months. We have worked with the Workgroup on the procedures, and we have worked together. We submitted comments on the EPA. We worked on the building D&D, and we are working on moving forward with our Area IV survey.

15 So with that, I will open it up for questions.

16 VICKI ROSEN: Just a minute, John. Jonathan wanted to make some comments or ask some questions about the evaluation of the EPA.

19 JONATHAN PARFREY: I guess this is more of a question to DOE.

21 What is the timeline that you envision right now on the next iteration of the EA?

23 ROGER GEE: Now you wonder why I made that presentation about the focus group. Right now our headquarters have already started looking at it. What

1 And as I said, we will discuss in  
 2 detail in a future meeting.  
 3 The other thing that we will discuss  
 4 more relative to our Area IV survey. It is committed to  
 5 perform the survey every year. We had stated  
 6 that previous surveys were not adequate to support a  
 7 rational decision when using the CERCLA process. We  
 8 provided a scoring document to show the way we felt  
 9 needed to be done and that included the performance of  
 10 the study based on the methods that are described in  
 11 the CERCLA Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation  
 12 Manual, dated 10/20/82. That's a consensus document  
 13 prepared by the Department of Energy and EPA along with  
 14 the Department of Defense and the Nuclear Regulatory  
 15 Commission.  
 16 The MACKSIM process, the process described in  
 17 that manual, includes planning steps, historical site  
 18 assessment, survey, confirmation or verification of  
 19 these surveys. As you have heard, we go back and  
 20 recheck things to make sure that we didn't miss  
 21 anything that an independent review would find to be  
 22 some thing. There is analysis of the numbers, what do  
 23 the numbers mean. And then there is the report  
 24 preparation.  
 25 We're starting in the first two steps right

1 now. We are preparing to do the historical site  
 2 assessment. That is part of the planning stage. And  
 3 the historical site assessment is part of the planning  
 4 for the rest of the survey.  
 5 Some people have told us they don't just go out  
 6 and survey. We have seen enough reports and heard  
 7 enough people talking and we need to get out there and  
 8 start measuring things.  
 9 Well, the reason for that is we need to plan  
 10 and we need to know where we are going. Because if you  
 11 don't know where you are going, you are likely to end up  
 12 somewhere else. So we're in the process of planning  
 13 this -- we are -- the historical site assessment, that  
 14 EPA and DOE's program is needed to plan the survey.  
 15 We need a concept design what we do when we go out in  
 16 the field. We need the right things. I can't tell  
 17 you the number of times that good investigators have  
 18 come to me with boxes and boxes of data and I looked at  
 19 them and I have had to tell them that was good. But if  
 20 you had thought about it before and you would have  
 21 gotten a little -- some more for information, some key  
 22 information that would have made the decision process  
 23 a lot better and a lot more precise and certain.  
 24 So that's what we need to know -- or  
 25 what we know and what we don't know, what decisions we

1 need to make. How those decisions will be made and then  
 2 what kind of information we need to make those  
 3 decisions. So that's a formal process. It's very  
 4 formal. It's through that carefully we can identify  
 5 the right data to collect in our survey. We need to  
 6 know what to look for, what the responsibilities. There are a  
 7 lot of different responsibilities to look for. We don't  
 8 want to get out and survey unnecessarily on things that  
 9 probably aren't there. We want to focus on things that  
 10 important. We need to think about where to look. We  
 11 need to think about how certain we need to be. We can't  
 12 be absolutely certain about the levels every where as we  
 13 want to make sure we know how certain we need to be and  
 14 where the most likely places are to look.  
 15 It also goes to sensitivity. In order to  
 16 support a decision, we need to know what the data is. We  
 17 want to know how to measure certain levels. You  
 18 can't always have those levels. You have to think about  
 19 how certain you need to be. We can end up with data  
 20 that we need to do.  
 21 So reports are in this process. We're  
 22 working with DOE. We put together a draft statement of  
 23 work, so they can give us money and we can say we're  
 24 going to do some work. The statement of work says what  
 25 that is. The Department of Energy -- we will enter into

1 a mutual agreement with them so that they can fund us.  
 2 The draft statement of work will be circulated.  
 3 to working members. We were looking to do it next  
 4 week. It may be delayed a little bit. We have had some  
 5 problems. It will be soon. We will have comments from  
 6 the working members. We will ask for that. And then  
 7 once we can incorporate comments, we should be able to  
 8 move forward with the survey and have it finished.  
 9 So that's about it for what we have done in  
 10 the last few months. We have worked with the  
 11 Working on the procedure and we have worked  
 12 together. We submitted comments on the EPA. We worked  
 13 on the building (DAD) and we are working on moving  
 14 forward with the Area IV survey.  
 15 So with that, I will open it up for questions.  
 16 VICTOR KUBERT: Just a minute, John. I would want  
 17 to make some comments or ask some questions about the  
 18 evaluation of the EPA.  
 19 JONATHAN HARPER: I guess this is more of a  
 20 question to DOE.  
 21 What is the timeline that you are working on?  
 22 Now on the completion of the EPA?  
 23 RODNEY GIBB: There are a number of things that  
 24 are under discussion about the focus group. Right now we  
 25 understand have already started working on it. I want



1 the focus group will do at the 23 sites is gather  
2 information on the 23 sites, look at what's most  
3 important, and be an advocate for those 23 sites to get  
4 the attention of our headquarters to get something done.

