

1714

G-000-1004.10

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FEED
MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER JULY 16,
1991 COMMUNITY MEETING**

07/16/91

**139
TRANSCRIPT**

1714

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

JULY 16, 1991

Community Meeting

- - -

PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION CENTER
% Westinghouse Mat'l. Co. of Ohio
P. O. Box 398704
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8704

1

Spangler Reporting Service

1 (513) 381-3330

1 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Good evening and
2 welcome. My name is Teressa Kwiatkowski. I'm with
3 the Department of Energy and I'm the Public
4 Information Officer here at the Fernald site. I'm
5 happy to see so many of you tonight, familiar faces
6 and some new faces. I want to thank you in advance
7 for your cooperation and participation this
8 evening.

9 Tonight we have a definite bright
10 spot with us, Leo Duffy, DOE's Director of
11 Environmental Restoration Waste Management has
12 taken the time to join us. He will share with us
13 his thoughts from a headquarters programmatic
14 viewpoint.

15 Following Leo Duffy we will have
16 Jerry Westerbeck, DOE Site Manager at Fernald, and
17 Jerry will lead us through a site office overview
18 on matters of current interest.

19 Next we will have Jack Craig, DOE's
20 Acting Branch Chief for Environmental Restoration,
21 and he will provide us with a statement on the
22 status of cleanup. This portion will be very
23 lengthy, so if you become a bit tired, I'd
24 appreciate if you can keep your ears and eyes open

1 because this is truly the heart of tonight's
2 meeting.

3 After Jack, Ray Hansen, DOE's
4 Assistant Manager for Construction, Engineering,
5 and Site Support, will brief us on safe shutdown
6 activities. At this time you might ask yourself
7 why are we talking about safe shutdown activities
8 now when production has ceased back in July of
9 1989. Well, recently cessation of production
10 became official, and I have to underline official.
11 DOE submitted a closure plan to Congress in
12 February of 1991. The plan passed through a
13 120-day advance notice period where Congress took
14 no action. Therefore, closure production is now
15 indeed official.

16 You probably have also heard mention
17 of a name change for the FMPC. The new name is
18 pending headquarters' approval. Once approval is
19 given, a ceremony will take place to commemorate
20 the new name and Fernald's new beginning. The site
21 will continue to devote itself exclusively to
22 environmental remediation. Notifications will be
23 made pertaining to this event.

24 Before we move on to the public forum

1 segment, we will adjourn for a much deserved break
2 at that point. During the public forum, US EPA,
3 Ohio EPA, and FRESH are invited to offer us their
4 comments. Immediately following the forum, a
5 question and answer session will be open for
6 discussion. I will ask for your expressed
7 cooperation in reserving your questions for this
8 segment of the meeting. This will serve all of us
9 in the interest of time and continuity.

10 Lastly, you will have noticed on your
11 seats we've distributed question cards. These
12 cards are by no means a substitute for the normal
13 questions during the session, but rather they're to
14 serve as a tool for those of you who may be on the
15 shy side or would perhaps rather maintain their
16 anonymity. So please bring those question cards if
17 you have any filled out over to me during the
18 break. We certainly would like to reach as many
19 people as possible tonight.

20 At this point I thank you and I would
21 like to turn you over to Leo Duffy.

22 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Teressa.
23 It's always a pleasure to be out in the field and
24 see the community interest in what we're doing, and

1 I am sure you'll have a lot of comments on how we
2 could do it better.

3 Recognize that we took over the
4 Fernald site as an environmental restoration
5 project in October, and we're still trying to find
6 our way really. We have a plan; I think we're
7 working with the public in every way we can. This
8 is hard for people to believe, that the Department
9 of Energy has an open philosophy on what we're
10 doing and how we're doing it and that we want your
11 comments. We've only had a year of operation
12 really as an organization. We started out with 58
13 people in October of 1989. We're now at about
14 1,000 total with 260 at the headquarters operation
15 and about another 700 out in the field, and we're
16 about 500 short.

17 I think from the Congressional
18 standpoint, we've gotten excellent support and
19 Senator Glenn and Congressmen Boehner have been key
20 supports for the Fernald operation, and Senator
21 Glenn has been a key support for our total program
22 as far as environmental restoration goes. He's
23 behind it all the time and he steps up and gets
24 counted on for us. We're very appreciative of the

1 Ohio delegation and specifically the delegation
2 around the Fernald area.

3 It's a hard job, and we've learned
4 the lesson over the last six months, and I think
5 we're working now to develop a better working
6 relationship with the Environmental Protection
7 Agency in this region, and I think we're working to
8 diligently involve the Ohio EPA in the operations
9 that we're doing, and we're trying to come up with
10 what we think is the best program that they feel is
11 necessary to support the citizens of this area.

12 As you see the Fernald operation
13 proceed, I think you're going to see a lot of
14 progress in the next year in the movement of
15 material off-site and the identification of fixes
16 for the K-65 silo. We've taken four more borings;
17 we've just completed horizontal drilling operations
18 underneath there and perched water operations, and
19 everything so far is coming out fairly good from
20 the standpoint of coming up with a fix.

21 We have a lot of work to do. This
22 facility was built in the 1950's and it's made out
23 of Transite, which is an asbestos based material,
24 and when we start taking material down, we have to

1 treat it as an asbestos operation. We have
2 facilities that have been abandoned over the years
3 and they have pigeon droppings in them, and the
4 pigeon droppings are a health hazard. So we go
5 from the metallurgical operation to the pigeon
6 droppings, and that's a pretty broad spectrum of
7 operations. Sewage treatment plants, metallurgical
8 extraction plants, radiological potential in some
9 of the material you see, so it's not a very simple,
10 straightforward job.

11 If you look at some of the Superfund
12 jobs that are out there, there are 33,000 potential
13 sites and there are I think 3,300 sites of active
14 maintenance or repair. Hardly any of them compare
15 with what we have here at Fernald or what we have
16 at Hanford. What we've done at the Hanford site,
17 which is a parallel site we picked up last year,
18 also is an environmental restoration site, is we've
19 not only done -- in spite of what people read in
20 the newspaper, we have not violated the Tri-Party
21 Agreement. We completed 77 out of 79 specific
22 events last year that were in the Tri-Party
23 Agreement. The only one we didn't take action on
24 was building a vitrification plant, and we have a

1714

1 team of scientists identifying what the problems
2 are with respect to pretreatment of high level
3 waste.

4 As a little note anecdotely, we had a
5 recommendation from somebody in the general public
6 on what to do with \$150,000 community fund that we
7 agreed to with the EPA as a result of our last
8 little discussion. And he said you should give it
9 to Hanford, they have a much bigger problem. So
10 you can see there's altruism in the crowd.

