Monsanto

file: Kennedy

FROM (NAME—LOCATION—PHONE) S. G. Collins - F3EB (4-3860) ADMA1/OPR 20

DATE : February 6, 1986 CC.

SUBJECT : DRUM Q&A

REFERENCE :

TO : D. M. Vandiver - 1740

I have some suggestions for the drum Q&A, and, for readability, had Tommye retype your draft.

We also need to send this situational "update" to the appropriate folks in the environmental and legal groups. Let me know if Jack, Warren or Roy have comments and we will go from there.

Your thoughts, please.

Sarah/ts

Sarah G. Collins

SGC/ts
Attachment

bcc: D. R. Bishop
M. Schannon

DSW 136461

IN-1120

COMPANY CONFIDENTIAL
DRAFT -- 2/6//86

Q1. Why have you stopped excavating at the Rt. 3 site?

A1. After we began excavating the site, we discovered the volume of contaminated soil was greater than had been anticipated. Consequently, we are considering additional disposal options such landfilling at an EPA-approved disposal site. We are now in the process of exploring our options and will not resume clean-up until we can suitably dispose of the waste material.

Q2. Why is there more contaminated soil than expected?

A2. We had no way of knowing before we began the excavation exactly what we would find. You may recall that the only map we had indicating the area or what was buried in it was more than 40 years old. The drums the material was placed in have deteriorated. Therefore the adjacent soil is considered contaminated and also must be appropriately disposed of.

This has created questions about the practicality of using incineration as the primary method of disposal. The increased waste volumes now would require a much longer timeframe for disposal via incineration, since incineration capacity of this country is quite limited. By landfilling some of it we can dispose of it more quickly. That's one reason why we are looking at this option carefully.

Q3. Is the site larger than originally thought?

A3. No. It is about what the map indicated: 40 feet wide, 220 feet long and about 15-20 feet deep. The disposal site is not larger than expected. However, the volume of material requiring disposal is greater than anticipated.

Q4. What exactly have you found in your analysis of the material so far?

A4. Though there is more contaminated soil than expected, preliminary analysis shows the chemicals are more dilute than we thought. We have been analyzing each truckload of material and so far have found what we expected -- ONCB (orthonitrochlorobenzene) and DNCB (dinitrochlorobenzene). However, we are continuing our analytic work, and if we find other chemical materials, we will dispose of those according to governmental regulations. We also plan to take core samples of the entire site and hope to have those results within 4-6 weeks.

Q5. What's involved in core sampling and why didn't you do this sampling before?

A5. The core sampling process includes _____.
When we thought we were dealing with whole drums of material, core sampling would have been inappropriate given the damage it could have done to the buried drums.

DSW 136462