

588

G-000-1004.6

**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FEED
MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER
COMMUNITY MEETING SEPTEMBER 25, 1990**

09/25/90

**SPANGLER/PUBLIC
75
TRANSCRIPT**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FEED MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER
COMMUNITY MEETING

September 25, 1990

8:00 P.M. LARGE GROUP MEETING

Welcome	Jerry Westerbeck
Ground Rules for Meeting	Andy Avel
DOE Site Office Update	Andy Avel
Public Forum:	
US EPA Comments	Catherine McCord
Ohio EPA Comments	Graham Mitchell
FRESH Comments	Lisa Crawford
Group Questions and Answers	

- - -

1 MR. WESTERBECK: Good evening. I'm
2 Jerry Westerbeck, the Site Manager at the FMPC.

3 If you were one of the 2,000 people who
4 joined us Saturday at the Open House, you will
5 remember that we think the FMPC now stands for
6 Fernald's Main Priority Is Cleanup. That's our new
7 motto, and that's exactly what I've been committed to
8 and will continue to be committed to, clean it up. We
9 have a small DOE staff on-site, small but dedicated,
10 and they have been teaming up with engineers,
11 scientists, with Westinghouse, ASI, and now Parsons
12 has joined our team to work on the RI/FS.

13 I don't really believe in measuring
14 progress by dollars spent. I think it's better
15 measured by how effectively and how efficiently we
16 spend the scarce tax dollars as we move as quickly as
17 we can through the RI/FS process and get into actual
18 cleanup. That's the goal, that's the target.

19 You know, the schedules for moving
20 through the RI/FS are pretty tight, the documents are
21 starting to pour out. Hardly a week goes by that you
22 don't see some announcement in the paper or get some
23 notice through the mail that there's another document
24 in our new library over in the Jamtek Building.

1 The input from you and from the Ohio
2 and US EPA's is very important to us. We consider it
3 important in our revising of the documents, and in
4 addition to your input, we need your support and
5 understanding as well. We want to keep you as
6 informed and as involved in everything we do as much
7 as possible. If you think that -- If you have any
8 ideas on how we can improve getting information to you,
9 either the kind of information or the timeliness of it,
10 please don't hesitate to call. I put some cards over
11 on one of the tables in there, I think Andy always has
12 his name in the newspaper or Bobby Davis, so please
13 don't hesitate to call.

14 Andy, are my two minutes up? Andy only
15 gave me two minutes. Thank you. I'm very happy to
16 see all of you here tonight.

17 MR. AVEL: First of all, I would like
18 to just go over a couple of ground rules that we like
19 to keep to when we have meetings. The first one is to
20 let you know we do have a court reporter here taking
21 the transcript of the meeting. That's for the benefit
22 of people who can't be here that will be able to go to
23 the Administrative Record, which I'm going to talk a
24 little bit about later, and get the transcript and see

1 what went on in the meeting. We do ask that you only
 2 ask one question at a time, use one of the microphones.
 3 There's three mikes, there's one back here, one here,
 4 and one right up here in front. We ask that you show
 5 common courtesy to those who are speaking. Let them
 6 finish asking their questions or responding to a
 7 question or making their comments.

8 We also usually provide, and the same
 9 is true for tonight, we provide question cards. Sue
 10 Wolinsky is standing over there at the door, has cards
 11 that those of you who may not feel comfortable with
 12 asking your question or making a comment into the mike,
 13 if you want to write it down, get the card to Sue, and
 14 Sue will bring it up for us to respond to or read the
 15 question out and respond to it.

16 That pretty much covers the ground
 17 rules. The agenda for the meeting is Jerry, of course,
 18 opened the meeting, and I just went over the ground
 19 rules, and I've got a report which will update you on
 20 the happenings at the FMPC since we had the last RI/FS
 21 meeting. Following my update we have Catherine McCord
 22 from US EPA will make a statement, and then Graham
 23 Mitchell from Ohio EPA will be making a statement, and
 24 Lisa Crawford from FRESH is also going to make a

1 statement.

2 Following Lisa's comments, we'll open
3 up the floor for questions or any comments that you
4 would like to make, either to have answered or become
5 part of the record.

6 As far as the update goes, I've got
7 several items here that I would like to report to you.
8 If you will just bear with me, we'll try to get
9 through these pretty quick. Some of the milestones
10 that we have met, both the US EPA and Ohio EPA have
11 concurred on two of our removal action EE/CA's, that
12 is the waste pit EE/CA and the K-65 EE/CA. The
13 opportunity was provided to get some more information
14 at the beginning of the meeting between 6:30 and 8 on
15 these removals. If you have any questions, we'll be
16 glad to further explore those.

17 Another major milestone, and Jerry
18 alluded to, was that Ralph M. Parsons has joined us
19 since the last meeting. I think the first part of
20 September they officially came on board. A couple of
21 people that represent them are here tonight, and I
22 would like for Dick Duda to stand up. Dick, where are
23 you? Right here. Dick is the program manager. He'll
24 be handling the Parsons office here on-site, and then

1 Bob Glenn, Bob, where are you? Bob will be his deputy.
2 Bob will be heading up the operable unit manager for
3 Parsons. Thanks, Dick, Bob.

4 Their role, their primary role will be
5 to design, do the engineering design of the
6 alternative that will result from the RI/FS. All the
7 documents that we're preparing now are leading up to a
8 remedy for their individual operable units. The
9 Parsons job will be to take that remedy and figure out
10 exactly how it has to be implemented, and they will do
11 the design work for that.

12 Just as a bit of information, following
13 Parsons, eventually there will be a remedial action
14 contractor who will come on board to actually do the
15 work. So another way to characterize this milestone
16 is that we're entering the design phase of the CERCLA
17 cleanup for this site. It is a pretty significant
18 phase to enter into.

19 We've responded to all of EPA's, both
20 Ohio -- I'm sorry, all of US EPA's comments on the
21 silo sampling procedures. The testing of the radon
22 treatment system for the K-65's out in the silos is
23 scheduled for this coming weekend. There's going to
24 be a mock-up sampling on the silo number 4, remember

1 that one is empty, that will start on Monday, October
2 1st, and sampling of silos 1 and 2 are scheduled to
3 start on October 8.

4 A couple of things concerning community
5 involvement. As Jerry said, we had about 2,000 people
6 attend our Open House, and 900 of those, many of whom
7 I recognize in the audience, took tours through the
8 plant. I personally had a good time and felt that a
9 lot of good information was communicated to those
10 people that live in the community.

11 We have opened the Public Environmental
12 Information Center, which is on Hamilton Cleves Road,
13 it's at 10845 Hamilton Cleves Road. For those of you
14 that are less familiar with the numbers and more
15 familiar with the landmarks, as you go past the site
16 heading towards Miamitown, just before you go down the
17 hill to where the flashing yellow light is, just
18 before you go down the hill, it's the last building on
19 the right, the last newer building, and there's a
20 brochure that's on the table back here that describes
21 the hours. One thing that I don't believe is in the
22 brochure is the commitment that we made to leave this
23 building open on the evenings that we have community
24 meetings until the community meeting starts. So, for

1 instance tonight, the building was open until 7:00.
 2 But I encourage you to get the brochure so that you
 3 can familiarize yourself with the location and the
 4 hours of operation.

5 We've held several meetings since May.
 6 One community round table on radiation, three
 7 workshops on removal actions, all three of the EE/CA's
 8 we had workshops on to discuss the contents. We've
 9 prepared two responsiveness summaries, and Jeanne, if
 10 I could ask you to get one of those responsiveness
 11 summaries, I would like to talk a little bit about
 12 that to show you what this document is. While she's
 13 getting that, I'll go on.

14 We met with community leaders to talk
 15 about how we're communicating, how good we're doing,
 16 and we got some surprising comments back, some that
 17 indicated that we needed to do more in the area of
 18 improving community relations. And I think one of the
 19 changes that as a result of that meeting is the format
 20 of this meeting. You notice we don't have several
 21 presentations and viewgrams to go through. We're
 22 trying to make more time available for one-on-one
 23 questions.

24 This is the responsiveness summary for

1 the waste pit, for the waste pit EE/CA. Those of you
 2 who have submitted comments on this document should be
 3 able to find your comment in this document and our
 4 response to your comment, and I want to make sure that
 5 you're aware that these documents are available. So
 6 when you do comment on a document, you do get the
 7 opportunity to see how your comment was responded to.

8 We have another handout or fact sheet,
 9 which is a calendar of the events and the documents
 10 that are coming out. I would like to say it's simple,
 11 but, unfortunately, the documents that we put out
 12 keeps it from being too simple. If you look for this
 13 facts sheet or this handout on the table, take one
 14 home with you, you will be able to keep up with the
 15 documents that are scheduled to come out and when they
 16 will come out.

17 We've been working with Hamilton County
 18 to do a modification of our sirens so that they can be
 19 used by the National Weather Service to warn people of
 20 dangerous weather conditions. We've had some
 21 discussions with Hamilton County, and we've still got
 22 some technical problems to work out, but we are very
 23 encouraged that the next time we come up to report to
 24 you, we will be able to give you a good indication of

1 something that is well on the way to making this
2 happen.

