



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

40-2061

PDR-Return

396-55

AUG 09 1982

FCUF:WAN
Docket 40-2061

TO SERVICE LIST

The attached questions and statements were received
at the public meeting held by NRC in West Chicago
June 21, 1982.



B208250212 820809
PDR ADOCK 04002061
C PDR

21088

COMMENTS - PUBLIC MEETING RE KERR-MCGEE RARE EARTHS FACILITY - JUNE 21, 1982
DOCKET 40-2061

Every spring when I cut my grass for the first time, I find objects half sticking up out of the ground. I have been told that my yard was once the area of the city dump many years ago. I understand the earth's expanding pressure process through the winter months. Can the process cause any problems later on if the materials are still around after 5 years?

Is the procedure you have recommended for the West Chicago site a new procedure? Has it been used anywhere else in the country? In the world?

Are the cost factors in this kind of storage vital in the decision to go this route?

Are there any figures available as to the difference in the method as opposed to Kerr-McGee removing all material from the area?

What will be done to insure that these radioactive materials cannot endanger the environment?

What will be done to insure that Kerr-McGee monitors the wastes properly?

If all of the radioactive material in the West Chicago city limits were piled on the corner of Ann and Factory Streets in the open (not covered), what would the percentage increase in the cancer cases be against no radioactive material?

Why is the Mayor of West Chicago fighting you and just how dangerous is this Kerr-McGee Co.?

Whom do we contact now and in the future about progress and the monitoring of the materials stored?

What about the devaluation of property surrounding the site? It will be worth nothing. Take everything to Fermi Lab, Batavia.

What about property values? We're trying to sell our house and we've been told by realtors that our house has suffered devaluation because of the Kerr-McGee plant. Is Kerr-McGee, the City of West Chicago, or any other government agency willing to reimburse the local homeowners who are trying to sell but can't due to the unsightliness and health hazards of the plant?

What kind of compensation would be considered on devalued property during the time the factory is completely down and buried?

You stated that it would be stored five years or until a suitable site could possibly be found somewhere nearby in the state. Does this mean that this could be chosen as a state dumping site for other waste from the area?

Will this be a dumping site? Would our water be affected?

How long is this mess going to be on Ann Street? I am getting tired of looking at such a deplorable mess.

Why do you have to post radioactive signs around the property if burying the waste is safe?

Is not the present condition of all the "so called" radioactive material on the site just as dangerous to the environment as it would be if it were encapsulated underground? If so, why any objection to site burial?

How can you guarantee that the radioactive waste will not after, say 5 years, leak or contaminate the air or water supplies? If it is found to be contaminating one or both, what do you plan to do to remedy the problem?

What medical group was responsible for studying the physical impact of these wastes on nearby residents and what were the results and their recommendations?

If the waste matter is buried here, what security measures will be taken and what will be the long range cost?

There is, in the files of NRC, an intra-laboratory memo relating to a physical given to a West Chicago man by the Argonne National Labs stating that there is "little question" that this man has thorium in the body, apparently in the lung. The statement was prefaced by a statement that his measurement of radon was matched by other West Chicagoans in the so called "Lindsay Controls." Have those people been told that they too have thorium in the body, "apparently in the lung?"

Why is a discrepancy of 8 feet allowed between the proposed 2-foot liner bottom and EPA, State of Illinois, minimum requirements of 10 feet? Also, why is the stipulation of in situ clay being disregarded?

What measures will the NRC take to ensure that Kerr-McGee will comply with the mitigative procedures for reducing the amount of airborne material (i.e., spraying water, vehicle speed limit of 25 MPH) carried off-site?

The DuPage County Planning Commission has gone on record as recommending that the radioactive material be moved to either Argonne or the National Accelerator Lab for storage and monitoring. Why is this not a viable alternative?

According to the West Chicago Press June 19, 1982, article, page 12, regarding EIS statement. "Its next procedure (NRC) will be to issue a final Environmental Impact Statement. The final statement could be the draft now issued or it could be a plan modified on the basis of comment and review. The Final EIS is expected by fall." Will this next EIS Statement take as long to prepare as the first one? Give an estimated time.

In laymen's language, without using terms such as half-lives, daughters, RA numbers, etc., tell us, after the expensive, intensive, research done, is there any danger to the residents of West Chicago from this plant or the remains of it which will be buried in West Chicago?

How has the city delayed the final plan you have submitted and what has to be done to proceed?

What is the duration (time span) of total clean-up operation?

In the City Newsletter of November-December 1981, "mayor explains city's position on Kerr-McGee," there is a statement which reads as follows: "The lawsuit was prompted by the decision of the NRC to grant Kerr-McGee the right to dismantle only certain buildings and allow the State of Illinois to store off site waste material on the plant's site." If this is correct, what material is being considered or was being considered?

