

FAQs for the Luckey Site From Previous Meetings

General Site Questions

1. Where is the Luckey Site?

The Luckey Site is located at 21200 Luckey Road near the Village of Luckey, OH, about 22 miles southeast of Toledo. Luckey Road borders the site to the west, Gilbert Road to the south and abandoned railroad tracks to the east.

2. How big is the site?

The Luckey Site covers approximately 40 acres.

3. What is on the site?

Numerous open areas are covered with grasses and brush. Several areas were previously used to store byproducts from magnesium and beryllium processing. Structures on the property include a large production building, utility buildings and a warehouse.

4. Who owns the site?

The Luckey Site has gone through several owners over the past 60 years. In 1942, the government owned the land and built a magnesium processing facility on the site that was operated for the government by National Lead during WWII. Custody was then transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation who may have leased parts of the plant to the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and its contractor, Brush Beryllium Company (later called Brush Wellman), as early as 1946. Brush Beryllium leased the entire site in 1949 and entered into a contract to design, construct, operate and maintain a plant for the production of beryllium and to maintain the former magnesium plant on a stand-by status. Brush Beryllium operated the facility until 1958, however, sintering and powder blending operations, established at the facility in 1957, reportedly continued through the early 1960's and were subsequently shut down. General Service Administration sold the facility in 1961 to the Aluminum and Magnesium division of Vulcan Materials Company, and in 1968, the property was transferred to Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. In 1988, the land was sold to Motor Wheel Corporation, which is now called Hayes Lemmerz International, Inc. The current tenant is Uretech, a company that molds urethane wheel covers for the automobile industry.

5. When did the site become a Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) Site?

The Luckey Site was designated as a FUSRAP Site in September of 1992, when it was determined that some areas of the site had residual radioactivity exceeding criteria and beryllium waste.

6. How did the area become contaminated?

In late 1951 and early 1952, when the site was being used to process beryllium, the AEC sent approximately 1,000 tons of radioactively contaminated scrap metal to the site in anticipation of Diamond Magnesium Company resuming magnesium processing at the facility. The scrap metal, which contained radioactivity within guidelines at the time, was stored at the site, and never used for its intended purpose. Records also indicate that beryllium scrap from other AEC operations was being sent to Luckey for reprocessing. Indications are that some of this scrap was contaminated with radioactivity.

7. What other organizations are involved in the cleanup?

Onsite contamination at the Luckey Site has been identified in surveys by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, the Ohio Department of Health, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the agency managing the cleanup program at this time.

8. What is the current status of the site?

The Luckey Site cleanup is currently in the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study phase. Remedial investigation fieldwork occurred from June to September 1998, and June to July 1999. A more detailed study of environmental conditions is underway. A Remedial Investigation Report was issued in September 2000, which documents the nature and extent of contamination at the site and adjacent properties. A Baseline Risk Assessment has been completed to evaluate the potential risks to human health and the environment and is included in the Remedial Investigation Report. Additional investigation of Toussaint Creek is also planned, as part of the ecological risk assessment.

9. What is a Baseline Risk Assessment and what do the results mean?

The results of the Baseline Risk Assessment provide a basis for determining whether cleanup is warranted. The project has been organized into the following five operable units where FUSRAP-related chemicals have been detected:

- On-site soils,
- Off-site soils,
- Ground water,
- Toussaint Creek sediments, and
- On-site buildings.

10. What is the purpose of the Feasibility Study?

Each operable unit that poses a risk to human health and the environment will be evaluated in the Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study identifies and evaluates possible cleanup solutions to determine their effectiveness in protecting human health and the environment.

11. How can I get more information about the Luckey Site?

The Corps welcomes inquiries about the Luckey Site. Call toll-free at 1-800-833-6390, or e-mail us at fusrap@usace.army.mil You can also ask to be included on the Luckey Site's mailing list, which will inform you about upcoming public meetings.

Letters can be mailed to us at: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, FUSRAP Public Information Center. 1776 Niagara St., Buffalo, NY 14207.

Beryllium/Radiation Related Questions

GENERAL BERYLLIUM QUESTIONS

1. Where has beryllium been located on the Luckey Site?

Based on the Remedial Investigation conducted by the Corps, the largest volume of beryllium contamination is in the soil in the northeast portion of the site. Beryllium concentrations in sediments in Toussaint Creek are well above background levels. Beryllium has also been detected above the drinking water standard in two on-site groundwater-monitoring wells and in an on-site production well, which is not currently used. Beryllium has also been detected in dust settled on building surfaces.