3 Results of the characterization include
4 an item that we've talked about several years ago, at
5 least two years ago I believe, and that is a vault or
6 a container of waste that was supposed to be under the
7 flagpole around the Administration Building. We did a
8 lot of looking, we did some magnetic surveys, I
9 believe we did some gravity surveys as well throughout
10 that whole area and could find nothing. In some of
11 the interviews with people that worked at the plant in
12 the past, we came, we were reminded that there used to
13 be an Administrative Building at the other end of the
14 plant, the north end of the plant, and a flagpole
15 there. So we did some characterization work up there,
16 and to date we have found a magnetic anomaly in the
17 area that leads us to believe there may be something
18 buried there. So we're currently going back and
19 researching some of the literature to see if we can
20 get a better idea of what would be buried there before
21 we do further investigations.

22 We're just getting ready to start up a
23 program that we call Paddy's Run Seep Study. What
24 that is is a program that consists of about 20 wells

1 that will be installed from, by the site all the way
2 down to the river. And what we'll be looking for is
3 whether or not we have uranium at low levels that are
4 moving right within inside the banks of Paddy's Run
5 from one bin to another. You'll see some drill rigs
6 out in that area in the near future, and there also
7 will be people that are taking samples of the water,
8 sediment samples, and doing temperature measurements.
9 So you might be on the lookout for those folks.

10 A couple of items that we consider good
11 news about the cleanup at the plant, one of them is
12 the drum overpacking. As a lot of you are aware,
13 there's several thousand drums that are stored outside
14 on the plant 1 pad, on several of the pads that are
15 located outside of other plants as well, and we have a
16 program to identify those drums that may be leaking or
17 weeping and get them overpacked. To date, let's start
18 with since the last meeting, we have overpacked 8,337
19 drums, making a total for the fiscal year 1990 of
20 12,481 drums that have been overpacked. Also, we have
21 moved 18,350 drums into plant 6 and plant 9 to get
22 them outside, or get them in from the weather to help
23 protect the integrity of the drums.

24 Last week we erected what is called a

1 small structure, looks like a tent that we are
 2 utilizing out of the plant 1 pad area to house drums
 3 that have been identified to be in a deteriorated
 4 condition until they can be moved and overpacked.
 5 Somebody help me, it's about 6,000 or 20,000 square
 6 feet --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 5,200 square
 8 feet.

9 MR. AVEL: 5,200 square feet. We're
 10 using it as a demonstration program. It's a facility --
 11 I believe there's some photographs in the exhibits
 12 back there if you're interested. I think these will
 13 stay up for a little while after the meeting. You can
 14 go back and take a look. But we can actually take
 15 that building down and re-erect it in another location
 16 in three days, and if it turns out to be a real useful
 17 facility, we may wind up procuring or purchasing some
 18 more and larger ones.

19 There are several underground storage
 20 tanks on the site. I believe there's a total of 13,
 21 and the FMPC is committed to remove nine of them by
 22 October 1st. I'm happy to report that eight of them
 23 to date have been pulled out. There's one more tank
 24 that will be removed in October, and then we're going

1 to have to abandon one in place, which is because the
2 tank is underneath the building. So for the time
3 being it will be left in place, and then there's a
4 couple more that will be addressed in the near future.

5 Another topic of interest and one that
6 we're pleased to talk to you about tonight is the
7 restart of the off-site shipments of the radioactive
8 waste. We've had 15 shipments that consist of 22,876
9 drum equivalents or the equivalent of a 55-gallon drum.
10 That's about 170,000 cubic feet. Some of our
11 engineers can give you an idea of what that is. I'd
12 say it's enough to fill this room and that room. But
13 we've started up our shipment for disposal. Again,
14 good news I think.

15 To give you an update on the NEPA side
16 of the house, the Environmental Impact Statements.
17 The renovation EIS, which is to address the renovation
18 projects at the site, since we've had the issue of
19 transitioning from the defense programs to the
20 environmental programs at our headquarters level,
21 headquarters is now considering whether or not we even
22 need to complete the EIS process for the production
23 facility, especially since there's an EIS that's being
24 done in conjunction with the RI/FS. In other words,

1 on the cleanup site.

2 Speaking of the RI/FS-EIS, we had a
 3 public scoping meeting in June, towards the end of
 4 June, and the implementation plan is now being
 5 prepared. The problematic EIS, this is the third one
 6 I'm talking about now, I know I always get confused
 7 and I think a lot of other people get confused along
 8 with me, but the DOE problematic EIS, notice of intent
 9 is scheduled to be out in the very near future. That
 10 will announce a scoping meeting which will follow
 11 shortly, and there are several of them to be held
 12 across the nation, and one will be held in the
 13 Cincinnati area, and as soon as we know when that will
 14 be, we will let you know in the way of phone calls and
 15 announcement in the newspaper.

16 Another topic that a lot of people are
 17 interested in is the Environmental Monitoring Report.
 18 We have a commitment from our headquarters folks that
 19 will be out in October. So we can look forward to
 20 that coming out.

21 I want to follow-up on one newspaper
 22 article that was in the Enquirer. The reporting was
 23 good reporting; unfortunately, it was based on a
 24 document of ours that had a typographical error in it.

1 The report reported that we had found cesium in some
2 of the fish that we were doing biological studies on
3 in the plant. The report should have stated that
4 there was no cesium found in any of the fish. There
5 was a level that should have been listed as below
6 detectable limit, but the symbol that would indicate
7 it was below the technical limit was left off, and
8 even though the levels were low, it came across as us
9 having found cesium in the fish, but that is not true.
10 We have not found cesium in any of the fish.

11 And also in that story there was some --
12 there was a reference to the fact that we have not
13 communicated to the community that there's thorium 230
14 in, I believe, silo 3 and at the site. After talking
15 to the reporter, I found out that that was based on
16 statements that were in the Tiger Team report. I went
17 back and looked in the Tiger Team report. It's true
18 that you can get that information from the Tiger Team
19 report, but if you look at the other reports like the
20 RR report for Operable Unit 4, the Environmental
21 Monitoring Report, I think we've made a lot of reports
22 to the community that we do have thorium 230 on the
23 site. I think it was a -- we didn't have the
24 opportunity to speak with the reporter that was

1 writing the story. That opportunity is my fault. I
2 did not return the call. The reporter did an
3 excellent job of reporting. We did not have an
4 opportunity to communicate and let that person know
5 that we had communicated this information to the
6 public before.

7 I think that's all that I have to
8 report. I'd like now to turn the microphone over to
9 Catherine McCord. Catherine, we thank you for coming
10 down from Chicago.

11 MS. McCORD: Good evening. My name is
12 Catherine McCord. I'm with the United States
13 Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 office in
14 Chicago. I know many of the people here in the
15 audience. I've been involved with the Fernald site
16 for the last several years, primarily overseeing the
17 cleanup activities and also other environmental
18 compliance actions at the site.

19 Some of you participated in a public
20 meeting that US EPA conducted last May, May of 1990,
21 that involved a new consent agreement between the
22 United States Department of Energy and US EPA. This
23 consent agreement laid out the framework for continued
24 cleanup of the site and replaced certain sections of

1 an older 1986 federal compliance agreement between the
 2 US EPA and DOE. Anyone at that meeting heard some of
 3 the specifics about that consent agreement, and in
 4 summary, basically the new agreement gave a new
 5 framework for completion of the activities or new
 6 deadlines and much more of the specifics that were
 7 left out of the original 1986 document. The reason
 8 for that is we're further down the line now; we know a
 9 lot more about the site. In 1986 there was very
 10 little known about the extent of the contamination
 11 other than we knew there was some groundwater problems.

12 There was a 30-day public comment
 13 period that ended the end of May, and US EPA gave
 14 notice to DOE that the consent agreement was final in
 15 the end of June. So right now we're working under the
 16 new 1990 consent agreement, and this is the framework
 17 that drives and rules, provides the rules for the rest
 18 of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, and
 19 then the ultimate remedial design or remedial action.

20 A big change in this consent agreement
 21 provides for, at least from the US EPA standpoint, is
 22 that it is also requiring removal actions which is a
 23 more shorter term cleanup action, and I am sure if
 24 you've gone around and spent some time in the room

1 next door, you've seen some of the posters that deal
 2 with the four removals that either are about to start
 3 or have already started at the site.

4 US EPA still, it's sort of the other
 5 arm of US EPA, in addition to overseeing the cleanup
 6 up there, we're still involved with environmental
 7 compliance, the general compliance with environmental
 8 laws and regulations. Many of these programs are
 9 delegated to the State of Ohio and are enforced
 10 through the Ohio law, but some of these regulations
 11 are still being enforced at a federal level. US EPA
 12 still has a hazardous waste enforcement action pending
 13 against Westinghouse. We're still waiting to either --
 14 we'll either be going to a hearing on that enforcement
 15 action or hopefully get a summary judgment from the
 16 administrative law judge that presides over that
 17 action.

18 US EPA has also continued to negotiate
 19 a compliance agreement with DOE with respect to air
 20 and the release of radionuclides into the air. The
 21 authorities for this consent agreement are in the
 22 Clean Air Act and have to do with the national
 23 emissions standards for hazardous air pollutants,
 24 NESHAP. This program generally has been delegated to

1 the State of Ohio with the exception of the
2 radionuclide portions which are still being run out of
3 the US EPA. I would expect that this document, we
4 will be finalizing in the next few months, and the
5 details of what this site has to do to comply with
6 regulations will be presented maybe at the next public
7 meeting.

