

Readme

Next is the number one polluter to Guam and the sole source drinking water aquifer. As I have said this is the largest AFB in the world. All these reports on Andersen show severe contamination to the base, the aquifer and to the entire island. It is an NPL site and is covered in the hearings before congress. It is the worst of the worst for AFBs.

During Viet Nam 10s of thousands of B-52 flights originated and ended at Andersen. Counting all flights of all planes in and out of Andersen, there were probably a million or more just during Viet Nam.

B-52s after each sortie were decontaminated or cleaned with a TCE and a water solution. All of this solvent and water went directly to the aquifer by way of the flightline drainage system. Contaminated fuels many times were disposed of in the same manner. Airforce personnel have said everything liquid was dumped into the drainage system, used on the flightline as a weed killer, buried, burned or dumped. This base sat over the aquifer and all the contaminants ran into the aquifer.

Sinkholes on the base were used as dumpsites. The cliffines of the north end of the island were also used as dumps on Andersen, Urunao dumpsite.

Andersen has the highest amounts of dioxin in soil in the world at 19,000ppm, and many of the dioxin contaminated sites are measured in the ppm range. The highest amount is at a burning pond. This is where the disposal of contaminated liquids was including pesticides. Many of the liquids burned formed dioxin. This amount is so high that it had to be used as a disposal site for the herbicides. Guam was a major staging area for Viet Nam. Many of the herbs used in Viet Nam were stored and used on Guam. By law Guam couldn't ship it's hazardous waste off-island until about 1995 or later(See emails below). They couldn't store all this stuff so much of it was burned or dumped. Either way it was contaminating the aquifer and the air on Guam.(wind patterns for Guam would have been taking the burned toxics across a big section of the island including Andersen and NCS)

Another problem was the fuel distribution system. Miles of pipeline corroded and had to be replaced. One of the 2 major lines was so corroded and leaking it had to be shutdown. Some of the substances distributed to underground tanks would have been JP-5, other fuels and pesticides such as herbicide orange. Any liquid shipped in bulk. All of these toxics are corrosive and create leaks. The liquid then would have leaked into the aquifer(see fuel link).

Remember Guam has high rainfall, porous soil and numerous sinkholes that allow for rapid runoff to the aquifer.(just a note here, a little obfuscation of the truth here. The report says there was no contamination to adjacent areas. There wouldn't be with this porous soil and underground tanks)

Each of the reports on Andersen is for a different time. The latest being the ATSDR report. This report shows what was contaminating Andersen and ultimately the aquifer.

Subject: Shipment of PCB Waste from Guam
Date: Wed, 30 Jul 2003 13:01:22 -0700
From: richman.lance@epamail.epa.gov
To: rubvan@nvcbell.net

Lance Richman
Superfund Programs
US EPA Region IX
75 Hawthorne St., SFD 7-4
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415) 972-3022
FAX: (415) 947-3518

----- Forwarded by Lance Richman/R9/USEPA/US on 07/30/2003 01:01 PM

Lance Richman
To: "
rubvan"@nvcbell.net
07/30/2003 12:21 PM cc:
Subject: Shipment of PCB
Waste from Guam

Readme

Mr. Van Sanderson: I have followed up on your inquiry to the USEPA HQ Information Resources Center concerning off-island shipment of PCB wastes from federal facilities. Below is information I have received from our PCB Coordinator.

The U.S. military (and other federal agencies operating outside the customs boundary of the U.S.) were allowed to move U.S. manufactured PCBs from Guam to the mainland for disposal under a series of PCB import interpretation letters. I do not have the letters at my fingertips and do not recall the date in the early-mid 90's they were signed, but they are available from the TSCA hotline at 202-554-1404.

Note that 40 CFR 761.99 formalized this approach in 2001.

If you have additional questions you may contact me at the address below.

Lance Richman
Superfund Programs
US EPA Region IX
75 Hawthorne St., SFD 7-4
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415) 972-3022
FAX: (415) 947-3518

Subject: Re: (127162206)
Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 13:29:21 -0400
From: "USEPA Safe Drinking Water Hotline" <sdwhotline@bah.com>
Organization: BAH
To: rubvan@nvcbell.net

Dear Mr. Van Sanderson,

The Safe Drinking Water Hotline, operated by Booz Allen Hamilton under contract to EPA, has received your inquiry.

Your question was as follows: What was the acceptable level for dioxin in 1985? What was the first year for regulation of dioxin? How much would ND(non detected) represent in 1985 for drinking water?

We hope you find the following information useful: EPA promulgated a standard for dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD) in drinking water under the Phase V Rule in July of 1992. Prior to that, there was no drinking water standard for dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD). The method detection limit for dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD) is 0.000000005 mg/L.

EPA's Safe Drinking Water Hotline answers questions about the regulations and programs developed in response to the Safe Drinking Water Act. The Safe Drinking Water Hotline provides information on EPA's drinking water standards, source water protection, on-site disposal systems and different kinds of underground injection wells and

Readme

can provide access to EPA publications. Referrals to State public water supply supervision programs, State underground injection control programs, and local contacts (such as certified laboratories to test drinking water) and other sources of information are also available.

If you have additional questions, you may contact the Safe Drinking Water Hotline at the following numbers:

(800) 426-4791 -- Toll Free

(703) 412-3330 -- International calls

For more information, please visit EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water Internet web site: epa.gov/safewater/.

Thank you for your interest in safe drinking water.

Internet Daemon Owner wrote:

>
> comments
> What was the acceptable level for dioxin in 1985? What
> was the first year for regulation of dioxin? How much
> would ND(non detected) represent in 1985 for drinking
> water?
> Thankyou for your time.
> Van Sanderson
> email
> rubvan@nvcbell.net
> name
> Vancil Sanderson
> org
>
> referring_page
> <http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwh/c-soc/dioxin.html>