G-000-1004.7

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FEED MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER COMMUNITY MEETING DECEMBER 11, 1990

12/11/90

SPANGLER/DOE-FMPC
80
TRANSCRIPT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FEED MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER

COMMUNITY MEETING

December 11, 1990

- - -

Presentors:

Jerry Westerbeck
DOE Site Manager

Andy Avel, DOE Site Deputy
Environmental Manager

Catherine McCord
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Graham Mitchell
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Lisa Crawford
FRESH Representative

- - -

MR. WESTERBECK: Good evening. I'm Jerry Westerbeck, the site manager.

Happy to see all of you here tonight. Hopefully you found an agenda on your chairs. We set up the agenda tonight exactly as the agenda we used for the last community meeting. It was requested by some community representatives to have less briefing time and more exhibit time, where you could interface one to one with the various operable units managers. We're open as always to suggestions on how we might change the format to better meet your needs.

I'll, as you can see on the agenda, cover a few items and then turn it over to Andy Avel, who will cover a few topics to update you on a few items, such as the Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study. Then we'll have comments by Catherine, Graham, and Lisa, and then, as we have in the past, we'll open it up to a question and answer session.

I have a few items here of general nature, not necessarily in any particular order. Some of you may have heard about a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement scoping meeting. It

is apparently scheduled, and I see no reason why it will change, to be held on the 14th of January at the Hilton Inn on I-275. It's an all-day meeting. It is handled primarily by headquarters, Department of Energy, folks out of Washington, and they are in the process now of holding scoping meetings for the programmatic EIS around the country. In fact, today, if I remember right, they held a programmatic EIS meeting in Chicago and in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

It will be handled as scoping meetings in the past, where people will be permitted or asked to make statements if they would like, and we will be getting more information out to you on the exact details, but I think it will start in the morning on the 14th and end that evening, but we'll be getting more information out to you.

A couple of items about, good news, I consider good news for us. We are being permitted to increase our staffing at the site, our staffing meeting of the Department of Energy people. We will be able to put a Department of Energy engineer or environmental scientist on each operable unit.

1 Now we're working a couple of the folks pretty
2 hard, they're trying to cover two operable units,
3 and that's just almost impossible.
4 Another addition, some of you met at
5 the FRESH meeting Teresa Kwiatkowski. Would you
6 please stand. Teresa Kwiatkowski is our new public
7 information officer. She is assigned to
8 headquarters Department of Energy. She reports to
9 really two people up there, the head of public
10 affairs, M. J. Jamison, and to Leo Duffy. So she
11 has to make or gets to make a weekly report to
12 headquarters and has a, I guess you might say, a
13 direct link, use a little space time.
14 With her on board, we've been able to
15 establish what we refer to as a Community Relations
16 Council to more or less integrate all community
17 relations activities, integrate all of them. By
18 that I mean the Westinghouse efforts, the DOE
19 efforts, the ASI/IT efforts, and now, of course,
20 the community relations involvement by Parsons, our
21 new architect engineering service contractor.
22 The council will give then, of
23 course, general guidance policy, so forth, to
24 Community Relations Committee headed up by Teresa

1 and, of course, there will be representatives from
2 each of the contractors. So hopefully we'll be
3 able to speak with one common voice to you.
4 Before I leave that area, I would
5 like to introduce Kim Hayes. She is from
6 headquarters Department of Energy in the Germantown
7 office. She will head up a brand new branch that
8 has been set up in Leo Duffy's organization,
9 specifically set up. She and her group of people
10 will be set up to be our chief advocates up there
11 for the FMPC program. In other words, they will be
12 the chief spokesman for us to get our budgets
13 justified and represent us so that we will get our
14 best shot at the funds as they become available
15 year after year. She's sort of new to me, but, of
16 course, I'm sort of new to DOE, but she is not new
17 to the site. She used to be, until about a year
18 ago, associated in a similar capacity when the site
19 was under defense programs. So we're glad to see
20 her, too.
21 MS. HAYES: Thank you.
22 MR. WESTERBECK: The warning system
23 where we're tying in the FMPC warning system into
24 the Hamilton County Civil Defense Warning System,

we're currently looking at that becoming operational or effective around the first of February. You'll be getting more information on that. As you know, that system is and will be, is capable of being activated by the National Weather Service. FMPC use of it will continue as always being the pulsating tone and the steady tone for the severe weather warning. As I said, we'll be getting more and more information out as we get closer to that effective date.

Another item I would like to talk about, some of you probably read about in the paper, Westinghouse set up what is called a School Of Environmental Excellence. They came up with the idea about a year ago, and within a year got the school set up. It's a seven-week course to educate and train. First time through they train engineers and environmental scientists, people of that ilk from the various Westinghouse contractor facilities around DOE. It seemed to be a very, very good success.

We graduated first class of 35 on the 2nd of November, and now we're looking at the various critiques of the class, feedback from the

1 students, feedback from the instructors, feedback
2 from visitors who sat in trying to adjust the
3 curriculum. Very seriously looking at holding a
4 second class beginning next spring, and we're going
5 to open it up to more than just Westinghouse
6 people, perhaps other DOE people, other
7 contractors, DOE contractors and, of course, we're
8 looking at opening it up to one or more people from
9 the public sector to actually sit in on the
10 course.
11 Right now it's a seven-week course.
12 Don't know if it's going to continue to be seven or
13 if it's going to be broken down into smaller
14 increments or maybe even perhaps expanded. But I
15 think for first time holding the course it was an
16 extreme success and, of course, as more and more
17 people get through the course learning about the
18 various environmental regulations, how they apply
19 to their specific sites, we think there can be
20 nothing but good things to come out of holding that
21 course over and over again.
22 Again to remind some of you, early in
23 November we released the 1989 Environmental
24 Monitoring Report, a document we're pretty proud

of, glad we could get it out as soon as that. We held a press conference on the 14th of November. Andy is holding a copy right now. Do we have extra copies here tonight, Linda?

MS. ENGLAND: We have a sign-up list for people interested in having it mailed.

MR. WESTERBECK: Linda England, who is head of Westinghouse's Environmental Monitoring Section, is planning a community round table or a community workshop to discuss the report in whatever depth people who attend the round table would like to, and I understand you're taking sign-ups tonight, so if you're interested and you haven't signed up -- Andy, he's got everything -- sign up, so we'll have a good idea how many people. It will help us plan accordingly, size of room, time, place, what have you.

I think that's all I plan to cover right now. So, Andy, it's yours.

MR. AVEL: Good evening. It's good to see a lot of you here again. Some of you I guess we saw as recently as last night. We had quite a productive meeting talking about some of the latest and most pressing issues on the site.

A couple of things I would like to talk about tonight, just to bring everybody up to speed with the progress of the RI/FS site. I anticipate we will have several questions following the presentations by myself, US EPA by Catherine McCord, and the State EPA by Graham Mitchell and Miss Crawford representing the FRESH organization.

The first thing I would like to point out, the first issue of the newsletter that we call Cleanup Update, which is solely dedicated to the RI/FS, it came out and was published and mailed out on November 15th, and this will be coming out about quarterly. Where's Sue? About quarterly?

MS. WOLINSKY: Quarterly.

MR. AVEL: And Sue also, raise your hand back there, Sue. Anybody that would like to be on the mailing list to receive this newsletter, if you just get with Sue Wolinsky, give her your name and address, and we'll make sure that you receive this, and I imagine we have some copies here that we can give people the first issue.