8 As you probably heard from Andy's talk
9 and from the poster sessions next door, there's been a
10 lot of activity as far as submission of documents and
11 reviews and approvals and disapprovals from US EPA and
12 Ohio EPA. If anyone has any questions about either
13 approvals or disapprovals or comment letters that US
14 EPA or Ohio EPA presented, Graham Mitchell from Ohio
15 EPA and myself are here. We can discuss those with
16 you. You may see some of these documents at the
17 information center. All the letters or correspondence
18 with DOE with respect to the cleanup at the site are
19 included in the Administrative Record, which is
20 located in the new information center.

21 Something I spoke briefly about at the
22 May meeting was the availability of a technical
23 assistance grant supplied by US EPA to provide citizen
24 groups some monies to obtain technical assistance in

1 their participation with Superfund cleanups. Now that
2 the site has, was finalized last November on the
3 national priority list, the NPL list, a citizens group
4 associated with that particular site is eligible to
5 apply for a \$50,000 grant from US EPA.

6 After talking with some of the FRESH
7 representatives, we understand that there is some
8 desire to apply for such a grant and that possibly a
9 notice of intent to submit an application is going to
10 be filed with us soon. I've supplied FRESH with a new
11 guidance document that we've got and forms that need
12 to be filled out, and we hopefully will process that
13 very quickly and will work closely with you and try to
14 get that together.

15 One of the requirements for a technical
16 assistance grant is that a certain portion of the
17 monies be put up by the group itself, but US EPA does
18 not require the actual dollars be matched or be used
19 to match the federal dollars that are provided by the
20 agency, but rather certain services can be credited
21 towards that portion of the grant that needs to be
22 matched. So if people are offering either some of
23 their own personal services, maybe some bookkeeping or
24 organizational type things, or you've got some space

1 donated to you, you can use a fair amount of, you can
2 essentially estimate a charge for donations of those
3 time or maybe the church that you have your meeting at
4 and use that against your portion of the grant.

5 That's really all I have to say tonight.
6 But if anyone has any questions, I'll be available
7 throughout the evening to answer them. Thank you.

8 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. My name
9 is Graham Mitchell with Ohio EPA, and for the last few
10 years I've been coordinating the State's efforts or
11 Ohio EPA's efforts at cleanup and studies of this site.

12 I feel a lot of progress has been made
13 since our May meeting. Ohio EPA and DOE have agreed
14 on a draft revision of our December, 1988 consent
15 decree, which is going to bring the site into
16 compliance with the hazardous waste regulations. You
17 may remember last spring the State filed contempt
18 charges on hazardous waste violations. These
19 revisions to the agreement will put DOE on track
20 towards identifying mixed hazardous waste and
21 preventing further environmental releases.

22 The next thing that is progress is the
23 Ohio EPA, and as Catherine and Andy mentioned, have
24 conditionally approved the K-65 EE/CA. The important

1 thing is conditionally approved. There are a lot of
2 conditions that were put on this by both Ohio EPA and
3 US EPA. So you should be at least aware of that, and
4 I'll be glad to answer any questions about those
5 conditions.

6 Ohio EPA has also approved the
7 alternate water supply portion of the South Plume
8 EE/CA, and we felt that this was an important action
9 to take to stop the contamination, the uranium
10 contamination from being drawn further down into the
11 aquifer via the Allbright Wilson wells and the
12 alternate water supply will replace those wells and
13 take those wells out of service and prevent the
14 additional extent of contamination.

15 Ohio EPA has also approved the waste
16 pit EE/CA. The important condition there is that DOE
17 provide some sort of alternate for reducing the
18 overall uranium discharge from the site.

19 As I say in all of these meetings, we
20 are here to answer your questions and hear your
21 concerns, and we really want to do that tonight. Also
22 with me tonight is Mike Profitt of our groundwater
23 group, he's also working on this site, and Donna
24 O'Hanon, who is the new Paddy's Run Road site

1 coordinator for Ohio EPA. Mike Starsky, who used to
2 be the project coordinator, is still with Ohio EPA, so
3 his expertise has not been lost. But Donna will be
4 taking over that.

5 Although this is not related to FMPC, a
6 number of you have expressed concern over the need for
7 a public meeting on the RI/FS that's being conducted
8 at that site, and over time we've been saying we want
9 to do that, we don't have enough data. I think we're
10 shooting for sometime towards the end of the year,
11 late November, early December, when we will have
12 probably two rounds of data complete and we can sit
13 down and have a public meeting. So that should be
14 coming up, and you can talk to Donna about the
15 mechanics of that and how we're going to let people
16 know about that.

17 That's all I have. I'll be here the
18 rest of the evening. Feel free to stop by and see me
19 and I will answer your questions as best I can. Thank
20 you.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: FRESH's comments,
22 you'll have to bear with me because I'm two hours
23 behind everybody here. I'm still on somebody else's
24 time.

1 FRESH has been trying to see that the
 2 Fernald plant gets cleaned up. We've worked on these
 3 issues for five and a half years. FRESH's leadership
 4 in the community has been instrumental in following
 5 the cleanup process.

6 Our comments for this evening's meeting
 7 are as follows. We're pleased that this meeting was
 8 moved from the site on Saturday to this place this
 9 evening. We would encourage DOE to continue this
 10 practice of holding all community meetings off the
 11 waste site. Too much time and energy were wasted
 12 arguing a simple point, not to hold community meetings
 13 on a Superfund waste site. This time and energy would
 14 have been well spent on cleanup projects.

15 With regard to comment periods and
 16 responsive summaries, DOE has tried to answer comments
 17 expressed but alternatives that commentators expressed
 18 were not chosen. It seems we're not making any
 19 difference. Once remedial action is chosen, we would
 20 like an explanation as to why you reached this final
 21 decision. We take the time to make comments and we
 22 feel we need a response.

23 With regard to the recently held Open
 24 House, it's our understanding that \$200,000 was spent

1 on this event. Most attendees were former and current
2 employees or family members. It's our understanding
3 that few community folks actually attended. Why not
4 call it an employee picnic. We feel that the dollars
5 could have been better spent on cleanup activities and
6 not on employee entertainment.

7 Also we're concerned with none of the
8 visitors who toured the plant on Saturday having on
9 protective clothing or having a urinalysis done. The
10 last time I toured the site with Congressman Luken in
11 early July, we had to have urine testing going in and
12 coming out. We had to wear a lot of protective
13 clothing, booties and jackets and protective glasses
14 and thing like that, and we had to be monitored with
15 badges, and none of this was done on Saturday. Also,
16 the media was absolutely forbade to go with us, but
17 not so with Saturday's affair. Seems we have two sets
18 of rules here, one for the DOE events and one for the
19 FRESH and community folks. This greatly disturbs us.

20 It's our understanding that the South
21 Plume EE/CA is still not approved. Again, FRESH urges
22 the Department of Energy to please treat the water
23 prior to dumping it into the river. We also still
24 have concerns regarding the waste pit EE/CA and the

1 K-65 EE/CA. It seems none of our suggestions were
2 taken into account.

3 This is just for everybody's knowledge.
4 FRESH, as you all know, we are in a corporation and we
5 are a non-profit organization, and we now have a new
6 address, and if you would like to write to us or send
7 us documents or anything like that, I would encourage
8 you to please send them to this address and not to my
9 house. P.O. Box 129, Ross, Ohio, 45016-019. The
10 mailbox will be checked on a daily basis. So make
11 sure everybody gets whatever it is you are sending to
12 us.

13 FRESH members -- oh, I was going to
14 talk a little bit about the Environmental Monitoring
15 Report, but since you told us that it would hopefully
16 be coming in October, we would encourage you to try to
17 figure out a process to speed this up and try to get
18 it to us in May if at all possible. It just seems a
19 little ridiculous that we don't get the '89
20 Environmental Monitoring Report until it's almost the
21 end of '90 or sometimes even into the following year.

22 FRESH members have put in thousands of
23 hours writing letters, educating ourselves, reading
24 documents, attending meetings, and dealing with this

1 issue. All we really want is what is best for our
2 community. Thank you.

3 MR. AVEL: Thank you. When I came
4 back and sat down, I realized there were several
5 things I forgot to talk about, but Lisa did remind me
6 of an issue that we spoke about earlier today.

7 Last night a truck that was carrying
8 uranium metal from the site down to Y-12, had taken a
9 route going around 275. I think, when it got about to
10 75, the brakes on that truck caught on fire. There
11 was no involvement of the incident with any of the
12 uranium metal, although we did respond with radiation
13 technicians and industrial hygienists and a response
14 vehicle. The fire was put out without incident. The
15 brakes on the truck were fixed rather than unloading
16 the truck where it was and placing that uranium on
17 another truck. They fixed the brakes temporarily,
18 well enough so that we could bring the truck back to
19 the site and unload the material for reloading. Some
20 of you may have noticed that the truck when it was
21 brought back was accompanied by emergency vehicles and
22 flashing lights, and I believe there was an article on
23 one of the radio stations that said there was a truck
24 containing hazardous waste caught fire, that some

1 evacuations were taking place. But --

2 MS. CRAWFORD: I wasn't here; I just
3 heard word of mouth.

4 MR. AVEL: That's the issue that I
5 wanted to let you know about.

6 I want to thank Graham, Catherine, and
7 Lisa for their comments. We have an open forum for
8 any verbal questions. While Sue brings those up -- we
9 haven't had any yet.

10 Let me remind you if you have any
11 questions that you would like to write down rather
12 than ask, Sue is standing right there by the door,
13 raise your hand and she will come over to you. The
14 microphones are open. Yes, ma'am.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you tell us
16 where that fire was?

17 MR. AVEL: I believe it was on
18 Hamilton Drive.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 275 and
20 Hamilton Avenue.

