Job No. 662

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COMMUNITY MEETING

TAKEN ON

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2007

REPORTED BY: LINDA FRAZEUR

CSR NO. 6697

Department of Energy Community Meeting, taken on behalf of Boeing, at 999 Enchanted Way, Simi Valley, California, 93065, on Wednesday, February 21, 2007, commencing at 6:35 p.m., before Linda Frazeur, CSR No. 6697.

APPEARANCES:

FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
BY: Thomas Johnson, ETEC Project Manager
5800 Woolsey Canyon Road
Canoga Park, California 91304-1148
818.466.8959
etec@doeal.gov

FOR BOEING:

THE BOEING COMPANY
BY: Ravnesh Amar, Program Manager
- AND -
Phil Rutherford, Radiation Safety
- AND -
Blythe Jameson, Environmental Communications
5800 Woolsey Canyon Road
MC 055-T487
Canoga Park, California 91304-1148
818.466.8782
ravnesh.amar@boeing.com

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

REPRESENTATIVES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:

Hilda Garcia (Senator Sheila Kuehl)
Jarrod DeGonia (State Assemblyman Cameron Smyth)
Dan Paranik (City of Simi Valley)
Brian Miller (Congressman Elton Gallegly)
Guillermo Gonzalez (Senator Dianne Feinstein)

Lora Ramey (DTSC)
Rob Greger (DHS)
Rich Schassburger (DOE)
Bill Taylor (DOE)
Simon Lipstein (DOE)
Brian Sujata (Boeing)

SPEAKERS:

Dan Hirsch
Bob McClain
Elizabeth Crawford
Bonnie Klea
Hilda Garcia
Guillermo Gonzalez
Dan Parks
Barbara Johnson
Christina Walsh
Chris Rowe
Mark Perryman
Sue Boeker
John Luker
Adam Salkin
Brian Miller
Dorrie Raskin
Rhea Mason
Betty Brio

I N D E X

SIMI VALLEY, CALIFORNIA - WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2007

6:35 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. SMYTH: Okay. I've been informed that it's officially 6:35. I believe that is officially late. So if everybody can take their seats, we'll go ahead and get started. Of course, during the meeting you can get up and get coffee or water or cookies or whatever you desire.

So welcome tonight to --

It's a long title. I need to read it.

-- the Department of Energy's public meeting to discuss the proposed disposition of Building 24 or the Energy Technology Engineering Center project.

My name is Jeff Smyth. This is actually the fifth DOE public meeting, I think -- I might have lost count -- but the fifth public -- DOE public meeting that I've facilitated.

Tonight's meeting is a little different than the ones in the past. Those meetings were on topical subjects, I guess, in a little freer form and broader range. Tonight's meeting is specifically to solicit your

comment on DOE's proposed disposition of Building 24.

As a result of the narrower focus, the format has also been changed from the meetings that you guys might have seen in the past, for those of you that have attended past meetings. There will be a formal presentation still. It will be about 20 minutes in length. And then there will be about an hour -- or longer if it takes longer or shorter if we can solicit public comment in a shorter period of time -- a comment period for you guys.

Part of the change in format from those earlier meetings is that instead of sitting in your seat and asking questions and getting comment, you're going to be asked tonight to come up to the microphone, identify yourself. The purpose for that -- Actually, this is one of the ways you can provide comments tonight on DOE's proposed alternative. The purpose of identifying yourself and coming to the microphone is so Linda, the stenographer, can record your comment. The purpose for that is because DOE has a legal obligation to respond to significant comments on the EE/CA -- on the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, which is the document that describes DOE's analysis of the disposition alternatives. And so they'll take the public comment that's recorded and respond to those in formal fashion.

If you don't want to come to the microphone and give verbal comment tonight, then you can also grab a sheet, a comment sheet, which is out there. I'll be happy to give you one if you raise your hand during the meeting. Write your comment and turn it in at the door on your way out. There's also, I guess, a third method, which is write your comment down or your question down. And if you want somebody else to read it at the microphone, you can take it back out there. And there's another box for those. Or you can raise your hand and give them to me and I'll make sure it gets read and, therefore, written in the record.

As you can see, there are three or four cameras here tonight, which is terrific. It's a public meeting. It should be recorded. But one of the things we want to make sure you guys understand is that you're under no requirement to be filmed. If you want to make a public comment, provide comment, and you don't want to be filmed, just let me know and I'll make sure that you're not filmed. We'll ask them to turn off the cameras during your comment. If you don't mind, they'll film you. And I guess everything will be fine.

Let's see. Some ground rules: Again, they're very simple since this is a pretty narrow, focused meeting. We ask, just like the past meetings, you hold

your comments during the formal presentation until the comment period. That's just so we can actually get through the formal presentation. It is basically a repetition of what's in the document that's a handout, the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis.

When it's time to give comment, please be courteous and respectful to the other people that want to provide comment. That means provide your comment and then give somebody else a chance. Okay?

What else?

Oh, if you could, please provide your name and, if you want, if you have any affiliation other than a member of the public, please provide that also just so it can go on the record.

Logistics: For those of you that haven't been here before, bathrooms are out that door. Mens on the left as you face this wall; women's on the right. There's also a drinking fountain out there. Water in the back, coffee -- looks like three jugs of caffeinated coffee and one that is decaf -- and cookies.

Handouts: I guess I've talked about the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, which again is the draft report the DOE is seeking comment on, and a fact sheet which summarizes the entire proposed removal action and I think provides some brief history of Building 24.

Introductions -- And I got the list about 5 minutes ago so if I miss anybody, please let me know. Elected officials that have representatives here tonight, State Senator Sheila Kuehl, Ms. Hilda Garcia.

And I got your name right?

MS. GARCIA: Yes.

MR. SMYTH: Great.

And for State Assemblyman Cameron Smyth, Jarrod DeGonia, over there.

From I think the only agency representative here tonight is Lora Ramey (phonetic) from Department of Toxic Substances Control.

MR. GREGOR: Rob Greger.

MR. SMYTH: Rob Greger from Department of Health Services.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible).

MR. SMYTH: Sorry for missing you guys.

MR. PERINACK: Dan Paranik, City of Simi Valley.

MR. SMYTH: Great. I thought I recognized you, Dan. Thanks for coming.

From the Department of Energy, some new names and faces again if you have attended past meetings.

Rich Schassburger in the back row is the Federal Project Director from the Oakland Project Office. He replaced Rich Daily (phonetic) in --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: December.

MR. SMYTH: -- December? Okay.

Thomas Johnson is the Department of Energy's project manager for the Energy Technology Engineering Center. You'll be hearing from Thomas tonight in the formal presentation and possibly later during public comment.

Bill Taylor is the communications -- sorry -- Public Information Officer for the Department of Energy. He was here a second ago.

He must be out dispersing public information.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could we have them stand so we can see who they are?

MR. SMYTH: Sure. Do you want me to go all the way back to Rich?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. SMYTH: Mr. Schassburger?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: DOE.

MR. SMYTH: Department of Energy, Federal Project Director from Oakland.

Thomas Johnson, Project Manager for ETEC. And he lives here. His office is at the site.

Bill Taylor, who is in the back. I'll make sure I identify him when he comes in.

And Simon Lipstein, the legal advisor for the

Department of Energy in the back row.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Based where?

MR. SMYTH: Cincinnati, I believe.

MR. LIPSTEIN: Based in Denver.

MR. SMYTH: Denver. Okay.

For Boeing, Ravnesh Amar. He's the Program Manager, DOE Site Closure. He replaced Majelle Lee, I think --

Last spring?

MR. AMAR: That's correct.

MR. SMYTH: Phil Rutherford, Manager of Health, Safety Radiation Services.

Brian Sujata is the Building 24 project manager. It's his project that I guess the meeting is focused on tonight.

And Blythe Jameson --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- from ETEC?

MR. SMYTH: Yes, Boeing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, Boeing? What is your name again?

MR. SUJATA: Brian Sujata.

MR. SMYTH: S-u-j-a-t-a.

MR. SUJATA: That's right.

MR. SMYTH: And Blythe Jameson who is the Environmental Communications Manager for Boeing.

I think that's the introductions.

So again, 20 minutes' formal presentation, give or take. And then we'll go on to the public comment period. Okay?

Thomas?

MR. JOHNSON: Before I get started on the presentation, I'd like to tell you just a little bit about myself.

My name is Thomas Johnson. I've been on-site at ETEC for a little over a month now. I've been with the Department of Energy for the last --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MR. SMYTH: Is that any better?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Is the mike switched on?

MR. JOHNSON: It's switched on. I can hear myself.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, that's not quite good enough for the rest of us.

MR. JOHNSON: Hold on one second.

Is that any better?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. SMYTH: Can you hear me better now?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hold the mike.

MR. JOHNSON: How about now? Okay. I'll start again.

My name is Thomas Johnson. I'm with the Department of Energy. I've been at the ETEC site for a little over a month now. I've been with the Department of Energy for a little over 14 years. Coming from the Savannah River Site in Aiken, South Carolina.

My experience with the Department has been in the soil and ground water arena for the last 11 years or so, and also with some facility D & D. I also have some experience in solid waste management as well. And prior to working for DOE, I actually worked for the Corps of Engineers for about 11 years. So I've got about 25 years of federal experience.

I did both my graduate and undergraduate at the University of South Carolina. And it's actually my first time living outside of -- outside of the Carolinas. So just now getting used to being here in the California area, but looking forward to serving you all as the project manager for ETEC.

And with that, I'll go ahead and get started with my presentation. I've got about seven --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We still can't hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this mike better?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I mean, you're talking out your -- You're talking like this and it's not by the mike.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Well, give him a chance to try to fix it. He wants you to hear him.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does this mike work?

MR. SMYTH: It should. But this one should also.

MR. JOHNSON: Can you hear me better now, Miss?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll try to make sure I hold it right here in front of my mouth.

Okay. Why are we here? We're here to discuss the DOE's plan for the removal of Building 4024. We're here to solicit the public comments on the proposed removal action. And I will give you some more details on what exactly we're planning on doing. And also that this plan presented tonight has been reviewed by the EPA, and it incorporates the comments that they have provided to us. So the focus of tonight's meeting is to try and obtain any public comments that you may want to provide on the proposed action.

The process that we're following here is called a removal action. It will be conducted in accordance with the 1995 joint memorandum between the Department of Energy and the EPA. And it is consistent with the Comprehensive Response Compensation and Liability Act, or what we normally refer to as CERCLA.

The decontamination and demolition of the remaining radiological facilities at the ETEC sites, which is there is two, will be performed using this non-time-critical removal action. I'll give you a really detailed look at the removal action -- non-time-critical removal action.

The non-time-critical removal action requires completion of EE/CA or Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis. This approach, as I've stated before, includes an opportunity for EPA to review and comment on the Department's plan and also provides the opportunity for the public to comment on our plans prior to us initiating any action on the facility.

Next slide.

What exactly is an "EE/CA"? Again, it's the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis for a specific action that the Department is planning on taking. This is a document that is produced as a part of the non-time-critical removal action process. The non-time-critical --

Thank you.

The non-time-critical removal action is performed when there's no immediate threat to the public or the environment and when there is sufficient time that's available for planning and for community

involvement.

I know this process is a little bit different than what you may have seen in the past at the ETEC site, but we wanted to make sure that we heard the public comment. We are aware the public has really not had an opportunity in the past to be directly involved in some of the processes. So for these last two remaining radiological facilities, we want to have you go through this process, where you certainly have that opportunity.

The specific scope of this EE/CA includes the identification of the removal action objectives, the evaluation of the removal action alternatives, and will also present a recommendation of a removal action for this specific facility.

The timeline for this particular EE/CA, we actually public-noticed this EE/CA January 26 in the Daily News and in the Ventura County Star. The administrative record for this particular project was established also on January 26. The document supporting for this particular facility is available in the public repositories in the area at local libraries and is also available on the DOE ETEC website.

The next item will be timeline for the community meeting which is tonight. As I said, this documentation for this has been available at the libraries and at the

website since the 26th of January. And we're here to try and get comments tonight. And we will leave the comment period open for basically another seven days so that, even after you leave this meeting, if you have questions that you'd like to have answered, if you will either provide them to us through the website -- there's information with the exact address for that website -- we will be able to take your comments and -- and address them as a part of this action.

And again, the public comment period for this document ends on the 28th of February.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Next week.

MR. JOHNSON: Just a couple more slides and we'll move on here.

The Santa Susana Field Laboratory is a little bit less than 2900 acres and it was established in 1947 by the North American Aviation as a test laboratory for large rocket engines and later expanded to a research facility for development of nuclear power.

Santa Susana is comprised of four discrete areas. The specific area that we're concerned with is Area 4. This is where the DOE operations occurred at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory.

This site is Area 4 and was established in the late 1950s time frame by the predecessor to DOE which is

actually the Atomic Energy Commission for nuclear research. Eventually, the research and testing shifted towards liquid metal components and other energy-related endeavors. The detail itself, the Area 4, is approximately 90 acres of the 2900-acre Santa Susana Field Laboratory.

The initial research for DOE on this site centered around nuclear power production for electricity and for spacecrafts. The research that's been conducted at ETEC mostly involved the development and testing components using metallic sodium systems.

This slide is just giving you an aerial view of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory. The thing that I'd like you to know here is that DOE nuclear operations ceased on this site in the 1988 time frame. And the focus at that time turned towards the cleanup for the site. And we're at the point now where we're at the last two radiological facilities on the site. And this is the first of the two EE/CAs that we'll be presenting to you. There will be another public meeting where we will present that facility as well for public comments.

And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Phil Rutherford. Phil will give you some details on the history of the site as well as some of the characterization, information on the facility, and also

present to you the options that we're going to do under this particular action.