Also I would like to mention that the Department of Energy, Ohio EPA, and US EPA reached an agreement on interim wastewater treatment system

1 that I think a lot of people have heard about or
2 read in the newspaper about. This was in response
3 to EPA disapproval of the South Plume EE/CA, and I
4 would also like to point out that technically it
5 was in response to US EPA disapproval, but
6 realistically it was in response to the community's
7 outcry concerning DOE adding additional uranium to
8 the environment.
9 At the community meetings a lot of
10 you questioned whether or not your opinion can
11 drive this process. This is one of the instances
12 that it did drive the policy, and I think you owe
13 yourselves a pat on the back. Graham Mitchell when
14 he speaks will give this in a little more detail.
15 He has some overheads to describe exactly how we're
16 all going to benefit from this particular action.
17 In Operable Unit 1, which is the
18 waste pit area, Oba Vincent -- why don't you stand,
19 Oba. Oba Vincent is the Operable Unit Manager for
20 the Department of Energy, and his report includes
21 the fact that DOE and US EPA and the state,
22 specifically US EPA and DOE are in informal dispute
23 resolution right now over the Initial Screening of
24 Alternatives document for that particular operable

1 unit. This dispute period ends the day after
2 tomorrow, and we have already met. We believe
3 we've worked out the resolution to the dispute, and
4 we believe that the Initial Screening of
5 Alternatives document will be revised and it will
6 be resubmitted January 7th.
7 Another removal action in this
8 operable unit is one that we talked about before.
9 Pit 6 is the pit that has the waste that is
10 currently above the water level in the pit. The
11 removal action objective is to move this waste down
12 below the water to mitigate air emissions or
13 emission of radionuclides to the air. Oba tells me
14 that he hopes to start physical work on this
15 removal action next week. If we do get started
16 next week, it will be finished by the end of the
17 year, close to the end of the year. It should take
18 about two weeks to complete.
19 The other removal action in the waste
20 pit operable unit is the storm water runoff from
21 the waste pits and Oba tells me that the physical
22 work on that particular removal action should start
23 in May, it's scheduled to start in May.
24 Operable Unit 2, which is the fly

1 ash, piles of the sludge, lime sludge lagoons, and
2 the sanitary landfill. Also Oba Vincent is the
3 operable unit manager for that operable unit. The
4 current report for that operable unit has the
5 Initial Screening of Alternatives, and again
6 remember, that is the first document that is
7 required by the Consent Agreement as a
8 deliverable. What that document does is takes
9 several alternatives for the remediation or the
10 cleanup of this particular operable unit and goes
11 through and screens out the ones that are not
12 practical or cannot successfully complete the
13 remediation. This document, we are currently
14 revising that report, and it is due to EPA January
15 the 9th. We have these documents also available in
16 the Administrative Record or Jamtek Building.
17 By the way, we've got a small
18 publication on the, what we call the Public
19 Environmental Information Center, which is just
20 down the street, it's down on Highway 128 on the
21 site. You might want to pick one up. It will give
22 you the hours of the Administrative Record and what
23 types of materials are there.
24 Operable Unit 3, which is the

1 production area, again Initial Screening of
2 Alternatives, the final document was submitted to
3 EPA on November 21st. They are in the process of
4 reviewing that document and will get back to us in
5 30 days on whether or not they approve the document
6 or whether or not we will enter into an informal
7 dispute resolution process on comments that US EPA
8 may have. The Operable Unit 3, and I didn't point
9 out Carlos Fermaintt, stand up Carlos, let
10 everybody look at you. Carlos is also in charge of
11 Operable Unit 5, and he is the DOE operable unit
12 manager for this operable unit.
13 The removal action, as most of you
14 know, consists of removing the perched water, the
15 contaminated perched water underneath the
16 production buildings or facilities that are located
17 on-site. As a lot of you remember, we had
18 installed, at least in Plant 6, some pumps to
19 actually pump that water out. After we did some
20 analysis for organic compounds, we found that there
21 were what are called VOC's, volatile organic
22 compounds, in that water, and we stopped pumping
23 and developed a work plan that explains how we will
24 remove those volatile organic compounds from the

1 water, in addition to removing uranium from the
2 water before it is discharged to the environment.
3 And that's another area where the
4 community has made a big difference. Up to I guess
5 several months ago the Department would take the
6 position that the levels of organics in that water
7 were low enough that it did not require treatment.
8 From the concern of the citizens that's been
9 expressed at these meetings, DOE made the decision
10 to disregard whatever levels those organics are and
11 install a treatment system to remove those
12 contaminants. And I think that's another
13 illustration of how your input can drive the
14 process.
15 Carlos tells me that those treatment
16 systems will be installed for Plants 2-3 and 6, 8,
17 and 9. All treatment systems, I believe, will be
18 installed by September, 1991, and that will again
19 be pumping water and treating water that is perched
20 and contaminated underneath the buildings.
21 Next on the list for Operable Unit 3,
22 another interesting topic, that's the vault that
23 we've been talking about for the past couple of
24 community meetings. I think at the last FRESH

meeting we talked a little bit in more detail about that. I think it would probably be a good time to repeat what we said or what I said at that meeting. The vault was initially identified in a meeting that was held when DOE first started scoping or determining what the size of the problem with contamination at the site when we first started our scoping for the RI/FS. This is back in 1986, I believe.

MR. FERMAINTT: '87.

MR. AVEL: '87, thanks. We had a meeting with people that had worked at the site a long time, people who were already retired but who had worked at the site back when it was first being constructed. We had indications from one individual that there was a vault that was about 20 feet by 20 feet by 20 feet high and by 25 feet deep located in the area of the flag pole by the Administration Building. So we got that information and we set out to find it.

We looked at the flag pole near the Administration Building and we used various geophysical methods like gravity surveys, magnetic surveys, and ground penetrating radar. Couldn't

find any anomalies.

Through further interviews we determined or we found out there is a flag pole at the Administration Building at the north end of the plant. So we moved our investigations to the north end of the plant, did the same geophysical type surveys. We found nothing with the gravity surveys, we found nothing with the magnetic surveys, but we did find an anomaly, which is just an indication that something is different, with the ground penetrating radar.

Currently we're taking all of the data that we have obtained in that area, and it is being evaluated by a separate consultant, a geophysical type consultant, to determine what we should do next. The question that we're currently contemplating is do we go out there and drill some holes or do we do one more geophysical type survey, which is a sizing survey to tell us whether or not there is something buried in that area. So right now we're looking at what the next step is.

Part of this determination will be discussions with US EPA and Ohio EPA's contractors to see how much, what level of confidence we all

three can expect in a sizing survey. One thing we don't want to do is spend money to do a sizing survey and have the results come back showing nothing is there but then we have something on the ground penetrating radar and have everybody not be in agreement that nothing is there and have to go back down and drill holes anyway and have to spend money twice. So we're currently looking at what would be the best next step to take.

Let me talk about Operable Unit 5. Again Carlos Fermaintt is Operable Unit 5 manager. The Initial Screening of Alternatives report for OU-5 was approved by US and Ohio EPA's on November 25th, 1990, and again that document is in the Administrative Record of the Jamtek Building on Highway 128.

The South Plume removal action, removal action two that was broken into three parts, the first part to install alternate water source to those users of the water, the contaminated water in the area, the installation of extraction wells, and then the installation of an interim treatment system that Graham is going to talk about a little bit later.

We have started to, we have turned it over to the corps of engineers whose job it is to obtain property for the government. One of their main tasks in their life is to get access to property, to actually purchase property, to get easements for property for the government agencies. We met with the corps of engineers today, and they are currently in the process of preparing to get the actual easements for this property.

Again, the whole project will be completed, the alternate water source will be installed, extraction wells will be installed, and interim treatment system will be installed and operating in December of 1991, about a year from now.

Operable Unit 4, Jack Craig, most of you know. Jack has been to many meetings and talked with a lot of you.

I would like to talk about the removal action for Operable Unit 4 first. As you remember, the removal action, its objective is to mitigate or to lessen, slow down or stop as much as we can the emission of radon, radon gas from the

1 silos, silos 1 and 2. And the way we've chosen to
2 mitigate that radon release is to place bentonite,
3 and those of you that were at the FRESH meeting a
4 couple of weeks ago, we did a demonstration with
5 bentonite. We mixed the bentonite up with water,
6 made a slurry, and we put it over some compacted
7 sand. That gave us a good idea of how the removal
8 action will work. We intend to install bentonite,
9 slurry bentonite into the silos, and the head space
10 will form about a one-foot cap over the K-65
11 material and will provide a seal to prevent the
12 radon gas from or to lessen the amount of radon
13 gas, tremendously lessen the amount of radon gas
14 from escaping into the environment.
15 The removal action, the EE/CA
16 document has been approved by both Ohio EPA and US
17 EPA, and project design has started, and the
18 completion of the project is scheduled for December
19 1st, 1991. So we are moving ahead with that
20 project.
21 The RI/FS for that operable unit, for
22 Operable Unit 4, which is the silos, the Initial
23 Screening of Alternatives document was approved by
24 US EPA in October of 1990.

1 The second draft of the Remedial
2 Investigation Report for OU-4 was disapproved for
3 the second time by US EPA on December 7th, 1990.
4 EPA followed up with a notice of violation of the
5 Consent Agreement to us on December 7th.
6 On December 6th, DOE sent a letter to
7 US EPA requesting a series of meetings to discuss
8 the schedules for this operable unit and other
9 operable units as they are laid out in the Consent
10 Agreement, and Catherine is going to talk a little
11 bit more about this in a few minutes.
12 The K-65 sampling activities are
13 continuing. We have a total of seven samples that
14 have been taken from the silos. The samples range
15 in length from 4 to 8 feet. I told the FRESH
16 people last night 14 feet. What we have is a 6
17 foot section at the top and then beneath that we
18 have about a 9 feet, 8 foot section, so we have a
19 representative sample of 14 feet, but as far as
20 continuous samples go, they range only from 4 to 8
21 feet. We intend to continue the sampling
22 activities with the goal of obtaining a complete
23 sample all the way until we're done. We're going
24 to keep doing it until we get a sample.