21 MR. AVEL: 275 and Hamilton Avenue.
22 The trucking company has a depot there or a station
23 where they pull the load or the trailer to that
24 location, and then they may switch the tractor portion

1 before it takes off on its delivery, and it was being
2 delivered to Y-12, which is the weapons production
3 facility in Oak Ridge. But the uranium metal was
4 depleted and it was some of the, what we call product
5 that is still on the site.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much was it?

7 MR. AVEL: Thirty-six thousand pounds.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There was no,
9 no one was injured, no one was evacuated?

10 MR. AVEL: That's correct. Yes, ma'am.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there anyone
12 that you have to notify in the Transportation
13 Department when this type of material is being hauled
14 on the highways?

15 MR. AVEL: I don't know the answer to
16 that question. Does anybody --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What was the
18 question?

19 MR. AVEL: I'm sorry. The question
20 was are we required to notify anyone, say the
21 Department of Transportation or anyone when shipments
22 like this are made from the plant.

23 MS. McCORD: There's no DOT
24 notification requirement. There is just Department of

1 Transportation shipping requirements that they've got
2 to comply with. There's no notification that this
3 material is leaving the plant and going somewhere on
4 the highway.

5 MR. AVEL: Let us look into that and
6 make sure. We'll have the question answered within 30
7 days along with the transcript of the meeting in the
8 Jamtek Building, or if you would like, we can give you
9 a call earlier than that.

10 Any other questions? Okay, we can all
11 go home I guess.

12 MS. MERRITT: My name is Maggie
13 Merritt, and I am a FRESH member and have been very
14 active in the community, and I want to tell Mr.
15 Westerbeck we're real glad to see you here tonight.
16 You're making yourself visible for a change.

17 Your Open House was great for PR, but
18 in the wake of probable cutbacks in cleanup funds, I
19 feel that \$200,000 could have been and should have
20 been put to a better use for this area by channeling
21 the money for more cleanup activities. It irks me
22 that you and DOE can spend taxpayers' dollars so
23 frivolously without regards to future curtailment of
24 cleanup funds. It's also like DOE has a bottomless

1 bank account. Someone should be held accountable with
2 restraints on how money is spent. I guess we didn't
3 learn a lesson with the \$600 and \$900 were spent for
4 toilet seats. This \$200,000 also went down the drain.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. AVEL: I feel I should address the
7 comment concerning the cost of the Open House and some
8 of the other comments that were made. First of all,
9 there were more than just a few people that were there
10 that did not have connections with the site. Several
11 people from the community -- I personally took two
12 tour buses of about 25 people each, and there were
13 only, I think, ten total that had a connection to the
14 site, and as far as the -- not only that, but there
15 were a lot of people there that usually come to these
16 meetings and are definitely not or at least appear not
17 to be connected with the site from the standpoint of
18 the questions that they asked and the comments that
19 were made. But I personally feel that it was a very,
20 very beneficial program and project, and our goal was
21 to open the site up, to let people see firsthand that
22 we're not just at this meeting telling you we're
23 cleaning things up or that we are placing drums into
24 production facilities. We wanted you to see this for

1 yourself, and we feel that it was worth the price.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: Several thousand
3 dollars per person?

4 MS. NUNGESTER: I just want to
5 reiterate a couple of the other comments that \$200,000
6 does seem kind of steep. That could have gone a long
7 way either to hiring some workers that have been laid
8 off or to do some of the cleanup.

9 Also, I find it very appalling that
10 when I toured the plant on July 5th with Congressman
11 Luken, I was subjected to urine tests and most of our
12 touring time was taken up with these urine tests,
13 going in and out of the site, and wearing the
14 protective clothing and all those sorts of things.
15 And the media was not allowed to attend with us. Two
16 of us at least on that tour, three of us really, had
17 been on every tour that FRESH has been offered, '86,
18 '88, and July. And on those tours we were allowed to
19 talk to the media, and this time as we went around the
20 different changes that we noted, we weren't allowed to
21 share with them. Your guided tour when you led the
22 media on, they only get to hear your side and opinion.
23 While it's true that you have barreled
24 up a lot of the waste and repackaged them, the new

1 thorium containers are rusting. I have that on my
2 video camera. This is brand new containers. Also, I
3 find it very interesting how you can tell us when
4 we're standing here by barrels under a roof that they
5 are protective, as if rain or sleet does not go
6 sideways or the wind does not blow sideways and that
7 if we stand on one side of the yellow line, that we
8 are safe, but if we cross that, we may be contaminated.
9 There's just a lot of discrepancies, and again, I
10 mentioned that we were not allowed to bring this out
11 to the media during our trip.

12 MR. AVEL: If I can reiterate, if you
13 took the opportunity to come out on Saturday, you
14 would have been able to talk to the media. There were
15 several media folks there.

16 We did take precautions for
17 individual's health and safety. The people that tour
18 the plant, production area toured on buses and were
19 only allowed to get off on mats that were placed, walk
20 in controlled areas which were cleaned and surveyed
21 beforehand. Each tour had an FMPC person that wore a
22 dosimeter and underwent urinalysis to monitor the
23 people in that bus. So we did take precautions. Some
24 of the individuals tonight have expressed their

1 concerns over the protection they had to go through
2 when they went on the site and the tour that they
3 participated in did not have restrictions. They did
4 have to wear processed clothing, lab coats, shoe
5 covers, protective glasses, just like I do or any of
6 the people that work at Fernald when they go into the
7 production area. That's because the areas that you
8 were allowed to go in were not, you were not
9 restricted.

10 Yes, sir.

11 MR. MILLS: My name is John Mills, and
12 this is the first time I've ever been to a meeting
13 like this, and I would like to tell you that I approve
14 very highly of your public tours, and I think they
15 should be held more often than what they have been
16 held. Even though it does cost money, I would
17 recommend very much encouragement for the DOE to hold
18 these public tours. Thank you.

19 MR. AVEL: Thank you.

20 Other questions or comments? I have
21 one written one that was submitted. The Enquirer
22 story today made reference to FMPC producing enriched
23 materials for weapons efforts. Is this true? I
24 thought no enrichment went on at the FMPC.

1 The reason I'm hesitating is because I
2 was told to make use of the people that really know
3 the answers rather than try to answer them myself. So
4 I'm going to ask John Frasier to watch me as I answer
5 this question. If I don't do it right, jump up and
6 fill in for me.

7 There is uranium that is enriched on
8 the site. Now there is no enrichment operation that
9 goes on at the site, but we have in the past processed
10 some of the yellow cake, for instance, that has been
11 enriched, and we have taken that one form of uranium
12 fuel or one step in the uranium fuel process and
13 changed it into uranium metal, and the uranium metal
14 would then be enriched. Now the enrichment levels at
15 the site are currently, are all very low. That
16 natural uranium, if you have natural ore, the percent
17 of uranium 235, the isotope uranium 235 is about .7
18 percent, and the enrichment levels that we have
19 on-site vary from .9 to 1.2. I've seen 2.25 percent
20 of U-235.

21 Just to maybe put that into prospective,
22 the percent enrichment for uranium fuel in a
23 commercial reactor would be somewhere around 4 percent,
24 and for a naval reactor or even for one nuclear weapon

1 is up in the high 90 percent. So the answer is, yes,
2 it's true there is enriched uranium on the site, but,
3 no, there has never been any enrichment process at the
4 site.

5 MS. NUNGESTER: There's also some
6 plutonium on-site, isn't there? That was a question
7 that I asked in '86 and I was told at that time, which
8 I have in my notes at home, that there wasn't any, but
9 there is plutonium on-site.

10 MR. AVEL: Where is Sam Schwartzman?
11 Sam, do you know the answer to this?

12 MR. SCHWARTZMAN: The levels of
13 plutonium that we have are an impurity of the product
14 that we have received after the plutonium was taken
15 out at Hanford site. The levels in I think the
16 highest case is 60 parts per billion in some of the
17 product we have on-site. In order for our operators
18 to handle it as they do normal uranium, it has to be
19 below 10 parts per billion. Once it gets higher than
20 10 parts per billion, then they have to wear
21 extraordinary clothing and so on. So it's at the very
22 small impurity level, and I can't give you the total
23 amount.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sure, the

1 point is that there is some now.

2 MR. SCHWARTZMAN: It's just like
3 saying there's uranium in the river water; it's there
4 as an impurity.

5 MR. AVEL: You can have a radionuclide
6 or an isotope like uranium and it decays, you're going
7 to have, even if we start with just -- John is shaking
8 his head. We do have plutonium there, but like Sam
9 said, it's almost a contaminant, if you will, in the
10 uranium. It's a very small amount.

11 MS. NUNGESTER: I have two more quick
12 questions. I mentioned before that I toured that site
13 three times now, once every two years, and I wondered
14 what is the policy on giving out the reading on the
15 dosimeters? I don't recall ever receiving a reading
16 on my dosimeter of what level it was. I think as a
17 citizen I should be entitled to that.

18 MR. AVEL: We can certainly give you
19 that information. The only time that we would notify
20 you is if you did receive a dose which is above what
21 we call our trigger levels on the site. In other
22 words, if you had a dose that was high enough that it
23 would be a concern to your health or to your safety,
24 then we would notify you.