2. How do people become affected by beryllium?

The main hazard with beryllium is if it's inhaled. Therefore, contact with it through water, such as wading through Toussaint Creek, where the sediments at the bottom are contaminated, or drinking water from the creek is not likely to produce health problems. Beryllium is a probable human carcinogen if it's inhaled, not ingested. If ingested in great enough quantities, beryllium has the potential to be toxic.

3. What are the long-term effects of beryllium exposure or radiological contamination, and how would someone know if he or she has been affected?

The long-term effects of beryllium exposure could potentially be lung disease. The long-term effects of radiation exposure could potentially be cancer. Some of the symptoms of beryllium exposure could be a dry cough, joint pain, shortness of breath and perhaps a skin rash.

4. Where can I get more information about berylliosis and the other diseases associated with beryllium exposure?

There are at least two good sources of information about health effects from exposure to beryllium. One good source is the fact sheet distributed by the Corps on beryllium, which is located on the fact sheets section of this website.

Another good source of information is from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), which is part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The ATSDR has created a "frequently asked questions" sheet and a public health statement on beryllium. To receive this information, please contact the ATSDR directly at: 1-800-447-1544, or by email at ATSDRIC@cdc.gov. This information may also be accessed on the web at <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/tfacts4.html> and <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/ToxProfiles/phs8807.html>.

5. Does the EPA list beryllium as a known carcinogen?

Beryllium is considered a carcinogen through the inhalation pathway. Many years ago, the EPA did list beryllium as a carcinogen for the ingestion pathway, but as time went by, more studies were conducted that showed animals did not get cancer from eating beryllium. Because of those findings, the EPA amended this classification and dropped beryllium into a Class BI, probable human carcinogen. This means that there is adequate data to prove that beryllium causes cancer in animals, but the data is too limited to adequately prove that beryllium causes cancer in humans through the ingestion pathway.

6. Can you contract beryllosis from touching beryllium?

No. To the best of our knowledge, some of the studies that were performed in the late 1980's showed no on-set of beryllosis from skin patch tests. However, one study involving skin patch testing with soluble beryllium compounds revealed that chronic beryllium disease sufferers may experience more intense symptoms from these patch tests. Skin patch testing involves a chronic or long-term skin exposure and not an incidental exposure that may occur from actual working conditions. Employees may be wearing personal protective equipment or may wash or shower at the end of eight hours to further reduce their contact time.

7. If the beryllium dust at the site becomes airborne, how far can it travel? Is there any potential exposure to neighboring residents?

It depends on the kind of force that is used to launch a dormant dust particle into the air. The most violent kind of force, from a jackhammer for instance, will only catapult the particle in the air a few feet. However, many variables can affect travel distance such as wind speed and mass of the particle.

TOUSSAINT CREEK QUESTIONS

1. What are elevated beryllium levels in the first 15 miles downstream at Toussaint Creek?

In the first mile downstream, the highest concentration of beryllium detected is 223 ppm. After a distance of one mile, concentrations are generally less than 15 ppm. At 13 miles downstream, the concentration is about the same as the naturally occurring concentration of beryllium.

2. Does the level of contamination get progressively lower as you go further downstream at Toussaint Creek?

No, it is not a gradual decrease in concentration; there are some areas where the concentration is higher and some areas where it is lower throughout that 15-mile stretch.

3. Is there any contamination upstream?

No, we didn't find any beryllium contamination upstream in the creek.

4. What happens to the beryllium-contaminants in Toussaint Creek when the creek floods?

The water flows back into the creek, and because of the clay in the soil, the potential for infiltration into the groundwater is reduced.

5. Have you done any kind of study of the soils located within the 15 miles of the contaminated Toussaint Creek sediments?

Yes, the Corps has collected 38 samples from the creek meander bends (curves in the creek where sediment may have been deposited along the banks). The samples showed beryllium concentrations from 1.4 ppm to 90 ppm. While these concentrations are above naturally occurring concentrations, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 screening level for beryllium on residential properties is 150 ppm. Therefore, concentrations of beryllium detected in the meander bend samples are less than the EPA Region 9 screening level.