1 That's about all I have to say. I
2 know that Catherine is listed to speak next, but I
3 believe Graham is going to trade places with her.
4 So Graham.
5 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening, I'm
6 Graham Mitchell, Ohio EPA. I'm going to discuss a
7 few different things tonight.
8 As you are aware, or you may not be
9 aware, Andy just touched on it, DOE has asked to
10 raise the issue of possible schedule extensions on
11 the various operable units at this site. They did
12 this in a letter dated on December 6th, and at this
13 point it's basically just a proposal to Ohio EPA
14 and US EPA, and we're in the process of reviewing
15 that. I can't really discuss at this point what
16 our reaction is going to be to that. We're just
17 going to have to discuss with my upper management
18 and consultation with US EPA to see where this
19 goes. There is going to be a meeting in Chicago on
20 December 17th with upper management staff with all
21 three agencies to try to get at this issue. Again,
22 I don't know exactly what the outcome of that is
23 going to be.
24 Andy said that I was going to be

1 talking about the uranium removal that's part of
2 the South Plume and also sort of part of the waste
3 pit removal actions. I think there's been some
4 confusion over that process and what really is
5 involved with that, so I -- Lisa Crawford asked me
6 to speak to that, and I have a viewgraph here and I
7 hope will explain some of this.
8 What you have here is the top numbers
9 here is the original proposal to discuss that 1,800
10 pounds -- these are approximate numbers -- 1,800
11 pounds of uranium go into the Great Miami River
12 approximately every year from the current
13 operations. In late 1991 the proposal for the
14 South Plume and the waste pit removal actions were
15 to increase that uranium by approximately 300
16 pounds, so that would have resulted in late 1991
17 under the original proposal by DOE of uranium
18 loading of 2,100 pounds to the Great Miami River.
19 Actions by, response by the citizens
20 here, citizens group and the public that live
21 around the site, concerns by both US EPA and Ohio
22 EPA basically resulted in DOE coming back with
23 another proposal. And the proposal is this: This
24 will proceed, but they will put an interim or a

1 short-term uranium treatment plant that will remove
2 approximately 600 pounds of uranium, resulting in a
3 net loading in late 1991 of 1,500 pounds. The
4 important thing here to understand is that we're
5 getting a net reduction in loading to the Great
6 Miami River of uranium being discharged from the
7 site, and I think that's really important because
8 we're getting environmental benefit while we're
9 also getting environmental benefit of keeping
10 uranium out of Paddys Run and also removing it from
11 the South Plume and preventing the migration of
12 that.
13 The next step is not part of this,
14 but I put this on the graph because it shows what
15 the process is involved. In late 1993, the
16 Department of Energy is proposing to put an
17 advanced wastewater treatment plant, a large scale
18 plant that will reduce the overall loading to
19 approximately 300 total pounds to the Great Miami
20 River. So over the years that you heard me stand
21 up here and talk to you about this project of
22 controlling uranium runoff to Paddys Run, we said
23 that we were keeping the uranium out of Paddys Run
24 and we were putting it over in the Great Miami

1 River and allowing that to happen, and I said at
2 some point we would be dealing with the uranium
3 contamination, we would be actually reducing the
4 load to the river, the amount of uranium that is
5 being discharged. This process here over the next
6 two to three years outlines a process for doing
7 just that, so we are going to get what I believe
8 are significant environmental benefits from this.
9 If anybody has any questions, I will
10 be glad to address this later on.
11 Also I wanted to introduce Mike
12 Profitt with our Groundwater Division in the
13 Southwest District. Mike works both on this site
14 and on the Paddys Run Road site.
15 On the subject of the Paddys Run Road
16 site, at the last meeting I mentioned the group
17 that handles the Paddys Run site in our office was
18 considering having a public meeting on that site in
19 December, and what happened there is that the data
20 from the first round of samples basically resulted
21 in, indicated significant contamination around that
22 facility and, therefore, there was a kind of a
23 hurry-up effort to evaluate that data and to get
24 additional wells in, and additional wells are being

installed right now to further identify this plume. The date that I have or the projected date for a public meeting on the Paddys Run Road RI/FS is now for February, and I believe that we will stick to that date.

If you have any questions on that, after the meeting you can ask either me or Mike Profitt, who will probably have more details on the actual contamination, what contaminants are involved. Thank you very much.

MS. McCORD: Good evening. My name is Catherine McCord. I'm with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 office out of Chicago. I'm going to try to keep my statement brief tonight. There will probably be a lot of questions this evening.

Many of you who participate with the monthly FRESH meetings have not seen me at the last few months, mostly because of the amount of work that's been coming into US EPA as far as document reviews. It's been consuming the majority of Graham's and my time, putting in a lot of extra hours trying to keep up with the approvals, disapprovals, and disputes that have come up over

1 the last several months.

2 The last public meeting, which I

3 guess was in September, I spoke about the intent of

4 US EPA to give a technical assistance grant to the

5 citizens group, to FRESH. There was a public

6 notice and public comment period, announcing that

7 US EPA had received a notice of intent from FRESH

8 to apply for a technical assistance grant. That

9 30-day public comment period ended without any

10 comments. Right now US EPA is waiting for the

11 deprecation to come in from FRESH and don't expect

12 any problems with the granting of the initial

13 $50,000 once the complete application is

14 submitted. We got word today that the state office

15 of budget management have waived their right to

16 review, and that should expedite the granting

17 process.

18 In addition to the normal reviews

19 that go on that come out of our shop in Chicago, we

20 had some additional activities last week. Andy

21 touched on those few things that relate to Operable

22 Unit 4, the silos.

23 Earlier last week, I guess that would

24 have been the 4th of December, US EPA issued a

1 notice of violation, violation of the Consent
2 Agreement to the Department of Energy with respect
3 to the access provisions. I'm sure if you
4 participated in these meetings over the last few
5 years, you know that there has been a continual
6 problem or dispute between US EPA and the
7 Department on pursuing access to the private
8 properties that surround the FMPC in order to
9 install monitoring wells or do whatever sampling is
10 necessary. There were specific commitments that
11 were in our last 1990 Consent Agreement that
12 required referral of any property owners to the
13 Department of Justice if access had not been
14 gained, and there were several properties that had
15 gone beyond the time frames outlined in the Consent
16 Agreement.
17 Then on Friday, we had a deadline of
18 December 7th to either approve or disapprove the
19 Operable Unit 4 Remedial Investigation Report/Risk
20 Assessment Report. EPA took an action through two
21 mechanisms, first a disapproval letter. EPA felt
22 based on the lack of data or the lack of completion
23 of the Remedial Investigation field activities that
24 the document was not in a form that we could

1 approve the document and allow the work to
2 proceed.
3 Through the language in the Consent
4 Agreement, US EPA's attorneys interpreted that we
5 needed to invoke dispute resolution, which we did
6 through this same letter, to prevent the document
7 from going final. In the second letter that was
8 issued by US EPA this same day, we issued a notice
9 of violation to US DOE and notice that they had
10 violated another provision of the consent
11 agreement, which was requirements that all
12 documents be put together and developed in
13 accordance with CERCLA, the law and Superfund
14 guidance and the regulations under the National
15 Contingency Plan. US EPA in its levy stipulated
16 penalties again for this second notice of
17 violation, and penalties are accruing as of
18 Friday.
19 I would like to point out I think
20 maybe a confusing point in the back of the first
21 update newsletter. On the last page in the back
22 there's a mention of some agreement that we picked
23 a 30, I think that was parts per billion, it
24 doesn't indicate here or it could have been

1 picocuries per liter, cleanup level for
2 groundwater. There's been no such agreement. We
3 have come up with a figure of 30 as being an action
4 level for the removal action for the South Plume.
5 There's been no determination of what the proper
6 cleanup level will be of groundwater. There is no
7 set standard promulgated under the Safe Drinking
8 Water Act. We will determine what the cleanup
9 level should be after we've done a complete risk
10 analysis and reviewed DOE's reports.
11 As an update on the Paddys Run site,
12 as some people may know, the Fernald site was
13 listed on the Superfund National Priorities List
14 last November. The process for determining if a
15 site needs to go on this priorities list or this
16 Superfund list is a screening process of where a
17 preliminary assessment and site investigation is
18 performed, and then the data is input into a model
19 where a numerical score is generated. US EPA had
20 an almost two-year hiatus on doing any scoring,
21 additional scoring of private sites because they
22 were coming up with a new model, a new scoring
23 model called hazard ranking system. US EPA has
24 finished their work on this new model and in the

1 upcoming months we expect at some point in time the
2 Paddys Run site will also be scored or evaluated
3 for the National Priorities List.
4 I expect that there may be quite a
5 few questions tonight, so both Graham and I will be
6 available during the question and answer period and
7 after to address any things that people need to
8 have clarified. Thank you.
9 MS. CRAWFORD: These are FRESH's
10 comments for this evening.
11 FRESH feels it's a conflict of
12 interest for Westinghouse and the Department of
13 Energy to be involved in the CDC Risk Assessment
14 Study. The Department of Energy and Westinghouse
15 should only be providing the Center For Disease
16 Control and Dr. John Till with documents and
17 information. They should not be sending out
18 notices for the CDC nor should they be attending
19 work sessions, workshops, et cetera. We feel this
20 is a clear conflict of interest for them to be
21 taking an active role in this study. This sends a
22 mixed message to this community that once again the
23 Department of Energy has its thumb in the pie and
24 the community becomes very skeptical.