1 MS. NUNGESTER: I'm not arguing over
2 whether it's high or low. I would like to have that
3 information.

4 MR. AVEL: I think we can get you that.
5 Wait just a second.

6 MR. DAVIS: I'm Bobby Davis. Someone
7 else asked me that question a couple of days ago, and
8 I have already asked, dealing with Westinghouse, to
9 get a procedure put in place so that all the visitors
10 to the site are provided the monitoring information
11 and urinalysis information regardless of whether it's
12 above the trigger levels or not. I think everyone
13 should be able to receive that information.

14 MS. NUNGESTER: Thank you, I
15 appreciate that.

16 And also, now on the EE/CA on the waste
17 pits, I forget which operable unit it is, I have it
18 written somewhere, you do address about some treatment
19 of the uranium in the water before you discharge it
20 off-site through the affluent line. My question is
21 what is going to be done now for the thorium because I
22 understand there's a goodly number of thorium in those
23 pits and it has had to leak in that water somehow. Is
24 it going to be cleaned as well before its discharged

1 into the river?

2 MR. AVEL: Your question --

3 MS. NUNGESTER: It's only addressing
4 uranium.

5 MR. AVEL: I think I heard you ask two
6 questions. You said, one, there's uranium in the pits,
7 and uranium is a contaminant and uranium is being
8 evaluated to be cleaned -- or thorium, I'm sorry, is
9 being evaluated to be cleaned up just as uranium is.

10 MS. NUNGESTER: I think that should be
11 mentioned in your documents, because it only addresses
12 uranium, as uranium is to be taken down to like, what
13 is it, 40 percent, I forget the exact amount, and then
14 released into the affluent, but I think it should also
15 be mentioned in there how much of the thorium is going
16 to be removed.

17 MR. AVEL: Dave Brettschneider, where
18 are you? Dave, the analysis of the runoff from the
19 waste pit, can you come up to the microphone and speak
20 to what we found in the way of thorium in the runoff
21 from the waste pit?

22 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: I'll be honest
23 with you, I don't know.

24 MR. AVEL: Let's go back and check to

1 see what the levels of thorium are.

2 MS. NUNGESTER: I think that should be
3 made public, not just to me, but to the newspapers and
4 the media somehow.

5 MR. MITCHELL: I want to make one
6 point on the monitoring. I think that although we
7 have approved the EE/CA's, it's more of a concept
8 approval, and there's still a work plan that will be
9 coming to Ohio EPA and US EPA for approval and comment.
10 Monitoring is an important part of that. So we'll be
11 looking at all of these. This isn't a carte blanche
12 approval for this project to go ahead. There are
13 going to be other check points to make sure that the
14 project is put into operation properly and monitored
15 properly.

16 MR. AVEL: Vickie has been waiting.
17 Why don't we let her go ahead.

18 MS. DASTILLUNG: I have some questions
19 about your EIS and your calendars that have been
20 issued. We came to the scoping meetings and at that
21 time questioned whether EIS for the RI/FS was
22 necessary because we were under the impression that
23 other things that you were doing would meet that
24 requirement. I take it that you have not come to an

1 agreement with US EPA about that?

2 MR. AVEL: That's correct. It's DOE's
3 position that an EIS is required for the RI/FS portion
4 of the activity.

5 MS. DASTILLUNG: The other calendar we
6 got, I guess at the last RI/FS meeting or one of the
7 meetings, that there would be a draft out in November,
8 but it's not listed on this new calendar. Are you
9 still planning to have a draft out in November?

10 MR. AVEL: A draft of the --

11 MS. DASTILLUNG: Of the RI/FS-EIS.

12 MR. AVEL: I would have to look at the
13 schedule. Right now the current plans are --

14 MS. DASTILLUNG: This one just has the
15 final for mid 1991 with no draft being issued at all,
16 at which time the public is supposed to be allowed to
17 comment again.

18 MR. AVEL: November, 1991?

19 MS. DASTILLUNG: It says mid 1991 a
20 final will be issued of the RI/FS-EIS. There's
21 nothing on here about a draft being issued at any time.

22 MR. AVEL: Let me get one of the
23 calendars. The reason I'm hesitating is because the
24 EIS is tied in with the FS on Operable Unit 4, and I

1 would have to look at when Operable Unit 4 -- Behrum,
2 why don't you answer this question.

3 MR. SHROFF: We are working on
4 implementation plans, and around January, the draft is
5 due to be out by January of 1991 of the RI/FS-EIS.

6 MS. DASTILLUNG: Can you elaborate a
7 little bit more on how you go about doing it, because
8 the renovation EIS has been years, and we haven't even
9 seen a draft, and yet within less than a year, you're
10 talking about having a final on this one, and I don't
11 understand.

12 MR. SHROFF: That's because it's tied
13 into the RI/FS, and we have a schedule.

14 MS. DASTILLUNG: If you have deadlines
15 you'll meet them, and and if you don't have deadlines,
16 you don't meet them?

17 MR. SHROFF: No, no, that's not true.

18 MS. DASTILLUNG: That's the way it's
19 sounding.

20 MR. SHROFF: It is an integrated
21 approach here. DOE is attempting to integrate the EIS
22 with the RI/FS, and that's why it's been going on and
23 supposed to come out in January.

24 MS. DASTILLUNG: What do you have to

1 do to create an EIS? You said that they were working
2 on implementation plans.

3 MR. SHROFF: The implementation plan
4 is being reviewed at the present time. What you have
5 to do to produce an EIS, any major federal action such
6 as the RI/FS requires the production of an EIS.

7 MS. DASTILLUNG: When the
8 implementation plans are ready, could we have access
9 to a copy of the steps you're going to take to produce
10 the document?

11 MR. SHROFF: I don't see a problem
12 with that.

13 MR. AVEL: We can do that.

14 MS. McCORD: Andy, the FS report is
15 11/25/90 for OU-4.

16 MR. SHROFF: That's correct. What she
17 was talking about was the drafted EIS. The draft
18 FS-EIS.

19 MR. AVEL: Yes, sir.

20 MR. CLASSON: It seems at the last
21 meeting on the K-65's as a testing sampling, it's
22 supposed to progress, start on October 8th; is that
23 correct? And then how long will it take to complete
24 that process or do you know?

1 MR. AVEL: Marvin, I'm sorry, can you
2 restate the question.

3 MR. CLASSON: You know, at the last
4 meeting, you was going to take sampling of K-65, the
5 boring slants and whatever you're going to do down
6 through the manholes, and I understand that hasn't
7 started yet, but it's supposed to start the 8th, and
8 how long will that take before we get any information?

9 MR. AVEL: Currently the schedule for
10 starting the sampling for the K-65 is the 8th of next
11 month. Now we anticipate that it will take about a
12 month to complete that sampling, and then it will take
13 anywhere from 90 days to as much as 120 days to get
14 the results, to get the samples analyzed and to get
15 the results back. It takes that long to go through
16 the laboratory processes to analyze those samples, so
17 that will be probably not until spring of next year
18 will we have the information back from these samplings.

19 MR. CLASSON: I see. Also, is there
20 any work or progress since the last meeting on this
21 South Plume; what's the progress on that?

22 MR. AVEL: That was another of the
23 items that I forgot to mention. Graham and Catherine
24 may want to help me out here. We are in the informal

1 dispute resolution process right now. We met today,
2 Graham, Catherine, and myself, to discuss final
3 resolution of this document.

4 I would like to say that all three
5 agencies are looking toward the objective of removing
6 uranium that is in, that is being discharged from the
7 plant to the river, to lowering that number, lowering
8 the amount of uranium that is being released to the
9 environment. That's one of the objectives that we all
10 agree upon. We're currently working on the best
11 mechanism to accomplish that.

12 The next step, we are going to write a
13 letter to the US EPA and to the State proposing a plan
14 that will reduce the amount of uranium that is being
15 released, and it will, that proposal will be evaluated
16 by both the State and the US EPA.

17 Catherine and Graham, do you have
18 anything that you would like to add?

19 MS. McCORD: It was on September 4th,
20 I think, we disapproved that document for the second
21 time, and that's why we kick into this dispute
22 resolution process. And so this 30-day period will
23 end next week, and so that's, our meeting today was to
24 continue negotiating to see if we could work out the

1 differences. We haven't done that yet. We're going
2 to wait, as Andy said, for another written proposal of
3 some things that were presented to us verbally today
4 before this sort of gets taken up to higher levels in
5 our organization if we aren't able to settle it with
6 our current players. We don't feel like we're close
7 enough yet that we could not approve that proposal
8 with conditions. We are that far apart. Hopefully
9 after seeing some of these new written proposals we
10 can possibly move towards getting the project underway.
11 We have not resolved the differences yet.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In this
13 proposal that you're going to send to the EPA, what
14 amount of percentage do you want to restrict the
15 uranium going into the affluent line? The last time
16 we talked it was 10 percent, and that was not enough.
17 Is it going to be more?

18 MR. AVEL: Our plans are to remove or
19 to lower the amount of uranium that's put into the
20 river as much as we possibly can with the resources
21 that we currently have. That's our objective. We
22 want to make a significant impact on the amount of
23 uranium that goes to the river.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You can't give

1 us any idea of what you're heading for, what amount or
2 if you like the last time you talked it was only going
3 to be 10 percent was going to be removed.

4 MR. AVEL: Well, that was 10 percent
5 of the runoff from the waste pit EE/CA, and what we're
6 talking about now is a significant amount. We're
7 going to up it to maybe 25 percent, I think that would
8 be fair to say, of the uranium that is going out from
9 the whole plant, which is a lot bigger number than 10
10 percent of the runoff from the waste pit. It's a much
11 bigger number. But I hesitate to say what those
12 numbers are before we get some kind of an agreement.