Once Phil is done, I'll come back up. And, if you have any specific questions for me or Phil or anyone else on the team, we'll try to answer as many of those as we can tonight as well as to record your comments and try to disposition them as a part of the EE/CA process. And we'll talk about that a little bit more as well.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Thomas.

Can everyone hear me well?

For those of you who don't know me -- and I know many of you do -- I worked for Rockwell International and then for Boeing for 28 years. I started off working in the De Soto facility down in Canoga Park working on nuclear reactor safety -- basically safety analysis and reliability analysis for the advanced sodium-cooled reactors that we designed for the DOE.

But then in 1990 I -- I moved up here to the hill to take part in the DOE remediation of the nuclear facilities. So I've lived in the West Valley for 28 years, the last 20 of those in West Hills. I live with my wife and two sons about three miles away from the site.

What I'd like to do this evening is to summarize the history of Building 24. I'd like to give you a brief

history of SNAP program, which was involved in the operations of Building 24, and then discuss the EE/CA that we're here to describe by looking at the various alternatives that we looked at and discuss the preferred removal action alternative.

Next slide, please.

The SNAP program stands for Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power. They were systems designed to power satellites in the '60s. We started out our research and developments in the late '50s. There were several models or types of these reactors. They were uranium-fueled. They were cooled with NaK, which is an alloy of sodium and potassium. As I said, they were used to power satellites in the '60s.

We launched SNAP-10 in 1965. And that was the only U.S.-launched nuclear reactor. The Russians launched many reactors -- 24, I think -- some of which are still orbiting and some of which fell to earth. SNAP-10 is still orbiting, operated successfully and demonstrated the technology.

These photographs illustrate the reactor. It was actually very small. The reactor itself is here. It's like about a couple of feet across, and maybe 2 feet high. This was a SNAP-8.

SNAP-10, which was tested in Building 24 that

we'll be discussing this evening, is illustrated here. And again, the reactor is at the top here, which is shown blown up here, expanded.

This system here is the system used to convert the heating to electricity. They are electric generators and also the heat radiator. These systems were about 15 percent efficient. And, therefore, approximately 85 percent of the heat had to be radiated out into space. So that was the reason for these large radiators here.

Okay. Next.

This is -- is Building 24. It's a relatively nondescript building, as you can see. It is one of the last two remaining radiological facilities we have to clean up on the hill. We have successfully cleaned up 25 of 27. They've been decommissioned, surveyed, sampled by Boeing and/or Rockwell. And then --

Oops. Well, we seem to have a little -- little technical issue here.

We have an alternate projector if need be.

This building that was constructed in 1960 and, as you can see, consists of a high-bay and associated office and equipment buildings.

The next slide shows the SNAP-10 reactor inside the building. Again the reactor is here and heat rejection system is here. Building was constructed in

1960. And it was used for testing SNAP reactors in a simulated space environment. And so the cells in which the reactors were placed were able to be sealed and evacuated. So we'll simulate the vacuum of space. So we not only tested the nuclear portion of the system but also the energy generation and also heat rejection.

Several -- Several different types of SNAP reactors were tested in this building. Several of the buildings on the hill we used for the SNAP program. And all of these have been decommissioned.

The reactors were very low power, approximately 50 to 60 kilowatts electrical. That's about 1000th of 1 percent the size of a typical commercial electricity-generating reactor. So, for instance, the amount of fission products or radioactivity that was generated during the nuclear process would therefore be this fraction of a typical radioactivity generated in a commercial plant.

Okay. Next slide.

This is what the building looked like inside. There were two cells: One here and one here. You see the thickness of the walls here. These walls ranged from nine foot in thickness to --

Is it two and a half feet?

The actual walls sealed two and a half feet, but

they were against the bedrock basically. All of this region is about three floors below ground. So the building that you saw in the previous slide was only the above-ground ancillary equipment. But the reactor itself was within these heavily shielded cells. So you see the operators here in the operating gallery monitoring the performance of the reactor.

Okay. Thanks.

This is what the interior of one of the cells looks like. You see that all the -- all the equipment has been removed, of course. The building itself is operational from 1960 to 1969. And after that all the equipment was taken out including the reactors.

The walls of the cells are shielded in aluminum rather than stainless steel in order to reduce the amount of radioactivity generated due to neutron absorption. However, there is neutron absorption in the shielding concrete and that has generated radioactivity. This will be managed and disposed of as radioactive waste.

So this little cartoon here illustrates neutrons being emitted from the reactor itself going through the aluminum and into the concrete. The exposure levels in these cells are relatively low at the moment. They're approximately ten times background or less than a hundred micro-R per hour. So one can easily walk inside there

without any -- any danger.

Okay. Next.

This is an example of one of the doors which rolls into the opening in order to seal the cells. You see it's nine feet thick, which is indicative of the thickness of all of the walls.

Next.

We took -- We took a concrete cores of the shielding concrete in 2004 in the floors and the walls and the ceiling in order to estimate the amount of radioactivity that's been generated within the remaining shielding concrete. And we found a maximum of 9 picocuries per gram of Cobalt-60 and 105 picocuries per gram of Europium-152. These are neutron activation products that form when steel and -- and the material within the concrete absorb neutrons.

We determined that the extent of contamination or activation is within the inner 15 inches of the concrete and the remaining six or seven feet is noncontaminated. However, this will be -- will be confirmed during the -- the demolition.

We also looked for other activation products that we might expect -- Tritium, Europium-152, Iron-55, Nickel-63 -- and didn't find any of those contaminants.

We also sampled the soil in the bedrock

underneath the reactive vault, underneath the concrete floor, and looked for contaminants and didn't find any there. So that is a good indication that when we finally excavate the building itself, we shouldn't find any contamination. However, we would be doing a full MARSSIM design survey to look for all contaminants.

Okay. Next.

Okay. So which alternatives did we look at when we wrote the EE/CA? It's really pretty simple. We only looked at the two alternatives. The first one is required by the CERCLA process. And that's the no-action alternative. These were evaluated for effectiveness, namely, the -- the ability of the -- the action to achieve the objectives of the removal action. And the next slide we'll discuss what those alternative -- those objectives are.

We looked at the implementability, which is really just a way of saying how practical is the alternative. And then finally the cost.

So the no-action one is obviously highly implementable. It's easy just to do nothing. However, that won't achieve the objectives of removing the building and contamination. It will basically be ineffective.

The buildings and structures would remain

on-site and require surveys and maintenance over an extended period of time. And we've estimated that the cost would be approximately $15 million over 30 years.

Now, the other alternative we looked at was the preferred alternative and that is the complete demolition and removal of the building and the disposal of all the materials off-site at disposal facilities.

The demolition is certainly technically achievable. It will be effective. It will be effective in removing all the radiological contaminants. And the approximate cost will be $15 million including waste disposal cost. I'm sorry. $5 million. I'm sorry.

Now, you might ask, Why do we look at only two alternatives? Since the -- Since the -- the removal action alternatives and objectives are to remove the contaminants and the buildings, this was the only real technically meaningful alternative.

Now, we could have looked at some -- something midway between these two, namely, removing all the -- all the contaminated concrete from within the building itself and then renovating the building and using it for other purposes. We've done that with several other buildings on-site. However, this particular building we have no use for. It would be somewhat difficult to remove all the concrete and still have the building to be

structurally intact, safe. And, therefore, we didn't see any point in looking at that alternative even though we actually considered it.

Okay. Next.

So what are all the removal action objectives? Again, pretty simple, pretty straightforward. It is to remove all the above- and below-grade buildings, foundations, and utilities, and the physical components associated with the building.

Furthermore, the intent is to remove all the potentially radiologically impacted soils which may lay beneath the building. As I've said, the limited amount of sampling we have done hasn't found any contamination.

And then ultimately, once we've excavated the building and there's a big hole in the ground, we would sample the remaining -- the remaining bedrock and soil using MARSSIM protocols, which is a survey technique developed by the EPA and the NRC and the DOE and the Department of Defense.

We would then bring in the Oakridge Institute of Science and Education and also the Department of Health Services to do a verification survey of -- of the hole to make sure there is no residual contamination.

Now, this is very typical in what we have done in previous remediation exercises. Some of you may

remember in 2004 we had a public meeting where we discussed the removal of Building 59, which was a very similar building. Again, it housed a SNAP reactor. And we had poster sessions and presentations on the -- on that program. And we successfully removed the building and all the basements between March of 2004 and September of 2004 in a six-month period between the rainy seasons. So we intend to do the same thing with Building 24.

Okay. Next.

So how do we assure that what remains in the soil and in the bedrock is safe? What's the health-based risk criteria?

Now, those of you who have been coming to these meetings before will remember that we have in the past used a 15-millirem-per-year dose limit which is typical of what is used, for instance, by the NRC and the rest of the Department of Energy and many of the state radiological organizations. 15 millirem per year was determined to be a safe limit.

We have decided for these last two buildings to switch to the CERCLA approach, and therefore, this is the objective which is in the -- in the EE/CA. And the objective is to lower the excess cumulative cancer risk to an individual from exposure to site contaminants in the soil to a nominal range of between 1 in 10 to the

minus 4 and 10 to the minus 6, which is between 1 in 10,000 risk and a one in a million risk using 10 to the minus 6 as a point of departure.

Now, what does "point of departure" mean? It means that we will strive to detect all the radionuclides at this risk level -- and we'll see in a later chart. I'll give you the -- the soil concentration limits which are -- are -- are applicable to these two ranges.

So we will strive to meet that. We will certainly meet the range. And that will be documented and presented to the public in a future meeting.

Okay. Next.

Now, what are the Agency's roles here? The EPA obviously regulates the whole CERCLA process. We have EPA participation and oversight as described in the 1995 joint EPA/DOE memo on the decommissioning which many of you are familiar with and which is in the Administrative Record.

The EPA reviewed and commented on the draft EE/CA. And their comments are incorporated fully and completely. They also specified what the removal action objectives would be in terms of the risk level that will be achieved.

The EPA will continue to participate in the program and review the final status survey and the

sampling plan for the final status survey.

The role of the DHS or the Radiologic Health Branch will be to do verification surveys following the removal of the building. Again doing the same process as had been done in the past.

Okay. Next.

So what -- what are the constituents of concern or the contaminants of concern that we're looking at? I've described that the primary radionuclides that we've found in the concrete are Europium-152 and Cobalt-60. So those are the primary radionuclides we would be looking at in the soil and the bedrock. However, we recognize that all these other isotopes are typically generated in any nuclear reactor. Typical fission products, for instance, are Cesium and Strontium. The other neutron-activation products include Helium, Europium-154, Iron, Nickel, Manganese, and Sodium -- Sodium-22. Now, we've included also Potassium-40 here. Now, that's a naturally occurring radionuclide which we will talk about later on.

The coolant in the NaK reactors was -- I'm sorry. The coolants in the SNAP reactors was NaK, an alloy of Sodium and Potassium. Now, the stable radioisotope of Potassium is Potassium-39. If it absorbs a neutron, it generates Potassium-40, then it will

potentially increase the normal levels of Potassium-40. So we're also looking for that.

We'll also look for all the nuclear fuel material which was in the reactor, namely, the isotopes of Uranium. And we will look for all the transuranic elements which are potentially generated during the nuclear process including Americium and all the Plutonium isotopes. I would add that we typically -- we've always looked for all these items and isotopes in the past also.

Okay. Next.

Okay. Now, hopefully most of you can see -- see this table. I know it's a little small for people sitting in the back. But these are all the -- all constituents of concern that I listed on the previous charts.

This column is the concentration in units of picocuries per gram which is the equivalent of a 10-6 risk goal. That is the EPA point of departure. These are the corresponding levels which are corresponding to the EPA's 10-4 risk level. So remember CERCLA has a risk range that we need to achieve. The EPA has stated that achieving anything in the risk range is fully protective of public health and environmental health.

So for most of the isotopes, almost all of these isotopes, one can achieve these kind of levels. Now,

there are two technical problems one has to overcome in achieving those levels. The first thing is that the radiochemistry lab that you send the soil samples to needs to be able to detect isotopes at those levels.

Now, for most of these they can readily detect these kind of levels. Some it would be a little bit of a challenge. For instance, for Europium-152, getting down to 0.04 may be a little difficult. We'll have to increase the count time. Something like naturally occurring Potassium-40. If one is to achieve 0.1, that may be a little difficult for a radiochemistry lab.

Just to put these numbers into comparison, if we look at the Potassium-40, for instance, 0.1, we can compare that with what we normally find in soil which could be anywhere between 10, 15, 20, maybe even 25 picocuries per gram. One could compare it with the typical Potassium-40 one finds in most of the food we eat which varies between 1 and 10 picocuries per gram and our own bodies, because of course we eat the food which is generated by plants and animals that have grown in -- in the soil, and typically that contains about 1 picocurie per gram. So the cleanup standard here of 0.1 is actually ten times less than what is already in our bodies. So it's very low. Okay. I've probably bored you enough on that slide.

Let me show you this now. Now, this is a very, a very busy slide. And I'll try to explain what it's supposed to be showing. We've done a lot of soil sampling in our past remediation activities. Our primary contaminants of concern is Cesium-137, which is a fission product. If we find any contaminants in the soil at all, it is usually Cesium with lower amounts of Strontium.

So what you're seeing here is -- is the theoretical risk from the residual Cesium-137 in soil after remediation. And it shows that we have met the CERCLA risk range of 10-6 and 10-4 in every single remediation project we've had.

Let's look at a few specific examples. The Sodium Disposal Facility here, which again has been discussed in many of our public meetings, was excavated in the early 1990s and then later in 1999. We sampled the residual soil, and the Department of Health Services also sampled the soil. And based on what we found was left there after remediation, we calculated a risk level of 1 in 10-7, which is -- which is a factor ten times lower than the lowest level of the acceptable risk range.