6. If there are cows who drink the water in the contaminated portion of the creek every day, what are the chances of the beryllium contaminating the cow and passing the contamination along to humans if they eat the meat?

There are some chemicals such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that can accumulate in animal tissues, but beryllium does not behave in this way. There have been studies and models done on animals, such as hamsters and rats with beryllium ingestion. Scientists found that beryllium doesn't stay in the animal or move into their muscle tissue; it passes through their digestive system after they eat or drink it. Therefore if cattle were exposed to sediments containing beryllium from Toussaint Creek, the chances of their beef or milk being contaminated are very small.

7. What are the health risks for children wading in the creek among the sediments?

In the past, the Corps conducted a study on this and it was determined that the risks for beryllium exposure from children wading or even drinking water from the creek are very low. To gather more information in answering this question, a full risk assessment to an adolescent (7-18 year old) wading in the creek was completed. The complete evaluation may be found in Chapter 6 (Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Remedial Investigation Report. This report is part of the Administrative Record File for the Luckey FUSRAP Site, located in the Luckey Public Library.

To develop this risk assessment, we used U.S. EPA established guidelines. We assumed that children might wade in the portion of the creek where contamination has been detected. We used very conservative assumptions about the exposures for a child playing in the creek for one hour per day, 52 days per year for 10 years. The results showed that exposure to sediments in the creek pose a very small risk of contracting cancer; there were no non-cancer risks. The cancer risk is about a one in one million chance that an extra cancer (above the normal background rate) will develop over a lifetime to an adolescent playing in the creek. The risk of one in one million is in addition to the background cancer risk rate of one in three for the general population of the United States (source: American Cancer Society). This is considered within environmental regulatory agency guidelines. We would like to point out that the contaminant contributing almost all of the risk associated with sediments in Toussaint Creek is a chemical [benzo(a)pyrene], which is found in asphalt used in building roads, in

diesel exhaust fumes, as well as in grilled meats. This contaminant is not found in the creek water, rather, it is in the sediments of Toussaint creek.

8. What if the children have mosquito bites on their legs and feet?

There are no risks above environmental regulatory agency guidelines due to MED-related contamination to children in the creek, even if they have open sores and cuts on their legs and feet. After we received this question, we performed an additional evaluation where we assumed that children would periodically wade in the creek with about 16 cuts or mosquito bites on their legs and feet. Even with this assumption, there was not a large increase in risk presented by the contaminants in the creek water and sediments. Risks remain very small and would be within environmental regulatory agency guidelines.

9. Is there any other contamination in Toussaint Creek? Is lead in the creek?

Although lead was detected in several of the sediment samples at concentrations above naturally occurring concentrations, the only contaminant contributing significantly to risk is an organic compound, benzo[a]pyrene, as discussed previously in Question 7.

ON-SITE BUILDING QUESTIONS

1. Are the employees in the buildings where beryllium dust has been found in any danger and do they know dust was found where they work?

Based on our test results and under current use conditions, the employees are not in immediate danger under normal workday operations. The beryllium we detected inside the buildings at the site is settled on surfaces. The primary hazard of beryllium is if the dust becomes airborne where it can be inhaled, which could occur if settled dust becomes airborne due to activities such as:

- Disruptive maintenance work,
- Remodeling, or
- Demolition work.

In short, if the beryllium dust is not disturbed, it is not airborne and can't be inhaled, so the hazard is not present.

The Corps and Uretech have provided results of our findings to the employees through employee briefings and fact sheets. We have also advised the factory management against the types of disruption listed above unless proper precautions are used. Under OSHA* regulations, the employer must ensure health and safety requirements are satisfied to protect its workers.

*OSHA stands for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which is part of the U.S. Department of Labor. OSHA sets the standards for safety in the workplace. It sets the code of Federal regulations that determines at what concentration a contaminant can exist in the workplace and still be considered safe. If the standard is exceeded, then the contaminant may have some negative impacts on human health.

2. If beryllium particles are in the dust at the Uretech facility, how long is the dust in the air?

There are many parameters to pinpoint the exact amount of time a particular particle is in the air. There are certain factors that take particles out of the air, such as gravity, static charge, and air currents.

