



Uploaded to the VFC Website

▶▶ July 2014 ◀◀

This Document has been provided to you courtesy of Veterans-For-Change!

Feel free to pass to any veteran who might be able to use this information!

For thousands more files like this and hundreds of links to useful information, and hundreds of "Frequently Asked Questions, please go to:

[Veterans-For-Change](#)

If Veterans don't help Veterans, who will?

Note:

VFC is not liable for source information in this document, it is merely provided as a courtesy to our members & subscribers.



From: Paul Sutton <ssgtusmc6169@yahoo.com>

To: Paul Sutton <ssgtusmc6169@yahoo.com>

Subject: Some correspondence With Dr. Alvin Young concerning C-123 aircraft

Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2011 8:49 am

Shared, courtesy of Lou Krieger who has been in touch via email with Al Young. While I'm sure this exchange, particularly Young's comments with respect to the C123K aircrews, will certainly anger and upset several veterans; the "mindset" and "agenda" needs to be seen by all, to truly understand what we have been faced with since at least 1982.

Paul Sutton

From: Lou Krieger

Subject: Some correspondence With Dr. Alvin Young concerning C-123 aircraft

To:

Date: Tuesday, July 12, 2011, 10:44 AM

Good Morning....below is some correspondence with Dr. Alvin Young concerning the information on C-123 Aircraft that are still contaminated from spray operations in Vietnam and elsewhere....I sent out much of the memo's from the Air Force and the paper trail they left concerning the discussion and the disposition of the aircraft, including their sensitivity to a "minute amount of dioxin" exposure to those aboard those aircraft.

Dr. Young has been great at communicating with me on this matter, even with a differing opinion. Instead of going off on him like a Vietnam Veteran would, I can appreciate the amount of work he has done and his studies, even though they are not supportive of many of our claims.

As I said to Dr. Young and I will say it again; had the military and government performed more timely research into our exposure to these defoliants years ago, many of Dr. Young's comments about "age induced illnesses" would not be a factor. We didn't ask that these diseases be added to the "presumptive list" when we were in our 50's or 60's, it took that long for science to persuade the government and the VA of the wrong they did to us, which I believe they are trying to "right". But as we know, it is just too late for many of our brothers, sisters, children, grandchildren and civilians who have died (or will) from this exposure.

The Media needs to continue to bring this to the forefront and let the people who know "nothing" of this exposure be educated as to what 2 1/2 million + troops and civilians were exposed to with more than 20 million gallons raining down in Vietnam, plus more in the U.S. and some other countries. Dioxin = It's the gift that keeps on giving....for GENERATIONS!

God Bless

Lou Krieger

843-251-8004 Cell

Sent: Sun, Jul 10, 2011 6:53 am

Subject: Fwd: C123K Aircrews & Al Young

Dr. Young,

Amazing that you traveled to Vietnam like so many others have done....I have not desire to go back there, I still have a bad taste in my mouth of the brave (chicken shit) South Vietnamese troops turning their backs and running as the North forgot the Paris Peace Treaty and pushed south, with very little resistance...

I had a SSGT Marine send me this link about the C-123's....he wanted me to send it to you for a response....Looking at documents on the internet concerning this case, you can see how the government tried to keep things quiet. Also, when these planes were taken out of service, the Agent Orange issue was not in the forefront yet. Although their were concerns and tests going on, I don't remember a lot coming to light until around 1980...I could be wrong, since I was in a drunken and drug stupor back then! However, I feel they would have had to take those planes totally apart to clean them up. It is just another piece of the puzzle to me.

I did find out that there are no agent orange records at Edgewood/Aberdeen and that all the records that have been reviewed are still in the possession of Mr. Randal Curtis from the Army Corps in St. Louis....I understand that according to their timetable, which these records were supposed to be reviewed, have now been pushed forward from this November to maybe 2 years from then....Just more of the government dragging their feet to avoid liability for the "massive" contaminated dump site(s) at Ft. Detrick....

Anyway, appreciate you continued correspondence, looks like that article almost wants u to run for political office since your picture is on there so much...Just being funny!

God Bless
Lou Krieger

From the Agent Orange Consultant, Office of Secretary of Defense, Dr. Alvin Young: displays contempt for Air Force Reserve combat veterans (except those earning Purple Hearts, of whom our squadron had many, including POWs). Young's own memos in other areas state that the aircraft were contaminated, that the aircrews might apply for Agent Orange exposure benefits re: illnesses, but considers that "freeloading". Such contempt from such a senior government official is devastating to any veterans seeking medical care from the Department of Veterans Affairs and its Board of Veterans Appeals.