5 Right now, since we were the first site  
6 visited, there are still other sites that we have that  
7 have to be assessed. Some of the things they will need  
8 to do is take a look at the whole picture in terms of  
9 all these sites and which ones need to have the most  
10 priority to get the most work done. So we are going  
11 through that process now. I am not trying to sidestep  
12 your question. It's only that I can't tell you that  
13 information because the process is still going on in  
14 which to assess that.

15 JONATHAN PARFREY: So the soonest would be three  
16 months from now?

17 ROGER GEE: That would be a better guess than what  
18 I would have. I don't know. And I don't want to  
19 pretend like I -- it's just I really don't know. That's  
20 why I went through the presentation for the focus group.

21 JONATHAN PARFREY: And is it your contention that  
22 the comments that this Workgroup put together and the  
23 DTSC comments and EPA's comments would be incorporated  
24 into the next draft of the EA -- or if they will be?

25 ROGER GEE: They're being considered because we had

1 soon. Because, obviously, as John has shown on the  
2 slide, there has been some time that has elapsed.

3 JONATHAN PARFREY: And EPA has had some major  
4 issues with the EA. One of the major issues with the  
5 Environmental Assessment is that the way it was  
6 presented initially months ago by Mike Nothers is that  
7 doing an Environmental Assessment may come back and say,  
8 you know, we need to do a thorough Environmental Impact  
9 Report, that it's not sufficient.

10 Is there any possibility that the next draft  
11 of the EA will come back and say, you know what, we need  
12 to do a full environmental impact report?

13 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes, Jon. That is still in the loop  
14 because we have not made a decision, and that's one of  
15 the possible outcomes.

16 JONATHAN PARFREY: It's possible. Is it like a  
17 50-50 chance or --

18 ROGER GEE: That one we would -- it would be hard  
19 to address. I think that would be clear conjecture.

20 Just for -- when a federal agency -- I would be  
21 dishonest if I told you that I knew, because I don't.

22 But what a federal agency has to do is before  
23 it takes a major action, it needs to consider some of  
24 the alternatives. Since we're going through this, one  
25 possibility is, yes, DOE go ahead and do what you

1 an open-comment period. In fact, that was extended  
2 because it was the year-end, and we extended it an extra  
3 time so we could make sure everybody got their comments  
4 in. So those comments are part of a package now that is  
5 being reviewed.

6 And all I'm trying to explain now is there are  
7 more people looking at this than we originally intended.  
8 And it's not just about what's good for ETEC but what's  
9 good for all facilities across the country. It has  
10 another round, if you will, of people looking at it to  
11 see what is good for this country, which sites need to  
12 be cleaned up first, maybe which sites would have the  
13 greatest impact because -- just -- because ETEC is not  
14 necessarily the biggest site in the DOE complex, part of  
15 the problem that we've had when we brought things  
16 forward to our headquarters is that we need to perhaps  
17 get the attention that -- that a big site might get the  
18 attention. So this is a good thing for us to go through  
19 because it allows the small sites to actually have more  
20 of a voice in the nationwide community to get our needs  
21 addressed. So this is a good process for us to go  
22 through.

23 Unfortunately, getting to your question, I  
24 cannot project when this would be done. We would  
25 definitely request, and we're asking for it to be done

1 initially planned. Another alternative is, no, you  
2 haven't done enough and you need go back and do  
3 something more extreme, more detailed. That's certainly  
4 a possibility. This is not a foregone conclusion. When  
5 we submit this to the headquarters, what will happen? I  
6 cannot answer that question because we are not the  
7 authority to make that decision. So please understand  
8 that.

9 JONATHAN PARFREY: I just would like to say that we  
10 don't think the environmental impact studies are  
11 necessarily extreme, but perhaps more thorough.

12 ROGER GEE: Definitely. With the State, there were  
13 actually fewer courses of action to analyze these. With  
14 the federal government, there is three alternative ways  
15 of doing it; with the State, there is two. So we need  
16 to be also fiscally responsible. And if this warrants  
17 more study, then we will be directed to do that.

