Monsanto

SEP 25 1980

FROM (NAME - LOCATION - PHONE): J. H. Craddock - St. Louis G3WA 4-4764

DATE: September 23, 1980 CC:

SUBJECT: PCB ANALYSIS - CAULK'S CREEK SAMPLES - ELLISVILLE

REFERENCE:

TO: D. R. Bishop - A3NB
C. E. Callis - B3CA
R. S. Nelson - G3WA
R. G. Ortiz - E2ND

Mr. James Long, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Jefferson City (1-751-3241), phoned on the 22nd with regards to Monsanto's invitation to monitor our PCB analysis of Caulk's Creek samples. "DNR appreciates the invitation to be present at Monsanto's laboratories; however, since Monsanto is more than capable..." and has considerable expertise in PCB analysis, they don't feel it necessary to be present.

In addition, EPA will perform an analysis on the samples also; so DNR doesn't feel it necessary to do any analysis themselves (since two capable laboratories have already committed to the analysis).

Other information from Mr. Long: The original clean-up involved 107 drums. Sixty-three contain material which was sampled. Of the 63, EPA sampled seven before removal from the site. No PCB's were in these seven. The drums were removed to Emergency Environmental Services site at Spirit of St. Louis airport for storage and a composite sample of 43 drums was taken and sent to ENSCO for analysis.

ENSCO reported 32 ppm in the composite. Subsequently, EPA analyzed the composite and reported 72 ppm PCB's as Aroclor 1260. Emergency Environmental Services sampled another eight drums and made a composite of the "black, oily mess." No PCB's were found in the composite of these eight drums. The remaining drums will be sampled individually and analyzed for PCB's.

That is all the information DNR has at this time on these samples. DNR contracted with the St. Louis County Health Department to sample water wells in the area. DNR had no direct involvement in taking samples or talking to the residents. Long was unaware of the local residents' concern about the samples and comments by the residents that DNR representatives had warned them against drinking the water. Long said he would not have made such a statement.

IN - 10 (REV. 8'77)

The conversation with Long was very cordial and appeared to be very frank. He is concerned with how we would report the results of our analysis. We mutually agreed that it may be appropriate to review analytical results from both laboratories to resolve any technical questions if differences arise. EPA expects the results mid- to late next week. Hopefully, Monsanto's results will be available Friday, September 26, 1980.

J. H. Craddock

jb