11 But we do have a major problem out
12 there; we have a major problem throughout the
13 complex of the Department of Energy. We started
14 out with a budget in 1989 before we were even an
15 organization of about \$1.7 billion. The '92 budget
16 is about \$4.4 billion. We're looking at budgets in
17 the order of \$5 billion and more for the '93 time
18 frame that are being discussed within Congress at
19 the present time, OMB.

20 So it's a major program and we want
21 to make sure we do it right. Everybody can look
22 around and see where there's government waste and
23 this is ripe for it. We're on the list for either
24 the second or third group that the GAO feels is

1714
1 eligible for fraud and abuse. When you get a
2 program that's grown this fast and you've got as
3 many sites as we have going and you have a
4 situation where we're bringing new people in to
5 train and to work on it, the potential exists for
6 fraud and abuse.

7 We want to make sure the taxpayers'
8 money is being spent effectively and efficiently.
9 We're going to have some growing pains and you're
10 probably going to disagree with us on how we
11 utilize the money. But the forum of community
12 meetings like this is where you can express your
13 opinions to us and we can tell you why we're doing
14 it and hopefully we can come to a mutually
15 satisfactory conclusion. Because it's your money,
16 it's not the Department of Energy's money, it's not
17 Congress' money, it's not EPA's money. It's your
18 money. And so we if we don't spend it right, it's
19 coming out of your pocket. And the thing is,
20 there's education, there's health, there's the
21 infrastructures within the cities, there's all
22 types of applications for the money, so we better
23 get the biggest bang for the buck out of this
24 operation.

1 The next go around out here is on
2 July 26 we'll announce the environmental
3 restoration management contract for the Fernald
4 site in the Commerce Business Daily and the Federal
5 Registry, and that will be a new methodology of
6 contracting cleanup. We hope that brings a more
7 efficient program, a program that effectively
8 identifies how we're going to clean up the Fernald
9 site and get it back to green pastures if
10 possible. That's what we're looking for.

11 We don't think this is that complex a
12 site from the cleanup standpoint. It's a matter of
13 getting the capability to send it someplace or to
14 treat it someplace, and you all have to recognize
15 there's nobody out there that's asking for this
16 waste. It's a national problem, and the Secretary
17 of Energy is working with the Government of the
18 United States to recognize that this is a national
19 problem.

20 There are states out there that have
21 problems that have to ship their waste to New
22 Mexico, there are states out there that are
23 shipping their waste to the State of Washington.
24 The State of Washington has to ship it to New

1 Mexico. Idaho is shipping waste to New Mexico;
2 Colorado is shipping waste to New Mexico if we
3 prove that the waste isolation pileup plant is an
4 acceptable operation. But the State of New Mexico
5 says okay, now we've done our share. Now we're
6 trying to characterize a site in Nevada, which may
7 be the national repository for such waste. Nevada
8 doesn't want that site.

9 Congress by act has directed the
10 Secretary of Energy to characterize the site. He
11 has no alternative but to characterize it. If it's
12 not right, Nevada has a veto project that can go to
13 Congress. They don't believe that they're going to
14 get the right reception if they say it's not
15 satisfactory, but in order for the Department of
16 Energy to demonstrate that the site is adequate or
17 is not adequate, we have to do a scientific
18 evaluation. It's going to take 20 years.

19 Now, that's an extremely long period
20 of time. We're talking about a 30-year cleanup
21 here. That's an extremely long period of time.
22 Some of your kids will be running this project out
23 here hopefully and they will be taking care of the
24 community as a perfect interest in cleaning up the

1714

1 site. We're looking at a long-term program. We're
2 looking at a hundred billion dollar cleanup
3 operation. That's a lot of money. So we better do
4 it right and we're trying.

5 We're working on our third five-year
6 plan. We're the only operation in the Department
7 of Energy who puts out a five-year plan to the
8 general public and has the public input. We have
9 the state and tribal working group, which is
10 composed of state legislatures, state attorney
11 generals, Indian tribes, and members of the
12 National Government Association. We have the
13 environmental groups working in the related area to
14 look at the methodology we use for planning and
15 budgeting, and we're going to get a lot of
16 criticism. We can't satisfy everybody's need at
17 the same time.

18 There is not a priority system in the
19 United States that identifies which is the top
20 priority. In our case we think that Hanford and
21 Fernald are our top priorities and as a result
22 we're working towards that. Our budget last year
23 was about 214,000,000. It's \$334,000,000 now based
24 on an advance hundred million dollars for next

1714

1 year's budget into this year's budget. That's a
 2 tremendous amount of money going into the site.
 3 And we're not in production; we're in cleanup and
 4 we're dedicated to cleanup and we're dedicated to
 5 demonstrating new technologies so we save you
 6 taxpayers money. And if we're not doing it right,
 7 we want to know about it and we expect you to tell
 8 us, and I'm sure everyone of you here will give me
 9 the opportunity to learn a new lesson. So I'm
 10 looking forward to it.

11 I think we're making an effort to
 12 communicate with you and it takes two to
 13 communicate. We have to have a dialogue, not a
 14 monologue, and I am not going to be standing here
 15 giving you a monologue. I'm here to listen to what
 16 you think we ought to be doing.

17 You're going to hear tonight what we
 18 think we have planned and how we're doing it. The
 19 area of the water project, we're waiting for
 20 Hamilton County to finish their study and we're
 21 standing by waiting to be an active participant,
 22 and I understand that's going to be in the
 23 September time frame. So we're just waiting until
 24 that takes place. We're doing everything we can to

1 find if there's any increased indication of uranium
2 in the groundwater, that the people that have that
3 indication have the opportunity to get water in the
4 interim time period before the city water system
5 comes in. So we're trying.

6 You'll see a change in the site from
7 an access standpoint. We're getting to a less
8 secure site from a national security standpoint to
9 a national industrial site, which will have
10 industrial security. So you'll see more access to
11 the site. We'll have more opportunity for those
12 people who don't have the high anxiety levels to
13 come on-site and see what we're doing, so you can
14 see right there what we're doing, why we're doing
15 it, and get a good indication of how we're doing
16 it. Those are the things to look forward to.

17 It's a very demanding project on the
18 people that are here. It's a demanding project on
19 the community because of the uncertainty of what is
20 the effect of the site, and we appreciate that, and
21 even though it doesn't appear that way, we are
22 concerned that you have a high anxiety level in
23 what we're doing and why we're doing it. So these
24 types of meetings are the way that you'll find out

1714

1 if we're doing it to your satisfaction. If we're
2 not, we expect you to tell us, and I am sure we'll
3 hear from not only here but from our Washington
4 associates.

5 Senator Glenn is very interested in
6 this program. We meet with his staff and we talk
7 to them almost daily. So you have good
8 representation there on making sure that Fernald
9 gets top attention from the Department of Energy.