13 MR. MITCHELL: Rather than getting
14 into numbers, if you remember when we had the South
15 Plume and the waste pit EE/CA meetings, the issue was
16 that the uranium was going to be taken out of the
17 groundwater and the runoff and just added to the river.
18 So there would have been a net increase of uranium
19 going to the Great Miami River. And that's when your
20 group and Ohio EPA and US EPA are both saying that was
21 not acceptable.

22 Without getting into numbers, the
23 proposal as we heard it will actually reduce the
24 overall below even what it is today, so there's

1 actually going to be a net environmental benefit here
2 to the proposal that we have that's sort of in draft
3 form and really nothing in writing yet. That's the
4 important concept to take away. And then as we move
5 ahead with this, we should resolve this hopefully in
6 the next couple of weeks. Feel free to call either
7 Catherine or myself as the details of this evolve.

8 MS. NUNGESTER: There's an important
9 question on that. They were exceeding that uranium by,
10 it was supposed to be 800, and they're exceeding it at
11 900 now. So what you're suggesting is that it may be
12 even lower than what they're dumping in there now?

13 MR. MITCHELL: That's correct, yes.
14 One of the reasons why we felt that was a concern was
15 they are exceeding their own limits, and we felt that
16 was acceptable to add more to that, but then you're
17 right, this would be actually a reduction --

18 MS. NUNGESTER: Because your permit
19 just allows the 800 number.

20 MR. MITCHELL: We don't even have a
21 permit.

22 MS. NUNGESTER: You don't have a permit
23 for the affluent line that goes to the river?

24 MR. MITCHELL: We have a permit for

1 the affluent line, but as we mentioned, the extension
2 gives DOE the whole relation over the uranium.

3 MS. NUNGESTER: I'm sorry, it just
4 takes a while for the facts to kick in.

5 MR. MITCHELL: You hear what we're
6 talking about through all these negotiations is
7 uranium.

8 MS. NUNGESTER: I would have to say
9 personally I would be in agreement with that reduction
10 that you're talking about.

11 MR. MITCHELL: That's what I think
12 everybody is working towards right now.

13 MS. McCORD: There's no regulation of
14 the uranium discharge under the Clean Water Act and
15 the NES Programs, but there's still regulation of that
16 discharge under the CERCLA Superfund authorities for
17 the cleanup, that the amount that will be allowed, if
18 any, allowed in the future is generally a CERCLA
19 action. So it's not just going to be DOE guidance
20 levels that will be used to judge whether or not
21 what's being discharged today is acceptable because
22 there will be always more water, we want to call it
23 waste water generated, because the cleanup will
24 generate more waste water.

1 MR. AVEL: We've been standing up here,
2 at least I have, every since I've been here, telling
3 you that we're serious about cleanup, and this
4 proposal we're currently working on we hope will
5 demonstrate how serious we are about cleaning up the
6 plant.

7 Any other questions? I've got a couple
8 up here that I can read.

9 MR. CLASSON: I was on the plant tour
10 Saturday, and I went through the building where you
11 have the large drum dryer, and what is the purpose of
12 that when it gets in operation?

13 MR. AVEL: You're speaking of the
14 rotary kiln that is currently in Plant 8. The purpose
15 of that kiln is to remove water that is in some of the
16 waste, for instance, some of the drummed waste out on
17 the Plant 1 pads and in the building contains a large
18 amount of water. Now, in order to ship that material
19 off to storage facilities, there is a restriction on
20 how much water can be in the waste, and there can be
21 no free-standing water. So before we can ship a lot
22 of the waste that's on-site, it has to be dried, and
23 that rotary kiln's purpose is to dry that waste.

24 MS. McCORD: There's probably a good

1 chance that that new equipment will be used at some
2 point in the cleanup. And there's plenty materials
3 still sitting on-site in drums, as Andy said, that
4 need to be dried, but there are air permits that are
5 required for that unit under state law and under some
6 of the federal regulation, these NESHAP's I spoke of
7 earlier, that will regulate that unit if it's being
8 used to process some materials here on-site. I don't
9 want to say production type of activities, but it's a
10 way to get material out, and then any emissions that
11 aren't resolved from the use of that rotary kiln as
12 part of the cleanup are still covered again under the
13 Superfund authorities that we're looking at, any
14 emissions that unit would put out and whether or not
15 it's acceptable and the kind of air pollution control
16 devices that are being used.

17 MR. AVEL: We are in the process of
18 obtaining a permit for that facility with the State of
19 Ohio. Yes, ma'am.

20 MS. NUNGESTER: May I ask the status
21 of the perched water under Plant 6, 9 and 2-3?

22 MR. AVEL: We, as a lot of you know,
23 we were pumping water from Plant 6 and stopped pumping
24 water because we found that we had volatile organic

1 compounds. Currently we are in the process of
2 developing or installing a -- first of all, we have to
3 evaluate what kind of a treatment system we want to
4 put in. Then we're going to put a treatment system in
5 to pull the volatiles out of this water. When we get
6 the system operating, we'll be able to start pumping
7 again.

8 Plant 9 and Plant 2-3 -- Carlos, help
9 me out if I misrepresent. We are currently awaiting
10 comments back from EPA on work plans that were written;
11 is that correct? We are expecting to get EPA's
12 comments on the work plans which identify and define
13 the type of work we want to do in those areas to
14 remove contamination.

15 MS. NUNGESTER: Will that information
16 be accessible to the community at large?

17 MR. AVEL: It will be --

18 MS. NUNGESTER: Your decision when you
19 decide with the EPA what you decide on?

20 MR. AVEL: It will be available pretty
21 much after the decision is made. This particular
22 removal action we call a time critical removal, and
23 that's why you haven't seen an EE/CA document for that.
24 We felt that it was a situation that needed immediate

1 attention, and so it does not go through the same
2 process. In other words, we go ahead and take the
3 action, and then we report on the action to the
4 community after it's taken. So you will have the
5 benefit of seeing what was done, and Catherine might
6 want to add something.

7 MS. McCORD: The letters that go
8 between Ohio EPA and US EPA and with DOE approval or
9 disapproval are all a part of the Administrative
10 Record. So they are in the information center. You
11 can go and talk to the librarian and locate all the
12 documents related to the approval of the work plans
13 for Plant 6.

14 MS. NUNGESTER: And later on for Plant
15 9 and Plant 2-3?

16 MS. McCORD: Yes. It's just as Andy
17 said, there's no formal comment period. We
18 essentially skip the EE/CA, moving right to the work
19 plan, which is the second phase, because we know more
20 about the problems, the solutions are more obvious,
21 and that's why this action is a certain type of
22 removal action that does not require these longer term
23 engineering evaluation/cost analysis documents.

24 MS. NUNGESTER: They throw out our

1 comments anyway. Thank you, Catherine.

2 MR. AVEL: This fact sheet, not a fact
3 sheet but handout that's on the table contains the
4 answers to about four questions that were asked at the
5 last public meeting, and we felt that we may not have
6 gotten the answers out in a form that was as we wanted
7 to get out, so we wrote the answers out. We've placed
8 them here on the table. If you're interested, you
9 might want to pick up a copy and take a look at the
10 questions and the answers.

11 MR. CLASSON: I just wonder, how many
12 drums have you still outside that's never been
13 categorized or taken care of? Do you have a number on
14 that? And when we complete the overpacking or the
15 drum --

16 MR. AVEL: Sam, do you have the
17 numbers that still remain to be characterized?

18 MR. SCHWARTZMAN: I want to be careful
19 when I say characterize. The answer is we know what's
20 in the drum. Every drum has a source code and lot
21 code on it. The issue that we're trying to resolve
22 now is a lot of those drums have not been
23 characterized in terms of a hazardous component as
24 defined by the RCRA laws. So it's probably on the

1 order, Sue is here, I guess about 40,000 or so,
2 roughly 40,000 drums that have to be characterized for
3 the RCRA constituent. That means either we have to
4 determine whether there's pesticides that could have
5 gotten in that drum, volatile organics, partially
6 volatile organics, some additional metals which we did
7 not have to characterize while the material was being
8 processed, but under the hazardous materials law we do
9 have to characterize.

10 MR. AVEL: Thanks, Sam. Why don't I
11 take care of one of these that I have. On one of the
12 tours at Open House it was mentioned that a decision
13 would probably be made within the next ten days to, as
14 to whether the plant will remain open or closed.
15 Please clarify.

16 I believe, if I could restate the
17 question, we had indications that by the 1st of
18 October we would receive a decision as to whether or
19 not the plant would remain in either standby or would
20 be closed down as far as production goes. The
21 response to date is that starting October 1st, we are
22 shifting from the program office in headquarters that
23 is defense programs that we have been reporting to
24 ever since Fernald has been in operation, over to the

1 program that is headed up by Leo Duffy, the
2 environmental management program office. That to us
3 is a statement that illustrates that we're no longer
4 going to receive the majority of our money from the
5 defense program side of the house. We will be
6 receiving the cleanup money from the environmental
7 side of the house. Now, where we haven't received a
8 statement that says that the plant will go into
9 permanent shutdown, we do believe that this is a
10 strong statement by the department that moves us that
11 much closer to being in permanent shutdown.