Studies that the Corps conducted included air monitoring at the site in 1998 and 1999. In a breathing zone, which consists of a sphere three feet in diameter around a person's head, the Corps determined in its study that the beryllium particles in the dust at the site were well below OSHA regulations. In fact, all of our 8-hour air monitoring results showed time weighted averages* to be less than one half of the current OSHA 8-hour permissible exposure levels.

*A time-weighted average is calculated by multiplying the air concentrations obtained over the sampling period by its time. These are called sampling events. These sampling events are added together and divided by the total time to obtain an average exposure for the day.

3. Is the government going to provide factory employees with blood tests or air monitoring devices to determine if anyone is susceptible to berylliosis?

As a Government agency, we do not have the authority to perform blood tests on factory employees or to install air-monitoring devices in the factory. That option is up to facility management personnel to decide.

Site Questions

1. What would be the better alternative: to leave the contaminated soils in place because they pose no immediate health risk, or to remove them, even though doing so could create more problems?

Possible alternatives developed in the Feasibility Study will be evaluated against the nine criteria established under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. These criteria are: protection of human health and the environment, compliance with regulations, long-term effectiveness and permanence, short-term effectiveness and environmental impacts, reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment, implementability, cost, state acceptance, and community acceptance to determine a preferred method of addressing the contamination that will leave the Luckey Site in a condition that is safe for future use. Only after evaluating all nine criteria can a recommendation be made as to what the best alternative is.

2. What would happen if it is determined that no further action is necessary?

If no further action is the chosen alternative and specified in the Record of Decision (ROD), the site will be turned over to the Department of Energy.

3. If it's determined that the Corps will need to excavate the contaminated material and ship it off-site, where will it go?

If excavation is the chosen alternative to address contaminated soil, the material would need to be taken to an appropriately permitted disposal facility.

4. What is the natural occurring beryllium level and what is the beryllium level at the site?

In soil, the naturally occurring level is about 1 part per million (ppm). At the Luckey site, the beryllium level in the soil varies greatly, from the western portion of the site where the average level is 6.6 ppm, to the north east region of the site, where the average level is 396 ppm. The area with the highest average level of beryllium is the north central portion of the site five feet below the surface, where one of the samples contained beryllium at a level of 13,300 ppm.

5. Was the beryllium brought on the site or is it natural?

Beryllium, in small amounts, is naturally occurring in soil, but the Corps knows that beryl ore was brought to the site from an outside source during the 1950's.

6. From where was the beryllium brought?

The beryl ore was brought from South America and Africa.

7. How deep was beryllium found at the site?

Beryllium contamination varies from a depth of zero feet in some areas of the site (that is, it's at ground level) to 18 feet deep in the northeast portion of the site.

8. Is there a way to treat beryllium in soil on site?

Others have used a solidification process to stabilize various types of contaminants. This technology may be evaluated in the Feasibility Study for the site.

9. Is the Corps going to continue to monitor the site for radioactivity after cleanup?

The need for monitoring and the nature of such monitoring depends on the alternative chosen to address contamination. The Record of Decision will determine what kinds of parameters will be put into place, if any, after the remediation is complete.

10. Does the current owner at the site have a NPDES limitation on the beryllium?

Uretech has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. If someone were interested in knowing if the company's NPDES included guidelines for beryllium, he or she would have to check with Uretech.

11. Is the Federal government looking into holding Brush Wellman responsible for the contamination?

The Buffalo District currently has a contractor conducting research regarding the site history and potentially responsible parties. After the contractor completes that work, the Federal government will determine which, if any, parties may have a legal obligation to pay at least a portion of the project costs and seek those costs where appropriate.

History/Sampling Questions

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Were tests done on the Luckey Dump, and if so, what was found?

At the Luckey Dump, we conducted seven soil borings to collect soil samples. In two of the seven borings, we detected beryllium at about 25 parts per million, on the other five samples, we did not find any contamination.

2. When you were testing the site, did you find any 55-gallon drums buried on site with radioactive contamination, and if so, could the contaminated metal that you found have been from those drums?

We found remnants of some drums in the northeast corner of the site. That was in an area where there was some radioactive contamination, and, yes, it is possible that the contaminated metal found at the site could have been a result from the buried drums.

1. Is it true that a contractor may have removed material from the Luckey site in the 1960's to use as fill material on two residential properties in Luckey? Is the Corps planning on conducting an investigation on those properties?