10 So without a further monologue, I
11 would like to welcome myself here since I'm the
12 only stranger. Hopefully I'll be back for more.
13 Let's get on the with the meeting now, get on the
14 with the facts, and hopefully we'll satisfy some of
15 your curiosity and answer some of your questions
16 and you'll try not to stump the panel. Okay?
17 Thanks.

18 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you, Leo.
19 And now we have Jerry Westerbeck.

20 MR. WESTERBECK: Thank you,
21 Teresa. I have a couple view graphs, about eight
22 points to touch briefly on.

23 At the risk of repeating some of what
24 Teresa said, just I think it bears worth

1 repeating. It was just two years ago, July of '89,
2 when production was stopped, the switches were
3 thrown. Then just this past October we changed the
4 program management responsibility from defense
5 programs to Mr. Duffy's organization, Environmental
6 Restoration and Waste Management.

7 As Teresa said, on the 19th of
8 February, in accordance with a legal requirement,
9 the Secretary sent a closure program and a
10 retraining plan to Congress giving Congress the
11 official 120 day notification that production would
12 officially cease, and, of course, just this past
13 June 19th is when the 120 days passed. So we're
14 now, as Teresa said, it's technically and legally
15 out of production.

16 A little later Ray Hansen will give
17 you some more facts and figures related to where we
18 stand with regard to waste shipments and plans for
19 shipping waste as well as other shutdown
20 activities. After that, Jack Craig will give you a
21 brief status on the ongoing DOE/EPA negotiations
22 that Leo touched on. I would like to just touch on
23 one aspect of those, of that settlement.

24 As you probably know, a part of that

1 settlement included a provision whereby DOE would
2 allocate \$150,000 to be used for a supplemental or
3 supplemental projects in the Fernald area,
4 supplemental environmental beneficial projects.

5 In the Dear Neighbor that I sent you
6 a couple weeks ago, I included a form asking for
7 you to suggest, if you would like to, a way to use
8 all or a part of that money. If you didn't get a
9 letter or if you lost your form, we have additional
10 forms on the table. I encourage you to take a
11 form, fill it out, and either drop it in the box
12 here tonight or mail it back to Teressa. We would
13 like to have your inputs into us by the end of this
14 month, by the end of July, so that we can
15 essentially screen, accumulate all the various
16 suggestions and present them to the US EPA so that
17 we can make it a part of our settlement of the
18 dispute that we had. Our goal, of course, as Jack
19 will tell you, being the 13th of September.

20 At the request of FRESH, we began
21 placing daily operations briefs on all DOE sites in
22 the Public Environmental Information Center. We
23 started that the latter part of May. These daily
24 operations briefs are summaries of occurrence

1714

1 reports that are given to the Secretary. We've
2 committed to place the previous week's daily
3 operations briefs in the Public Environmental
4 Information Center by Wednesday of the following
5 week. And I think so far we've been getting them
6 regularly from headquarters and have been getting
7 them into the PEIC by Wednesday. So far it's
8 working. But if we have a breakdown, we will -- of
9 course, anytime you set up a system, there's always
10 an opportunity for breakdown, but we'll endeavor to
11 fix that. As I say, so far it seems to be
12 working.

13 Some of you may have seen a press
14 release recently on the breaking grounds for our
15 new D&D or decontamination and decommissioning
16 facility. In May we awarded a \$4.65 million
17 contract to a small firm from Dayton, Ohio called
18 Wise Construction. They have begun construction on
19 this project, which incidentally was designed by a
20 local architect engineering firm from Cincinnati
21 called A.M. Kinney. This D&D facility is designed
22 to remove contamination from a full range of items,
23 from small tools, electrical equipment, motors, up
24 to entire pieces of equipment, including tractor

1714

1 trailer rigs. Something that can handle the
2 equipment that big. It will feature a modern
3 industrial cleaning and environmental control
4 system, and as Ray may touch on later, is actually
5 an integral part of our overall environmental
6 restoration effort here at the site.

7 Two important emergency preparedness
8 exercises took place in June. On June 19th, the
9 Department of Energy and Westinghouse sponsored an
10 emergency training exercise which simulated a
11 tornado strike involving the K-65 silos. Emergency
12 response organizations from Butler and Hamilton
13 Counties and the State of Ohio joined with key site
14 personnel for this training. Each of us lost about
15 10 pounds I believe that afternoon. It was hot and
16 unair-conditioned Ross High School. We conduct
17 these exercises to better prepare personnel who may
18 be called upon to assist in emergency situations.

19 The second scenario involved our site
20 emergency response team working in concert with
21 Crosby, Ross, and Colerain Fire Departments. We
22 simulated a chlorine leak and rescue of an
23 employee. In tandem with the emergency response
24 team and our emergency operation center, we ran a

1714

1 drill of our joint Public Information Center to
2 improve communication with the public and the
3 media. The drill had to be terminated early so
4 that some of the people participating in the
5 exercise could actually attend to a real problem
6 that four employees experienced by heat stress.

7 Since our last community meeting we
8 have conducted two community round tables. On May
9 20th there was a round table on contaminated
10 groundwater. Among the topics discussed were
11 groundwater flow, the Fernald site monitoring
12 program, how wells are selected, and the risk
13 assessment methodology.

14 On the 17th of June we held a session
15 on hazardous waste at the site. Some of the topics
16 discussed were the amount of hazardous waste at
17 Fernald, the difference between hazardous and low
18 level wastes, and storage locations for hazardous
19 waste materials.

20 On July 29th, we are planning our
21 next round table, which will be in the ERA Alpha
22 Building, Classroom B. The topic for that round
23 table will be radiation, including the types of
24 radiation concerns at Fernald and the health

1 effects of radiation.

2 Round table topics, locations, and
3 times are determined by a community round table
4 survey which was completed in January of '91.
5 I might add, over a hundred people responded to
6 that survey, but if you have ideas for future round
7 table, we obviously take suggestions any time.

8 In fact, we held two special meetings
9 just recently that sort of qualify as round
10 tables. Held them with members of FRESH. The
11 first one was in April to discuss the
12 meteorological effects on radon concentrations near
13 the K-65 silos. Had to do with inversion
14 conditions that we experienced. In fact, this
15 meeting was set up during a meeting that, when Leo
16 was out here and met with a smaller group of folks
17 back in February.

18 Second meeting was held on July 2nd,
19 again at the request of FRESH, to discuss the
20 evening activities associated with the K-65 silos.
21 I think our workers found it was a lot cooler to
22 work in some of those suits during the evening
23 hours rather than during the day.