If you look at the SRE area up here, the Sodium Reactor Experiment, we see that we've achieved a risk level of 3 times -- 3.6 times 10-6. The highest risk number you see on the map here is 1 times 10-5. Now, that

is 90 percent of the way towards the 10-6 level -- well within the acceptable risk range, all of these results.

Okay. Next.

Okay. So in summary, we are instituting a -- a process here, a CERCLA process which includes EPA's participation and review and oversight and also public participation and comment.

We've looked at the two alternatives: No action and our preferred alternative, which is the complete removal and demolition of the building and disposal off-site of all the waste so produced.

Let's see. Additional information is -- on the EE/CA is available in the administrative record. That's a --

Would you like to hold that up?

That's all the documents which are the basis of the EE/CA and which were used in developing the EE/CA, which includes both the regulatory requirements and also the specific site documentation including the core sampling and the historical site assessment which we've described in previous -- previous public meetings.

All this is available in the three public repositories: The Simi Valley library, Platt library in West Hills, and CSUN library, and also on the DOE website.

We are requesting public comments this evening either verbal or written. All those public comments will be addressed in a revision to the EE/CA. And that's -- The revision will be also published on the website and put into the administrative record in the three repositories.

So with that -- I'm not sure we did our 20 minutes, but we were close. We'll throw it open now for comments.

MR. SMYTH: One second, Phil. A couple other things beforehand. I just wanted to assure you guys -- I know the presentation ran longer than advertised. We'll make sure that we provide ample time for everybody to provide comment, the comments that they'd like to.

Also want to introduce Guillermo Gonzalez in the back from Senator Feinstein's office. He arrived at the beginning of Phil's presentation.

And I omitted one way to provide comments. And I think Thomas addressed it in his presentation, but I just wanted to reiterate it. Tonight is not the only chance to provide comments. Officially, you were allowed to begin providing comments -- The public comment period opened in January 26. You can continue to provide them in writing through the mail at addresses that we'll make sure are up here. They're also in EE/CA. And they're in

the fact sheet that's a handout.

They're also -- I think one of the other things I was supposed to talk about and I forgot to in logistics, there's a revamped, revised, new DOE website on the Energy Technology & Engineering Center. And I think that web address is also available on the fact sheet. It's not in the EE/CA but it's on the fact sheet.

Any other ways to provide comments? Did I hit them all? Okay.

And in case you didn't see it, I had an example of what the comment page looked like out there in the hall. It's a little late to show you now after it's all wadded up. But that's what it looked like in case you want to provide written comment tonight.

I think what we'll try to do is see if there's an orderly progression to the microphone. If there's not, I'll ask you to raise your hand and I'll recognize you to go forward.

Dan. I'm not supposed to recognize you. It's different from the last meeting.

MR. HIRSCH: My name is Dan Hirsch. I'm president of the Committee to Bridge the Gap. And I'm outraged by both the abrogation of the law and by the substance of this proposal.

You folks have been given a dog-and-pony show

tonight, an hour of our time where they're supposed to listen to us. Instead, you've been listening to their spin and misrepresentations about what's being done.

Let me first talk about the claims Mr. Johnson made about trying to finally comply with the law. He mentioned a law called CERCLA -- that's Super Fund law -- and a 1995 joint policy that DOE had committed to clean up all of this site consistent with EPA's Super Fund criteria.

For many years now, his department has thumbed its nose at that requirement. And now he's announced to us that for the last two buildings they will supposedly comply.

Well, that's false in two ways: One is they're not complying, as I will disclose in a moment; and secondly, under that joint policy, the entire site was supposed to be cleaned up consistent with EPA's criteria. And so they're saying we're going to clean out the rest of it. We're going to leave all that contamination behind. We have frozen you out of the public process for years. And for the last two little buildings we're going to pretend to let you into the process if you pretend that we complied with CERCLA and the 1995 agreement. When I say "pretend," let me give you a few specifics.

Those of you came to the meeting got this post

card. There's not a word on the post card about this document called the EE/CA, its availability or comment period expiring February 28. It invites you to come to a meeting.

When you arrived, you're given a copy of the EE/CA. As you sit here, you have no time to read it. They claim that the meeting is to get your comments on a document you can't possibly have reviewed.

They published -- The sole public notice was two fine-print ads in the newspaper. The first ad said If you want more information, go to a certain website. If you click on that website, you get emptiness. Doesn't work.

The second ad when you click on to go to the website, you do get their website. But if you did it when the ad ran, there is not a word about the EE/CA. They showed you a moment ago what the website shows today. For the first two weeks after the notice went out when you went to the website, there wasn't anything about the EE/CA on it. You would go to a section called "Cleanup," and it would open up a page that said, "Under Construction."

So they've asked you to comment on something you haven't seen. They're now telling you you have seven days to get comments in on this document and that

administrative record. They're telling you today. The handout that they gave out to you as you walked in said "How do I comment?" You can comment today on the EE/CA which they say they're handing out today -- and none of you can read it because you've been sitting here listening to them -- or you can send in comments within seven days.

Now, that's not what the CERCLA law requires. They didn't notify, to the best of my knowledge, a single state legislator or federal legislator about the availability of the EE/CA or the comment period. They didn't notify a single reporter. They didn't send out a press release. They didn't make a phone call. There was a mailing list that has been generated of everybody that's concerned about this site. They did not send out a mailing saying, We have a document. We have 30 days. They didn't send out copies of the document. Instead, they sent out a misleading post card saying, Come to a public meeting, without mentioning there is a document, how to find it, or the comment period. So they're pretending that this is a session for you to comment on.

And so my first request is that you comply with the law, that you renotice this, that you mail out to your mailing list a notice that there is this document, that it is available now finally on the website --

And I'd ask you to actually mail out the document and announce a 45-day comment period from the time people get it.

-- that you notify each legislative office of this matter as well, and that you notify the press. This otherwise is simply a sham. Two fine-print ads in the newspaper with links to websites that don't work and a public meeting where they tell you to comment on something that they handed a minute before you walked in.

Well, there's an old saying. This is a different kind of meeting. We have a transcriber.

MR. SMYTH: I was just going to ask if you wanted anybody to respond to your first --

MR. HIRSCH: No. This is my public comment. I hope that you will positively say, yes, we'll get an extension to the comment period so maybe documents may be available.

You mentioned that the administrative record is available now finally on the website and you just showed us the page. But when I went on the website, it tells us you have to go to the reading room, the library to see the administrative records. I'm not even sure that your statement that it's now available on the website is true. What you showed us on the website says the opposite. You can't get it from the website.

MR. SMYTH: We'll -- Okay.

MR. HIRSCH: Excuse me? We had a notice issued on January 26 or January 27 that there was a 30-day comment period on the EE/CA and to go to the website to obtain it. It was not on the website at that time at all. Okay?

Now, let's get to the substance of what they're proposing. And they've slid over it really beautifully, really beautifully.

The first thing that Phil Rutherford told you is they're going to get rid of all the radioactivity. All the contamination is going to be removed. But then he shows you a chart showing how much radioactivity they're going to leave behind.

He told you that the Environmental Protection Agency has signed off on this. False. EPA in December of 2003 issued a detailed letter which they continue to stand by saying that this site will not be safe at least for unrestricted use, which is their plan to make it residential; that they have not adequately characterized the site; that the only safe use would be limited day hikes with restrictions on picnicking; and that they have not followed the EPA requirements for cleanup; and that they are not using safe and protective cleanup standards. None of it has been revoked by EPA. They told us just in

the last days they stand by that letter.

DOE has ignored all of those EPA comments. In January, EPA issued a second letter dealing with this particular project, not with any of the prior projects. It says that this EE/CA -- E-E-C-A, which is a term of CERCLA -- violates EPA's guidance on how you're supposed to do these kind of cleanups.

DOE has not done anything to fix that. It continues to violate it. It continues to issue what they call a streamlined EE/CA. Let me tell you what is meant by "streamlined."

The fundamental principle to EE/CA is that it's supposed to identify the proposed cleanup level, how much they're going to leave behind of the radioactivity so the public can comment on it.

The actual EE/CA that they've given us here says, After the comment period expires a, quote, unquote, risk management decision will be made as to how much radioactivity to leave behind. Doesn't say who will make it. Doesn't say how or what criteria. It simply says that someone after you no longer have an opportunity to comment will decide how much radioactivity to leave behind. And as Phil has indicated in their presentation, their intention is to leave a hundred times as much as the table that he's shown you in that slide.

Is it possible to get that table again, the one that appears on the notice?

Let me tell you what he didn't tell you. First of all, he said that that is the EPA's 10-6 risk goal. It's false. EPA has said over and over and over again that these numbers -- the numbers you need for Americium-241, Cobalt-60, and so on -- has to be based on the land use that is feasible for this property and that would reduce the greatest exposure.

This land is zoned RA-5, Rural Agricultural 5 -- small ranchettes where you can have goats and gardens and orchards, which is in fact the use for a number of people around the site at present. It is the current zoning. Under EPA guidance, you have to use that current zoning if that produces the most restrictive doses, the most restrictive cleanup.

What Phil didn't tell you is that these numbers here are not based on current zoning, not based on RA-5, but are based on suburban residential and that these numbers are a hundred times higher from many of those radionuclides than what EPA would permit.

Instead of being a 10-6 risk, as he says up here, most of those numbers are in fact 10-4, a hundred times higher risk already as a point of departure. That means that the column to the right, which is what Phil is

really going to end up at, is a hundred times higher than what he claims is the EPA goal, which is already a hundred times higher than what the EPA goal really is, that the actual cleanup that they are contemplating is 10,000 times more radioactivity than the EPA would normally permit.

But they're not going to let you comment about it, first of all. Second of all, they're not going to tell you the truth about it. And third, the actual decision is to be made, quote, unquote -- see if I can find the quote -- "After the comment period is all over, quote, a risk management decision will be made."

The purpose of CERCLA is to have the public involved in this management decision. The purpose is to be able to have you have a say in how much radioactivity is left behind. So despite the claim that they finally complied with CERCLA, the EPA guidance, they continue to ignore EPA's past comments and they continue to evade EPA's guidance both on public participation -- the straw to have you comment on something you haven't seen, but the substance as well.

Let me tell you a couple of other problems with this document which if you had had a chance to read you would still have trouble finding it because it's buried. They intend to release the contaminated -- radioactively

contaminated material, send it not to a licensed radioactive waste disposal site but to an unlicensed facility neither licensed for radioactive material nor designed for them.

They will say in the document they're going to call everything in the building and all of the soil that is beneath the top cleanup level, the one that is the least protective -- anything between that and background they're going to call something that is decommissioned material which means radioactively contaminated but which they're going to evade the law that that stuff has to go to a licensed facility. It appears likely that it will be sent to a place called Buttonwillow which is a place where there is a long history of environmental justice in the central valley. They may send it elsewhere.

You probably remember that they got into a lot of trouble because they were sending some of this to local landfills -- the Sunshine Canyon, Bradley, and Calabasas. Without disclosing it, without telling you the implications they are now saying they're going to distribute most of the radioactive waste where there is no assessment of the environmental impact. Just silent about that.

One other matter, they do put in a table -- It's a false table based on the wrong scenario. They

misrepresented it, but they do put in a table of what they're going to be looking for in terms of their initial sweep for the dirt in contaminated soil. But they don't even put any cleanup standards for the building. You're asked to comment on cleanup of buildings and they don't even put into the document what the standard is for cleaning up the building. That's hidden from you as well.

So Phil said that EPA's position is that anything in that risk range from 1 in 10,000 to 1 in a million risk -- anything in that -- is protected. You can go anywhere you want to in that risk range. He clearly intends to go to the highest, to the 10-4 level, which I told you is really 10-2, which means one in a hundred. Every hundredth person would get cancer, grossly outside of what has ever been permitted for carcinogen.

But he says that EPA says that's fine, that you can do it anywhere in the risk range and that's false. The EPA CERCLA guidance is clear. And they say they're going to try to comply with it for once. They aren't. The EPA guidance is clear. If you can't meet 10-6 risk, a one in a million risk, you can fall back somewhat if you can show you really can't meet it. But you can only fall back to the absolute minimum necessary. And you

demonstrate it by balancing a nine balancing criteria on the CERCLA. And to do that balancing, there has to be public participation. And you have to get as close to the 10-6 as you can.

But Phil described it, "We can do anything we want to between 10-6 and 10-4," which means when he told you that no longer is it 15 millirem, they're intending to do the same they thing they always planned to do -- leave these huge quantities of radioactivity behind.

Now, they have also said that the fundamental sin in environmental law is to artificially segment an analysis of environmental impact. Do you know that there has never been an environmental impact statement done? A quarter of a million dollars in the only place in the world there has been meltdown of a reactor. There has been serious accidents at three others on the property. They've got a Tritium plume in the soil. They have never done an environmental impact statement. And what they're now doing with this is they're segmenting, looking at one building, looking at another building and, now, looking that they claim under CERCLA but they're not going to do the rest of it under CERCLA and they're telling you they're going to leave the property sometime and release it for unrestricted housing. I'm going to make one other point at the moment and then I'm going to stop. I want

to let other people come. I want to get my stuff in the record. I know you're going to be frustrated because the record is asking you to comment on a document you weren't permitted to see.

But one other comment: Phil told you that there were only two alternatives possible. And what he said was our way or no way. Clean it up the way they're proposing, which is to very lax standards -- huge risk -- or not clean it up at all. Pretty remarkable that those are the only two choices.

Those aren't the only two choices. The real choices are to clean it up consistent with CERCLA, to clean it up consistent with the current zoning, to clean it up to as close to 10-6 as is humanly possible.

