To: Whitley, Christopher[Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov]
From: Salter, Jim
Sent: Mon 6/17/2013 6:11:59 PM
Subject: RE: Bridgeton

Thanks Chris.

Can you respond on the record to Rep. Otto's call for emergency action to remove the radioactive waste? That is, does EPA have a provision for emergency removal and would the radioactive material at West Lake be eligible?

Jim

From: Whitley, Christopher [mailto:Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Salter, Jim
Subject: RE: Bridgeton

Jim,

Here is EPA Region 7's response. You may attribute this as a written statement provided to you by EPA spokesman Chris Whitley:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission made a mathematical error on the first page of its November 1, 1974 letter to Cotter Corporation when it calculated the uranium concentration in the mixture of leached barium sulfate residue and soil as 0.0001%. The value should have been 0.01%. Regardless of the percentage calculation, the *amount* of uranium in this mixture (seven tons) has been consistently reported by NRC and EPA and is not in question. Most importantly, EPA has extensive analytical results for the materials actually present in West Lake Landfill, as reported in the Remedial Investigation Report, the Record of Decision, and other documents in the Administrative Record. The actual site conditions, analytical results and risk assessments form the basis for EPA's decision-making at the site.

Chris Whitley

Public Affairs Specialist

U.S. EPA Region 7 Office of Public Affairs

11201 Renner Boulevard

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7394

From: Salter, Jim [mailto:jsalter@ap.org]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Whitley, Christopher
Subject: Bridgeton

Greetings Chris.

State Rep. Bill Otto, D-St. Charles, is holding a news conference at 3:30 today to announce that he is asking EPA for what he calls "emergency removal action" to transport away some of the nuclear waste at the West Lake Landfill in Bridgeton. Otto says someone on his staff checked old documents and found a significant error _ the nuclear waste makes up .0146 of the landfill, not .000146 as had been previously thought. He said EPA confirmed the error.

Has EPA confirmed old documentation was in error? If so, is there some sort of emergency declaration procedure that could expedite the removal, and what needs to be done for that to occur? IF the amount of waste really is much greater than originally thought, is there any renewed concern in EPA about the danger posed by the underground smoldering?

Any help greatly appreciated, as always.

Jim Salter

AP-St. Louis

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at +1-212-621-1898 and delete this email. Thank you.
[IP_US_DISC]

msk dccc60c6d2c3a6438f0cf467d9a4938