24 In May we graduated 39 people from

1 the second session of the DOE Westinghouse School
2 of Environmental Excellence. I believe 34
3 graduated from the first class. This -- of course,
4 the first class was made up of students from the
5 various, I think six DOE facilities from around the
6 country. This particular class had the extra
7 special significance, I guess you might say, in
8 that three DOE people and one FRESH member, Marvin
9 Clawson, attended and graduated from the class. We
10 got nothing but good feedback from all attendees
11 again, constructive feedback encouraging us and
12 enabling us to improve the course or at least in
13 its next offerings or at least blocks of the course
14 that will be offered in the future.

15 The last bullet, public water supply,
16 Leo touched upon. We talked just briefly about
17 that at our last community meeting. I think it was
18 just before that we had met with the City of
19 Cincinnati and the Hamilton County Department of
20 Public Works. Things have been -- there have been
21 a couple of articles in the paper -- things have
22 been moving along I think quite well with this
23 project.

24 As Leo said, the Hamilton County

1 Department of Public Works currently has a
2 consultant doing a study for them to look at
3 potential suppliers to bring in public water, to
4 bring public water into this area. Essentially
5 where they would be bringing the water, the
6 quality, the pressure, everything associated with
7 it, the cost of the project perhaps. Just like
8 you, we are anxiously awaiting the recommendations
9 of the consultant and we maintain, what, weekly or
10 biweekly contact with him to track the progress. I
11 think the study can go as long as the end of
12 September, but we understand the consultant may be
13 finishing early. So we'll try to keep you informed
14 as to -- obviously Hamilton County is the lead on
15 it, but we are prime interfaced with you, so we'll
16 try to keep you as up-to-date as we can.

17 That's all I have. Later when we
18 have questions and answers, I'll try to entertain a
19 few if you have them. Thank you.

20 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thanks, Jerry.
21 And now we have Jack Craig coming up.

22 MR. CRAIG: Thanks, Teresa. I
23 would like to welcome everybody here again
24 tonight. I want to give a short, hopefully short

1714

1 and brief overview of cleanup actions at the site.

2 Jerry mentioned in his opening
3 remarks about the renegotiations of our Consent
4 Agreement which are ongoing with US EPA and with
5 the involvement of Ohio EPA. A little background
6 on that. As Jerry mentioned, a settlement
7 agreement was signed between DOE and US EPA in May
8 of this year. Agreement at that time was to
9 renegotiate milestones for our CERCLA documents.
10 The time frame which was agreed to for that
11 negotiation period was four months, and that will
12 put the negotiations concluding and the agreement
13 signed approximately the middle of September.

14 Status to where we're at to date, we
15 have been holding weekly meetings with Ohio and US
16 EPA. For the most part our meetings to date have
17 been talking generally about improvements we can
18 make in the language of the agreement, more
19 specifically, lately we have been talking about
20 actual dates in the agreement. We have jointly
21 agreed to not discuss the details of negotiations
22 tonight, but at the time that we're concluding the
23 negotiations in September, there will be an
24 opportunity for public comment and review of the

1 new milestones at that time.

2 Next I'd like to talk about operable
3 units tonight. I would like to give a brief
4 overview of the description of the operable units
5 and maybe the locations of each operable unit and
6 what's going on as far as RI/FS activities on the
7 operable units.

8 After that I would like to get into a
9 little bit about the activities ongoing at the site
10 as far as sampling, some of the plans for the
11 submittal of treatability study work plans to EPA
12 for approval, and also a brief discussion of some
13 documents that have been issued within the last
14 three months.

15 Also I would like to talk a little
16 bit about Operable Unit 3, I'll get into a little
17 bit more detail on that when I get to that point.
18 And I would like to close with a brief status of
19 the removal actions which we have ongoing at the
20 site and a little bit of discussion on some of the
21 other ones that are planned.

22 A little bit of background
23 information, this may be old news to some of you,
24 but the CERCLA Program at the site has been broken

1714

1 up into five operable units. They are numbered
2 here. I think there's a map, the next slide, that
3 gives a little bit better pictorial of the
4 locations of the operable units.

5 Operable Unit 1, as you can see
6 shaded in orange, includes the waste pit area, this
7 being waste pits 1 through 6, the burn pit, and the
8 clearwell, which is a basin that collects
9 stormwater runoff from the waste pits.

10 Operable Unit 2, which is shaded in
11 blue, includes the sanitary landfill, which is
12 located here; the lime sludge ponds, which are
13 located in this area; the inactive and active fly
14 ash piles, which are in this area; and an area
15 which we call the Southfield area, which is at the
16 southern portion of the site located in this area.
17 Operable Unit 2 includes some waste units which
18 typically have low concentrations of contaminants
19 but may have high volumes of waste with the low
20 concentrations.

21 Operable Unit 3 is the area shaded in
22 yellow here, and it includes the former production
23 facilities, that being all the buildings,
24 structures, and so forth that are above ground and

1714

1 man-made. It also includes all the waste materials
2 on-site, whether it be low level waste in drums or
3 thorium, and through our recent negotiations with
4 US EPA and as a settlement of a dispute on Operable
5 Unit 3, all the material within the shaded area
6 here in yellow is now under the CERCLA Program at
7 the site. I'll talk a little bit more about that
8 in a minute.

9 Operable Unit 4 includes the four
10 waste storage silos in this area. Two of them,
11 K-65 silos, contain some radium-bearing waste
12 material that contains some large concentrations of
13 radium which produce radon gas, and we have a
14 project underway which I'll talk about a little bit
15 later, removal action to address that problem.
16 Also silo 3, which is a silo that contains some
17 metal oxides which have some higher concentrations
18 of thorium, and also silo 4, which is empty and has
19 never been used.

20 Operable Unit 5 includes everything
21 else on the site that's not included under another
22 operable unit, that being all the contaminated
23 soils that are on-site, all the groundwater and any
24 perched groundwater which may be encountered on the

1 site.

2 A little bit of overview, our status
3 on where we're at, some of the RI/FS activities in
4 Operable Unit 1. There's a sampling program
5 underway right now to further characterize the
6 waste pit area. This is an additional sampling
7 effort, kind of in addition to the sampling data we
8 already had. It was a sampling program which was
9 reviewed and approved by US and Ohio EPA. The
10 purpose of this sampling is to retrieve samples
11 both of the groundwater and of material in the
12 waste pits to further characterize the material in
13 the waste pits and also to get some material for
14 treatability testing which we can use to determine
15 what's the best way to treat the waste so we have a
16 better idea of how to evaluate the alternatives and
17 come up with the best cleanup method.

18 The status of the sampling to date,
19 the field work started for Operable Unit 1 in June
20 of this year, it started with the installation of
21 some temporary roads in the area to make sure that
22 the drill rigs and so forth driving on top of the
23 waste pits was a safe operation. I believe they
24 have placed some wells in the area now. That

1714

1 sampling, the total sampling activity for Operable
2 Unit 1 is scheduled for completion in October of
3 this year.