So he's told you, We want to leave a ton of stuff behind and your choice is to let us leave the ton of radioactive stuff behind or let us leave all of it behind.

Those aren't the two choices and that violates CERCLA also. It makes a mockery of attempting to comply with public participation. It misrepresents that EPA has signed off. It misrepresents that the public has had meaningful comments. It says, for example, that we will after the comment period is over figure out how we're going to measure for these radioactive materials, but the

public will be frozen out of that as well.

It says that EPA has signed off on all these public comments. False. It said that EPA had to review the sampling analysis plan that's supposed to be done before the cleanup starts. Boeing, DOE, same thing changed that despite what EPA had demanded. So EPA now doesn't get to comment about the sampling before it's done in terms of the finding of the contamination, it only gets to comment about the post-cleanup final survey. EPA gets to at least comment on that one. You're frozen out of both. And this is with a company that is a convicted environmental felon indicted by an environmental grand jury, pled guilty to multiple environmental crimes, has a history of fabricating its radiation and chemical data. And so you're left out of that as well. And none of the protocols are in the EE/CA to even available to comment. But they're pretending you have input. So it's a fraud and people will be hurt, injured, die because their intention is to leave vast amounts of radioactivity behind and then put homes on top of it, which EPA has said is unsafe and yet it's been characterized now as if it's okay.

Okay. I'm going to sit down. And you all should comment if you can. But I would urge you, if you feel you can't comment meaningfully because you're handed

a document as you walked in and ask for that extension and ask for them to mail that out to everybody and ask that they start disclosing in the document the true aspects of the cleanup that you ought to be able to comment on rather than hiding them until after the comment period is over so that you really haven't had a chance to comment on it at all.

That's enough for me. Thank you.

MR. SMYTH: Response or just -- Do you have anything you want to say Thomas or just more comment?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, we'll take everything that Dan has said under advisement. It's there in the records, so I'll go through them. It's kind of hard for me to follow the many claims that Dan made during his speech.

A couple things that I'll absolutely respond to right now saying that we did not provide this EE/CA in good faith. And I would say to you that that's absolutely false. We did provide this document in good faith. We did provide the document to EPA for their review and their comment. And I know that as a matter of fact, through my multiple discussions that I had with the EPA representatives for this document.

Now, where Dan gets the source of his information I'm not exactly sure, but I know from my

multiple discussions with the EPA representatives they had an opportunity to comment on the document as it exists today.

MR. HIRSCH: I just want to clarify for the record because we have a transcript and this is probably going to end up in court.

I didn't say you didn't give it to the EPA. I said you didn't give it to the public. I said you ignored EPA's prior comments. The EE/CA was not up on the website when you published the ad, the URLs on the ad didn't take you to the proper website. You didn't mention the EE/CA in the mailing that was sent out to the public, its availability, comment period. You handed it to the people as they came in today. You didn't try to stimulate news stories, and you didn't notify the legislators.

So all you did was place two ads in fine print in newspapers with incorrect information in them and then hand stuff out to people as they walked into a meeting and comment, and if you can't comment now we'll give you seven days. That's what I said. I didn't say you didn't give it to the EPA. I said you didn't give it to them.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Next. Sir...?

MR. McLAIN: My name is Bob McLain (phonetic). And I worked at North American Aviation, Rockwell

International, and Boeing for 42 years. I started out in the Reactor Physics Group which is next to the sodium fire disposal area. And I worked in Building 24 during the latter part of its existence.

And one comment I'd like to make is during the operation and sodium graphite reactor facility we had the air monitor go off in the control room and we traced the cause of that to a Russian nuclear explosion atmospheric test in Siberia. And that's the only time that that air monitor went off except for calibration when you put a source up to it.

I was responsible for all the research electronics for several facilities on the hill. I did experiments in fast critical reactor, the sodium graphite reactor. I did debugging and repair of modification to the nuclear instrumentation for the helium reactor in Lincoln, Nebraska, where we had -- The problem we solved there was they had 600 instrument scrams during the operation due to statistical noise in the electronics and also over thermal -- over thermal temperature gradients in the reactor.

The problem with this was all of these were false alarms because the -- the plant protective system was an analog computer that was based on magnetic amplifiers which were powered by line voltage. And

during the summer storms there, they had -- all of a sudden you go along, you have one volt drop on the line voltage which got -- when it was amplified by the magnetic amplifier, it would tell it was a 600-volt -- degree transient other a reactor and it would shut it down. So we -- we went through that. So I had that experience with nuclear design.

I designed the electronics for the Loose Parts Monitoring System for nuclear reactors and that was the system that traced the hydrogen bubble during the Three Mile Island reactor. I designed the electronics for the Atomics International Loose Reactor Inspection System for using all sign testing. I designed that. I designed --

MR. SMYTH: I don't mean to interrupt you, sir. You have an amazing technical background. Do you have a comment on Building 24?

MR. McLAIN: Yes.

MR. SMYTH: Okay.

MR. McLAIN: So during -- The questions I have are something that was brought up. I wasn't here to be available here during the last thing. I was undergoing chemotherapy. And during that day that I wanted to come I had one of those pumps on me. And the thing that concerned me then was why one of the reasons I came that I was told by the nurse Lorraine that took the pump off

that she was also treated somebody for Cesium poisoning at -- from Rocketdyne. And I don't know where she got this information. But it gives me great concern. And also it gives me great concern when I reviewed the -- the epidemiology study that was done on -- I was one of the basis -- or one of the principals in that study and then they threw out everybody's radiation data before that was off-site that had nothing to do -- you know, and the person that operated the sodium graphite experiments -- experiment -- sodium SRE, during the so-called meltdown, the director of operations at that time had 73 man-years of radiation and 71 of them were received at the -- at the University of California Radiation Lab, you know, at Berkeley. And all the nuclear reactor operators on the hill came from the navy submarine program for the most part.

And I'd like to ask you, How do you escape nuclear radiation from the -- when you're on a submarine?

So they throw out all this data. So to me the person that had all this radiation exposure, most of it off-site, that was thrown out of this so-called epidemiology study retired at 68 --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We need to keep this focused on Building 24.

MR. McLAIN: Well, I know, ma'am.

MR. SMYTH: I understand, ma'am.

MR. McLAIN: But when somebody gets up and refutes, because I worked in that building. And I want to finally get to my experience --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What type of cancer do you have?

MR. McLAIN: I had colon cancer but it had nothing to do with radiation.

MR. SMYTH: Sir, because the purpose of the meeting is Building 24 disposal, if you could --

MR. McLAIN: Okay.

MR. SMYTH: If there's other topics you're interested in talking about, we'll write them down and try to focus them at --

MR. McLAIN: The main focus is when I saw the comments that were up there that that building is like it was a big -- that was a -- it was a very short-lived reactor program because right after it -- that building started up, they did very few low-powered experiments and then the programs were over. And I did an experiment called the SNAP-Tran (phonetic) and where we used the cell because of the radiation shielding of that cell, we did an experiment there where I had to take my measuring electronics and put it inside shielding blocks inside the cell because of it, you know. And we used the operating

reactor instrumentation. And the biggest problem we had there, that they had somebody wire up the stuff that was color-blind and so that was the worst problem we had at that. But the facility was used as a analog laboratory, as a machine shop for the general purpose of the hill. And there was no -- And I was -- used that building and there was no problem with anything.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Do you have any other comment on the proposed demolition?

MR. McLAIN: Yeah. There was one other comment I have is -- is -- is there anyway of including radon background from the building in these tables?

MR. SMYTH: Okay.

MR. McLAIN: Because this is the thing that the risk factor I think is because I'm very familiar with what went on because I worked at the CT facility on the hill when most of this stuff were on, and I just saw it on the -- as at the side and I know --

MR. SMYTH: So if radon can be included as a contaminant of concern?

MR. McLAIN: No. I'm just saying I don't see how you can clean up this building to so-called EPA standards without and then get below background --

MR. SMYTH: -- because of radon?

MR. McLAIN: -- because of radon.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Liz?

MS. CRAWFORD: Hi. My name is Elizabeth Crawford. I run the website rocketdynewatch.org. I also educate physicians for social responsibilities. I worked for Ventura County Supervisor Linda Parks for two and a half years as her environmental specialist. And I represented the communities of Bell Canyon and Ahmanson Ranch.

Been following this for about 6 years now. And I have to say that I unfortunately echo Dan's opinion which is, you know, same old stuff, different day.

Anyway, I would like to start out by saying, we were told by the Department of Energy that Mike Lopez was fired for obstructing public participation answering for your requests and so forth. And then they said, Oops, I guess we shouldn't have said that.

So I hope that it does indeed represent a new era in change in the DOE and Boeing's approach to this whole site. And I would say unfortunately this doesn't bode well for a new opening leaf. I have to say, again, that this whole notification process is certainly less than satisfactory. In six years, I've certainly never seen less notification for a plan or a meeting or anything like that and especially something as critical

as one of the two remaining buildings on-site.

Ordinarily, in case you don't know since you've just been on this site for a month -- I don't know how it works, but the process that has been followed, the process that I understand that is legal by under CERCLA and that has been operating here is you notify the stakeholders that there is a plan, you tell them where they get the plan, and you let them know when the clock starts running. So I would have to say definitely on behalf of everybody here I would urge very strongly that DOE indeed institute a 45-day comment period so that indeed now that we know there's a document, now that we have it we can actually go home and in a reasonable amount of time absorb the information, make our comments in the way that we're used to making comments, in a way that is indeed consistent with established California and federal law. I think that would go a long way towards showing how DOE does indeed approach this process.

I would like to say also, this is a non-time-critical cleanup. And I'm kind of wondering, What's the hurry? We have a document here -- one of the operating licenses says that decommissioning and decontamination of the site was done, finished in 1978. And then it said it is assumed this -- this building will stay here for a very long time to allow it to cool down.

And I'm sure that when you look at the lives of these radionuclides, some of them lasting 250,000 years, that 16 or 19 years is really not what they had in mind when they say a very long time to let it decay. So I would like to put that on the record.

I would like to point out in case anybody hasn't seen it that I think that the DOE puts a sharp point on their new banners. Check out some of their cleanup sites, and it says, "Making accelerated cleanups a reality." What's the fastest way you know to accelerate a cleanup? It's not by pouring more money into it. It's not by running more tests. And it's not by cleaning it up. It's by declassifying stuff from high level to medium or medium to low and calling it something that it's not and then disposing of it in the Calabasas landfill. There SNAP reactor buildings going to the Calabasas landfill. No kidding. That's what they're saying.

Okay. So you really need to get your head around what they're talking about here because the scope of this is just astonishing. "Making accelerated cleanups a reality"? How about safe cleanups, we don't care how much it costs? In dealing with easily a dozen different agencies -- state, federal, county, local, community-based, homeowners associations -- in my life

I've never seen anything put out by any agency supposed to be in charge of our protection that has the word cost analysis associated with it.

High risk management. Words say everything and you guys are wearing it all over your sleeve. What's fastest, what's cheapest, what's quickest, and what's gets us the heck out of here the fastest. You're coming into a very nasty situation, sir. I really don't feel -- I'm sorry. You really are being walking just into a malestrom here.

I would like to say -- again, duplicate what Dan said about the sort of shell game that was played with the numbers in terms of residential versus rural versus industrial. That's exactly what it is. It is a numbers shell game. I would like to see DOE use only residential EPA standards as the only measurement here because that's the only bank of numbers that we can trust.

Why are the DOE offices on-site now at SSFL? And can somebody please explain to me what the difference is between you guys? because you sit together, you eat together, you talk together, you work together. And we can't see any difference. Maybe there is a difference. I'd like to have enunciated and, more importantly, I'd like to be told where the divisions and where the separations are.

MR. SMYTH: Liz, just for clarification, you mean between DOE people or between DOE and Boeing?

MS. CRAWFORD: DOE and Boeing. We can't tell the difference. Can somebody please explain the difference between the two roles? Somebody? Phil?

MR. SMYTH: You're asking -- That's a question?

MS. CRAWFORD: Somebody. Can somebody please explain? because this is a new change. Is it DOE has moved on-site to SSFL? It's a little odd, so I'd like you to give you this opportunity to get that question answered.

MR. JOHNSON: That one question?

MS. CRAWFORD: That one question. Everything has been a comment on that point. This is number 5.

MR. JOHNSON: One of the reasons why I'm here or why DOE now has a full-time presence on that site is that we want to focus on the cleanup and finish up the remediation there on that site. Some of the remediation there is taking considerable length of time. That site's operation ceased in '88. And we're sitting here in 2007 and there are still several facilities there on that site.

MS. CRAWFORD: And may I add that there is screechingly little information and documentation on what happened to all of the other buildings until EPA got

involved. That was part of what we were asking Mike Lopez for. So actually there has not been much disclosure about what happened until then. So it's just like we've only got a very brief glance about what has been going on up there. So that's why we're extra careful about the last little bits of it.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm here and I'm not going anywhere. So you're going to see me quite often as we try and clean up the site. My responsibility is to make sure that the public is involved in the cleanup process. In spite of what may have happened there in the past, it is my responsibility and the Department's commitment that the public will have an opportunity to comment on the work that we're doing there on that site. And this was the first attempt, first project that I had there on that site. And I'm trying to make sure that it happened. There have been a number of claims here through the night or throughout this evening as to how much -- whether this is a sham or not -- it's not a sham. We really are trying to involve the public in the process.

MS. CRAWFORD: You understand how you've really -- I'm sorry -- stumbled out of the starting block on that one? That was not public notification.

MR. JOHNSON: I've heard the comment.

MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah. Okay. I mean, it violates

the law and it's, you know, really disingenuous. I mean, just for the future, I'm just trying to tell you why we are so upset at that because it doesn't follow CERCLA law and it doesn't follow the precedent that has been long-standing in this community about proper mailing, proper notification about 30-day comment periods, about the availability of documents that you know impact the site. It's extraordinarily important and I can't urge you strongly enough to agree to a 45-day extension to hopefully rectify the problem.

Anyway, and maybe it was a comment about the seeming indivisibility between Boeing and DOE, but I would -- I would say that this is a grand step up from what we have been subjected to in the prior DOE meetings in the last few years which is a set of posters, cookies, and no opportunity to get questions answered. So this really is a wonderful opportunity and we really appreciate that you turned this format.

And so I would just say this -- this -- it's a streamlined EE/CA. You can't stream anything -- streamline anything. I'm sorry. Not in this community. Not on this site. Not on this project. Cross all the Ts, dot all the Is.

I did download four copies of the EPA comment letter January 11 on this plan. And they do say you're

streamlining. They do say you're not following CERCLA. They do say that your standards are not EPA-cleanup-compliant with residential use, which is what they have been on record for the past seven years as doing. So I have to back up everything that Dan said because the facts do speak in his favor.

Thank you very much.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you, Liz.

And a couple -- Just a second. I have a couple things to say. In case anybody hasn't noticed, there's a line forming if you want to speak at the microphone. I've also -- A member of the audience asked me if you guys -- if you want to, you certainly don't have to -- when you identify yourselves, if you could also identify your technical background. The comment was they're not sure where the comments are coming from.

MR. HIRSCH: Who said that?

MR. SMYTH: A member of the audience.

Go ahead. Certainly up to you whether you want to identify your background or not.

MS. KLEA: My name is Bonnie Klea, and I'm a former worker on the SNAP program and a cancer survivor. And I'd like to say I support everything that Liz and Dan said. We need a longer comment period. And also I'd like to reprimand you people for not putting any notices

in the papers in the San Fernando Valley. Not the Daily News and not the Los Angeles Times. And your report said that you were going to do that and you didn't.

Anyway, I have a series of questions. I'd like to know how would you be cutting up the concrete so it's of size to move when there is no hot lab to protect the process? The hot lab is gone and the hot lab was used in the past to cut up concrete so it could fit on a truck and be taken out. Now, how are you going to -- how are you going to make these pieces down to a size that's -- that you can transport and protect -- protect the air, protect the workers and protect the community?

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Let me speak to see who Thomas wants to have answer that.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Hi, Bonnie. How are you?

MS. KLEA: Hi, Phil.

MR. RUTHERFORD: When we did the Building 59 excavation in 2004, we had a similar -- a similar projects requirements in that we cut up the concrete into blocks. We did air monitoring to assure there was no airborne contamination generated.

MS. KLEA: Are their records of that air monitoring?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, indeed there are.

MS. KLEA: Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: And we -- we disposed of the concrete blocks to the Nevada test site which is a low-level waste facility. We did not need to do it in a hot lab. The Building 24 contaminated -- some concrete is much less contaminated than the 59 was. So it's less of a hazard when you demolish it. In fact, in this case, it would be rubblized within the building itself before the building is torn down, so it would be rubblized within the cells. Remember they are 9 feet thick. And then they'll be container- -- containerized and then shipped off-site to the Nevada test site.

MS. KLEA: Now, I read that, in 1978, 2000 square feet was already taken away from that building. Do you know where that went and what was removed?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I'm not familiar with that. But I am familiar with what was taken away in 2005. That was a material that the Dan was referring to.

MS. KLEA: No. This is 1978.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Let me -- Let me check on that. I'm not familiar with that reference that you cite.

MS. KLEA: Okay. Just stay there. Where are they going to get the backfill from to fill in this site?

MR. RUTHERFORD: The backfill will be piled up. It will be sampled. If we verify that it's clean, then

it will be used as backfill.

MS. KLEA: So you're just going to take it from the same area to backfill it, surrounding the reactor?

MR. RUTHERFORD: We will sample the soil. And if it's verified that it is not contaminated, then we'll just put it back. If it is contaminated, then we will use -- use backfill from an off-site, borrowed site.

MS. KLEA: Okay. Now, there have been studies done that the route of transport for this stuff has a high cancer rate. Can you tell us which route will be used?

MR. RUTHERFORD: We used the route -- Are you familiar with the neighborhood obviously? We will be driving down Woolsey Canyon. And we will then either go through Chatsworth Lake Manor, through Plummer, and make a left on Topanga Canyon, north to the Simi Valley Freeway. We'll head east to Highway 5. We'll go north on Highway 5, and then on to Highway 14, and then across the desert to the Nevada test site in Nevada. So that's one option.

Another alternative is to -- to go along Roscoe Boulevard on Topanga Canyon and then the same route.

MS. KLEA: Any other routes?

MR. RUTHERFORD: No, those are the only routes.

MS. KLEA: Just those two?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Those are the routes that we take to the Nevada test site, and also similar routes for the decommissioned material if we send it to Kettleman Hills which of course is in the central valley. So, again, you'll go up Highway 5 and it's in the central valley.

MS. KLEA: Okay. Do you know the risk of cancer during the demolition for the workers and for the surrounding community? because I did read in the Tiger Team report that all demolition does release radionuclides to the community.

MR. RUTHERFORD: The risk is extremely low and controlled and managed. As I said, the radioactive concrete will be removed from the building while it is still intact. Okay?

MS. KLEA: But you have to saw it. Right? You have to saw it to make smaller pieces?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Some of it will be sawed. Some of it will be rubblized.

MS. KLEA: So there would be a potential release of dust?

MR. RUTHERFORD: -- within the sealed building. We'd be using normal dust suppression methods. We'll be doing air monitoring to ensure that the airborne contamination doesn't exceed the regulations.

MS. KLEA: Okay. Also, I'd like to add one more thing to my employment at the company. I spent two weeks ago five meetings with the Labor Department, and I met very few people that used to work at the site who don't have cancer. I met a lot of widows, and I met a lot of children who have lost their fathers. And I can tell you that there is an extreme amount of cancer among the employees.

MS. GARCIA: Hi. I'm here on behalf of Senator Sheila Kuehl. My name is Hilda Garcia to ask you to extend the public comment period so that people can have enough time to voice their concerns. Thank you.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you. Guillermo?

MR. GONZALEZ: Hi. I'm Guillermo Gonzalez from Senator Feinstein's office. And I think earlier it was referenced that the public comment period started on January 27. Our office was never made aware of that date. And I would also ask that the public comment period be extended. Thank you.

MR. SMYTH: Thanks.

MR. PARKS: Good evening. My name is Dan Parks, P-a-r-k-s. And I just have a couple of things to say. First of all, were any of you gentlemen that have all of these eloquent facts -- were you there when any of this was going on? Were you there?

MR. McLAIN: Yes.

MR. PARKS: Where were you?

MR. McLAIN: I was on the hill in -- in working electronics all over the hill.

MR. PARKS: You worked in --

MR. McLAIN: I worked in Building 59, the SRE --

MR. SMYTH: Gentlemen --

MR. PARKS: I'm not going to argue. I'm making my comment.

MR. McLAIN: I was in Building 24. I just made the comment. Weren't you listening?

MR. PARKS: Do you know me?

MR. McLAIN: No.

MR. PARKS: I got my certification there. Worked there about two and a half years in Building 24. Never saw you before.

Okay. Sorry about that.

First of all, how many of you were really there to see what transpired during its peak years? I predict that maybe one or two, possibly this gentleman. I don't see anybody that I recognize.

There were numerous fires that went on there, especially in Building 24, Building 10. And there were nuclear fires. So you have to think that, Where did that contamination go at the time of the fire?

Sorry I'm not good at public speaking, but --

MR. SMYTH: You're doing fine.

MR. PARKS: -- I'm doing the best I can.

MS. KLEA: Stay close to the mike.

MR. PARKS: Okay. There were numerous fires in Building 10, 24, and Building 59.

That's about all I got to say. You know, none of you were there.

And incidentally, I do have some more to say. I was in health physics. I was in health physics department. I was in reactor operations. I received two certifications for the Reactor Operations Department. I got my certification as a health physicist there to work on the hill. So I have a pretty good memory of what transpired during that period of time.

One last comment is, I'd like to talk about the De Soto facility. Everybody seems to forget about De Soto. That's where a lot of nuclear work was transpired. And that's where the fuel was fabricated. And nobody seems to be addressing De Soto. 8900 De Soto. Look into that. Thank you very much.

MS. CRAWFORD: I'd like to answer that. We have asked time after time after time, Where are the operating information on De Soto and also the Canoga facility where they did tons of nuclear reactions? And you know

what? We've been stonewalled for six years. Thank you, Mr. Parks, for bringing that --

MR. SMYTH: Actually, let's keep focused on Building 24.

MR. PARKS: Okay. There was a radioactive fire in Building 24. It was in the center vault. I was there the night it occurred. I know the people involved. I'm not going to say names, but I was there. But these things are never brought up.

And then there was a nuclear fire in Building 10 where the SAPR was operating. I was an operator there at the time. So I think you guys should talk about those issues too.

MS. KLEA: Dan, what years were those?

MR. PARKS: I'm sorry. I'm not good with dates. I really don't have the dates.

MS. KLEA: '60s? '70s?

MR. PARKS: -- in the '60s. I don't have the exact date.

I went to work there right after the SRE fire happened. And I participated in the cleanup of the SRE.

And this gentleman spoke of the contamination of the Russian test. Sure, we picked it up daily. But that was just part of the background. In the fires and the various incidents that happened, they're much more

catastrophic that you guys really are even aware of because you weren't there.

And we talk about log books. Log books will give you so much data on what happened in each of these facilities. So don't discount them. I don't know whether we've ever found them, but everyone had a log book. And the shift supervisor was required to fill it out hourly and daily. And they don't talk about the fires. They don't talk about the incidents. They don't talk about the spills. They don't talk about the people that got burned. We had one death up there in that facility. I don't know what the number was, but there was a death in the SNAP area from a fire, I believe, or in a pit it occurred. But nevertheless somebody lost their life.

You know, I've given you facts that happened back in the '60s. You know, that's a long time ago. But I wish I could be more precise and be more eloquent as a speaker, but there's a lot of emotion here involved. And I get a little bit mad and angry for the way this thing has been covered up. And you have people like Bonnie here who have cancer and God only knows how many other people in this community.

MR. SMYTH: It sounds like there's a lot of topics that you have on your mind.

MR. PARKS: Yeah, there's a lot of topics to discuss. You know, when you talk about 24, it's just you want to --

MR. SMYTH: I understand it's a narrow topic. Maybe one thing you could do is meet with Thomas after the meeting or Ravnesh or any of the DOE or Boeing representatives and they can try to take down your comments. I guess they are taken down, but address them at a future meeting.

MR. PARKS: Could I just say one more thing?

MR. SMYTH: Sure.

MR. PARKS: You're talking about cutting up Building 24, taking it down, and putting it in -- Well, you couldn't get big pieces of cement in that vault -- in that middle vault. I mean, it's a small door. And you talk about putting three -- taking down three stories, and putting it and taking it inside and cutting it up in that little aluminum vault. That's impossible. You know, this is a pretty large facility with lots of cement and lots of aluminum. So I don't know how you could do that. You might be able to get that in the substructure above, but you're not going to take down that aluminum. It's impossible.

Thank you.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Hello. My name is Barbara Johnson. I have been working on this as a community member since 1989 when it was first discovered that there was a problem up there.

In 1990, I got breast cancer which I firmly believe was caused by pollution from the site because I lived right below it.

I want to thank people like Dan Hirsch, Cleanup Rocketdyne, Rocketdyne Watch, new people that have come on here to help the community have a voice and be heard and be listened to.

What your plans tonight that you're showing about cleaning up Building 24, I'm going to do an analogy. When I had my cancer, I didn't just have them take out the cancer; I went through radiation and chemotherapy.

Sorry. I'm going to get emotional on this.

I now have a son who has cancer. When he was growing up, he played in the hills up there. He rode his motorcycle. He -- He jumped into some of the streams and creeks that were there. He played in the caves that were up in there where water was seeping down, probably polluted water from Rocketdyne. But little did we know that at the time.

Now he's getting treatment for his cancer.

They've found in his lymph nodes that he has squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. They could not find the primary source and they did take out the lymph nodes. But instead of saying, Oh, we took the lymph nodes out. We took the cancer out. We're not going to do anything else. This is what I can liken to what you're doing to Building 24. Instead, he is going through horrific treatment where he's had seven weeks of radiation to his entire mouth because they couldn't find the primary source. And if he had done like you're saying you're going to do at Rocketdyne, he wouldn't have had this chemo. He wouldn't have had the radiation. He would have said, Oh, they took the cancer out. I'm not going to do anything more.

This is systemic. Cancer is systemic. You've got to treat the whole problem. And I would advise you -- urge you not to release this for public use.

Thank you.

MS. WALSH: Hi. My name is Christina Walsh. I represent cleanuprocketdyne.org, and there were several comments I wanted to make that have been very well put already.

First off, the comment period must be extended 45 days. This has not been noticed and that is illegal. That cannot be allowed.

Now, this afternoon when I desperately started skimming through these reports, I -- I tried to read through as much as I could trying to make sense of what kind of questions would I ask. And then I thought about this -- this consulting company prepared by Sapere Consulting, Incorporated, and The Boeing Company. Does that mean that The Boeing Company actually got paid for writing the report about the damage they've done up on the hill? That I find to be astonishing, first of all.

So I did a Google search on Sapere Consulting, Incorporated, to see what I could learn about this consulting because we keep getting new ones. Every time we get a new presentation, we have a new set of consultants that are going to tell us new, happy stories about how nothing really happened. Right. Sir?