Yes, based on an interview conducted with a former land developer, soil was reportedly removed from the site in the 1960's to use as fill material on two properties. As a result of information provided by the former land developer, the Corps of Engineers conducted site inspections in December 1999 at the two residential properties where fill material was placed. Based on results of the site inspections, we conducted a more detailed investigation at one of the two properties and a portion of an adjacent property. As in the above case, if we obtain definite evidence that material was removed from the Luckey FUSRAP Site, we will pursue the evidence to determine if contamination is present.

It is possible that other land developers may also have removed fill material from the FUSRAP site. If anyone has information regarding past removal of material from the site, please let us know so we can evaluate the evidence to determine whether a site inspection is warranted.

2. When the contaminated material is dug up, what measures will the Corps take to ensure that beryllium dust and radioactive material does not become airborne and blow onto nearby residences? Will the Corps have to evacuate any residences?

If excavation is the chosen alternative to address soil contamination, our health and safety program would include engineering controls such as watering down the soil to prevent the spread of dust. A program of perimeter air monitoring would also be utilized to monitor airborne dust. Operations involving soil movement are stopped during high wind conditions to prevent the potential spread of contamination.

QUARRY QUESTIONS

1. In the late 1950's and early 1960's, a company called France Stone pumped water from the quarry, which affected local wells. Could the pumping have pushed more water and some of the contamination from the site to nearby residences? Were

samples taken from the nearby rock quarry to ensure that no contamination was spread?

Pumping of water from the quarry reportedly occurred from the 1940's to the early 1970's. The quarry operation very likely influenced the flow of ground water at that time and probably caused water in the vicinity of the quarry to flow toward the quarry. Sediment and surface water samples were collected from the quarry as part of our remedial investigation, but no FUSRAP-related contamination is apparent in the quarry.

2. How far did you sample in the quarry; did you go all the way to the bottom?

Yes, we collected a sediment sample from the bottom of the quarry, which is about 70 feet deep. We also collected water samples at different intervals in the quarry.

3. If the water from the quarry isn't affecting the well water in town, then why, when the water was emptied from the quarry, did the water levels in the town wells drop?

When the quarry operation occurred, water was pumped from the quarry, which did affect groundwater elevations in that area. However, the quarry is no longer in operation, so the quarry is no longer affecting groundwater flow.

4. Would the quarry ever be a water source for the town of Luckey?

The quarry could potentially be a source of drinking water. However, since the quarry water is surface water, a water treatment system would probably be required due to the potential for bacterial contamination.

5. So the water in the quarry isn't as good as Lake Erie's water?

Even though the quarry doesn't contain any FUSRAP-related materials, there may be other contaminants in there that haven't been tested.

6. Is it logical to assume that contamination did travel further from the site when the pumping of the quarry occurred?

It is possible that contamination could have been drawn into the quarry when it was in operation. However, our test results show no FUSRAP-related contamination in the quarry, although it is possible that other contaminants could be present.

GROUNDWATER QUESTIONS

1. What is the natural flow of groundwater in the area of the Luckey FUSRAP Site?

In that particular area, groundwater flows in a northerly direction.

2. When the Corps came to test groundwater depth in Luckey residential wells, did it test for beryllium?

No, groundwater depth was measured to help calibrate the groundwater model for the site and to determine groundwater flow direction.

3. How many residential wells have been tested, where were they and what were the results?

The Corps has been collecting tap water samples on a quarterly basis from three residential wells; two of the wells are directly north of the site and one is adjacent to the

west side of the site. The initial tap water sample collected at the first residence north of the site in July 1998 contained beryllium at a concentration of 7.7 ppb, exceeding the drinking water standard of 4 ppb. However, beryllium was not detected in six of the eight subsequent samples and was detected at concentrations less than the average naturally occurring concentration in the remaining two samples. In eight quarterly samples collected from the second residence north of the site, beryllium was detected in one of the samples at a concentration less than the average naturally occurring concentration, but was not detected in the remaining seven samples. A tap water sample was collected in 1998 and 1999 from the residence located west of the site and beryllium was not detected in either sample. We attempted to collect tap water samples from two residences and a church directly east of the site in 1998, but we were refused access.