4 For Operable Unit 2, the purpose of
5 the sampling is similar to that in Operable Unit
6 1. It is in addition to some data that was already
7 gathered for Operable Unit 2. Like Operable Unit
8 1, it will be used for treatability testing to
9 determine the best waste form for final remediation
10 and disposal of that waste.

11 Locations of the sampling, we are --
12 I pointed out before, the lime sludge ponds within
13 Operable Unit 2, that sampling has been completed.
14 Sampling of the fly ash piles was also completed,
15 that was completed today as a matter of fact. The
16 work left to do in this operable unit includes the
17 sampling of the sanitary landfill and I think four
18 additional samples in the Southfield area, and that
19 work is scheduled to be completed in August of this
20 year.

21 Operable Unit 4 is probably the most
22 extensive sampling program we're undertaking right
23 now. It includes the sampling of soils both around
24 and underneath the K-65 silos and also includes

1714

1 some additional sampling of the material or the
2 residues which are in the K-65 silos. The purpose
3 of this sampling is to determine whether or not
4 that any of the material from the silos may have
5 leaked or leached into the underlying and
6 surrounding soils or maybe potentially the
7 groundwater and also to retrieve material for
8 treatability testing.

9 The status of the sampling, the first
10 sampling activity was the berm sampling, which is
11 designated as vertical borings here. This program
12 included the taking of four vertical samples, two
13 around each silo, approximately 30 feet deep.
14 These borings were completed in June of this year.
15 The slant borings is a program which takes a
16 vertical sample starting at the surface of the
17 ground and boring at an angle underneath the K-65
18 silos. We have -- we're scheduled to take five
19 samples at different angles, different locations
20 around the silos. We have completed three of those
21 borings; the two that remain are scheduled for
22 completion in August of this year.

23 The K-65 silos content sampling, that
24 activity started today. The plan is to take three

1714

1 cores from each of the silos, and that activity is
2 scheduled for completion in August of this year.

3 Operable Unit 5 field work includes
4 an ongoing program right now which is entitled
5 Paddy's Run Seepage Investigation Study. This is a
6 program which is ongoing to determine if
7 infiltration from Paddy's Run Creek, any runoff
8 going down Paddy's Run Creek which may be
9 contaminated has a potential to migrate through the
10 creek bed to the aquifer. This investigation is
11 being done in the area which is south of the South
12 Plume, which I'm going to talk about a little bit
13 later. It's in the area generally to the south of
14 New Haven Road and in the vicinity of Paddy's Run
15 Creek. Just a note in addition to that, those
16 activities started in March of this year, and it's
17 an approximately one-year program of monitoring
18 those wells.

19 Some other related RI/FS activities,
20 I mentioned a little bit about treatability
21 studies. In the near future we will be submitting
22 treatability study work plans for some of the
23 operable units, which will be available in the
24 Administrative Record. The scope of those studies

1714

1 will be outlined in the plan. What we'll be doing
2 for each operable unit, plans or some activities
3 such as some studies to see if some of the wastes
4 can be converted to a waste form through
5 cementation, through stabilization, or possibly
6 through a melting process called vitrification.
7 Those studies will be undertaken as soon as US EPA
8 and Ohio EPA approve those work plans. I think
9 there will be three of those work plans in the
10 Administrative Record by the end of August.

11 On reports issued since March of this
12 year, we have for Operable Unit 2, there was an
13 Initial Screening of Alternatives report which was
14 submitted to US EPA and approved in June of this
15 year. That document is a primary document of the
16 RI/FS that is available in the Administrative
17 Record. A removal action work plan for the Plant 1
18 pad, which I'll speak of a little bit later, it is
19 a work plan which outlines the activities necessary
20 to renovate one of the large storage pads at the
21 site that's presently undergoing EPA review, but a
22 copy of that work plan as submitted is available in
23 the Administrative Record.

24 A little bit of discussion on

1 Operable Unit 3. As a result of a dispute¹⁷¹⁴
2 resolution on one of the documents in Operable Unit
3 3, we have included a larger amount of units or
4 facilities within the scope of Operable Unit 3.
5 This includes, like I said earlier, all the waste
6 material on-site, some of the product material
7 on-site, buildings, structures, and some of the
8 roadways, anything man-made is included in Operable
9 Unit 3. This is a subject of our negotiations
10 now. The new redefinition of this operable unit is
11 going to significantly increase the amount of
12 characterization required for this operable unit.

13 Removal actions, just a brief update
14 on some of the actions that have been completed. I
15 think this removal action was announced at the last
16 community meeting, but to bring it up again. The
17 waste pit 6 removal action was completed in
18 December of 1990. This removal action included the
19 reconfiguration of waste in pit number 6, which is
20 a part of Operable Unit 1, and the reconfiguration
21 of this waste to a state that would reduce the
22 fugitive emissions which come off the waste
23 historically. What they did was they took waste
24 material that was above the water line of the waste

1 pit, moved it under the water line so the wind and
2 weather would not spread the material fugitively.

3 K-65 decant sump tank, this was a
4 removal action that has been completed since the
5 last meeting. This removal action involved
6 removing approximately 8,000 gallons of liquid from
7 a decant sump tank which is shown here in the
8 picture. This decant sump tank historically took
9 liquid from the K-65 silos and was used in the
10 process of filling the tanks back in the 1950's.
11 The operations included pumping the material from
12 the tank into a tanker truck. The tanker truck was
13 filled and moved to a facility near Plant 2-3
14 on-site, an above-ground tank which could be
15 monitored. The liquid is now all removed, it's in
16 the tank near Plant 2-3. The water is at the lab
17 for analysis right now, and based on the lab
18 analysis, there will be some treatment required and
19 that will determine the treatment requirements for
20 the water. But the removal action was completed in
21 April, ahead of schedule. I think it was completed
22 in approximately three weeks.

23 Some of the removal actions that are
24 in progress, the first four I'm going to talk about

1 here are removal actions that were required from
2 the 1990 Consent Agreement. They were in that
3 agreement and there were milestones in that
4 agreement for these removal actions.

5 The first one, the perched
6 groundwater removal action, included removing some
7 contaminated water in the production area that was
8 in some perched water zones underneath the
9 buildings, specifically Plant 6, Plant 2-3, Plant
10 9, and Plant 8. That removal action work plan was
11 approved by US EPA. Pumping operations began in
12 Plant 6 the end of May of this year. That material
13 -- I think there's a slide for this one -- That
14 material will be held in a collection plant in
15 Plant 6 until the treatment system comes on-line in
16 Plant 8 to treat the water. The contaminants in
17 this water were VOC's, which are typically
18 degreasers in a facility like this. The pumping
19 started in Plant 6 the end of May. The treatment
20 facility is scheduled to come on-line July 24th of
21 this year. Perched water from Plant 9 will begin
22 operations in August of this year and operations in
23 Plant 2-3 will begin in November of this year.