Okay. So this -- So I did a Google search. And the first line is a report also prepared by Sapere Consulting -- and I'm sorry if I'm mispronouncing that -- and The Boeing Company for the Department of Energy under contract DE-AC03, and this is for the Santa Susana Field Laboratory, but it's dated May 2005. Also Boeing made money writing this report. It is 36 pages in length. And it goes through all of those buildings --

Liz, you mentioned that I think it's nearly 200 buildings -- 200 buildings that used to be in Area 4 that

were removed before any oversight or any EPA was involved at all.

This report is page after page after page of each building, what it was. And then the next page, it will put it in a different group. And then say, No, change the number from 4633 to 4075, and then refer it over to 4836 -- no, 4636. 36 pages of just nonsense like that.

I would hand it to Dan Hirsch, but I'm sure it would make his head explode because it is absolute, utter nonsense. And I ask you how it is that this is how time and money is being spent as people like Barbara Johnson, like her son, like so many people that are sitting in this audience that may have come directly from their chemotherapy -- Okay? This is not the way people to go about things. And now you're going to -- When you're calling this streamlined, this is not acceptable. You need to find the truth, which means you need to actually look where you know the problem is and not pretend that you can just put a plastic bubble, as my friend Bill Bowling (phonetic) mentioned. What a great idea that would be. That's not what we need to do. So we really need to look and find the truth.

Thank you.

MS. ROWE: Hi. I'm Chris Rowe. I live in West

Hills. And I have a bachelor's in health education from CSUN, masters level courses in environmental health and environmental geology.

I became aware of this site about 15 years ago in my environmental engineering classes at CSUN and received as a resident of West Hills a disclosure letter that right now, since it was 15 years ago, I don't know what agency sent it to me. But it says that where I live in West Hills is a prevailing winds area implying that something is coming off the site at Rocketdyne that's impacting me 5 miles as the crow flies. And as Liz and other people mentioned, I also live very close to the other Rocketdyne sites.

Now, I've got a number of issues that I want to address. First of all, we sit here and we say, The EPA says this, the EPA says that; DOE says this, DOE says that. Well, therefore, it should be a joint meeting so that we have people from both agencies here at the same time.

Next, I'd like to say that if I hadn't come to the couple previous meetings -- I just started coming in the fall because of my own personal needs -- and I'll go into that in a second -- but if I hadn't been to previous meetings, I would not have known about this meeting tonight if I hadn't gone to the DTSC meeting about two

weeks ago.

I know, because I am more or less a health advocate activist, that if you want to reach groups there are certain newspapers that you notify in. And The L.A. Times gets the greatest readership in this area.

Also, like I said, when I got this letter disclosing that I'm in this prevailing winds area, if I'm getting that kind of letter about that, then if you've got a big enough problem with this building, you should be sending letters to the residents of Simi Valley and West Hills or anybody that's in that prevailing winds area to their homes so that they know about this meeting.

This meeting we might have a hundred people here or whatever or less? This can't represent the millions of people that are impacted because we don't know about it.

Cancer clusters. I know there's been research done. I know how research is done about cancer clusters. And people that are here that talk about it, you know, they're frustrated. I know of two people -- I'm 54 -- that have breast cancer, grew up in the Canoga Park area. I'm wondering and they wonder what's the relationship to the Rocketdyne meltdowns and radiation releases at that time?

Talked to a friend the other day. He's a Boy

Scouter, which is where my personal interest came into why I'm fixed on this site right now. He said his mother worked there, had bone cancer, and he did not know that there was a meeting two weeks ago that had to do with the labor department. Why aren't people that work at this facility or their families being notified of these meetings?

This gentleman over here mentioned the radiation that's found in our bodies and compared it -- you know, making it look like these are normal parts. Okay. Well, when you look at the radiation in our bodies, we're all individuals. For example, were we exposed to some kind of milk as a child that the milk is contaminated in the 1950s by radiation release? Did we live at high elevations like in Denver where you get natural background radiation? There's all ways -- all kinds of ways that we can get exposed to radiation. And, therefore, just saying we've got natural radiation in our bodies is not a good answer and comparative.

They talk about in this site about background levels and comparing things to background levels. But they don't go off-site to the areas that are outside the perimeter of this area to look at what is noncontaminated areas for their background levels. So we need to see that -- those levels. And again, as Liz said we need to

see the EPA levels as our basis, not these other numbers that are misconstrued.

Why isn't there an environmental impact report of this whole site if that's the case? Unfortunately, there's so many documents. I mean, we're talking thousands and thousands of pages. We would literally have to spend every day of our lives sitting on these websites and looking at all the information and most of us don't have that time.

We need to have meetings that, Number 1, are more frequent that are geared to the general public. When you put up things up there with the elemental symbols -- I'm sorry. I haven't had chemistry since a little bit in college, high school or more. I don't have every one of these symbols memorized and don't know all the dangers of them.

I have two friends who have worked for Boeing and do soil cleanup. One of them is an environmental soils remediation person, has been telling me for the last 15 years, There is no problem with the soil up there. Well, if that's the case and he's cleaning up, what do you think the chances are that he's really being careful with what he's sending off-site? And I feel like each bit of soil that we are taking off-site we're releasing contaminants into the air.

Also, we're talking about now sending this stuff, the breakdown of this building to Nevada. Nevada doesn't want our contaminants. So we need to address that issue. We can't all of a sudden dismantling and saying, Okay, now it's dismantled. Where are we going to send it now? because that's one of the major problems with anything nuclear these days.

And I want to know if the people that worked there have to wear Geiger counters on-site and, if they don't, why don't they?

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Is that a --

MS. WALSH: At the Department of Labor meeting last week --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Your name...?

MS. WALSH: -- one of the representatives --

THE REPORTER: Your name again...?

MS. WALSH: My name is Christina Walsh.

MR. SMYTH: Just -- Just -- Just --

MS. WALSH: And I just wanted to share that there was a person at the Department of Labor meeting that said that he wore separate badges for each because they're cumulative. So there were separate badges that he wore. He wore four separate ones for each of the facilities as he cleaned up the spills.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Would you like somebody at

Boeing to answer that?

MS. WALSH: His name was William Jennings.

MS. ROWE: Yes, please. Tell me.

MR. SMYTH: Dosimeters?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Let me understand your questions.

As I heard it, I think you were wanting to know, Why doesn't everybody who works at Santa Susana wear a dosimeter.

MR. SMYTH: "If." If everybody that worked there wore a dosimeter.

MR. RUTHERFORD: The people who worked in the nuclear facilities -- there's only two remaining, one is Building 24 and they wear dosimeters. But there are regulations specifying when you have to wear a dosimeter. We follow those regulations. So the majority of people on the hill who are, for instance, doing chemical remediation, they don't wear radiation dosimeters because they're not working in radiation facilities. So it's only those radiation workers working in radiological facilities who wear dosimeters.

MR. PERRYMAN: Good evening. My name is Mark Perryman. I'm the website administrator for rocketdynewatch.org. I have several questions. I'd like to bring up a couple things.

I didn't notice that there was any kind of publication in the newspapers or anything until I visited your website about a week ago regarding this meeting to download all the documents for it after I heard from -- I think it was Dan Hirsch.

On your website you have posted that you put it in the Daily News. And if you PDFd it, you can actually get the Daily News article. It's actually not an article. It's an advertisement that was paid for.

In addition to a public notice in the back in fine print in the Ventura County Star, I'd just like to note that both an advertisement and a public notice doesn't show up in any kind of national archive system -- just Proquest or any news archive system -- nor were -- Thank God that the elected officials and representatives were here today. Nor were they notified either.

I want to know if you'd answer the question whether or not you've received any public comments yet before this meeting from members of the public. If maybe DOE or Boeing could answer the question as Boeing's contractor, and who they were from.

MR. JOHNSON: To date we have not received any comments on it. We've received none.

MR. PERRYMAN: Thank you.

I'd also like to follow up everybody's request.

We've gone out -- gone ahead and printed out these postcards for everybody here at the meeting today that basically ask DOE to extend the public comment period and also we require agencies to produce a full circle compliant analysis and cleanup plan that -- I'm sorry -- Dan Hirsch was talking about earlier. So if you guys would like to fill these out, I have them. And we have a box right next to the door, and we'd be happy to give them to DOE.

Also, I'd like to bring up another comment. In the process of D & D of building -- of any building at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory, a presentation was shown by, I believe it was, Mike Lopez regarding the transportation of transuranic waste from the Santa Susana Field Laboratory to wherever they disposed it.

It was noted that the Department of Transportation was notified, and all Department of Transportation laws and regulations were followed. I've received a PowerPoint through a Freedom of Information Act request of that individual PowerPoint presentation that he presented at the meeting. I've zoomed in on the actual trucks sitting on Roscoe Boulevard --

Well, I'm sorry. At the Santa Susana Field Laboratory they took photos. And then they also took photos on Roscoe Boulevard, which is down in the site.

On the site, as you know there's little hexagons or -- Not hexagons -- you know, squares on each truck that identify what the waste is on each truck. These were white -- both at the Santa Susana Field Lab and at Roscoe Boulevard. Therefore, everybody that lives in that entire area wasn't notified when they saw these trucks that radiation-contaminated products were in this truck. Not only --

So one can assume that, since it wasn't done at the field lab nor was it done on Roscoe Boulevard on the streets in our community, it wasn't put on in the highways that went wherever it went.

So I'd like to follow up on that. I'd like to know why your agency hasn't done that. I want to know how Boeing, the contractor, who hires these groups to transport these waste off-site, how we can somehow make sure that, one, Boeing is reprimanded for these actions, for not following up in following the Department of Transportation rules. And also I'd like to make sure that this doesn't happen again in the future.

I'd also like to know -- maybe Phil, with your radiation experience at the field lab, what's the cost of human lives in the cleanup of this project? I know, in past presentations, it's brought up what the cost is to human life in the process of D & D.

MR. RUTHERFORD: We don't -- We don't use the cost of human life in any of our decisions on remediation.

MR. PERRYMAN: I didn't ask whether or not it was considered in any of your decisions regarding D & D. I was asking whether or not you had the analysis of whether or not human life is at stake in the process of your clean-up.

MR. RUTHERFORD: I see. That's a very different question to what you first asked.

MR. PERRYMAN: I'm sorry. I had to --

MR. RUTHERFORD: Obviously, we -- we're extremely safety conscious at Boeing. We are required to be, and we want to be. We have a safety culture that percolates down from the requirements, management oversight, procedures, training --

MR. PERRYMAN: Is your goal compliance to (unintelligible) --

MR. RUTHERFORD: All employees are aware that safety is their responsibility, not just the safety department. So yes, we value human life supremely like everybody else.

MR. PERRYMAN: Okay. But that still doesn't answer the question of the calculation of human life sacrificed in the process of the cleanup or D & D. But

if you'd get back to me on that, I'd appreciate it. Since I think it is a part of your D & D plan, it's required by law.

I'd also like to know, Phil, while we're talking here, What was your job description and assignment in 1995 when the explosion occurred that killed the two workers in the field lab? if you could just briefly answer that.

MR. RUTHERFORD: My position was the same as it is now -- Well, actually a little different. I was the manager of radiation safety.

MR. PERRYMAN: Okay. Thank you. I think those workers died from radiation sickness.

MR. RUTHERFORD: No, they did not. That's a plain falsehood.

MR. SMYTH: Sir, let's keep the questions focused on Building 24.

MR. PERRYMAN: I understand. My only issue is that this is a public meeting and the Department of Energy holds meetings maybe once or twice a year. The thing is, is that we have a Santa Susana Field Lab worker meeting in which the Department of Energy work -- and I'm sorry, many different agencies come to this meeting and it's on a regular basis. We don't know when your agency is going to be back here again for us to communicate our

individual comments. Therefore, this ETEC 4024 cleanup plan that, by the way, so needs a proper public comment period because it wasn't followed. It also needs to be expanded to allow the community's comments about what's going on in this facility as it is in our back yards and we don't have any other time to communicate it to you in a public forum.

MR. SMYTH: Okay.

MR. PERRYMAN: I'm sorry. I'll be brief. I'm just reading through my notes real quick. We've kind of rushed through the presentation today.

I'm familiar with an EPA report -- or not EPA. I think it was Department of Toxic Substances Control -- that's now requiring Boeing to make filtered and unfiltered samples. I was just wondering whether or not you guys plan to follow through not only during the period of time that a DTSC has mandated that you follow during the D & D process of this facility but also, you know, after that period of time.

MR. SMYTH: See, I can understand the desire you have to ask questions about the whole facility. I understand that that's a concern of yours.

MR. PERRYMAN: This isn't just the whole facility. This is specific to also --

MR. SMYTH: I know. Building 24, though, is

a -- The plan to D & D Building 24 is something that requires, needs public comment and that's the topic of this meeting. Those comments are wonderful and terrific. I agree they should be the focus of broader community meetings. We'll write them down and that's how we're going to address them. But we need to make sure we get everybody's comment on Building 24 tonight.

MR. PERRYMAN: I completely understand. My only thing is -- is that I communicate these ideas to your organization, Boeing I believe it is, one of the world's largest aerospace manufacturers. And at the last meeting, in fact, I even brought it up that we should have more community meetings and you should involve the public more; and I got no response.

MS. CRAWFORD: This is what we get.

MR. PERRYMAN: This is what we get.

MR. SMYTH: Maybe we can ask Thomas that question.

MR. PERRYMAN: Well, you're his contractor as well. So you know, you guys also have to follow through and bring that to him. So regardless, if I communicate it to the contractor, it should also be brought up to upper level management.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Duly noted.

MR. PERRYMAN: I'm sorry to see that Mike Lopez

is gone. I hope that his knowledge and background on the site as far as what's been going on also gets communicated to you and that we haven't lost any of his valuable information during his time at the field lab regardless of, you know, what effects he's had on the project itself.

