To: Daniel Telvock[dtelvock@investigativepost.org]
From: Daly, Eric
Sent: Tue 10/4/2016 5:47:37 PM
Subject: RE: Holy Trinity - Area 5 Soil Sample Results

The SSALs are based on specific risk of each nuclide. They are not updated. That is site specific and the numbers we have had throughout this removal action. The K-40 is borderline and just natural. We highlight anything that exceeds the SSAL for our health physicist to evaluate. Also, background is not subtracted yet. Like I wrote, this is preliminary. You have what I have. If we compare the K-40 to background…..the number will not exceed the SSAL.

From: Daniel Telvock [mailto:dtelvock@investigativepost.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2016 1:43 PM
To: Daly, Eric <Daly.Eric@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Holy Trinity - Area 5 Soil Sample Results

The SSALs for Ra-228, Th230 and 232 seem way high. Are they recently updated?

In addition, how do you explain the high K-40? Oldbury furnace?

Dan Telvock

Environmental Reporter

Investigative Post

(w) 716-831-2626 x 3

Twitter: @dantelvock

On Tue, Oct 4, 2016 at 11:27 AM, Daly, Eric <Daly.Eric@epa.gov> wrote:

> Actually it supports that it may be naturally occurring since we did not get any elevated gamma in the home, no elevated gamma on the property and now no TENORM detected via soil sample on the property along the pathway of the roadway across the street. Naturally occurring radon is from rock structures underneath structures that build up over time and

would not necessarily give off enough gamma readings to be detectable. If the TENORM was under the basement we would see increased gamma readings like we saw in GNBC office area or the parking lot at Niagara Falls Boulevard

Regards,

Eric

"We must, indeed, all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately", Benjamin Franklin

Eric M. Daly
On-Scene Coordinator/Radiological Response Specialist
US Environmental Protection Agency- Region II

ERRD/RPB/PPS
2890 Woodbridge Avenue
Edison, NJ 08837
daly.eric@epa.gov
732-321-4350

On Oct 4, 2016, at 11:19 AM, Daniel Telvock <dtelvock@investigativepost.org> wrote:

Hi Eric,

Got them. So, doesn't this confirm that the elevated levels in the basement are not naturally occuring and attributable to slag being used underneath his home from contaminated piles? You'd think you'd find higher readings in these tests if there was naturally occuring radioactivity.

Dan Telvock

Environmental Reporter

Investigative Post

(w) 716-831-2626 x 3

Twitter: @dantelvock

On Tue, Oct 4, 2016 at 11:06 AM, Daly, Eric <Daly.Eric@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Dave:

At the request of the Town of Lewiston, we reached out to other homes across from HTC. Two residents then asked us to perform gamma surveys. We had some technical issues and will have to go back to survey in the next two weeks. So no real info to report right now on that.

Attached are the preliminary data products from Area 5. Please let me know that you received one table and two images. I am sending from my iPhone since I am at a training. This data is preliminary and not validated. However, we do not see exceedance of the radionuclides of concern. Which is good news. No gamma readings and now no elevated radiological in soil samples. The reason for this assessment at area 5 was the history provided. The roadway within cemetery property was said to continue across the street onto this specific property. Roberts Street sample also did not show elevated levels.

Regards,

Eric

"We must, indeed, all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately", Benjamin Franklin

Eric M. Daly
On-Scene Coordinator/Radiological Response Specialist
US Environmental Protection Agency- Region II

ERRD/RPB/PPS
2890 Woodbridge Avenue
Edison, NJ 08837
daly.eric@epa.gov
732-321-4350