24 The next removal action is the South

1 Plume. This removal action has been broken into
2 five parts. It deals with addressing a problem
3 south of the facility which is an area of
4 contaminated groundwater. This removal action has
5 been broken into five parts, based on the agreed
6 work plan. Part five is now being reviewed. We
7 have comments from EPA on that and I can talk a
8 little bit about that in a second.

9 Part one included an alternate water
10 supply for industrial users in the area. This
11 would include installation of an extraction well
12 outside the area of contamination and providing
13 water for industrial users.

14 Part two includes the groundwater
15 collection system in the South Plume area, but the
16 goal of this part is to stop the flow of the South
17 Plume to the south and also pump the water back to
18 the facility for discharge to the Great Miami
19 River.

20 Part three included an interim
21 wastewater treatment facility, which was a facility
22 designed at approximately 150 gallons per minute to
23 treat a stream of existing FMPC contaminants so
24 that with the addition of the water from the South

1 Plume we would not be discharging any greater
2 amount of uranium to the river. That project is
3 currently on schedule and I believe is scheduled to
4 come on-line in December of this year.

5 Groundwater monitoring and controls,
6 institutional controls is part four. This includes
7 the monitoring of the effectiveness of the
8 extraction wells out of part two and also
9 institutes some controls in place to make sure that
10 no access can be gained to the contaminated
11 groundwater.

12 Part five includes some groundwater
13 monitoring and some additional investigations south
14 of the locations for the extraction wells from part
15 two, and the goal of part five is to better
16 determine the boundaries, the southern edge of the
17 boundary of the South Plume, and to also look at
18 its relationship and determine the boundaries of
19 the Plume from the Paddy's Run Road site.

20 The K-65 removal action includes the
21 addition of bentonite clay into the K-65 silos.
22 The goal of this removal action is to reduce radon
23 emissions from the silos to the environment. As
24 you can see from the schematic, the bentonite will

1 be pumped into the silos through a glove bag, and
2 the glove bag is then placed to isolate the silos
3 from the environment to make sure no radon escapes
4 during the installation of the bentonite clay.
5 This removal action is on schedule and it is
6 scheduled for completion in December of this year.

7 The final removal action that was
8 outlined in our 1990 Consent Agreement was the
9 waste pit area runoff control removal action. This
10 removal action includes -- or the goal of this
11 removal action was to reduce or eliminate the
12 stormwater runoff which could be potentially
13 contaminated from the waste pit area which
14 historically had run off into Paddy's Run. This
15 removal action will include the installation of
16 ditches, dikes, and sumps in the area to collect
17 all the stormwater runoff, put it through a
18 collection sump and treat it through the existing
19 plant for that treatment system. This removal
20 action, ground breaking took place, as Jerry
21 mentioned I believe, in June of this year, and it
22 is on schedule for completion in July of this year
23 -- or of 1992.

24 I think there were two more on that

1 first slide which listed the removals. The two
2 additional that were on the slide, pad one plant
3 removal action I spoke of earlier is a project
4 which is planned to renovate the Plant 1 pad, a
5 large storage pad on-site, which currently stores
6 drum waste. The removal action will renovate the
7 pad and also provide approximately 100,000 square
8 feet of covered storage for waste on the pad. That
9 removal action work plan was submitted to US EPA in
10 June of this year, and it is at US EPA for review
11 and approval.

12 Finally, I have two removal actions
13 which we have planned, touch on just a little bit.
14 The Plant 1 ore silos, at the last public meeting
15 we spoke of an action which we undertook to clean
16 up some material which had leaked from one of the
17 source silos south of Plant 1. As a result of
18 cleaning up that, we have decided that it would be
19 a good idea to undertake a removal action to
20 demolish those silos. They are rather
21 deteriorated. There are a total of 14 silos, and
22 we are writing a removal action work plan to
23 address the decontamination demolition of the
24 silos, and that will be sent to US and Ohio EPA for

1714

1 approval.

2 The last one includes the active and
3 inactive fly ash piles. For the inactive fly ash
4 piles, there is a removal action going to be
5 undertaken to restrict access to both the fly ash
6 pile -- the inactive fly ash pile in the Southfield
7 area. These are two areas that have been covered
8 with soil but access restrictions have been deemed
9 appropriate. For the active fly ash pile we are
10 looking at some options for reducing the fugitive
11 emissions which may come from the active fly ash
12 pile. Some of the alternatives we are looking at
13 conceptually are possibly putting a cover over the
14 active fly ash pile or some type of suppressant to
15 cut down on fugitive emissions. Those are the
16 Plant 1 ore silos.

17 That's all I have. I'll be available
18 at the break or after the meeting tonight if you
19 have any questions. I'd encourage everybody to
20 look at the materials behind us. It includes a lot
21 of the items I talked about tonight and also the
22 Fernald Site Update, which has information on all
23 the things I spoke of also. Thank you.

24 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you, Jack.

1714

1 And now we have Ray Hansen.

2 MR. HANSEN: Good evening. As
3 you've heard a number of times and already probably
4 know, production really was suspended in July of
5 1989. Once we suspended production, we really
6 stayed in a standby status until we could qualify a
7 private sector vendor for depleted uranium. That
8 still is a critical material for defense of the
9 country. One vendor has been qualified, and I
10 understand the second is about to be qualified.

11 In July of 1990, Leo authorized a
12 task force to implement the transfer of the FMPC
13 from defense programs to environmental restoration
14 waste management. The plans for that transfer was
15 officially approved by the Secretary and became
16 effective October 1st, 1990. Although the transfer
17 plan dealt with assigned responsibilities for each
18 of the organizations, other tasks and issues, two
19 plans included in that transfer plan we're going to
20 discuss tonight.

21 One was a closure plan required by
22 public law for any DOE defense related facility to
23 be closed and a corollary plan, a training plan.
24 We're required to submit those to Congress and

1 allow Congress 120 days to comment on those plans.
2 No comments were received, which indicated that
3 Congressional approval was given for shutdown of
4 the production facilities.

5 The training plan really covered a
6 three-phase retraining process. The three-phase
7 retraining process really began in late December,
8 '88. By January, 1989 we were looking at 24-hour
9 training to upgrade general safety skills of the
10 workers. We developed specialized skills training
11 in restoration and waste handling and introduced
12 the work force to a new priority, that of
13 remediation.