12 Another question I've got is what is
13 dispute resolution and how does it work. Well, the
14 federal facility consent agreement that was negotiated
15 by US DOE, US EPA, and Ohio EPA and signed by US EPA
16 and the Department of Energy recognizes that the
17 documents that we prepare may not be approved by US
18 EPA, and that with that recognition, a process is
19 defined that allows the two agencies to meet starting
20 at my level and Catherine's level to work one on one,
21 and we always have the State with us to meet one on
22 one and discuss various alternatives or various
23 methods that we might use to arrive at a final
24 disposition that's agreeable by all parties. It

1 starts with what is called informal dispute resolution,
2 and that can start with again, at my and Catherine's
3 level, and can work up the management chain until
4 eventually it gets to the head of EPA, who makes the
5 final decision. And I have to apologize because I
6 jumped from informal dispute resolution over to formal
7 dispute resolution. Let me back up.

8 The informal dispute resolution is
9 again a 30-day opportunity to work out differences
10 between the two agencies on a document or on an issue
11 that is required to have US EPA's approval, but it
12 does not have their approval at that time. After the
13 30 days of informal dispute resolution, we go into
14 formal dispute resolution, which starts out at the
15 next level of management above me and escalates to Joe
16 LaGrone and Al Damcus, and if a resolution cannot be
17 reached by those two -- for those of you who don't
18 know Joe LaGrone, the head of the DOE operations
19 office in Oak Ridge, the office that we report to, the
20 operations office we report to, and Mr. Damcus, who is
21 the regional administrator for US EPA in Chicago. If
22 they cannot reach agreement, then the issue is kicked
23 up to Mr. Riley, who is the head of EPA for his final
24 decision.

1 Catherine, do you want to add anything?

2 MS. McCORD: We have to expect that
3 there's just going to be things that we don't, DOE and
4 EPA don't agree on. We don't like the proposal put
5 forth, we don't maybe like how it's being carried out,
6 but most documents submitted by US DOE to EPA for
7 approval are subject to this dispute resolution
8 process. And the reason for that is we don't want
9 these disagreements where we're not approving a
10 document and they can't start work to go on forever.
11 So that's why there are set time frames laid out in
12 the consent agreement for dispute resolution. As Andy
13 said, the first phase is the informal 30-day period.

14 The next phase, I believe, is either 10
15 or 15 days, where both our people that we immediately
16 report to are also involved in the discussions. And
17 then it kicks up to people, Dr. Bibb and an associate
18 in my organization, and then up to Joe LaGrone and the
19 regional administrator, Al Damcus, level before it
20 goes to Washington. The key point there is the EPA
21 has the final say in those disputes, that it is the
22 administrator of US EPA in Washington that gets to
23 make the final decision.

24 And there also are some documents that

1 are submitted under the consent agreement which are
2 not subject to dispute resolution, which essentially --
3 the big example is the records of decision. That if
4 DOE presents us with a draft and then a second draft
5 document that we don't feel is approvable or
6 acceptable, US EPA is just going to rewrite it
7 ourselves, and at that point it has to be implemented.
8 So as far as the long-term remedial cleanup, the
9 records of decision are a very important document
10 because that's the document that outlines the selected
11 remedy and what is going to be done to clean up a
12 particular operable unit, so we will not even go
13 through that dispute resolution process.

14 MR. AVEL: Thanks, Catherine.

15 Yes, ma'am.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: You mentioned earlier
17 that by October 1st you may know and have a final
18 decision about whether we'll never produce again or we
19 will produce again, and if the decision comes down
20 that says this plant is now closed, we're moving you
21 from Oak Ridge to headquarters, you're not going to
22 produce anymore, this is it, it's final, it's over.
23 Is there a -- what's the word -- who says a year and a
24 half from now that -- can they come back a year and a

1 half from now and say, well, gee, we need this place
2 again, so we're going to go back in and we're going to
3 fix it and we're going to use it all over again. Can
4 that happen? Once you shut it down, is that it or is
5 it a temporary shutdown?

6 MR. AVEL: I think anything is
7 possible. You're asking --

8 MS. CRAWFORD: The inclination I'm
9 getting is we're going to shut down, this is it, we're
10 going to go into full, headlong cleanup, this site
11 will never produce again. Is that the message?

12 MR. AVEL: Yes. That is the message
13 that we bring to you; that's our expectations, that's
14 how we're planning.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: There's not an
16 assurance?

17 MR. AVEL: I cannot promise you that
18 this country won't get into a state that it may need
19 the plant to operate. I can't make that statement.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: I thought what we do at
21 Fernald was going to be, what I read, it may be done
22 by commercial people, the operation would be moved to
23 another site. I mean, I think it's really silly. I
24 don't know about anybody else. This is my personal

1 opinion. To shut a site down, put it into full-fledged
2 cleanup, and two or three years down the road, five
3 years or ten years, however many years, you dismantle
4 things, you've got waste piled in all the buildings.
5 It would take a tremendous amount of money to go back
6 ten years from now and say, gee, we need the site
7 again, move everything back out and start from scratch.

8 MR. AVEL: I agree with you. If the
9 decision comes down that it's going into permanent
10 shutdown, that will definitely be the objective of DOE
11 to permanently shut it down, not to shut it down with
12 the thought some day it will be revised.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: So we won't go through
14 Oak Ridge operations -- if this happens October 1st,
15 we will not go through Oak Ridge operations, we will
16 go straight into headquarters?

17 MR. AVEL: Currently we report to both
18 headquarters and to Oak Ridge operations. We receive
19 different types of support and guidance from the two
20 organizations. Right now we report to the Defense
21 Program, the assistant secretary for the Defense
22 Program in headquarters, and we report to the
23 assistant manager for defense programs in Oak Ridge.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Who's that?

1 MR. AVEL: That's Bill Bibb. After
2 October 1st, in headquarters we'll report to Leo Duffy,
3 who is the equivalent of an assistant secretary, and
4 then we'll report to Bill Adams in Oak Ridge, who is
5 an assistant manager for environmental management
6 projects. So we still go through Oak Ridge, but we
7 shift programs over in Oak Ridge also.

8 MS. McCORD: Just something I forgot
9 to mention earlier was that a concern that was raised
10 at the public meeting for the 1990 consent agreement
11 was that there was no language in the agreement about
12 startup of production, and that concern was raised
13 from US EPA's regional administrator to Joe LaGrone.
14 Joe committed to giving notice to US EPA for six
15 months prior to any startup of production. We have
16 that in writing. That will address some of the
17 concerns.

18 It doesn't mean, that doesn't affect
19 whether or not the plant will go down to permanent
20 shutdown, but at least as long as we're in this sort
21 of standby mode, there will be at least a six-month
22 period where at least we would have time to come in
23 and make sure the operations would be complying with
24 all environmental laws. So we felt very comfortable

1 with that kind of time period. In fact, LaGrone
2 mentioned probably more time to actually get things in
3 shape than six months. He had no concerns about
4 granting that period.

5 MR. AVEL: Thanks, Catherine.

6 Let me bring back up a question that
7 was asked concerning the thorium in the runoff of the
8 waste pits. We have, the question if I can remember
9 it, was are we concerned about thorium and are we
10 finding thorium. We know there's thorium in the waste
11 pit. Are we planning to treat to remove the thorium
12 from the runoff water from the waste pit. Any
13 treatment that we do at the plant, we have indications
14 or we're constantly confirming this with sampling. If
15 we treat the uranium, the levels of uranium down to
16 acceptable levels, then we also take care of most all
17 of the other heavy metals, the thorium, radium.

18 John, am I --

19 MS. NUNGESTER: What about when you
20 pump that water out of Plant 6?

21 MR. AVEL: That was the volatile -- we
22 were treating for uranium out of Plant 6, and again,
23 when we talk about treatment at this stage, we don't
24 take the water down to levels that are much below a

1 thousand parts per billion, I'm sorry, about one part
2 per billion, but when we treat that water that has the
3 uranium in it and take it down to the levels that we
4 do discharge uranium to, we also get the thorium. We
5 also treat the thorium down to acceptable levels.

6 John, go ahead. This is John Frasier.

7 MR. FRASIER: It's not that we don't
8 know much about the thorium in the service water
9 because we have analyzed that, and I do not recall the
10 actual numbers, but they are lower. Yes, there is
11 thorium, especially the thorium 230, which doesn't
12 have a whole lot of mass to it, but it certainly has
13 radioactivity associated with it present in the waste
14 pits. There are some quantity of that, and not a
15 great, great quantity compared to what you have in
16 uranium. So if you're looking at materials, surface
17 water running from the waste pit area, that
18 contaminant which is prevalent, by far prevalent is
19 uranium, and that's confirmed by analysis.

20 Another thing about thorium as compared
21 to uranium is that thorium is not very mobile in the
22 environment compared to uranium, and because of that,
23 it sort of stays where it is. That's another reason
24 that you don't see much thorium in surface water

1 runoff or for that matter migrating to the groundwater.

2 That was the comment I wanted to make
3 earlier, and I did make a note to myself that we need
4 to better address the questions relative to the other
5 radionuclides in the waste pit runoff EE/CA. Even if
6 they're negative, we need to make sure that they are
7 stated as such, that they were reviewed and their
8 levels are very low.

9 And I think in general Andy's comment
10 about the removal -- I'm not a radiochemist or a
11 chemist -- but I think in general that is true, when
12 you're removing, the process to remove the heavy
13 metals tends to remove more than just the uranium and
14 also the thorium.

15 MS. NUNGESTER: My point was this
16 whole problem could have been addressed if it was just
17 mentioned in your EE/CA's.