1 The Department of Energy needs to
2 better organize its FMPC site office. There needs
3 to be a better support system from one department
4 to another. Emphasis should be placed on
5 individual operable units and not public
6 relations. All efforts should be focused on
7 supporting each department and dealing with the
8 problems at hand, not working on a crisis level all
9 the time. Organizing and planning is very
10 imperative.
11 Every time we turn around we're told
12 he's new, he's only been here two months, he's only
13 been here six months, or whatever. New employees
14 should be given an overview and an orientation of
15 this site. We're tired of having to wait for your
16 new employees to learn about the site. Maybe you
17 should have a two to three-week schooling period
18 for all the new employees. This would save
19 valuable time, energy, and money and most of all
20 would save a lot of frustration in this community.
21 If this site is a training facility,
22 we would like to know how you can train others to
23 do work when you yourselves do not have all the
24 necessary skills to perform some of these

activities that are going on.

FRESH is very unhappy with the process of extensions for deadlines on the operable unit reports. DOE should not submit final plans without extensive data to back up these plans. All characterizations should be done prior to the final plan. We dislike the worst case scenario phrase. You don't always get a true reading all of the time in a worst case scenario plan. Good hard data tells the true feelings of the situation. We want a good solid plan with good hard data to back it up. Extensions should only be granted when deemed absolutely necessary by the US and Ohio EPA and by community groups like FRESH.

DOE needs to learn what a deadline is and plan and organize around these deadlines. If deadlines are continually broken and never met, FRESH feels that the FMPC will never be cleaned up. DOE must make up its mind now to do the right thing. Stick to your contract agreements and get this site cleaned up. It is imperative that this happen now. Later may make it too late for all of us. Thank you.

MR. AVEL: That concludes the

presentation portion of the meeting. Now I would like to open the floor up for questions. The way we would like to work it, I'll just stand up here and field the questions or you can direct them to Catherine, Graham, and we will do our best to answer them or direct them to our folks that can best answer the questions.

Any questions? We would like you to step up to the microphone if you don't mind and, again, as always, we have a court reporter here to take down the questions so that we can put a record, a complete record of all these meetings into the Administrative Record located in the Jamtek Building.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question about the scoping meeting. I didn't know if the scoping meeting refers to all sites in Ohio or just, is it just in relation to FMPC?

MR. AVEL: Bobby, why don't you answer that question.

MR. DAVIS: The scoping meeting is to address the total scope of the document across the United States, covering all the Department sites. What they're doing is they're holding these

meetings for the environmental restoration waste management. They're holding the meetings near the various facilities across the country figuring that to be sure that we get the public input from the folks that live in the vicinity of the facilities but seeking input across the entire spectrum of environmental restoration and waste management. There will be another meeting in Ohio located in Columbus, and I am sorry, I don't know the date for that one.

MS. CRAWFORD: The 16th of January, it's at the Capital something or another.

MR. DAVIS: They've indicated, at least the couple of meetings I heard about, comments are that it will focus on the site issues, but clearly the Department will be soliciting issues that any individual will want to bring, regardless of whether it's Fernald, Portsmouth, Richmond, wherever.

MS. CRAWFORD: There's going to be one held in Paducah on the 20th at J.R.'s Executive Lounge. I remembered that because I thought it was a strange name.

MR. AVEL: Other questions?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This School
2 of Environmental Excellence, it talks about the
3 classes that is on law regulation, case studies,
4 implementing cleanup. Course work also include
5 study and physical science and geology and
6 geochemistry. Don't your employers know this
7 already, that they have to have a class for it?
8 That's what I thought you hired them for, because
9 they were aware of all this and that's why they're
10 doing this job, our cleanup supposedly.
11 MR. AVEL: Currently there are
12 several environmental laws that are starting to
13 affect, newly affect a lot of individuals and
14 especially government operated organizations, and
15 one of these is the Superfund law. Another one is
16 RCRA, the hazardous waste law.
17 There are not a whole lot of people
18 in the industry that have a great deal of
19 experience with these laws. And one of the things
20 that, one of the goals of this school is to take
21 the people that are currently working in the sites
22 and educate them not only to those laws but also to
23 the way, the different sciences like geochemistry,
24 geology, biology, the way those sciences are

1 affected by the laws and how they're used to
2 enforce the law.
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What about
4 environmental monitoring, that's what you have been
5 doing since '84, I mean as far as the well
6 monitoring, the soil, and you still have to have
7 classes on that?
8 MR. AVEL: There's continually new
9 people that are brought into the process and there
10 are needs and requirements for new skills so that
11 these new individuals that come in, the people that
12 are currently working and familiar with the
13 activities that are going on at the site need to
14 have a significant amount of education on the
15 different environmental laws.
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't they
17 have the basic monitoring knowledge, though?
18 MR. AVEL: Yes. The people that
19 Linda England, employees in her organization, and
20 Linda would be glad to get with you any time I'm
21 sure to give you the level of experience, the type
22 of people that she has that work for her in the
23 environmental monitoring area, and they are
24 qualified individuals, but keep in mind there is a

1 need to broaden that education base, to broaden the
2 experience, and that's one of the goals of this
3 environmental school.
4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. There's
5 always a need to broaden your education, but this
6 brings up another thing is why you hire people
7 every three months, every six months, new people
8 which have to be trained all over again, and then
9 the ones that have been here a year who are just
10 catching on to what's going on have to leave, and
11 then you get new people. This way I have a feeling
12 is why you cannot meet your deadlines.
13 MR. AVEL: You make a good point.
14 When you bring new individuals in, they do have to
15 learn the process. When they are in the process of
16 learning a site or any condition, and I am an
17 example of that, for the past year that's what I've
18 been doing, you sacrifice something, but hopefully
19 you gain a lot more than you have to give up.
20 If you look at the trend, if you look
21 at the project office now, there have been very few
22 people that have left the office and several new
23 people that have come in not because there's a big
24 turnover right now, but because the office itself

is expanding. There are more positions within DOE in the site office now. As a matter of fact, there are over twice as many today as there was a year ago today, and as Jerry said, we're expecting to get eight more individuals, somewhere in there, eight or nine more individuals within the next three or four months, and this is good news because it gives us more resources to get the job done.

However, you're right, a lot of those people that come in won't know very much at all about Fernald. Hopefully we'll be able to find people that understand the laws and have experience with the different environmental laws and all they'll have to do is catch up on the Fernald part, but we may have to look for people who have good management skills or good technical skills and have to learn the laws and the Fernald portions. It's our goal and our drive to get the best people here that we can to do the best job, and that's one of the things Jerry has been doing since he's been here.

MS. CRAWFORD: Eight technical people, right, no more public relations people?

MR. AVEL: No, no more public

1 relations people. They're all in the technical
2 arena.
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, thank
4 you.
5 MR. WESTERBECK: Can I add to that?
6 At the risk of stating the obvious, Andy, you are
7 taller than I am.
8 There is a shortage of people in the
9 environmental business. It's a tremendously
10 growing field across the country. You listen to
11 any TV shows, you pick up any magazine, and it's
12 environment this and environment that. Everybody
13 is after everybody's employees. I came here from
14 Wright Patterson. What did I do, I immediately
15 turned around and encouraged Westinghouse to hire
16 the guy who replaced me, and we hired about six or
17 eight environmental sharp people from Wright
18 Patterson. My name is mud up there.
19 We lose people from here, when I say
20 we, I'm talking Westinghouse/ASI. That is just the
21 nature of what is going on right now.
22 When you talk about training, it's
23 more training than education. You go to school,
24 college, to get your education, but you don't go to

1 college and learn RCRA or CERCLA or Safe Drinking
2 Water Act. That you pick up in courses, whether
3 it's three-day courses, five-day courses, two-week
4 courses, what have you, and the laws and the
5 application of the laws and the interpretation of
6 the laws by the various EPA regions, the states;
7 the states have their own laws. You have to learn
8 those wherever you happen to work within the
9 country.
10 So it's a tremendously dynamic field,
11 a changing field, an increasing demand for people.
12 What you learned last year, if you don't stay
13 current, if you don't get in these continuing
14 education programs, what have you, you are quickly
15 out of date and your value is down, and not only
16 value in your paycheck but value in what you can
17 contribute to your job.
18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, what
19 besides the law issues and that, what about the
20 physical science, the geology, the hydrology, and
21 the environmental monitoring and waste management.
22 Aren't you supposed to be known on that when you
23 come in to be hired for such a job?
24 MR. WESTERBECK: Well, you named

about seven college degrees right there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I mean, but you hire an individual for each one, one specific field, waste management.

MR. WESTERBECK: Yes, but these various fields and various disciplines are very, very interrelated, and you can't go to school and become a civil engineer or environmental engineer without then getting some related training in hydrogeology or chemistry or biology, because the application of all these various laws and interpretation of them require maybe not the detailed knowledge that you get in a college curriculum, but you have to be able to speak the language enough to be able to talk to people and deal and understand how things relate. But you don't go to school and obviously in four years you come away with your environmental engineering degree and know everything about hydrogeology. The same way you can't go to school and get a degree in geology and know all the various engineering applications.

MR. AVEL: Just take a look at our office. I'm a geologist, Bobby is a health

1 physicist, Oba is an industrial hygienist, Jack and
2 Carlos are both civil engineers. Jack and Carlos
3 have to know a little bit about what I learned in
4 college, what Bobby learned in college, and what
5 Oba learned in college. The same for us. What
6 this course is designed to do is to be a location
7 where everybody can get that portion or at least an
8 introductory portion of all the different
9 disciplines that are involved in the environmental
10 arena.
11 MS. CRAWFORD: We want you to hold
12 it in the evening. We can't come during the day
13 for seven weeks, and I would be more than willing
14 to sign up and come, but it has to be in the
15 evening, like evening classes or whatever, and like
16 two nights a week.
17 MR. WESTERBECK: We might be able to
18 work out some sort of arrangement like that. You
19 couldn't get seven weeks trained in the evening,
20 but we may be able to set up blocks such that, like
21 night school almost.
22 MS. CRAWFORD: No Saturdays.
23 MR. WESTERBECK: Saturday school,
24 that's for the kids who can't learn during the

1 week.

2 MR. AVEL: Are there any other

3 questions?

4 MS. NUNGESTER: I was talking to the

5 gentleman in the back about the South Plume before,

6 and I asked him about any volatile organics or

7 anything they may have found in there, and he said

8 sometimes they did and sometimes they didn't, and

9 that sounds like really a good answer, and I am

10 wondering just exactly if there's heavy metals in

11 there, what was found, and if that's going to be

12 removed along with the uranium when it's discharged

13 to the effluent line.

14 MR. AVEL: My first inclination is

15 to ask who answered your question. Thomas did? We

16 may call you up here again, Thomas.

17 The South Plume, depending on how far

18 north you get, the further north towards the plant

19 you get, the more likely of getting contaminants or

20 material other than uranium. You have to get

21 pretty darn close to the plant before you start

22 picking up volatiles and other heavy metals. The

23 only contaminants we found in the South Plume area

24 south of the site, and Carlos and Dave

1 Brettschneider, the DOE and Westinghouse managers,
2 help me out here, is uranium. Have we found
3 anything other than uranium in the South Plume?
4 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: We told her
5 before we haven't found anything --
6 MR. AVEL: Why don't you go to the
7 microphone, Dave. Dave Brettschneider is with
8 Westinghouse. He's the Operable Unit 5 manager.
9 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Basically what
10 we were trying to tell you is that where we have
11 found other volatile organics, they haven't been
12 above what we call the maximum contamination
13 levels. We haven't seen anything that would really
14 trigger a concern at this point.
15 MS. NUNGESTER: To you, but to me
16 they do.
17 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Catherine is
18 here. You're going to have to address that.
19 MS. McCORD: It depends on where you
20 are in the plume, there's different areas. There's
21 the other disposal areas in the Southfield where
22 some other contaminants have shown up, things we
23 didn't expect, some pesticides. It depends on
24 where the collection wells as far as the removal

action. Right now there are other contaminants of primary concern.

MS. NUNGESTER: At this point, but in the future.

MS. McCORD: They could migrate or what may happen is that you pull those into the collection wells.

MS. NUNGESTER: That's a great concern.

MS. AVEL: Norma, one of our concerns and one of both Ohio and US EPA's concerns is when we put those collection wells down there, how do we guard against pulling other contaminants into those collection wells. One of the things that we are looking at is a monitoring system, a way of monitoring wells to monitor the water before it gets up in the collection wells so we can determine whether or not there's contaminants there.

MS. NUNGESTER: The benzene and xylene have been pulled, although if you could treat it and get rid of it, it might not be such a bad idea.

Now I have a question for Catherine.

1 I just want to ask her, she mentioned something
2 about PCB's were found in the K-65 silos. I was
3 wondering when they were found and if she could
4 give us anymore detail about that.
5 MS. McCORD: Jack Craig should be
6 able to tell you. The initial or I should say the
7 second to last round there was an attempt to sample
8 the K-65 silos where only a portion of the
9 sampling, a very small portion was successful, and
10 it was shut down after exposure and other
11 problems. Some of those samples were analyzed.
12 There were constituents found in there that we
13 didn't expect, hazardous substances that we
14 wouldn't have expected to have been part of those
15 wastes in the silos. In fact, that's one of the
16 reasons that we felt the Department of Energy could
17 not proceed without, you know, this RI/FS process,
18 without having analysis and knowing what's in those
19 tanks.
20 Again, the tanks were loaded in
21 layers. They were used as decant tanks for
22 settling, where slurry-like materials were put in
23 and the liquid was decanted off. So there's
24 actually a layer and there's material in the

tanks. As we discussed last night, there was actually another, there was other materials placed on the top, which really there's very little information about. But that could have been the source of these other contaminants like the PCB's or the PCB waste could be your contaminants, could be in the actual K-65 reservoir.

MR. CRAIG: That information is in the RI report. I think there were 12 parts per billion of PCB.

MS. NUNGESTER: I've been through so many reports in the last couple of months.

MS. McCORD: The Remedial Investigation reports that were submitted for the silo operable unit for the ones that were just disapproved.

MR. AVEL: Norma, we talked about this in community meetings before. In fact, we talked about we did have low levels of PCB's in the silo.

MS. NUNGESTER: I must have been half asleep somewhere along the line.

MR. AVEL: A lot of people are shaking their heads. Let me go back and check the

record, but I was almost sure we talked about it. We found it, it's been about a year ago.

MS. NUNGESTER: It's not in my shorthand notes and I've been involved in public hearings that you've had. I might have missed the one on the silos.

I had another question. Somebody approached me this evening and mentioned the fact that someone told them when they were questioning about the silos that one of the gentlemen said there was no Manhattan Project waste in there. I don't know if there was a confusion on the question or whatever, but there is Manhattan Project waste in silos 1 and 2, is it 1 and 2, Andy?

MR. AVEL: The material in silo 1 is Manhattan Project waste. The material that's in silo 2 is, and I am not real sure if there's actually Manhattan Project waste in there, but there are wastes that are very, very similar to other residue from ore that was very similar to the Belgium Congo ore. Silo 1 definitely contains the Belgium Congo ore residue that was processed at a chemical plant in St. Louis that was transferred up to Fernald or a portion of it and stored in the

1 silos, and Jack tells me partly in silo 2, so there
2 are Manhattan Project wastes in both of those
3 silos.
4 MS. NUNGESTER: And silo 3 has some
5 of the thorium and other chemicals and ores,
6 basically other things.
7 MR. AVEL: Thorium and uranium
8 oxide, and 4 is empty.
9 MS. NUNGESTER: Thank you.
10 MS. CRAWFORD: I have a question
11 too. Have any of the silos, 1, 2, or 3, recently
12 been opened without the glove bags being used for
13 the residue sampling?
14 MR. AVEL: Bobby, you want to answer
15 that?
16 MR. DAVIS: No.
17 MS. CRAWFORD: They have not at all?
18 MR. DAVIS: I don't know.
19 MR. AVEL: Let us check.
20 MS. CRAWFORD: Please do.
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
22 question while you're talking about silos. This is
23 really kind of petty, but I just noticed in one of
24 the reports that there's malathion in the silos,

1 and I was wondering what that was used for, that's
2 an insect repellant.
3 MR. AVEL: In the silos, at one time
4 when the material was placed in the -- when the
5 K-65 materials was placed into the silos, the soil
6 around the perimeter of the silo was cleaned up
7 where some spillage had taken place and was placed
8 in the silos also. I wasn't aware there was some
9 insecticide materials in there. Are you familiar
10 with that, Jack? Where's Dennis Nixon?
11 MS. CRAWFORD: What did she say it
12 was?
13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Malathion.
14 It's a mosquito insecticide.
15 MR. AVEL: It could be from
16 insecticide that was on the grass. I don't know,
17 we'll have to check into it and see.
18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can't
19 remember what the amount was, but it obviously was
20 something that you all knew about. It had to be
21 large enough that you all detected it.
22 MR. AVEL: Jack, do you know
23 anything about it? Mickey, we'll have to get back
24 to you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Andy, in the school that DOE has set up, is there a prerequisite required for individuals taking these courses in order to graduate, like you demand so many years of their services or their employment; is there anything required?

MR. WESTERBECK: Westinghouse set the school up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Whomever.

MR. WESTERBECK: I don't know. Pat Hopper --

MS. CRAWFORD: Can we add on to that, do you have to pay?

MR. WESTERBECK: No, not pay.

MR. AVEL: The only requirement, if there is a prerequisite, is that you are employed by one of our facilities, and we have opened the door for members of the community to attend also, and there would be no tuition costs for the people that we send or for any members of the community that would attend.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would also like to say that we were glad to meet with Miss

1 Hayes last night, and we're sorry we ruffled your
2 feathers so bad, Andy, but somebody has to take the
3 heat. If you're in the seat, you're going to get
4 it.
5 MR. AVEL: I told you you could pick
6 on me tonight.
7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to get
8 back to the South Plume. When you were talking
9 about the treatment of pumping and treating and you
10 said that if there was other contaminants in it
11 that your plant would not put in, you were going to
12 filter them out?
13 MR. AVEL: No, no. I said one of
14 the things that we are doing is looking into
15 various ways to check to see if other contaminants
16 that may not come from our facilities would be
17 pulled up in extraction well.
18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, but if
19 they are, you're still going to treat the water.
20 You don't just have to set up your treatment plant
21 to cover those other contaminants.
22 MR. AVEL: It's our position to
23 treat the water for the contaminants that are in
24 there before we would discharge it, but one of the

1 things we would not want to do would be to
2 complicate any, complicate the environment by
3 missing the plume from our site with another type
4 of plume from another site so that --
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, how
6 would you prevent this if they're all going to be
7 pumping, you know, where pumping happens, it's
8 going to pull this all together.
9 MR. AVEL: If we had an extraction
10 well, we would put a ring of wells around it and we
11 sample the wells around it, it will give you an
12 indication if you're pulling contaminants. The
13 contaminants will have to show up in one of those
14 area wells first, and if it did show up, you could
15 readjust the way you extract, the way you pump, or
16 you could not pump out of that well at all and
17 start another well somewhere. You can steer the
18 plume by where you put your well or how much you
19 pump from an individual well.
20 MS. CRAWFORD: Can't you go ahead
21 and pump and treat that stuff too, and then send
22 the bill, let them pay their fair share.
23 MR. AVEL: That's why we have to
24 have a school for environmental laws to address

1 those types of problems. The answer is not that
2 clear cut.
3 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, it should be.
4 MR. AVEL: The type of treatment
5 that may be required for the contaminants they
6 have, we may have no reason to have that type of
7 treatment system, and if we can avoid pulling their
8 contamination into our wells, I assure you we would
9 do that before we would start treating their --
10 MS. CRAWFORD: I think that's going
11 to cause a lot of problems.
12 MR. AVEL: Well, yes. First of all,
13 we don't anticipate it will be a problem.
14 Hopefully, our design for the extraction wells will
15 already take into account any plumes that are down
16 there and it will be designed so that it won't
17 affect any other plumes, but again we're still
18 looking at ways to trigger or to tell us if we do
19 start to move those plumes towards our extraction
20 wells.
21 MS. CRAWFORD: If they do start to
22 move and everything becomes mixed up and goofed up
23 together --
24 MR. AVEL: But the goal would be to

1 detect that movement, to get an indication that the
2 plumes are moving before it got mixed up together.
3 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: I think an
4 important point is we're not trying to draw the
5 water at such a rate that we're changing the
6 groundwater flow pattern. We're not trying to move
7 the flow. That is an interceptor wall system. The
8 objective is to just catch the plume as it comes
9 through. We're not trying to draw additional water
10 from the site or anything else. We're just trying
11 to catch what's coming to it.
12 MS. CRAWFORD: So in the wells that
13 you've already dug down there in that Southfield or
14 whatever it is you call it, in all the DOE wells
15 you haven't picked up like any of their chemicals
16 or anything yet?
17 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Not in the
18 wells where the South Plume is going to be drawn.
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But what
20 about the ones down around Paddys Run?
21 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Again, you have
22 to separate the South Plume removal action from the
23 total South Plume. We're not trying to address --
24 Operable Unit number 5 will address the total

1 Southfield or South Plume area. We are addressing
2 the known uranium contaminated plume. That's what
3 the removal action is.
4 MS. CRAWFORD: And none of those
5 wells have shown benzene, xylene, or none of that
6 stuff.
7 Let's forget about the remedial and
8 the South Plume. Let's go to those new wells that
9 were drilled at Paddys Run.
10 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Down at Paddys
11 Run Road site?
12 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, Paddys Run.
13 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Yes, certainly
14 there's, as Graham mentioned, they're finding
15 contamination at the other sites where we are
16 getting a mixture. But that south site, at least
17 it's outside --
18 MS. CRAWFORD: And those wells have
19 uranium in them, right? The wells that are being
20 drilled at Paddys Run are showing uranium in them,
21 right?
22 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: Yeah, there is,
23 but again our trigger level for the South Plume, as
24 Catherine mentioned earlier, we agreed to that 30

1 parts per billion PCB is our trigger level for that
2 removal action. So the 30, as far as I know, the
3 30 parts per billion levels are not -- the plume 30
4 parts per billion are not over that far. Now,
5 there may be localized spots, which again we will
6 have to address down the line, but not now.
7 MS. McCORD: Remember, that's not
8 the cleanup standard.
9 MR. BRETTSCHNEIDER: I agree, I
10 agree.
11 MS. McCORD: It's the actual level
12 for the removal only.
13 MR. AVEL: We need to speak in turn
14 so we can keep track of what's going on.
15 Next question.
16 MS. DASTILLUNG: Attention to detail
17 is really important in planning any cleanup
18 project, and we seem to be having trouble with
19 details as far as milk and meat sampling. We asked
20 in October for the milk and meat sampling data that
21 you said would be available in October. I now
22 finally have some milk sampling. Where is the meat
23 sampling?
24 MS. CRAWFORD: It's not on your

desk, is it?

MS. DASTILLUNG: You said you had a USDA report and also the FMPC was doing something.

MR. AVEL: I've still got it and I have to get it to you. Linda brought it over to me last week, no, the week before last and --

MS. DASTILLUNG: What's so difficult about providing data to the public?

MR. AVEL: Just so much going on that I forgot to bring it. It's my fault. I know you asked me for it a month and a half ago and I got half of it to you here tonight.

MS. DASTILLUNG: The public is having a little difficulty understanding -- I guess really we can understand why you're asking for extensions on the whole RI/FS project when you can't get something that should be relatively easy to do out in a timely manner. Is there any way you can work this through so this doesn't continue to happen?

MR. AVEL: I can continue to try to do the best to get the information to you. I think with Teresa being with us now, I'm sure she will be able to handle a lot of these kind of requests and

1 follow-up on them to make sure that they are
2 responded to.
3 MS. DASTILLUNG: Is she our contact
4 person for information at this point?
5 MR. AVEL: She will be.
6 MS. DASTILLUNG: When?
7 MR. AVEL: I don't know. In the
8 next couple of months we will make a transition
9 from me over to Teresa.
10 MS. DASTILLUNG: And you will let us
11 know at what point that occurs?
12 MR. AVEL: We sure will.
13 MS. CRAWFORD: The other thing we
14 need to follow-up with, I tried to call Teresa last
15 week, and I have the number written down, and the
16 phone rang 32 times and nobody answered it, and I
17 told her that, right, when I talked to you last
18 week. So you need to find somebody to answer this
19 lady's telephone.
20 MR. AVEL: That sounds like a
21 problem for you, Jerry.
22 MS. CRAWFORD: Not that I want you
23 to hire anybody else, but she needs a secretary.
24 MR. AVEL: I understand.