14 In July of 1989 we also had a
15 three-level training program that included 24 and
16 40-hour RCRA training, 8-hour refresher training
17 for hazardous waste. We gave job specific training
18 based on job tests that were identified, and we
19 gave training for site-wide RCRA awareness for the
20 whole site.

21 In May of 1990 we provided 15,000
22 hours of CERCLA, SARA regulations training for the
23 site. The training plan also included job
24 placement services for how we would place people

1714

1 who were retrained for future work of remediation.

2 Principal elements of the closure
3 plan dealt with the CERCLA Section 120 Consent
4 Agreement. Basically that agreement, as you know,
5 established operable units with individual remedial
6 investigation/feasibility study per operable unit
7 and included the removal actions that Jack has
8 talked about. It also included an environmental
9 restoration and waste management plan that dealt
10 with environmental issues, regulatory requirements,
11 planned corrective actions, and how we would comply
12 with NEPA.

13 It also included a nuclear materials
14 disposition plan, which really dealt with the
15 thorium on-site, uranium materials on-site, in
16 process materials, product materials, and residues
17 from past operations. And last it dealt with a
18 safe shutdown of the facility, and that's what I'm
19 here to talk about.

20 Safe shutdown is really an enormous
21 program that includes disposition of remaining
22 product inventory, in process materials, shipment
23 of low level waste, assuring appropriate handling
24 of hazardous waste, and shutting down and cleaning

1 out all of the production equipment on site, all
2 prior to eventual decommissioning and
3 decontamination.

4 Safe shutdown program also means that
5 we will continue basic site services. These
6 include maintaining fire protection, security,
7 lighting, heating, water and sanitary facilities
8 needed for the next major phase of restoration.
9 Once again, leading to eventual decontamination and
10 decommissioning.

11 On-site we have 117 facilities
12 covered under the safe shutdown program. Sixty-one
13 of those facilities we will need for the future
14 restoration activities. Of the remaining
15 buildings, 28 are warehouses and 28 we have
16 identified with no future need. Many of those
17 facilities are former production plants or
18 production operations facilities.

19 When production was suspended in July
20 of 1989, much of the activity of in-process
21 production of uranium was literally suspended.
22 Much of the in-process material remains in that
23 equipment and needs to be cleaned up. It's easy to
24 talk about shutting down a facility, you just stop

1 operations and walk away from it. What we would
2 like to do is what we call safe shutdown. That
3 means taking apart the equipment, cleaning out all
4 the materials that are in there, those are
5 potential contaminants that could be released to
6 the environment.

7 When we did shutdown production
8 operations, as an example, we had 81 castings of
9 depleted uranium that were used in the US Army Tank
10 Armament Program still in molds. Those molds have
11 now been emptied. We've taken materials out, we
12 are packaging them, and will ship them to the
13 custody of the US Army. Other material residues
14 from various steps in the process of uranium
15 production are still in the equipment and need to
16 be removed.

17 In order to remove that material,
18 that means we're going to have to start up screws,
19 conveyors, packaging stations, dust collectors.
20 Let me assure you, though, that before we start up
21 any equipment, there will be adequate inspections,
22 health and safety plans, operational readiness
23 reviews, other careful preparations prior to each
24 phase of the program of safe shutdown. Once the

1714

1 material is removed from the equipment, we can
2 proceed then with remedial investigation of
3 Operable Unit 3 to determine how to dispose of the
4 buildings and equipment that are no longer needed.

5 Counting all of the product,
6 in-process materials, residues from past
7 production, we have in all approximately 57 pounds
8 of materials to move off-site as part of the safe
9 shutdown program. What did I say -- 57,000,000
10 pounds. Big difference.

11 Federal property regulations require
12 that we determine that is there a potential use for
13 all of those materials we have on-site. For
14 instance, we had 400,000 pounds of magnesium
15 materials used in uranium production on-site that
16 had never been used. We actually did advertise for
17 that material, made it available, and ended up
18 actually selling that material to the commercial
19 sector. Magnesium, while not radioactive, was a
20 fire hazard potential. That and other chemicals
21 that we removed from the site include the ammonia,
22 if you'll remember, and hydrous hydrogen chloride.
23 Those chemical hazards have all been removed from
24 site.

1 We also -- well, let me go over the
2 in-process type of materials. Those are things
3 that we have from the intermediate steps of the
4 site production of uranium. Process materials,
5 those are intermediate materials that we can sell
6 as an intermediate material, uranium trioxide, for
7 instance, and uranium tetrafluoride, we had some
8 8,000,000 pounds of that material on-site. Product
9 materials including derbies, ingots, and, as I
10 mentioned, the material for the US Army, what we
11 call depleted uranium flats, those materials can
12 also be sold, and we're looking at some 13,000,000
13 pounds of that material on-site.

14 Waste residues, that's probably
15 another 36,000,000 pounds. We also have on-site
16 4.7 million pounds of thorium compounds, which we
17 have advertised for sale in the Commercial Business
18 Daily. That includes some 1,800 drums of thorium
19 oxides removed from an aging silo and bin at Plant
20 8. This material has been packaged and stored in a
21 special warehouse. Altogether we have some 15,000
22 containers of thorium to dispose of under this safe
23 shutdown program.

24 Recently over 2,000,000 pounds of

1714

1 that thorium material has been declared waste and
2 we intend to ship these materials very soon. Since
3 very little interest was expressed in our other
4 thorium materials, we expect that that material
5 will also be declared waste material also.

6 As I mentioned, we have lots of
7 uranium on site, not 57 pounds but 57,000,000
8 pounds in various forms, such as oxides, metal,
9 waste residues that we also plan to ship off-site,
10 about 60,000 drum equivalents of materials in
11 various chemical forms. We are now shipping this
12 material off-site.

13 We also have shipped 1.7 million
14 pounds of product off-site this year. We have made
15 inquiries into the need of this uranium and other
16 federal agencies have found no interest. We have
17 prepared a draft for a Commerce Business Daily
18 announcement, announcing this material for sale
19 also. As soon as we get approval from
20 headquarters, we will publish that announcement.
21 If we find interest in it, and we do expect some
22 interest from England and France and possibly
23 Canada, we'll get ready to ship those materials
24 off-site. If there is no interest in the

1714

1 materials, and we expect no interest in some of our
2 materials, that will also be declared waste and it
3 will be shipped off-site too.

4 Much of the material we have on-site
5 we've been shipping off-site since 1986 and really
6 we're quite proud of the fact that since then we
7 have shipped over 200,000 drum equivalents of
8 material off-site. Our goal, as you can see this
9 year, is to ship 232,000 drum equivalents of
10 material.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: How far away from
12 that, are you?

13 MR. HANSEN: We are probably half
14 way. We have accelerated shipments to meet that
15 goal, and we expect to do that by the end of this
16 year.