I'd like to wrap up here and say thank you again to the public officials for coming to the meeting in addition to the individual state regulators, et cetera.

I hope that we have these meetings more often and, if they're not held more often, I'd like to have some kind of notification as to why they're not held more often.

I look forward to a proper response and drive safely.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you.

I just ask you beforehand to try to get all the comments on Building 24 out first.

MS. CRAWFORD: Second.

MR. SMYTH: Well, keep the first thing very, very brief because we're running out of time. And the line doesn't get any smaller.

MS. BOEKER: My name is Sue Boeker. I'm sorry I was late and didn't get to hear your presentation. And I know you've been hearing from a lot of angry people here,

which is not -- not your fault. It's just the conditions exist up there and we live here. I mean, when Phil talked about driving here, he thought we knew where Roscoe Boulevard -- this is where we live. The winds blow down, the waters come down off that hill all the time.

Building 4024 --

MR. SMYTH: Thank you.

MS. BOEKER: In -- I'm kind of like Scooter Libby. My -- my memory is not what it used to be.

Early -- I think I've been at this business for about 15 years. And I remember a document stating that Building 4024 would probably have to stay there forever. Somebody said that the half-life of these isotopes is 250,000 years. Well, they're dangerous until almost over 400- -- like 460,000 years.

And the area up there, I'm sure through working there you know it's beautiful. And it's -- Well, I have to have a fence around my pool because if a kid falls in there and drowns, it's called an attractive nuisance. Well, that's up there only it's a deadly, attractive nuisance.

And the -- Is this the only public comment meeting we're going to get to have on these documents? Do you have the authority to say that? Yes or no?

MR. JOHNSON: No. In coming here tonight, we were intending for this to serve as our public meeting. But what I have heard loud and clear is that you're wanting more than tonight's meeting. You're wanting an extension to provide comment on this document. And the other thing that's been absolutely clear to me, my introduction to the community --

MS. BOEKER: Fire. Fire.

MR. JOHNSON: -- you're wanting to have regular meetings to voice your concerns, not only on the specific facility we may be dealing with but your other concerns for the area as well. And what I can commit to is that I hear and that is something the Department absolutely needs to do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'd like to see you at the worker meetings too.

MS. BOEKER: You might get taken to dinner, but then they may --

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I will attend -- I will attend the work group meetings in the future.

MS. BOEKER: I'm sure people will try to be nice.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That would be great.

MS. BOEKER: The other thing is, there has been recently a lot of new old documents released --

ostensibly, all of them, but they aren't all of them. They're out of sequence. They're some of the crash-printed numbers or handwritten numbers and the sequences of pages are missing. But this is a document -- and excuse my artwork on it. I'll give it to you -- that early on it was written in 1989 when this -- when this situation first really became public that talks about how to mitigate the findings of radionuclides. And it talks about they had very high readings. And it -- somebody figured out -- somebody at ground water resources -- the names of these people keep popping up -- that the companies change but their names remain constant. That if we filter, gee, it goes from -- let me pick a number -- 239 to 13. We can live with that. And then they throw the filter away, and then they decant it, and then they send it to the lab. It always says "filtered and then acidified and revealed" your water samples. The soil samples, are you ashing the soil samples before you test them?

MR. RUTHERFORD: (No verbal response.)

MS. BOEKER: Are you sure?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

MS. BOEKER: And how -- how many -- What's your grid pattern in this and the surrounding areas, surrounding Building 4024? This is -- You know, I know

that you're very -- I know Phil's pretty casual about radioactivity. But some of us have been exposed to a whole lot of it through medical problems. And this -- this document I have -- I haven't had an opportunity to read it, so it's not fair for me to comment on it. I would greatly appreciate if you would at least provide -- It would be very nice if you could give us 60 days on this. I know other people said less, but it -- Some of these documents are pretty technical. And there are a lot of us who spend a lot of time reading.

And when I had cancer, the only way I got through -- got through it was to become very clinical and very analytical. And that's the only way I can get through this stuff. Some days I can't even read any of it, but other days I do.

MR. SMYTH: Thanks, Sue. I just want you guys to know that there's 15 minutes left.

MS. BOEKER: Also, these are some records -- hauling records -- bills of lading from the old days. There is radioactivity coming out of the Calabasas landfill. And it -- We had to get this from the Department of Regional Sanitation in Los Angeles. So I think before we start tearing up Building 4024 and packing it away, we need to know where other stuff is.

MR. SMYTH: Thanks, Sue. So 15 minutes left.

MR. LUKER: I'll make it brief.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you.

MR. LUKER: My name is John Luker. I'm a long time resident, Box Canyon. By trade, I'm a professional cinematographer, cameraman working in documentary film, television, and motion pictures. About eight months ago I started getting involved in this process. Every time I turn around, it gets scarier and scarier. I'm supposed to restrict my comments to Building 4024.

MR. SMYTH: To the extent that you can.

MR. LUKER: Yeah. Well, there you go. There are some things that are outside of that.

Building 4024, there was a question asked, How are you going to cut it up? How are you going to get it out of there?

You're reasonably succinct about that. But how do you take the foundation out from under a building without removing the building itself? At some point you're going to put some kind of structure around this with, say, sprinklers or something to keep the dust down? I live in Box Canyon. The routes for transport are literally right past my house. Will there be some notice given when these transports are going to be rolling past my home?

On -- on some of the larger issues, you know,

your public outreach stinks. It really does. This wasn't enough time to respond to this. You need to extend it by another 45 days I would say. We could get twice as many people if it had been extended like that.

By cutting things up into smaller pieces you're sort of ignoring the larger problem. From my perspective, there are too many agencies with too many different agendas here. And everything should be controlled by one agency so that we can go to one central source for information. Since nobody is in charge because everybody's in charge, DOE doesn't talk to DTSC, doesn't talk to Health Services, it doesn't talk to the water board. At the last working group meeting, you know basically I got up and I told the DTSC that they should start talking to you so that you guys can coordinate your efforts. There is no coordination between the DOE and the DTSC, and somebody should be doing that. We really need to talk about this site in its totality and not just this building here, that building here. DTSC will not talk about radiological contamination, so I can't even address that. You guys can't talk about chemical contamination, so I can't address that here. But they're inextricably linked. There's still stuff coming off that property going into outlying communities. I've gone all the around the property where I'm able to, and seen how

it falls with goo going down into Sage Ranch where I used to take a Boy Scout troop. You know, it's like 12-year-olds. You know, there's trails everywhere. That creekbed, it's not safe for kids to go there. I've gone down there and I see examples of this all over. What is this white powdery goo? Sage Ranch is right next to an old asbestos dump. Has the asbestos dump been stabilized? On a windy day, is it safe to bring Boy Scouts there? You know, these are big questions that I have that nobody seems to have an answer.

I would very much like to see more transparency. I would like to see more notice of these meetings. I would like to have a public question and answer period where we could have a wide-ranging discussion about everything that goes on up there.

One of the big questions in my mind is, Which is safer: Hauling this crap away to Nevada or just leaving it where it is? And maybe you stabilize the building and you turn it into a monument to the atomic -- the atomic industry. Maybe you take these tests and you turn them into monuments to rocket testing and the moon program. You know, there's some really amazing stuff that's been done there. But people don't know about it. People don't know about what's left over. You know, I wanted atomic power when I was a kid. I wanted to see us go to

the moon. This is the cost of doing business. It's time to do the right thing and clean it up. It's taken far too long.

In closing, more transparency, please. I would very much like to see more notice of this stuff. You got to start talking to people and let people talk to you without any kind of, you know, problem.

Thank you so much.

MR. SMYTH: Thanks, John.

MR. SALKIN: Again, I could probably talk way too long on this, but I'll try and keep it short.

MR. SMYTH: Please.

MR. SALKIN: Knowing things that are always running through my mind about this when I'm not standing in front of a mike in front of all the people that I want to talk to you about it, but aside --

My name is Adam Salkin (phonetic). I grew up in the area. And my family and I have -- unfortunately have a lot of health problems. I'm trying to learn as much as I can about all this. As I'm learning, a lot of these toxins, whether it was from the burn pit, from nuclear accidents, have gone into the air. That's one of the things that isn't addressed enough.

You know, when you're going to cut up these materials, what is going to measure what is actually

being put into the air? That's one of my questions that I'd like to ask.

What is -- How is it going to be measured? What's being put into the air? And has it been measured in the past to my knowledge? How is it going to be measured going forward?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Hi, Adam.

MR. SALKIN: How are you doing?

MR. RUTHERFORD: We -- We use workplace monitoring air sampling when there's a potential for generating general contamination. As with this decontamination exercise, whenever we rubblize concrete, for instance, or saw-cut concrete, we sample the air and analyze it for contaminants and calculate the concentration, if any, compare it with regulatory limits that exist for workplaces.

We also have environmental air monitoring going on surrounding Area 4, have done for decades and decades all during our --

MR. SALKIN: Are those -- Can the public see those records?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We asked for that during the fire. You said you'd do it. Isn't a fire an event that should be monitored?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I would -- I would -- can

refute that statement also. We had -- We had a public meeting immediately after the fire when we --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the air monitoring guy said that --

MR. RUTHERFORD: Where we showed the data. Excuse me. Would you let me answer this.

UNIDIENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Thank you. We had the air monitoring systems in Area 4 operating during the fire for six hours into the fire. And then we lost power, so they stopped working. We were on-site on the Friday when the fire was still burning on the northwestern end of Area 4. We took grab air samples then. We also took air samples on the following Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday when it was extremely windy and ash was blowing all over the place.

MR. SALKIN: And that showed what?

MR. RUTHERFORD: And we presented the data to the agencies and the local fire departments and presented the same data in the public meeting a month later. Okay?

MR. SMYTH: I don't -- I don't really want to stop the question/answer period because I know you have lots of questions. But we really do have a short amount of time and, to the extent that you can focus on Building 24, I promise Phil will talk with you --

MR. SALKIN: He took all this data, but what it did it show?

MR. SMYTH: I understand your question.

MR. SALKIN: I mean, I always ask a lot of questions. I just never get any answers. I'd just like that one maybe.

MR. RUTHERFORD: They show no contamination.

MR. SALKIN: So everything is fine. Okay. I just --

MR. SMYTH: Do you have any comments on Building 24 in the proposed action?

MR. SALKIN: I actually do.

MR. SMYTH: Okay. Great.

MR. SALKIN: Now, in this analysis in areas it has a scope of proposal action session, it says two radiological constituents of concern are known to be present in Building 4024 -- Cobalt-60 and Europium-152. No other radiological constituents are expected to exist.

With all of the SNAP reactors, with all of the accidents that have taken place with the work that has been done there, how could none of these other contaminants be expected to exist?

MR. RUTHERFORD: If you recall my presentation, I said we will be analyzing for a whole suite of radionuclides.

MR. SALKIN: But here it says they're not expected to exist. I find that --

MR. RUTHERFORD: (Unintelligible). However, we are measuring for them anyway. So we're being ultra-conservative --

MR. SALKIN: But you truly don't expect them to exist.

MR. RUTHERFORD: No.

MR. SALKIN: Okay. Then it says, "But excavation and removal of asphalt and incidental soils will likely remove any radiological constituents." Now the problem is that they're to open this up for residential use. Where it says, "will likely remove" really isn't good enough for the families that are going to have to live there and deal with the health problems if the contaminants are there. So again, you're saying you don't expect them to exist, they will likely be removed.

On the page before this in another section, it says it is assumed that the underlying bedrock does not contain radioactivity. So there you're assuming. Over here something is likely. And in another place you don't expect them to exist. But, you know, all of this basically doesn't --

MR. RUTHERFORD: Adam -- Adam, the bottom line

is we'll be doing a MARSSIM compliance survey in compliance with --

MR. SALKIN: And who is watching over this survey basically?

MR. RUTHERFORD: (Unintelligible). And we do the survey --

MR. SALKIN: You do the survey.

MR. RUTHERFORD: And ORISE and the Department of Health Services will do verification soil sampling after our survey.

MR. SALKIN: So the Department of Health Services is looking over what the Department of Energy and Boeing is doing. Does that make sense?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Say that question again.

MR. SALKIN: Department of Health Services is watching over what Boeing is going to do here? Is that what you're telling me right now?

MR. RUTHERFORD: They always do verification surveys of both buildings and land.

MR. SALKIN: So after that's done, I can talk to Mr. Greger about the Department of Health Services and he can tell me what happened there and verify that everything is now safe for residential use? Is that what you're telling me?

MR. RUTHERFORD: He can provide you with

whatever data that his department generates.

MR. SALKIN: Because so far I've been told by DHS that they are not watching over this, what's going on here, and it's not in their jurisdiction.

Isn't that correct?

MR. GREGER: California Department of Health Services has in the past done confirmatory sampling at building demolitions at SSFL. We do not have regulatory jurisdiction, as I have made clear to people at the SSFL work group meetings.

MR. SALKIN: But in this instance he's saying you will be able to tell me if what they're doing is --

MR. GREGER: In the past we have done that. We do not know if we will continue to do that since we do not have regulatory jurisdiction. That decision will be made at some time in the future.

MR. SALKIN: Apparently, it's already been made. You're telling me that the DHS is going to be much stronger. Mark, why are you involved in -- What's your job despcription? Why are you involved with the site?

MR. GREGER: One moment, please.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Let me say --

MR. SMYTH: I understand. I'm not trying to shut off. (Unintelligible).

MR. RUTHERFORD: There's an organization,

Oakridge Institute of Science & Education, who helped write the survey protocols that all of the U.S. uses. It's called a MARSSIM -- the MARSSIM final survey.

MR. SALKIN: See, I go from one place to another.