18 MR. FRASIER: It would be nice to make
19 sure that we get every -- in hindsight we can see
20 20/20, and beforehand we try to address all the issues
21 in the assessments when we go through those, and
22 sometimes we can do better and we end up responding to
23 comments by saying, now, silly us, we should have been
24 more careful on this. And responding to comments, we

1 do go back and revise the documents, and that's the
2 purpose of the comments and the response process, that
3 there are areas that we feel that we were deficient in,
4 we go back and correct those. We try to get
5 everything, but sometimes things slip through. And
6 certainly the levels of thorium and the other
7 radionuclides are very low compared to uranium.

8 MS. NUNGESTER: They're still there.

9 MR. FRASIER: Yes. And if they're low,
10 we need to say they're low.

11 MR. AVEL: John Frasier from IT
12 Corporation.

13 Any other questions?

14 MR. CLASSON: Has the thorium all been
15 overpacked and is the program all finished?

16 MR. AVEL: The question was has the
17 thorium all been overpacked, and I didn't hear the
18 last part.

19 MR. CLASSON: And the program all
20 finished.

21 MR. AVEL: And is the program all
22 finished. We have all the thorium that was stored
23 outside currently stored inside, and that which was in
24 drums that were deteriorated outside have all been

1 overpacked. So we have all the thorium moved into
2 indoor storage. I don't believe we have -- Do we have
3 any plans to overpack any thorium?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's
5 approximately 13,000 drum equivalents of thorium
6 on-site that will still have to go through some
7 overpacking. All the material is inside currently,
8 and as soon as next year possibly, we may be starting
9 a program to get that overpacked and then get, the
10 overpacking of that portion of it would also be a
11 shipment of it. It probably won't be handled until we
12 have a place to send it, but we're still waiting
13 information on that.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: Andy, when is the
15 public comment period over for Operable Unit 3?

16 MR. AVEL: Lisa Crawford asked about
17 the initial screening of alternatives for Operable
18 Unit 3 that just came out on the 24th, that was
19 yesterday. She asked when the comment period was over.
20 The answer is there's not an official public comment
21 period; however, US EPA and the State, Ohio EPA, will
22 provide comments to us within 30 days, which is
23 October 23rd, 24th, and your comments are always more
24 than welcome. If you can get them in before the 24th

1 of October, it would help to us address them.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: Why isn't there any
3 comments on this one like there were -- I don't
4 understand.

5 MR. AVEL: There are certainly
6 documents in the process that are required by law to
7 be submitted to the community for comments, and those
8 are documents like the EE/CA's, the RI reports,
9 Feasibility Study. But initial screening of
10 alternatives, while they're not required, we put them
11 out and we accept comments. So, but there is a --

12 MS. CRAWFORD: The next step is the
13 EE/CA for this? Or no?

14 MR. AVEL: No. This is an operable
15 unit, so it does not have an EE/CA. The deliverables
16 for the operable unit -- it's complicated. There are
17 primary deliverables and there are secondary
18 deliverables.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: Never mind.

20 MR. AVEL: Let me just run through the
21 primary, because these are the ones that are important.
22 They're also in this calendar. The first document
23 that comes out is the initial screening of
24 alternatives.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: We got one of these on
2 the South Plume, didn't we?

3 MR. AVEL: You got an EE/CA on the
4 South Plume; you got an EE/CA on the K-65's; you got
5 an EE/CA on the waste pit. Now, every operable unit --
6 That is the last one to be completed for the operable
7 units. All the other operable units, initial
8 screening of alternative documents are done. We can
9 go over to the Jamtek Building and pull one out for
10 Operable Unit 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

11 The next step is the RI report, that's
12 the next deliverable. The next primary document will
13 be the Feasibility Study. The next one will be the
14 proposed plan, and then the next one will be the draft
15 Record Of Decision. And each operable unit has that
16 set of primary deliverables, and they are all placed
17 in the Administrative Record and we accept comments on
18 all of them.

19 Heber reminded me that this is the
20 first step of the Feasibility Study for evaluating the
21 different cleanup alternatives and reaching a
22 conclusion which alternative is the best.

23 MS. DASTILLUNG: When does the
24 engineering angle of it come, after the ROD or before

1 the ROD?

2 MR. AVEL: After the Record Of
3 Decision, we've got 15 months to be in the field doing
4 work. In order to meet that time frame, we have to
5 start design on several of the alternatives early on.
6 The answer to your question is design is starting
7 right now and on some of them has already been started.
8 But when you're preparing design, you prepare first of
9 all what is called a conceptual design report, and you
10 are conceptualizing, and it is pretty broad base and
11 you do it in order to meet our schedule for remedial
12 action, we have to start now and develop those
13 conceptual design reports early in the process, and so
14 that's what we're doing now.

15 MS. DASTILLUNG: How do we know the
16 engineering designs that you're beginning won't end up
17 driving the decision on the actual final alternative
18 chosen?

19 MR. AVEL: That comes with the
20 Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study is your
21 assurance that the way we evaluate the alternatives is
22 unbiased and accurate and adequate to meet the ends or
23 meet the objectives of the operable unit, and you have
24 Ohio EPA and US EPA to regulate us to make sure that

1 they meet with the alternatives that we screen and how
2 we screen them for the final alternative.

3 MS. McCORD: A point of clarification,
4 remember that the EE/CA's are only associated, the
5 EE/CA's, engineering evaluation/cost analysis, those
6 are only associated with removal actions, and there's
7 two basic types of Superfund actions. There's the
8 shorter term, let's address a threat removal actions,
9 and that term removal doesn't mean necessarily
10 removing material. And then there's the longer term
11 remedial actions.

12 The list of documents that Andy just
13 went through that are submitted under the operable
14 units for remedial actions. So that's why there's no
15 EE/CA for, on the remedial side. But you have to
16 remember that anything done as part of removal has to
17 be consistent with what we think is going to be the
18 ultimate remedy on the remedial side. It's a
19 requirement. So we always have that in the back of
20 our mind when we're approving or disapproving a
21 document. We feel this would not prejudice where the
22 action for removal is consistent with what we expect
23 the final remediation to be.

24 Then on the remedial side, Andy went

1 through the primary documents which are submitted, the
2 last being the Record Of Decision. After the Record
3 Of Decision, there are set time frames that kick in
4 where work plans are submitted to us for the next big
5 step, which are called RD/RA, Remedial Design/Remedial
6 Action. That remedial design is where the heavy-duty
7 engineering design work is done. But because so many
8 alternatives -- because in some of the operable units
9 it's not clear what the final cleanup alternative is
10 going to be, a lot of these alternatives are being
11 carried forward very far into this decision-making
12 process.

13 So that's why DOE is trying to do some
14 of the leg work, very basic leg work in some of the
15 design, but this is not something that is going to
16 prejudice the remedy that is selected in the Record of
17 Decision. And those are documents that are formally
18 submitted. The remedial design documents and work
19 plans are submitted to EPA for concurrence and
20 approval.

21 MR. AVEL: Thanks, Catherine. Bobby.

22 MR. DAVIS: I think what the
23 discrepancy is, the initial screening operable unit
24 document, that is still to come.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: We can't hear you.

2 MR. DAVIS: The initial screening of
3 alternatives document, I think you indicated those are
4 all out. Operable Unit 2 has not come out yet. That
5 one is listed as October 29th.

6 MR. AVEL: That's right.

7 MR. DAVIS: I think the other point
8 you make in terms of the public participation in the
9 CERCLA process I think really revolves around the
10 decision-making documents in the process.

11 MR. AVEL: I apologize for misinforming
12 you on Unit 2. As Bobby said, the documents that make
13 decisions, the result of decisions, are those that are
14 required to have public input.

15 Any other questions?

16 Could we get maybe a response by a show
17 of hands, does this form of meeting, is this better
18 than what we've done in the past? I don't know if
19 you've gotten the opportunity to see some of the
20 videos that we prepared on each one of the operable
21 units. If you did not, the Administrative Record has
22 copies that you can check out on VHS format, take home
23 and watch. What we've done is each operable unit
24 manager has made a report on videotape of the scope of

1 his operable unit, what the problem is as far as the
2 potential release to the environment or release to the
3 environment, and some of the actions that we're taking
4 to approach cleanup. We try to do a lot of the what
5 we have done in the past by showing slides and giving
6 presentations. We try to do a lot of that up front on
7 one-on-one format.

8 Can we have a show of hands if this is
9 meeting some communications needs. Do you all think
10 that this is a good format to continue these meetings
11 under?

12 Okay, thanks. Are there any other
13 questions? Yes, ma'am.

14 MS. DASTILLUNG: Just in reference to
15 that, is there a way that you can arrange for TV so
16 that you don't hear all the noise around? It is very
17 hard to hear.

18 MR. AVEL: That's a problem that we
19 experienced tonight. We experienced that same problem
20 at the Open House. It's our hopes that by being able
21 to check these out or watching them over at the Jamtek
22 Building, Administrative Record, PEIC, we have several
23 names for it, that that will give you an opportunity
24 to review them one on one at home where you have quiet

1 atmosphere, for those of you who don't have kids, that
2 you can absorb what is being said.

3 Anything else? If there's nothing else,
4 I think we're going to keep this open, Sue, until how
5 long? The poster session will stay open for some time
6 yet. We will be available to answer questions. Thank
7 you for your attendance.

8 - - -

9 PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

10 - - -

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Lois A. Roell, the undersigned, a notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify that at the time and place stated herein, I recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had transcribed into typewriting under my supervision the within seventy-five (75) pages, and that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL
AUGUST 12, 1992. NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO