**To:** Zigman, Leisa[LZIGMAN@ksdk.com]
**From:** Whitley, Christopher
**Sent:** Fri 2/7/2014 8:00:26 PM
**Subject:** RE: KSDK follow up

Businesses have not been allowed to operate inside the fence. Indeed, property owners and developers did move soil around on these properties in the course of their development before they were included in the fenced portions of the site, but the bottom line is that the actual screenings that were done as follow-up to the document you are citing did not indicate any levels of concern. Consequently, no soil removal was done by EPA or the responsible parties because no soil removal was determined to be necessary.

I will have to do some additional research to pin down a date for construction of the fence, and I will follow up with you.


**Chris Whitley**

Public Affairs Specialist

U.S. EPA Region 7 Office of Public Affairs

11201 Renner Boulevard

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7394


**From:** Zigman, Leisa [mailto:LZIGMAN@ksdk.com]
**Sent:** Friday, February 07, 2014 1:52 PM
**To:** Whitley, Christopher
**Subject:** RE: KSDK follow up

Thanks Chris.

According to Paul Rosasco, this material originally was carried by erosion of Area 2 on to the Ford Property in 1974 and has since been moved twice by landowners and/or land lessees. Were businesses allowed to operate inside the fense? (see above pdf). When was the fence built? So, in 1997 when Ford was still operating, the property was fenced in on the Westlake site?

1.1 Background

As illustrated on Figure 1, the Ford and Crossroad properties are located to the west of Area 2 immediately adjacent to the toe of the landfill berm. Long term erosion of impacted soils present at the surface of Area 2 and subsequent transport in conjunction with precipitation runoff have resulted in transport of some of these materials onto the surface of the Ford and Crossroad properties. In addition, a small section of the slope of the landfill berm was subjected to significant erosion resulting in transport of landfill berm soils onto the Ford and Crossroad properties. Historically, the Ford and Crossroad properties had been used for agricultural purposes. Tilling of the soil on these properties may have resulted in further transport and homogenization of these soils.

Over the past several years, Ford subdivided and sold its properties to the west of the West Lake Landfill, and the property has been developed into Crossroads Industrial Park.

Crossroad Industrial Park consists of light industrial uses, such as warehouses and sales

and rental of heavy equipment. In 1997, Ford sold its remaining tracts of real property in the area to Crossroad, exclusive of the 1.78 acre buffer zone which has been retained

by

Ford and is situated immediately adjacent to the western edge of Radiological Area 2 of

the West Lake Landfill (the Ford Buffer). (Terms are being finalized pursuant to which

Ford would convey and Rock Road Industries, Inc. at the request of the other members of

the Respondent Group, would accept title to the Ford Buffer.) The property Ford sold to

Crossroad included the 9.40 acre parcel known as Lot 2A of Crossroads Industrial Park.

Crossroad split Lot 2A into Lot 2A1 (consisting of 5.82 acres) and Lot 2A2 (consisting of

3.58 acres). As presented in the draft RI Report (EMSI, 1998), the 3.58 acre parcel of

land now known as Lot 2A2 was found to contain areas of low-level radiologicallyimpacted

surface soils; the area now known as Lot 2A1 appears not to have been

impacted by soils containing radioactive constituents. In 1998, Crossroad sold Lot 2A1

to AAA Trailer which uses the property as a trucking terminal. The Respondents

understand that AAA Trailer holds an option to purchase part of Lot 2A2, and proposes to

cover this additional property with an asphalt parking lot to provide an expanded area for

tractor-trailer parking. Negotiations are currently ongoing pursuant to which Rock Road

Industries, Inc., at the request of the other Respondents, would accept title to the

remainder of Lot 2A2 to assist the investigation and remedy of Operable Unit 1.

The majority of the impacted soils on the Ford and Crossroad properties are contained

within the current 1.78-acre buffer reflected on Figure 2. As indicated above, some of the

samples collected for Lot 2A2 were found to contain additional low-level radiologicallyimpacted

soils. Samples obtained by EMSI from the upper 3-inches of soil in these areas

detected slightly elevated levels of radionuclides. Samples obtained from depths of 12 to

**From:** Whitley, Christopher [mailto:Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov]
**Sent:** Friday, February 07, 2014 1:41 PM
**To:** Zigman, Leisa
**Subject:** RE: KSDK follow up

Leisa,

To reiterate:

EPA Region is not contradicting what is stated in the 1985 memo. The memo accurately stated what was known at the time: that no evidence existed of past or present exposure.

The Ford and Crossroad properties referred to in the document that you just sent are within the fenced, secured boundaries of the site. Screening that was done subsequent to this Interim Measures Work Plan did not find radiologically-impacted materials at levels of concern. Consequently, there was no soil removal action done. However, at this and other portions of the site since 1999, vegetative cover and rock has been added to provide stabilization and prevent erosion from wind and water.

As for Dr. Criss, we understand that his interpretation of groundwater data suggests to him that migration of some sort may be occurring. EPA Region 7 is unaware of any data that suggests contamination may be moving off the site. As long as there is no contamination migrating off site, persons outside the fenced, secured boundaries of the site are not at risk of harmful exposures.

**Chris Whitley**

Public Affairs Specialist

U.S. EPA Region 7 Office of Public Affairs

11201 Renner Boulevard

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7394

**From:** Zigman, Leisa [mailto:LZIGMAN@ksdk.com]
**Sent:** Friday, February 07, 2014 12:11 PM
**To:** Whitley, Christopher
**Subject:** KSDK follow up

Chris,

In your comments below you said:

"We are not contradicting what is stated in the 1985 memo." "There is always the potential for a health risk but what is most important, as the 1985 memo notes, there is no data to show anyone has been exposed. ***There is no data that shows contamination has migrated off site***, or gotten into the air, or people have been exposed."

According to Criss, and others, the recent ground water samples suggest migration. Do you disagree?

In addition,

Documents suggest, there has been migration to the Ford Motor Credit Site. Please explain. (see pdf)

Could you please let me know where the contaminated soil at the Ford Motor site went? went? Or is it still there?

Thanks,

Leisa

Leisa Zigman

Five on Your Side

KSDK-TV

314-444-5295

lzigman@ksdk.com