MR. RUTHERFORD: And they will be doing verification surveys also.

MR. SALKIN: Who will be? The DHS will be doing them like you just said and who else?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Oakridge Institute of Science & Education.

MR. SALKIN: So but when you're done, I need to talk to DHS.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Also, I will say that for eight of the radiological buildings that we have decommissioned already, the EPA themselves came in and did a fourth verification survey and verified all the previous results.

MR. SALKIN: I've talked to the EPA and they tell me that they also are not involved.

MR. SMYTH: Let's get your question answered --

MR. SALKIN: Okay.

MR. SMYTH: -- by Mr. Greger.

MR. GREGER: Did you get confirmation, Phil, from someone in the Department of Health Services that

they will continue to do verification surveys?

MR. SALKIN: You have done in the past?

MR. GREGER: Yes, we have.

MR. RUTHERFORD: And we've arranged for a meeting with your colleague.

MR. SALKIN: You just said they were doing. You just said they were going to do it. You're saying now they've had verification in the past but not for this particular case.

MR. GREGER: We don't know at this point in time whether we will continue to do so. It's a matter of funding and resources.

MR. SALKIN: The frustration here -- Hold on. Hold on. The frustration here is that usually you're not both in the same room. So I ask you that question, and then two months later I ask you, and then two months later I ask you. This is the problem right here. You are telling me something is going to be done having to do with DHS. I talk to DHS. He says they are not involved. You're now saying they are involved. They were in the past. They might not be in the future. And you're saying --

MR. GREGER: I'm saying we do not know if we will continue to be involved.

MR. SALKIN: You don't know, but he just said

you will be.

MR. SMYTH: You've made your point.

MR. SALKIN: This is my problem. I've made my point, but I'm still getting nowhere. So okay.

MR. SMYTH: I want to make sure all your comments get in the record and the people behind you --

MR. SALKIN: It would just be great if I actually got an answer for something at some point. But I'll continue making comments.

The last thing I'll just say is that, with all this going on, with all this going on on this site, I have no idea how morally or, you know, with anybody that has a heart can put families on top of this site or open it up for any sort of unrestricted use for anybody to hike on, for anybody to be involved in in any other way than looking at it far away from a distance and saying, You know, there was a day when people used to live around there and had a lot of cancer.

Thank you.

MR. MILLER: My name is Brian Miller with Congressman Gallegly's office. I just have a brief comment and quick question.

Like Senator Feinstein's office, to my knowledge we have not received any type of a notice for a comment period. So I guess I would ask on the record that it

will -- it should be extended to allow the public to comment on this.

The second, we seem to be coming rapidly to the conclusion of a very long process. And I was just wondering what the timing was for the DOE to turn the land over to Boeing and when they will actually take the possession of the land. Is that done -- Is that potentially going to be done this calendar year or what -- You know, what's your timing?

MR. JOHNSON: At this point, DOE will not -- We have no intentions of turning it -- It's actually Boeing land, but we have no intentions during this calendar year to do anything other than to go through the D & D for the various facilities. There's no intention to -- for DOE to walk away from that site or anything of that sort.

MR. MILLER: But we've got Building 24. There's one more facility to do the decontamination of and then that's probably --

MR. JOHNSON: There's another -- We're at the end of the facilities there near the end of the facilities there on the site. There's still other soil and groundwater concerns and there are investigations that has to be done for the entire site within Area 4.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HIRSCH: When do you anticipate it final

returnable to Boeing? If it's not this calendar year, when do you anticipate release?

MR. JOHNSON: No decision has been made at this point as to when DOE will be turning it over to Boeing.

MR. HIRSCH: But you must have some sense. If the last two buildings will be done shortly, when is it all over?

MR. JOHNSON: There is still some soil and groundwater work that needs to be done on that site.

MR. HIRSCH: But you have a plan as to when you're doing it. It sounds like you're not being candid about when you anticipate it being over.

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know the date. If that's the -- I do not know.

MR. HIRSCH: You need to recommend a date.

MR. JOHNSON: I can't tell you anything other than I do not know, Dan.

MR. SMYTH: Ma'am....

MS. RASKI: Dorrie Raskin (phonetic). And I just have four things. First, comply with CERCLA. And everything -- everything there -- should be cleaned up to EPA standards.

And also having the seven-day comment period is crappy. I had no knowledge of it except for your little lovely card that I got. There was nothing in the

newspapers. So it should be extended 45 days.

And also DOE stopped coming to the work group meetings. They dropped out after about three -- more than three years ago.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you.

MS. MASON: My name is Marie Mason, and I sit on the work group. I also live in the Knolls Canyon community directly below the site. I have a couple of comments. You're using the wrong cleanup standards and the wrong land use. I think we need to all be on the same page to have the right cleanup standards and the right land use if it's going to be released for unrestricted use because it's not -- that's not the standards you're going to.

I was actually kind of shocked, Phil, when you acted like you might be going to one in a million because for 18 years I've been coming to the meetings. And for 18 years all I've heard is we have can't ever get to those standards. We'll have to live with whatever we get to.

And I think you need to get as close as possible to the 10-6 if we're going to have people live up there. We're going to have young children and families. And just one time -- So when you said the EPA went up there and checked on your work, I remember one time when we

were invited up there to see them check it and immediately the building was gone. You'd already torn it down, carted it away. And the EPA stood there like, Whoa, where's the building? Nothing ever happened, but we all trucked up there to see it get a checkup from the EPA and the building was gone.

So you know, maybe the EPA looks, but sometimes you get beautiful before they look at you. And I'm sure remember that one.

MR. RUTHERFORD: I remember, Marie. How are you today?

The EPA spent almost three years in planning their survey. During that three years, we made EPA very aware that as part of the schedule was the demolition of three buildings. And we were told, Do not delay that schedule just to wait for us. Go ahead and demolish the buildings.

So when they finally got their work plan together after three years, they were able to survey eight buildings and they reviewed the records of the three buildings that had already been demolished, verified that prior surveys had been conducted appropriately.

MR. SMYTH: I want to get us focused back on 24.

MS. BRIO: My name is Betty Brio (phonetic) and

I have a very unhappy story to tell you. Everything has been about this building that they're talking about.

But my husband was there in '59 when the terrible explosion happened. First, I have to tell you about where he came from. He was in the air force in London fighting the Germans with the Eagle Squadron. But when he came back to the states and got out of the air force, he decided, I think I'm going to go up there on the hill and test rocket engines. I thought, My heavens. That's terrible, because I knew what it was.

So I lived on Roscoe Boulevard directly down from the lab. Every evening after he setoff the rockets, our house just shook like that. And you had to sit down. You couldn't stand up.

So after a while -- He worked there three years; and after a while I decided that that must be dangerous up there. So I convinced him to leave Rocketdyne because he couldn't tell me what was going on. They wouldn't let him say anything. So the -- he left. But shortly after he left, he became seriously ill. He became a stockbroker and worked for several years in Glendale.

And so then from then on it was going to this hospital, that hospital, that doctor. We couldn't figure out what was wrong with him because they told us nothing.

They didn't test him. They never asked us is he all right. Nobody said anything. So essentially what I'm trying to tell you is, the contamination up there was terrible. Now I'm -- He of course died a horrible death ten years of horrible illness. So now I'm left all alone for the rest of my life. But what I understand is he was on bravo stand. And you all know where bravo stand is. Right outside of Area 4. Okay. If you -- If you were not working for the energy department, you don't get any compensation. So I've been left high and dry from this -- this law that's been passed. But yet he died a horrible death. And I've been fighting ever since in the '90s -- I have -- I have all of these portfolios full of doctor bills, everything. And so they -- they send me letters say, Well, we have a link to your health -- no to your husband's health. But you haven't proven anything. I said well he's dead. What else can I tell you? And I have all the doctor bills for them to look at. I have two big -- big summaries of what happened to him. They read that and they say, That doesn't help us.

So now I'm going back to the fact that he was there in '59. The pollution came out of that building but they said it stops at the doorway. He -- He -- That's the end. He was here bravo stand. And there's the doorway. Doesn't mean a thing.

So I'm telling you that if you have any people that are going to live on that land, that's what's going to happen to them. They're all going to end up in the same situation because that Dan has said that can never be cleaned up. Never. So I just wanted you all to know what -- what are we're headed for for years. I guess I better be quiet now. Just -- I just thought I'd give you a note of what happened in '59, what's going to happen for the next 25 or 30 years. Please don't let them build houses there.

MR. SMYTH: Thank you. Thank you for your time.

As you know, public comment officially extends for a little while longer.

Thomas, are you --

It's 9:00, actually.

MS. CRAWFORD: I believe you heard loudly and clearly from me as well as all of the elected officials here, we need a 45-day comment period. Can you tell us tonight? Can you give us that commitment tonight before we go home, please?

MR. JOHNSON: I guess.

MS. CRAWFORD: This is the only one I know that works.

MR. JOHNSON: I guess I'm not too good with the mike. What I will commit to is that first thing tomorrow

morning what I will be campaigning for and what I will provide to the higher up in my department, it was made absolutely loud and clear here tonight that you would like to have the comment period extended. And I commit to you that that's what I will be doing as soon as I get into the office tomorrow morning. And we will put the information on the website as to how long the comment or when the comment period will be extended to.

MS. CRAWFORD: And then post the document itself so that we can both download it and let you know where it is and so forth so we can fill in the gaps for the public notification I think that we were missing.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. I will commit that the document itself will be there on that -- on the website. I know hard copies were available outside, but electronic copies will be there on that website.

MS. CRAWFORD: So obviously, time is of the essence. We're ticking down. We got seven days. When will we know?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and how?

MR. HIRSCH: And how are they going to know?

MS. CRAWFORD: The Department of Energy has all of our mailing addresss and we've got lots of letters, lots of email, and other stuff.

I'm sure that Rocketdyne would join in the offer

that we'll be glad to notify our viewership. And we'll do anything we can to get the message out if you've got a good message to give us and we can get it out there in time. I commit to that.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

MS. CRAWFORD: All right. Thank you very much. And Mr. Johnson you are not in an enviable position.

MR. HIRSCH: I ask that you put it on the website -- also a current schedule, a planned schedule for site closure. I can't believe you don't have one. There is a budget request in for money. You have to have some idea of when that money is to be spent. So rather than make us nervous that there's something you're not telling --

MR. JOHNSON: No, Dan. I'm not going to let you do that. You asked two different questions. You asked me before when we're going to turn it over to Boeing. There's a difference of when we turn it over to Boeing and when we expect to disposition the various facilities that are there on the site.

MR. HIRSCH: That's not what I'm asking. I'm asking about site closure. The topic for the meeting on the back side of the card says to discuss ETEC closure. I'm asking you to post on your website your current schedule for ETEC closure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When I went to the toxic substances meeting two weeks ago, I got the impression when they were talking about how they were remediating the site that they weren't even going to have a plan for like five or six years of how they were clean up site. Yet you guys are trying to take out the contaminated materials and you're not working hand in hand with them. So how can you even be thinking about releasing this site any time if they have radioactive chemicals there, you know, because they -- they're looking at the elements. You're looking at the radioactivity. But they're one and the same sometimes.

So I think we need coordination. We need a meeting where all DHS, you know, DTS -- whatever, DOE, everybody is there, EPA. We need that. And we need it with, you know, our legislators and stuff like that.

Like I said, I'm new at this game. I came in and John mentioned earlier because of the Boy Scouts. I was a scout master. And one of the issues here, again, that they were talking about, you're focused on Building 24. I know that. I recognize that. But we're talking a lot about the general effect of this site on the whole area and on our population.

And when John was talking about the Boy Scouts and I look at documents on some of these sites and they

say Dave's only on Sage Ranch. And then I know my Boy Scouts have gone up there to camp. And they're digging in the soil because, if you're doing some kind of camping activity, you're putting tent stakes in, you're trucking along, kids are running in the bushes and whatever. John was saying he's seen stuff in the creekbeds there.

You can't just be looking at Building 24. You have to be looking at the effect of the whole site -- the prevailing winds, disturbing the soil. You know, I don't -- you know they're talking about chopping up blocks, they're talking about trucking the stuff out.

And my knowledge of cleanup of radioactive things is limited. But I know, for example, that the scientists are looking at environmental ways of cleaning up goos and gunks and whatever. And they're using micro-organisms, for example. I don't know how you're trying to clean the soil up there. And I need to know more information than what's being put out there.

In other words, are you just taking all this soil and going to put it in trucks and it's going to contaminate the air. But we're going to truck it to Calabasas landfill or take it to Nevada landsite. You know? I want to understand this better and he did a little bit of it. But I just feel like there needs to be

more remediation and biological remediation and greater cleanup than the levels that were being discussed with us today. Okay?

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. SMYTH: Thanks. Thank you all for coming.m.

(The Department of Energy Community Meeting was concluded at 9:19 p.m.)

I, Linda Frazeur, Certified Shorthand Reporter number 6697, duly licensed to practice in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That said transcript was taken before me at the time and place therein set forth, was taken down by me in shorthand and transcribed under my direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcription of my original stenographic notes;

That the dismantling of the transcript will void the reporter's certificate.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to said action, nor in anywise interested in the outcome thereof.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this _____ day of _____, 2007, at Simi Valley, California.

_____
LINDA FRAZEUR, CSR NO. 6697

I, Linda Frazeur, Certified Shorthand Reporter number 6697, duly licensed to practice in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That said transcript was taken before me at the time and place therein set forth, was taken down by me in shorthand and transcribed under my direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcription of my original stenographic notes;

That the dismantling of the transcript will void the reporter's certificate.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to said action, nor in anywise interested in the outcome thereof.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 6th day of April, 2007, at Simi Valley, California.

Linda Frazeur

LINDA FRAZEUR, CSR NO. 6697