MS. CRAWFORD: An answering machine, that will do it.

MR. AVEL: Lisa asked earlier if any silo had been sampled in the past couple of weeks, several weeks without the use of a glove bag. Silo 3 had been, it was opened last week, the week before last, sometime in the past couple of weeks, and a sample of the head space, the free air, the free space above the thorium and uranium oxide was taken.

MS. CRAWFORD: And they didn't use a glove bag at all?

MR. CRAIG: No.

MR. AVEL: That's correct.

MS. CRAWFORD: So we lost some stuff into the air then, right?

MR. CRAIG: I don't know the details of it, maybe Jerry Gels can answer any questions.

MR. AVEL: Jerry. Jerry is in the Environmental Monitoring Section for Westinghouse. Jerry, can you go ahead and answer that question for us.

MR. GELS: We were requested to take some samples out of silo 3 to determine radon

concentration in the head space air as part of a calculation to be made on the flux, the radon flux being emitted out of silo 3. It's part of the new NESHAP guidelines. So we did take a number of samples in September and October, I believe five samples total, five different occasions about a week apart from the sampling ports, the sampling locations up on the domes of silo number 3.

The results essentially indicated that radon concentration was approximately 150 times lower than the radon concentrations that we had measured previously in silos 1 and 2. So those samples were taken. The actual involvement of opening it was a period of, an area about three inches in diameter was opened, a pipe, a sampling tube was put down. The sample was collected in about two minutes and it was resealed.

MS. CRAWFORD: I thought the policy and procedures, maybe I misunderstood, but it's my understanding that the policy of the SOP's or whatever you call them, was that you didn't open the silos without using the glove bag.

MR. AVEL: That's true for silo 1 and 2.

MS. CRAWFORD: If there's thorium and uranium oxide in there, then the same policy should apply.

MR. AVEL: I'll have to look into it and see what the situation was.

MS. CRAWFORD: The follow-up question is were the neighbors notified that you were going to be taking samples out of the silo?

MR. AVEL: The obvious answer is no, they were not.

MS. CRAWFORD: That's been a sore spot with the FRESH group, especially with the perimeter neighbors, that anytime you are going to mess with the silos, they are to be notified immediately.

MR. AVEL: Let me look into what happened and why it happened.

MS. CRAWFORD: I consider that to be an unusual incident.

MR. AVEL: I know I told you earlier we would inform you anytime we were doing work on the silos.

MS. CRAWFORD: One and two are probably the worst of the four, but the perimeter

neighbors have a right to be informed if there's somebody out there messing around with those silos. They have a choice to remain at home or to leave that day.

MR. AVEL: You're right. I'll check into it and see what happened and let you know.

MS. McCORD: I would like to make a statement. The whole idea behind CERCLA or the Superfund law is it's a Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Act. What it means is it's a comprehensive umbrella for all other environmental laws too. While the plant has the obligation to comply with RCRA for hazardous waste, portions of the Clear Waer Act, the Clean Air Act, since they are right now a Superfund site, all activities essentially at the site is under the obligations of CERCLA, which means certain things like the ongoing groundwater monitoring program, actually that data is being fed into the RI/FS reports, which means there's got to be certain rules and frame works complied with, which means some work plans for removal actions such as underground storage tank removals, work plans, sampling analysis plans for such activities as this

1 what's coming out right now I guess for silo 3.
2 There's got to be some redirection of how these
3 other people doing environmental work at Fernald
4 operate. Because it has to be under the auspices
5 of the operable unit manager who knows what's going
6 on with his or her operable unit.
7 MS. CRAWFORD: That goes back to the
8 point I made in my comments that one department
9 doesn't seem to know what the other department is
10 up to, and we talked about this at length last
11 night, that there needs to be, Jack Craig or
12 whoever is in charge of that operable unit should
13 know every little detail, who's out there walking
14 around, who's taking samples, who's doing
15 everything. If you have to hire some personnel to
16 help him do that, then that's the way it ought to
17 be.
18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
19 question concerning the core sampling in the K-65
20 silos. You say it's ongoing now. When do you
21 think you can get the samples and the data so that
22 you can prepare the documents that you need to
23 prepare?
24 MR. AVEL: Jack, do you want to

address that?

MR. CRAIG: The best estimate I have right now for getting samples is probably late spring of this year or next year, '91. Currently in the lab the turnaround time is about 120 days, so the analysis of those samples is 120 days from sending it to the lab. We're talking late spring, early summer of next year.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Before you get the samples?

MR. CRAIG: We'll have the samples in the spring, and it is about 120 days from the time we get the samples until we get the analysis back from the laboratories.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So how long will it take to prepare the documents that EPA requires?

MR. CRAIG: I don't know the answer to that right now. I venture to say you're probably talking another three to four months from that time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From the time you get the sample or from the time you get the results?

1 MR. CRAIG: The analysis back.
2 MS. CRAWFORD: There's been a little
3 bit of talk here tonight about deadlines not being
4 met, extensions being asked for. If and when are
5 you going to do this? Are you thinking about it
6 now? I know Graham and Catherine apparently can't
7 comment on it because of their agencies, but you
8 guys are here. Are you going to ask for an
9 extension? How much time are you going to ask
10 for?
11 MR. AVEL: Again --
12 MS. CRAWFORD: I think everybody
13 should be told this tonight.
14 MR. AVEL: I understand. We have
15 sent a letter to the US EPA requesting a series of
16 meetings to sit down and discuss the status of the
17 schedules on all the operable units, and until we
18 can carry out with these meetings and also
19 Catherine and Graham both alluded to a meeting that
20 is going to be held on the 17th, until we get the
21 results of that meeting, we really don't know.
22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've heard 18
23 months kicked around.
24 MR. AVEL: There have been a lot of

1 months kicked around.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I heard you

3 all are going to ask for an 18-month extension. Is

4 that at all what you're thinking or is that what

5 EPA is thinking? What do you think you'll need?

6 MR. AVEL: Again, Mickey, repeating

7 what I said to Lisa, until we have the opportunity

8 to sit down and discuss this at length with US EPA

9 and the state and until we have the benefit of the

10 results of the meeting on the 17th, we just would

11 be speculating.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: But asking for an

13 extension for this operable unit plan is going to

14 throw every other operable unit plan off schedule,

15 correct?

16 MR. AVEL: That is a possibility.

17 When I mentioned the letter that we sent to EPA, it

18 says schedules for operable units.

19 Any other questions? Yes, sir.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I read

21 somewhere that you're going to expand your

22 laboratory facilities to do testing of various

23 materials. Now, will that be a complete laboratory

24 so that you can speed up the process a little bit

1 instead of dragging your feet, you know, shipping
2 off 120 day turnaround? What kind of a facility do
3 you envision to build or expand?
4 MR. AVEL: Our current plans are to
5 have a laboratory that will be able to handle most
6 of the needs of the site. Now, there's problems
7 that yet have to be worked out with qualifying that
8 lab as a lab that is capable and demonstrates
9 ability to do that work. But that is our goal, is
10 to establish a lab on-site that can handle the
11 greater majority of all of our laboratory needs,
12 and that is what we're working towards now.
13 MS. CRAWFORD: When do you envision
14 that being done?
15 MR. AVEL: I don't know. Anybody
16 here that has a schedule for when the lab, the
17 construction will be complete?
18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 1992.
19 MR. AVEL: 1992. Again, there's
20 still some work that has to be done to get the lab
21 to be considered a qualified, if you want to use
22 that word, a qualified lab capable of doing all of
23 these analyses.
24 MS. CRAWFORD: You will also have

like quality assurance checks and you will have someone kind of looking over your shoulder and splitting samples with you; it's not going to be a one-sided DOE laboratory, correct?

MR. AVEL: That's correct, that's what I'm talking about when I referred to other work that needs to be done. It's our goal to have Ohio EPA and US EPA to agree that it is a laboratory that we all can rely on and feel certain that the data from that lab, the analysis from that lab can be certified. But, again, there's still a lot of work that needs to be done to get that laboratory -- just equipping the lab is the easy part. Now we have to get the lab certified or qualified, if you will, but that is our intention to do that.

MS. CRAWFORD: You already have the money budgeted for this project?

MR. AVEL: Yes.