On Sun, Jul 10, 2011 at 5:22 PM, Alvin Young > wrote:

Lou, A sad commentary for blaming me. The Air Force did the right thing for the right reason in destroying those aircraft. It would have been a benefit to the tax payer to have sold those aircraft, but we all knew in time that the Air Reservists would seek presumptive compensation, and those aircraft would become the center of a social (not scientific) controversy, and never be used. The link just about says it all. The only reason these men prepared such a story is that they are hoping they can cash in on " tax free money" for health issues that originate from life styles and aging. There was no exposure to Agent Orange or the dioxin, but that does not stop them from concocting exposure stories about Agent Orange hoping that some Congressional member will feel sorry for them and encourage DVA to pay them off. I can respect the men who flew those aircraft in combat and who made the sacrifices, many losing their lives, and almost all of them receiving Purple Hearts, but these men who subsequently flew them as "trash haulers", I have no respect for such free loaders. If not freeloading, what is their motive?

Then came this:

On Mon, Jul 11, 2011 at 5:09 PM, Alvin Young wrote:

Lou, Please don't bother to send my comments on. They will only anger and upset the men. Let them proceed with their plans for additional compensation with my blessings (which they don't need or I suspect want). I'm out of this business of trying to put the science. Department of Veterans Affairs isn't basing their decisions on the science, so why should I keep sending the recent studies to them. Better to go play some golf or go fishing. It's been an experience to communicate with you, and I thank you for your efforts to at least look at the science.

Dr. Young.....I'm sorry but I did send it out already. You know, you are in the same position as we are...You are on one side and the veterans and others are on the other. I wish the "ENTIRE" scientific community would get together and come to "ONE" conclusion concerning these dioxins. I can tell from chatting with you that you are a good man and anchored in your beliefs. I am the same way, but I must say you made me look at all of this with another pair of eyes. I can see your frustration trying to get your point across from all of your research, and I see the other side with veterans and families suffering also. I realize that many veterans are probably getting these disability ratings due to age and their physical condition. However, it was not the Veterans that stalled out and stonewalled a lot of the research for Agent Orange, where results on diseases from exposure have taken so many years to be acknowledged. Many of these veterans have also been carrying these diseases from a much younger age, before compensation was allowed. Also, so many years have passed since we were exposed, you cannot go back and get any "true" reading on the amounts that saturated the ground and other places. I know not every soldier was sprayed, or walked through areas that were sprayed, but here is how it was in the Central Highlands where I spent most of my time. When we were on convoys, we cooled down in streams by areas saturated by spraying; we showered with non-potable water taken from these same streams, sometimes heated by kerosene that "cooked" the dioxin even more; we used old 55 gallon spray drums from dioxin, allowing any residue to come out of our vehicles as "aerosol" spray, and of course the "monsoon season" that flushed the residue all over the place.

Then, there is Ft. Detrick! You know, all I pretty much ask for is "verification" for things I know since I have many sources and original documents. However, since I stood up to speak in February, to let the people of Frederick know the bullshit that was disseminated at their RAB meetings. I followed that up with requests for authentication of pictures and the numbers for Arsenic levels and some other questions. Because of this, Ft. Detrick will now not communicate with me "at all" concerning their testing and investigation. So what does that tell you Dr. Young?? What are they really hiding from the people of Frederick? Are they trying to extend this inquiry and cleanup for years until all the "exposed" residents are dead or have moved away?

I have interviewed the residents and some former employees personally; they will talk with Ft. Detrick and me since I am a Veteran and not associated with the military. I talked with grown ups who were kids at the time, saw the men in the protective suits spraying, animals that were put out in cages, sirens sounding, spraying done around the animals, and then the animals dying in their cages. The story with the 6 - 55 gallon drums of Dowco Coolant that was just taken out and dumped in the Area B "pit" without being registered and the "switchover" Dowco Coolant being flushed from the Lab Cooling systems right down the City Of Frederick storm drains. Plus, you personally told me of the leftover defoliants used at Ft. Gordon that were shipped back to Ft. Detrick following those tests in 1967. They are "mum" on the disposition of those returned amounts probably because they have no records or have not come across those records. I wish they would come

across those records since the people at Ft. Gordon don't know exactly where the spraying was tested; they used a "mosaic" of pictures to establish an "estimated site".

It's been over 40 years since the spraying stopped, and residue is still being found today. Those high Arsenic levels that were found at the Hawk Missile Site in Homestead are present just from "backpack" tank spraying, and have lingered on even after the area was "rolled over" by Hurricane Andrew. If you look at the retention pond where drums were dumped, there are no "mangrove" trees around it. Yet, if you go back 100 yards or so from that pond to other wetlands, they are numerous, as they are all over the Everglades. My witness who was stationed and sprayed there told me that before spraying all around the pond, there were mangrove trees and 40 years later, they haven't returned!

I'm sorry I didn't get your e-mail before I forwarded it to the author and I sincerely hope this is not the end of our correspondence. It is because of speaking with you that I am keeping an open mind to all the information I come across. It's like I said in the previous e-mail, there is enough of a paper trail and some very serious "implications" in the correspondence on these contaminated aircraft that warrants further investigation. These are not statements from the reservists, but statements from the government and individuals who were in possession and control of these C-123's. I firmly believe that if the case for the reservists ever went to a Federal Court, with the evidence and information I have read, they would lose. That is just my opinion!

Wish I could play some golf, I have a brother in law who has terminal cancer, he has taken a turn for the worse and we will be leaving in the morning for Baltimore. But that means I get to go back to Frederick with my Orange suit and signs! They should have never stopped communicating with me, right or wrong, especially if they have nothing to hide. I'm sorry to say, I think they do!!!

You have a lot of knowledge and experience Dr. Young, please continue to share it!!!

Thanks

God Bless

Lou

Memo for the Record

24 June 2009

Subject: Response to comments from Jim Malmgren's presentation on UC-123 disposal given at the Air Force Strike Board meeting at AMARG on 18 June 2009.

1. Should additional sampling include the area under the floors? Disposal of the aircraft by metal recycling exempts them from the hazardous waste regulations (see 40 CFR §261.4(a)(13) and §261.6(a)(3)(ii)). Technically, sampling the aircraft is not required before scrapping them. However, we feel it is protective of the Air Force to characterize the aircraft in the event of future liability issues and to protect personnel that may be involved in the recycling process. If the compartment under the floors was contaminated by spills that may have leaked through the floor or by sprayed material that entered through the external weep holes, this contamination is not likely to be evenly distributed within the compartment. Proper characterization of this space would require an excessive amount of samples and the partial demolition of the floor surface to access the compartment. Personnel will not be working in the area under the floor during the recycling process, so the risk of exposure potential from this area is minimal. Therefore, we feel it is not necessary to go to the additional work of opening the floor space to sample there.

2. Is engine contamination a concern? No contaminants were found on the exterior of any of the sampled aircraft, and the engine operating temperature would likely have burned off any organic contaminants ever there. Therefore, we feel it is safe to assume that the engines are uncontaminated. However, the very association of these engines with Agent Orange opens the door for litigation. A single law-suit would obscure any financial gain from them.

3. What can be done with the Agent Orange supply tanks? The one tank in aircraft 54-0605 that was sampled had higher levels of dioxins and furans inside the tank than were found in the aircraft fuselage. There are two tanks in the 18 aircraft and another 13 tanks in the storage yard. Again, when scrapped, their level of contaminant concentration does not matter. The concentration found inside the tank exceeds the risk based screening level for a worker working in the environment all day every day for 365 days. In actuality, the tanks will be remotely crushed, chopped, shredded, and melted into ingots. There is no need to treat the tanks differently than the aircraft.

4. What should be done with miscellaneous equipment in the aircraft? There is, indeed, a large amount of ancillary equipment in the aircraft. Nearly all of it was likely placed in the aircraft after the operational missions were completed, and would not be expected to be contaminated with any higher concentrations than found in the interior of the aircraft itself. The large part of this material consists of interior auxiliary fuel storage tanks and exterior wing tanks. The wing tanks would not be contaminated in excess of that found on the exterior of the aircraft (where none was found). The large fuel tanks bolted to the floors may have been used in the

long flight back to the United States, or in other extended operations when spray tanks were not installed in the aircraft, and should not be directly contaminated.

This material would not need to be removed to facilitate Phase 2 sampling - we would sample around it. Phase 1 sampling revealed that, on those aircraft where **low levels of dioxins and furans were discovered, they were fairly uniformly distributed within the fuselage**, and sample location was not as critical as might otherwise have been assumed.

Wayne C. Downs, Ph D.
75 CEG/CEVC
Hazardous Waste Program Manager
Hill Air Force Base

Karl Nieman, Ph D.
Senior Environmental Engineer
Select Engineering Services

DIOXIN CONTAMINATED C-123s

TIME FRAME: 1995-1997

NUMBER AIRCRAFT INVOLVED: 18

“**DIOXIN---MOST POTENT CARCINOGEN KNOWN TO MAN**”

THE DIOXIN FAMILY INCLUDES 75 CHEMICALS

AGENT ORANGE CONTAINED TWO HERBICIDES

2,4,5-TRICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID (2,4,5-T)
2,4-DICHLOROPHENOXYACETIC ACID (2,4-D)

