

SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY-COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP

HIDDEN LAKE CLUBHOUSE

DECEMBER 17, 2015

**Meeting called to order:** Ron Ziman at 7:00PM

**I: Members Present:** Alec Uzemeck, Ron Ziman, David Karchem, Barry Seybert, Tom Nachtrab, Abe Weitzberg, Sharon Ford, Michael Kuhn, Tim Brehm, Kathy Weiner. A quorum was present.

**II: November meeting minutes** approval put forward by Ron Ziman and seconded by Abe Weitzberg. Motion passed unanimously.

**III: Presentation: Fugitive Dust and Excavation:** Chris Shubeck

Mr. Shubeck is an engineer and is familiar with issues related to grading. He and his family live 2 miles from SSFL.

The estimated volume of soil to be removed in a "clean up to background" is 2 million cubic yards. Volumes are usually underestimated according to Chris. Soil volumes also tend to increase (fluff) as they are removed from the ground. Chris estimated that if you were to stand in the middle of a football field (bowl shaped) and imagine that bowl being filled in with soil (**multiply that X 3 football fields**), you would have an idea of the amount of soil to be removed to accomplish a "clean up to background".

Dust alone is considered a pollutant and affects the quality of the air that we breathe. Chris distributed a handout from the California Air Resources Board (800-952-5588) entitled Fugitive Dust Control. The health effects from moving that amount of soil could be major. Chris urged us to contact the legislators in the surrounding communities: Simi Valley, Bob Huber, mayor; Steve Knight, Congressman; in the San Fernando Valley: Englander, Sherman, Blumfield, Pavley & Long.

Chris spoke about the importance of specifying the exact type of truck used for soil removal. A 10 wheeler is able to carry 10 yards of soil. When full, the weight of the truck would be 3,300 pounds per axle. Most likely diesel trucks will be used and these trucks frequently fail emission tests.

Mr. Shubeck gave us some numbers for thought:

To dispose of 2.5 million cubic yards of soil:

With the use of 10 yard trucks= 260,000 truck loads

Running 100 trucks/day= 36,000 trucks per year

7.2 years to project completion

\*Ron Ziman stated that recently DOE, NASA & Boeing have agreed to a maximum of 45 trucks per day/10 hour day. This would extend the cleanup completion to approximately 15 years.

How do you control fugitive dust? This really is a misnomer according to Chris as even with best management practices (bmp) fugitive dust is just that, fugitive. Contractors are on the "honor system" to use the bmps that are known to keep dust down: watering down the soil at frequent schedules, hosing down trucks and having workers wear masks. The sheer weight of the trucks, loaded or otherwise, breaks through the water/soil crust and releases more dust.

Wind velocity is also a factor. And although its effects could be mitigated during work hours, there would be times when the site is unattended and the wind picks up and flings dust and contaminants into the atmosphere. Bmp's to control this possibility may be to cover the site each time it is unattended.

\*There is an agreement that if the wind is greater than 5-10 mph, all excavation stops during the cleanup.

Other considerations would be the fact that a cleanup of this size would consume a tremendous amount of water to control fugitive dust. Water is at a premium in Southern California with our drought in its seventh year.

Mr. Shubeck concludes with: What is the point?? Are people currently getting sick? What is actually going to be accomplished by the cleanup?? Approximately, 90% of the surface water from the site flows into Bell Creek. The bedrock is made up of fractured sandstone, siltstone and claystone interbeds. Grading is pointless. If the soil at SSFL is so toxic and cannot remain in place, why are we willing to place it in a truck and then drive it through neighborhoods, risking the chance of having it blow into your homes and greatly increase your chance for real & deadly illnesses. What is the Point?

Questions: Discussion about the cost to maintain trucks used for the removal of soil is very expensive and, most trucks would fail emissions testing. The cost to outfit a truck for pollution control is estimated to be in the \$25,000 range.

Abe asked if Chris would be able to take a look at DOE's EIS and DTSC's EIR when they are made public to give his opinion. Chris agreed.

Mr. Shubeck's report in its entirety will be available on the CAG website: [ssflcag.net](http://ssflcag.net)

Abe Weitzberg spoke briefly about a letter that he received from ATSDR, as the petitioner requesting they revisit the safety of SSFL. ATSDR explained their decision not to open another public health investigation because they believe that a "thoughtful process has been used to evaluate threats to public health & develop plans to address those health threats".