MS. NUNGESTER: I've been trying to digest your 1989 Environmental Monitoring Report for the last couple of days, and what I get from this when I read it is everything is great, there's no problems in anything you find. However, when I

1 go through this letter from Catherine McCord, she
2 raises there's four or five questions here on what
3 you're not testing for, and I was just wondering if
4 this is going to be amended, why it isn't going to
5 be included in the monitoring report.
6 One question is children are not
7 tested. They play in Paddys Run. They have
8 typical ingestion rate of about about 100
9 megagrams, mgs per day---
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Milligrams.
11 MS. NUNGESTER: Milligrams. And
12 then she asks questions is thoron emitted from the
13 silos, are thoron decay products present in the
14 plume, and what are typical products of radon
15 exposure, what are the fill patterns -- and I am
16 not going read the whole thing, there's four or
17 five pages of questions here that she submitted to
18 the DOE. And I just wonder if these things are
19 going to be done in the future instead of just
20 putting out something that looks good and says
21 nothing, there's no problems, there's nothing to
22 worry about, when you're not measuring and the
23 classes that you're using to measure are
24 inadequate.

1 MS. McCORD: Just to clarify
2 something before there's a response, Andy, the
3 letter that you're reading from is the disapproval
4 of the second or revised old RI, the Remedial
5 Investigation report for Operable Unit 4, the
6 silos. In addition to having the problem with the
7 lack of data, there were some other, four or five
8 pages of other deficiencies that US EPA identified
9 in both the Remedial Investigation Report and the
10 Risk Assessment Report. I've got copies of the
11 letters if people want to see it, and that really
12 is not the Environmental Monitoring Report. Even
13 though the Environmental Monitoring Report should
14 be feeding into the Remedial Investigation and
15 should be following Remedial Investigation
16 procedures and quality assurance procedures, it is
17 not one of the primary documents.
18 The EMR, Environmental Monitoring
19 Report, is not one of the primary documents
20 required by the Consent Agreement. It's not a
21 CERCLA driven report. It is something that DOE
22 does because of internal orders, but the data is
23 being being used in the CERCLA process, so there
24 are obligations reflected in analysis of the

samples.

MR. AVEL: There is portions of the data collected by environmental monitoring tasks that supports the CERCLA process, and that data is collected under all the CERCLA protocols.

The comments that Norma was reading have to do with the Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study for Operable Unit 4, and the Environmental Monitoring Report is an entirely separate effort. That is an effort to evaluate what the effect of the site is to the environment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Andy, the lab you're talking about building over there, is that just to test what is at the FMPC plant or is this for other DOE sites to have stuff brought in?

MR. AVEL: Our current plans are only for our site, but we have the capability to test samples from other locations. We may do some of that, but keep in mind if we do that, the amounts, the samples that would come in -- and again I'm not saying that those are our plans, those aren't our plans, but I don't want to exclude that option right now -- Any samples that would come in would be very small and would be sent back

to whoever sent them to us. Right now the plan is just to test the material from our site.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Andy, on the update in the extracting the K-65 samples which you did not meet that in December, but it says that if you did, when you got your, when you were able to get the sampling, first the 8 foot or the 6 foot and then the 8 foot one or the 9 foot one, and it says here that you would, and we had mentioned last night about just taking maybe 3 foot and then pulling some out then going down and getting another 3 feet, and you said, no, you could not do that with sectioning. But yet they say here this is what they do, they cut up into sections and then send them off to the IT Laboratories. Are these IT laboratories that are here on 128 or are they the ones that are --

MR. AVEL: The laboratory is in Knoxville.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, Knoxville, okay. If you're going to section them off anyway, then why couldn't you try to take them out in sections?

MR. AVEL: That is our current plan,

is to -- currently what we're planning to do -- Jack, go ahead. He doesn't trust me.

MR. CRAIG: I do. The plan is to take out as much material as you can while you're sampling, because in doing that, the sampling is always much faster. Each time you sample the silos, if you're taking three feet at a time, you're going to have to open and close that manway and put a glove bag on several times. Whereas if you took a sample, you get more material in the core, you could get it all out at one time and close the manway.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What if this never happens? How long are you going to try this idea and it never works?

MR. CRAIG: That's a good point. Our plan is right now to take out those samples in sections. We're probably talking approximately 6 to 8 foot sections, so it's probably going to take us three to four times per manway.

MR. AVEL: Just to clarify what the plans are is to insert the vibracorer down to a depth of about 6 feet, pull it back out, take that sample out, then go back in the same hole with the

vibracorer and take the sample that will go from 6 down to 12 feet, pull that one up, put it back in the same hole and take the sample from 12 feet to 18 feet. Do that until we get to the bottom of the K-65, and we're looking at putting what is called casing in the hole as well.

MR. CRAIG: I don't think that we will have to do that.

MR. AVEL: That is an option that we have, to put a pipe in the hole to keep it from collapsing back on itself.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MS. DASTILLUNG: Do you have enough data on silo 3 to go forward with plans to take care of that one, or are you still waiting on data for that too?

MS. CRAWFORD: Stay up there, Jack.

MR. CRAIG: There are currently no plans to go back and sample residue out of silo 3. One of the comments that US EPA made in their latest comments on the RI Report was they felt the samples we got out of silo 3 were not adequate. That's an item we're going to have to discuss with them. We got the comment Friday, and it's going to

be, I guess, an item that we discuss in the next month or so.

MS. DASTILLUNG: It seems that an extension for silos 1 and 2 would have to be a fairly long one, maybe that one could be dealt with in a separate manner so that at least something could be going forward instead of waiting and trying to do everything at once.

MR. CRAIG: That's possible.

MS. CRAWFORD: Do you know exactly what's in silo 3? There's no question that it's the same thing all the way to the bottom?

MR. CRAIG: They took samples back in the summer of '89 out of silo 3. I think the depth of the samples they got was approximately 12 feet of material. They did go to the bottom of the silo, but when they pulled the sampling tube out, they only had 12 feet of material in it. From what I can recall, it was fairly consistent with what was on the top.

MS. CRAWFORD: Do you have pictures of this vibracorer thing that you are using?

MR. CRAIG: There's a picture on the wall back here. You can't see the whole thing very

well, but I can get you pictures of the whole thing.

MS. CRAWFORD: We were given an explanation last night there's a tube, you put it down in this thing and it brings a sample back up, but you have to let it lay 24 hours before you can open it. Maybe we need a visual aid here to try to figure out in our minds exactly what it is that you are talking about.

MR. CRAIG: Each time we take a sample, the whole process is videotaped, both the outside and even there's a camera installed inside the silo. You can actually see the vibracorer going into the material. I would suggest we show that at a FRESH meeting or one of the next meetings.

MR. AVEL: What we can do is put it up at the Administrative Record over at the Jamtek Building and make it available for anybody who wants to see it.

MS. CRAWFORD: Do all the other things we asked you first before you make this videotape. Send us the neat stuff first.

MR. AVEL: One thing I would like to

1 emphasize, Vicki made a good point about
2 consideration of any extension of any kind for the
3 cleanup schedule, it is the Department's position
4 and it's the DOE people that are personally
5 involved, our personal commitment to do as much
6 cleanup that can be done in the shortest possible
7 time as we can take, and we are constantly looking
8 at areas of the site that can be cleaned up
9 quickly, and that's one of the things that I do
10 want to repeat and just make sure that you guys
11 understand that it's one of our strong goals.
12 Jerry, you might want to confirm
13 that.
14 MR. WESTERBECK: I think when you
15 answered Mickey's question or didn't really answer
16 her question about 18 months, I don't think we want
17 to discuss a flat, let's just shift the whole
18 program out 18 months, 15 months, 20 months, but
19 look at each operable unit and the deliverables
20 required for each of those and let's move on with
21 what we can and by agreement, and those that are
22 going to take longer because we need data to
23 complete the reports, then we'll -- but obviously
24 they are somewhat interrelated too, so you have to

take that into consideration.

MR. AVEL: Any other questions?

The people that are here from the site, DOE people, the Westinghouse folks will be around for probably another hour. We will be more than happy to discuss any questions that you may have. I know Graham talked about the interim water treatment plant. There's a poster on the uranium, removal of the uranium from the effluent water, the site back here. Also Dave Brettschneider and Carlos Fermaintt will be glad to discuss that further. Any questions that I can answer, Jerry, any of the operable unit managers, anybody here from the site will be glad to spend time with you and answer any questions you may have.

Thanks a lot for coming out. Our next meeting, our next community meeting we're currently planning sometime in March. We'll get back and let you know when. Thank you.

- - -

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

- - -

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 I, LOIS A. ROELL, RPR, the undersigned, a
3 notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify
4 that at the time and place stated herein, I
5 recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had
6 transcribed with computer-aided transcription the
7 within (79), seventy-nine pages, and that the
8 foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete
9 and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.
10
11
12
13 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL, RPR
14 AUGUST 12, 1992. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24