2,4,5-T WAS CONTAMINATED IN THE MANUFACTURING PROCESS
WITH 2,3,7,8-TETRACHLORODIBENZO-P-DIOXIN (2,3,7,8-TCDD)

2,3,7,8-TCDD IS CONSIDERED THE MOST TOXIC DIOXIN AND IS
THE MAIN FOCUS OF AGENT ORANGE HEALTH-RELATED
STUDIES

TEST RESULTS - AUGUST 1996:

17 AIRCRAFT TESTED

2 METHODS OF TESTING CONDUCTED:

METHOD 1: (EPA APPROVED FOR 2,3,7,8-TCDD)

1 AIRCRAFT TESTED; TWO SAMPLES TAKEN (\$1250 EA)

RESULTS/RANGE: 210 AND 6900 PICOGRAMS 2,3,7,8-
TCDD—PICOGRAM =TRILLIONTH OF A GRAM

METHOD 2: (MODIFIED NIOSH METHOD 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T)

17 AIRCRAFT TESTED; 34 SAMPLES TAKEN (\$100 EA)

14 AIRCRAFT HAD DETECTABLE AMOUNTS OF 2,4-D
AND/OR 2,4,5-T

RESULTS/RANGE: 2.2 - 960 MICROGRAMS
MICROGRAM = MILLIONTH OF A GRAM

ANALYTICAL REVIEW RESULTED IN UNCERTAINTY WITH THE
SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS.

355 AMDS/SGPB (CAPT BORMA) REQUESTED AN EVALUATION
BY AL/OEMH (RONALD PORTER, PhD)

355 AMDS/SGPB AND AL/OEMH RECOMMENDED MORE
EXTENSIVE SAMPLING

**355 SGPB AND AL/OEMH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SALE OR
TRANSFER:**

MINIMUM OF 10 SAMPLES PER AIRCRAFT (\$1,500 EA)

FULLY DECONTAMINATE BEFORE SALE OR TRANSFER

**INSURE JAG IS INVOLVED ON ISSUES RELATED TO POTENTIAL
LIABILITIES**

CLEANUP LEVEL:

**THERE ARE NO ESTABLISHED STATE OR FEDERAL STANDARDS
BASED ON SURFACE CONTAMINATION OF DIOXIN**

USING STANDARDS RELATED TO OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL
CONTAMINATION, THE ALLOWABLE CONCENTRATIONS WILL
BE BELOW THE DETECTION LIMIT, MAKING THE "CLEAN" GOAL
0.0 MICROGRAMS



AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND
Command Civil Engineer

4225 LOGISTICS AVE
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-5739

DATE: 26 Dec 96

MEMORANDUM FOR:

BGen Hanes
HQ AFMC/LG

Sir:

- I've coordinated on your proposed memo to AMARC. However, there is one somewhat-subtle point I'd bring to your attention. In para 4.b, there is the implication that we would convey a potentially contaminated aircraft to an FMS customer, while we would not release that same aircraft to a non-FMS party. That seems inappropriate to me... an unjustified double standard.

VR

Todd Stewart
HQ AFMC/CE

TODD I. STEWART

Brigadier General, USAF
Command Civil Engineer

Talking Paper

on

Dioxin Contaminated C-123 Aircraft

- The aircraft have been in storage at AMARC since 1980 and were identified in 1984 as parts donors for the Department of State.

- GSA sold them at public auction in Apr 96 and the aircraft have subsequently been resold to other parties

- In Apr 96, GSA advised AMARC that the Air Force had transferred these aircraft to them and sold them. Jointly, GSA and AMARC Disposition Office (LG-3) worked on their release

- During the aircraft sales period, AMARC employees detected and reported the presence of strong chemical vapors inside the cargo compartment. All work was stopped by the Bio-environmental and the Safety Office until verification of health hazards could be cleared. Subject aircraft at one time had aerial spray systems; used to spray a variety of insecticides and defoliants

- In Aug 96, AMARC provided funding to have swipe test samples taken from all C-123. These were taken by D.O. Consulting Ltd and ALTA Corp on 17 aircraft. All samples tested positive for traces of dioxins

- The Davis-Monthan AFB Bio-environmental office requested support from Armstrong Laboratory Toxicology Department at Brooks AFB in Sep 96 to evaluate the test results and provide AMARC with recommendations on clean up procedures, health risk evaluation and exposure limitations. They have stated they are unable to provide the requested information because detailed laboratory analysis studies have not been accomplished on dioxins 2, 4-D and 2, 4, 5-T. The only information currently available is that the aircraft have detectable levels of contamination

- The aircraft are still physically located at AMARC. They have been undergoing safety inspection and are not releasable due to the reported safety health hazards