#### **IV: Soil Removal Estimates & Impacts:**

Abe Weitzberg

About one half of the fugitive dust particles are big particles, larger than 10 microns in diameter (the average human hair is 70 microns in diameter). However, the other half are particles 10 microns or smaller (PM10), small enough to travel to your lungs and cause health effects.

When excavating soil during the cleanup they will create storage piles. Oftentimes, they will need to run a test on a sample from the pile to see where it can be disposed of safely.

Abe used estimates from studies performed by DOE, NASA and Boeing in spread sheet form to show the amounts of soil that would need to be excavated in 3 different scenarios. The DOE preferred alternative scenario would pose a cancer risk of  $3 \times 10^{-4}$  lifetime risk, while cleanup to the AOC standards posed a  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  lifetime risk. This is actually a FONSI=Finding of No Significant Impact on preferred cleanup.

Mr. Weitzberg reviewed topographical maps depicting chemical & radiological soil areas & remediation sites at SSFL prepared by the responsible parties.

Abe presented bullet points including the need to be vigilant when reviewing DOE's EIS and DTSC's EIR to ensure that all questions are answered fully before a cleanup begins.

Mr. Weitzberg presented information on Terminology to Consider when discussing soil estimates

Chemical & radiological contaminants of concern (COC)

Risk Factors:  $10^{-4}$  = 0.0001 (alternative 1) and  $10^{-6}$  = 0.000001 (alternative 2) DOE

Suburban Residential scenario

Backyard Garden-ignore the natural arsenic

Rural Residential (agricultural) scenario-crops, beef & fish

Unrestricted Use 2007 agreements

Cancers are the second largest cause in the USA of deaths. You have approximately a 1 in 4 (23%) chance of death from cancer.

Questions: Michael Kuhn stated that the APQD (Air Pollution Control District) has a monitoring station at Simi Valley High School. The station records ozone, oxides of nitrogen & particulates among other data. Abe suggests requesting a monitoring station at the site & offsite also.

A community member asked a question about the contaminants in the soil. Answer: radioactive contaminants, such as strontium and cesium are primarily on the surface while chemical contaminants were deeper. Tridium levels are not going up, it is decaying.

Michael went on to mention that 20,000 landslides occurred in the Santa Susana Mountains following the 1994 earthquake & aftershocks (USGS data). The dust plumes associated with those landslides resulted in a major spike in San Juaquin Valley Fever in humans & dogs

Dayton Canyon with its recent new homes construction project is also an area that may utilize this type of monitoring device.

Bonnie Klea spoke about the 1999 study which concluded: No offsite cancers; and the fact that "they hid" the incidence of bladder cancer. CAG members Abe and David Karchem again requested that they receive a copy of this study from Mrs. Klea.

The 2010 AOC cleanup will require over 3-5 times as much soil being removed from SSFL.

Please refer to the full text of Abe Weitzberg's presentations at: [ssflcag.net](http://ssflcag.net)

#### **V: CAG Facts Page**

Alec Uzemeck

*The SSFL CAG is working together on a Facts Page that further defines the CAG's stance on cleanup issues. The Fact Page takes our Vision Statement: Know the past, understand the present and advocate for a clean & healthy future and places it more in context with where the cleanup process is at the present time.*

David Karshem stated that the Fact Page needs to state our stance on water, runoff, seeps and springs. Another addition is that of "Fugitive dust & regional effects" within the Partial List of Concerns. Alec agrees that the Fact Page would be more complete with the addition of these points and he will bring the topic back at our next meeting.

#### **VI: Public Discussion:**

All

CAG member Tim Brehm wrote a response to NBC after their airing of: SSFL Dirty Secrets Part II the Brandeis Barden "secret" contaminated camp for kids.

Tim requested assistance with editing his letter. Our challenge, as a group, states Ron, is our inability to pull a group together, in a timely manner, to respond to such needs.

A show of hands as to who would be willing to get together, weekly, to formulate timely responses was taken. A web conference call was suggested.

Sharon Ford suggested a system like the Sierra Club uses when they send out an "Action Alert" to their members, requesting that they individually respond to an issue.

Ron will let us know when a meeting will be set.

No further discussion:

Meeting adjourned: 9:45PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Weiner  
CAG Secretary