18 MIKE BROWN: Perhaps also with respect to the  
19 release of the EA, we are looking at the  
20 January-February time period. We don't want this  
21 process to drag out for any longer than is absolutely  
22 necessary. We do need to get concurrence from our  
23 headquarters, but we want to move forward on cleanup.  
24 So we don't like the fact the EA is -- as a major  
25 decision-making document, has not moved forward. So

1 the focus group will go on at the 25 sites in Denver  
 2 information on the 25 sites, look at what's most  
 3 important and put an emphasis on those 25 sites to get  
 4 the attention of our headquarters to get something done  
 5 Right now, since we want the focus on  
 6 Denver, there are still other sites that we have that  
 7 have to be assessed. Some of the things that will need  
 8 to be taken a look at the whole picture in Denver.  
 9 All these sites and which ones need to have the most  
 10 priority to get the most work done. So we are going  
 11 through that process now. I am not trying to mislead  
 12 you question. It's only that I can't tell you that  
 13 information because the process is still going on in  
 14 order to assess that.  
 15 JONATHAN BARREY: So the assessment would include  
 16 months from now?  
 17 ROGER GEE: That would be a better guess than what  
 18 I would have. I don't know. And I don't know  
 19 because this is -- it's just really don't know. That's  
 20 what I went through the presentation for the focus group.  
 21 JONATHAN BARREY: And is your intention that  
 22 the comments that this working group put together and the  
 23 DOT's comments and EPA's comments would be incorporated  
 24 into the next draft of the EA -- or if that would be?  
 25 ROGER GEE: They're being considered because we had

1 an open comment period. In fact that was extended  
 2 because it was the year-end, and we extended it as a  
 3 matter we could make sure everybody got their comments  
 4 in. So those comments are part of a package now that is  
 5 being reviewed.  
 6 And all the things to consider now is there are  
 7 some people looking at this that we originally intended  
 8 And it's not just about what's good for FTEC but what's  
 9 good for all facilities across the country. If that  
 10 was the reason, if you were looking at it  
 11 and what is good for this country, which sites would have the  
 12 be closed up first, maybe which sites would have the  
 13 greatest impact because -- just -- because FTEC is not  
 14 necessarily the biggest site in the DOE complex, part of  
 15 the problem that we've had when we thought things  
 16 forward to our headquarters is that we need to bring  
 17 get the attention that -- that a big site might get the  
 18 attention. So this is a good thing for us to go through  
 19 because it allows the facilities to actually have more  
 20 of a voice in the national community to get our needs  
 21 addressed. So this is a good process for us to go  
 22 through.  
 23 I hope we're getting to your question.  
 24 comment project when this would be done. We would  
 25 definitely request and we're asking for it to be done

1 soon. Because obviously, as you can see shown on the  
 2 slide, there has been some things that has changed.  
 3 JONATHAN BARREY: And EPA has had some things  
 4 issues with the EA. One of the major issues with the  
 5 Environmental Assessment is that the way it was  
 6 presented initially months ago by Alicka Johnson is that  
 7 doing an Environmental Assessment was come back and say  
 8 you know, we need to do a thorough Environmental Impact  
 9 Report that it's not sufficient.  
 10 Is there any possibility that the next draft  
 11 of the EA will come back and say you know what we need  
 12 to do a full Environmental Impact Report?  
 13 MIKE LOPEZ: Yes, because that is still in the loop.  
 14 because we have not made a decision and that's one of  
 15 the possible outcomes.  
 16 JONATHAN BARREY: It's possible. Is it like a  
 17 50-50 chance or --  
 18 ROGER GEE: That one we would -- it would be hard  
 19 to address. I think that would be a hard question  
 20 just for -- when a technology -- I would be  
 21 dependent if I had you that I would be dependent on  
 22 that what a federal agency has to do is either  
 23 if takes a major action, it needs to consider some of  
 24 the alternatives. Since we're going through this one  
 25 possibility is to DOT go ahead and do what you

1 initially planned. Another alternative is not to  
 2 have it done enough and you need go back and do  
 3 something more extreme, more detailed. That's certainly  
 4 a possibility. This is not a foregone conclusion. When  
 5 we submit this to the public, what will happen, I  
 6 cannot answer that question because we are not the  
 7 authority to make that decision. So please understand  
 8 that.  
 9 JONATHAN BARREY: I just would like to say that we  
 10 don't think the environmental impact studies are  
 11 necessarily extreme, but perhaps more thorough.  
 12 ROGER GEE: Definitely. With the State, there were  
 13 actually fewer comments in order to analyze these. With  
 14 the federal government, there is more information we  
 15 of doing it with the State, there is less. So we need  
 16 to be more flexible responsible. And if that means  
 17 more study, then we will be directed to do that.  
 18 MIKE LOPEZ: That's also what happened to the  
 19 release of the EA, we are looking at the  
 20 January-February time period. We don't want this  
 21 process to drag out for any longer than is absolutely  
 22 necessary. We do need to get comments from our  
 23 headquarters, but we want to move forward on this  
 24 So we don't like the fact the EA is -- as a major  
 25 decision-making document, has not moved forward. So