The Corps has been collecting samples from the Uretech International facility tap and the East Production Well (the well supplying water to the facility) on a quarterly basis as well. None of the nine samples collected from a tap within the Uretech facility have exceeded the drinking water standard. All nine samples collected to date from the East Production Well contained no detectable beryllium.

4. Is the Corps going to test the water in the Village of Luckey for beryllium?

Our investigations indicate groundwater flows north from the Village toward the site, so testing of the Village water was not believed warranted. In other words, the groundwater in the village is “upstream” of the groundwater at the site. However, based on input provided by the public at the September 19, 2000 public meeting, the Corps of Engineers and Wood County Health Department conducted limited tap water samplings in the Village of Luckey and at several residences along Gilbert, Luckey and Garling Roads, as well as several locations on Lemoyne Road near Toussaint Creek. Beryllium was not detected in the tap water of any of the sampled residences.

5. The Luckey FUSRAP Site has two wells. Which well is contaminated?

The West well, which is currently not in use, has a beryllium content between nine and 13 parts per billion (ppb), which exceeds the drinking water standard of four ppb.

6. If the water quality in the wells is acceptable now, is there any chance that during or after the Luckey Site cleanup, the workers would disturb the groundwater flow, thereby contaminating the wells?

If the source of contamination is removed by excavating the contaminated soil, then groundwater quality should only improve.

7. If my well has elevated levels of nitrate, would that have come from the site?

Nitrate is one of the most common problems encountered in residential drinking water wells around the world. Elevated concentrations of nitrate in well water are typically the result of:

- Septic systems spaced together too closely,
- Malfunctioning septic systems,
- Fertilizers that leach into ground water from lawns or farm fields, and
- Liquids that percolate into the ground in areas where animal manure is concentrated.*

*Source: V.I. Pye, R. Patrick, and J. Quarles, 1983, Groundwater Contamination in the U.S., University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

8. Is the Corps going to conduct air monitoring?

During our remedial investigation we detected airborne beryllium, but it was well below our action level and does not present a hazard to Luckey area residents. If excavation is the chosen alternative, air monitoring would be conducted during the cleanup.

9. Can the Federal government install a municipal water system for the Village of Luckey?

FUSRAP was initiated specifically to address FUSRAP-related contamination (that is, contamination that is a direct result of Manhattan Engineer District or Atomic Energy Commission activities) and does not provide us the authority to build a municipal water system, particularly for non-FUSRAP-related contaminants, such as nitrates. Current conditions indicate that the town of Luckey's water supply is not threatened by FUSRAP-related contaminants associated with the Luckey Site. However, there are other potential sources of assistance and your elected officials may be able to assist you.

10. If a resident were to take independent tests of his or her wells and found beryllium, would he or she have to report it?

No, we are not aware of any regulatory requirement to do so.

11. As a preventative measure, can a filtration system be put onto resident's houses to filter the beryllium in the groundwater?

This decision is up to the homeowner. Most water softeners are designed to remove metals from the water, and since beryllium is a metal, it is possible that this would work. You would have to check with the particular water softener manufacturer and review the product literature and the warranty to see if it specifically says it will remove beryllium from the water.

12. Can a neighboring resident of the site request that his or her well be tested?

For well water testing, a resident can bring in a sample to the Wood County Health Department, and for \$15 - \$30, it will send the sample to an independent lab to be tested for beryllium.

13. Is there an organization that the Luckey community can contact in regard to its groundwater concerns?

A good place to start would be the Wood County Health Department and the local Congressman.

For help understanding any aspect of the project, the Technical Outreach Services for Communities (TOSC) is an excellent resource. TOSC is an independent organization based at Michigan State University and funded by a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Its goal is to assist communities in participating effectively in site-cleanup decision-making through technical assistance and education.

It should be noted, though, that representatives from TOSC attended two previous Public Information Meetings where the Corps presented results of the remedial investigation. At the last meeting TOSC attended, the TOSC representative reported to the public that they have spoken with members of the community and that, in general, the community seemed satisfied with the performance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. As a result, the TOSC representative reported that they would not stay involved unless an organized group of community members could make a commitment to TOSC to work with them and express areas where assistance is necessary.

Due to lack of response, the TOSC decided to end their involvement in the project. However, TOSC can be reached at 1-800-490-3890 and on line at www.toscprogram.org for further discussion about possible involvement if the community believes the organization could be of assistance.