



048052

# CONFERENCE NOTES

DOE CONTRACT NO. DE-AC05-81OR20722

BECHTEL JOB 14501  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES  
REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

PAGE 1 OF 2

DATE 9/25/87

CONFIRMATION OF: Meeting

CONFERENCE NOTE NO: 309

RECORDED BY: [REDACTED]

DATE AND TIME: 9/24/87

SUBJECT: Status of FUSRAP for Tonawanda  
Sites (Ashland 1 & 2, Seaway  
and Linde)

LOCATION: Town Hall  
Tonawanda, New York

ATTENDEES: Town Supervisor - [REDACTED] - BNI  
Town Engineer - [REDACTED] - DOE  
Building Inspector - [REDACTED]

\*Part-time

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION OF DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>The meeting was held for the purpose of providing town officials with a status of recent and planned activities at the four sites in Tonawanda. General background information regarding the FUSRAP program nationwide was provided as well as historical information regarding how radioactive material came to be at the sites. A copy of viewgraphs used in the recent meeting with NYDEC was used as a basis to further describe the initiation of the ERA process. Copies of the viewgraphs and a write-up providing background information (see attached) were given to the attendees.</p> <p>Emphasis was placed on the planned publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register regarding the scoping effort associated with the ERA process. A publication date of November 5, 1987 was provided and dates of November 18 and 19 were identified for public meetings in Albany (for Colonie) and Tonawanda respectively.</p> <p>Town officials were informed of consideration being given to a portion of the Ashland 2 site as a permanent disposal facility for materials from Ashland 1 and 2, Linde, and Colonie. The importance of public input in the ERA process was stressed.</p> <p>Relative to the Seaway site, note was made that a hazard assessment was underway and that there is reason to believe that the material should be left in place with a clay cap placed over the currently exposed area (Area "A").</p> <p>Town officials noted that the landfill operation at Seaway was a subject of much concern in the town due to fears of its expansion. They suspect that Ashland property would be used for such expansion. A rezoning is underway which would incorporate</p>	



# CONFERENCE NOTES

DOE Contract No. DE-AC05-81OR20722

BECHTEL JOB 14901  
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES  
REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

PAGE 2 OF 2  
DATE 9/25/87

ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION OF DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>essentially all of Ashland 1 and 2 and Seaway into a waterfront and light industrial development project. This rezoning is planned to be complete before the scheduled publication of the NOI, and admittedly was being done to keep out undesirable elements.</p> <p>We were warned of a probable negative reaction by the public relative to development of a disposal site. [REDACTED] also indicated that such development would not be supported by himself or the Town Council. He did say that he would present the information to the council. He also suggested that contact with [REDACTED] is appropriate. [REDACTED] is a county legislator and Chairman of the county's "Energy and Environment Committee". [REDACTED] is expected to react negatively and emotionally to this subject in a manner similar to his reaction to potential further expansion of the landfill - a subject which has been highly publicized.</p> <p>Contact with the local "Hazardous Materials Advisory Council" was recommended. A brochure was provided and the primary contact was identified as [REDACTED]. This council is made up of representatives from the general public as well as industries in the area and has a good reputation in the community.</p> <p>It was noted that drawings are available of the leachate collection system at the landfill if we need them.</p> <p>The town is also aware that samples have been taken from both sides of the storm drain going under the landfill to determine if any contaminants are being contributed. No additions have been noted. Data should be available from [REDACTED] of NYDEC.</p> <p>Township officials were told that the work, once begun, would be subcontracted to local firms to the extent possible. It was also noted that the ERA process, per schedule, would take about 3 1/2 years and that construction and remedial actions at the sites would take place over a 3-4 year period beyond that. In the interim, a considerable amount of characterization activity would take place.</p> <p>[REDACTED] inquired regarding potential incentives which might be available if the disposal facility were to be sited in Tonawanda. He was informed that, in the past, incentives have not been offered by DOE.</p>	