In this letter dated June 4, 1982 (after the EIS statement was released), you stated that your letter to Mr. Rainey of December 18, 1981, was to be disregarded because you were going to further assess the radiological contamination of Kress Creek. What bearing will this have on the decommissioning of the plant?

What will prevent any future dumping at the factory site or burial site once the existing buildings have been buried and dismantled?

We are tired of all this. When will final report be ready?

Alternative III is the NRC selected course of action. Yet by admission within the DES this alternative could have both short- and long-term negative air quality impacts, has the potential for contamination of ground water, results in a change to topography and could result in a long-term radioactive impact when removed to a permanent site. How then, licensee cost aside, can this be the best alternative available?

Alternative III is generally labeled "temporary" onsite storage, yet the DES in several areas acknowledges the probability that the wastes will not be moved in the future. In view of these acknowledgements, how can Alternative III be viewed as more than a smokescreen to lure the public into a false sense of security?

The DES, in various sections, states that local ordinances, rules, and regulations will be observed at all times; yet throughout the text, functional activities, such as drainage, transportation, storage, etc., are listed which violate these same ordinances, rules, and regulations that are to be observed.

The selected Alternative III calls for safe storage in a manner identical to that specified in Alternative I. We are led to believe Alternative III is temporary, yet in Alternative I it is stated that the disposal cell plan will make excavation difficult. How do you explain the inconsistency?

The DES has totally ignored section 208 of the U. S. Clean Water Act of 1977. Is not the project subject to federal law?

It is acknowledged that in Alternative I, the scheme for safe storage, it is not known if the cover is adequate to meet radon flux and gamma radiation criteria. How can this be so safe if the radiological results are an unknown?

Alternatives IV and V are addressed only in view of probability and cost consideration to the company. Isn't it the duty of the NRC to protect the general public and not the pocketbook of the licensee?

The DES acknowledges that there are negative impacts on public health and safety and environmental values if the material is left on-site, yet these negative impacts are not addressed in any detail or mitigated in any manner. How do you explain this?

Costs to the company are extracted from the plan of Kerr-McGee without benefit of detailed analysis or determination of fact, yet no in-depth cost benefit analysis is made relative to the predictable incidence of cancer or other diseases resulting from the long-term increase in radiation exposure. Just what is a life worth?

The DES definitively states the advantages of clay/shale quarries, yet selects a highly urbanized broad till plain with poorly developed drainage. Other than political problems and cost to the company, how can the NRC justify such a selection?

The DES totally skirts the issue of Public Law 90-148 (Clean Air Act of 1977) on the basis that the Kerr-McGee project is temporary. Yet throughout the text acknowledgement is made that the material will probably not be moved. Is the NRC trying to circumvent federal law on behalf of a licensee?

The DES states that air quality appears to be within standards. Why "appears to be"? Why hedge? Should not an EIS contain definite statement of fact?

Cannot the NRC state categorically that air quality will not be affected by stagnant air mass; also by what criteria do they make the judgment that Kerr-McGee's plant and site is located in rural or semi-rural areas?

The analysis of alternative sites clearly establishes site #3 as the most favorable of those mentioned, including West Chicago. Why then is not Alternative IV the NRC selection made, political and licensee cost aside?

This is purported to be a draft environmental impact statement related to Kerr-McGee's decommissioning plan. An incinerator is part of that plan, yet incinerator emissions are specifically precluded in air quality calculations on the basis that particulates will be negligible compared to that generated by earth moving equipment. Incinerator particulates are specific; earth moving generated dust is generalized. How in an EIS can the NRC not address all points?

Much of Section 5 is written in generalized nonspecific language. Is this because the NRC did not conduct an independent systematic evaluation and in fact does not know what the environmental impacts are?

The DES states when a national or state low level waste plan evolves NRC may require other remedial actions. Including removal of the materials from the site. Is it not true that you also may not?

The DES states that the local community must be assured that "interim" or "temporary" will not become "final" or "permanent." This is totally inconsistent with acknowledgements in the DES that the material will not be moved. In order to assure the community, will the NRC issue an immediate binding order upon the licensee to the effect that at the end of 5 years, all material must be off site even if Kerr-McGee must store it on one of their active locations?

Is it not true that if the radiation exposure rates during the decommissioning process are equivalent to 3 years' exposure and the material is again moved within the 5 years, you have exposed the population to a 6-year radiation dose in 5 years?

The DES states that there will be an increase in radiation dose rate to persons living adjacent to or near the site. It is also stated that this additional dose is not expected to be in excess of background. Are we to assume that the background dose plus the increased dose will have absolutely no effect on any individual?