17 This facet of waste removal from site
18 and the fact that we have been shipping off
19 material is really an effort that has been
20 overlooked when we talk about site remediation.
21 The fact is we've removed an enormous amount of
22 waste, potentially dangerous chemicals and other
23 materials from the site, but as you can see, we've
24 still got literally tons of materials to get

1 here with me tonight. Jim Sarick, who is also with
2 the Waste Management Division, and also Daniel
3 Reardon. Dan has been acting as the Community
4 Relations Coordinator for the site for EPA for the
5 last year and a half.

6 As most of you know, US EPA along
7 with Ohio EPA have been providing oversight of the
8 cleanup project here at Fernald ever since 1986
9 when we entered into an original cleanup agreement,
10 which was then subsequently replaced by the 1990
11 CERCLA agreement. Over the last -- well, actually,
12 since late 1990 there's been some difficulties with
13 implementation of that Consent Agreement, which led
14 to a series of notices of violation, which most of
15 you again know about. I'm not going to dwell on
16 that tonight, but I do want to talk a little bit
17 tonight about the outcome of the disputes that
18 arose out of those deficiencies and violations of
19 the agreement.

20 Early this year the technical aspects
21 to the disputes as far as implementation of the
22 agreement were settled, but it wasn't until May
23 13th that the penalty aspects of that agreement
24 were settled, and Jack and others tonight have

1 touched on what that real settlement was. About a
2 month and a half ago I spoke at a FRESH meeting and
3 outlined the details of that penalty settlement
4 agreement. I'm going to go through a brief version
5 of that discussion tonight for people who weren't
6 at that meeting.

7 At the settlement on May 13th between
8 US EPA and DOE involved several elements. One was
9 the payment of a \$100,000 penalty to the Superfund
10 trust fund, but more importantly, it involved
11 several other aspects, including the \$150,000
12 supplemental environmental projects payment which
13 was discussed earlier by Jerry. I do encourage
14 members of the public to submit ideas of things
15 that you feel that EPA and DOE should agree on for
16 the supplemental environmental projects. This
17 money is to be used for projects that are somewhat
18 related to Fernald but are not projects that were
19 already committed to by the Department under the
20 current CERCLA agreement. We're looking for a
21 range of suggestions that could include
22 supplemental assistance to citizens for technical
23 review of documents, it could mean some kind of
24 educational program. Again, we're sort of looking

1714

1 at this with open eyes, and our goal is to be able
2 to talk about what these projects will be in the
3 next couple of months.

4 Another major element of this
5 settlement, this dispute over the penalty was that
6 -- and the EPA considers very important -- is that
7 it was confirmed that we have an ability to enforce
8 these cleanup agreements. And also we also agreed
9 to enter into a four-month renegotiation period to
10 renegotiate the remedial cleanup schedules for
11 Operable Units 1 through 5.

12 For people who have copies of the
13 1990 Consent Agreement or would like to review them
14 in the Public Reading Room, there are actually
15 schedules for each primary document for each
16 operable unit, and that is the focus of these
17 renegotiations. There's no intent on EPA's part to
18 renegotiate any of the framework or basic structure
19 of the Consent Agreement. We're focusing on new
20 schedules if they are justified for completion of
21 the remedial action at the site.

22 There also are some extensive
23 discussions on some tweeking, I would like to call
24 it, of the operable unit scheme. No major changes

1714

1 to that operable unit scheme is anticipated. But
2 otherwise, because we are in negotiations and it is
3 EPA policy not to discuss the specifics of
4 negotiations as they're going on, I won't be giving
5 you really any more details about that until the
6 time that we have reached a signed agreement on
7 what and if these changes to the schedule should be
8 made.

9 The penalty settlement provided a
10 four-month period for renegotiations and that
11 started May 13th and will end September 13th. What
12 EPA is anticipating is that a 30-day public comment
13 period would be announced to present to the public
14 any renegotiated schedules, and that EPA is also
15 anticipating a public meeting will be held sometime
16 mid-course of that 30-day public comment period.

17 EPA is optimistic that the
18 renegotiations will be fruitful and that we will be
19 able to come to an agreement with DOE on new
20 schedules for the completion of the remedial
21 action, and again, as I explained in the FRESH
22 meeting a month and a half ago, EPA is going to be
23 evaluating DOE's proposals for schedule extensions
24 in a technical light, and we want to make sure that

1 the schedules in any kind of Consent Agreement
2 modification are enforceable and are something that
3 is realistic.

4 I think I'll turn it over to Tom
5 Winston, who is here from Ohio EPA.

6 MR. WINSTON: Thank you, good
7 evening. Graham Mitchell is normally the person
8 who attends these meetings and speaks on behalf of
9 Ohio EPA. Graham is out of town and sends his
10 regrets and asked me to attend on his behalf.

11 My official role at Ohio EPA is I'm
12 head of the regional office out of Dayton and I
13 handle 16 counties in Southwestern Ohio. Beyond
14 that our office has the challenge of having the
15 Fernald site, the DOE Mound site, and the
16 Department of Defense Wright Patterson Air Force
17 Base within our district, and because of that, for
18 the past year or so, I've been coordinating federal
19 facility activities for Ohio EPA. Graham normally
20 gives me routine briefings on almost a daily basis
21 on Fernald activities.

22 I'm here tonight to talk about three
23 issues and I won't belabor them. The first one is
24 the negotiations which have been discussed and

1714

1 referenced numerous times. Ohio EPA is
2 participating in those negotiations. We, too, are
3 optimistic. We certainly are interested in
4 protecting State of Ohio interests and we feel as
5 though the interests of the citizens in the area
6 and the workers. It's not a pleasant prospect to
7 renegotiate schedules on a site with the kind of
8 long history that we already have at the Fernald
9 site. At the same time we are optimistic, and I
10 should tell you that we feel strongly that as we
11 renegotiate and discuss schedules, we are
12 interested in looking at additional removal
13 actions, other actions that can enhance the safety
14 to residents in the area, workers, and the
15 environment as well.

16 The second issue I would like to talk
17 about tonight is the fact that I anticipate
18 significant governor support for Ohio EPA's
19 activities at Fernald. Being a civil servant, this
20 is the sixth gubernatorial administration that I've
21 served under, and as such, whenever there's a new
22 administration, we're always watching very closely
23 to see what kind of signals we'll get, and I am
24 very optimistic and I am very pleased to report

1714

1 that they've had us hopping, the Governor's office,
2 relative to the Fernald site. Mike Dawson, the
3 Executive Assistant to the Governor, toured the
4 FMPC site on May 24th and later that afternoon
5 visited with a number of representatives of the
6 FRESH group, and as I said, this sort of kept us
7 hopping. We've had numerous inquires and probing
8 questions, exactly why are things done the way they
9 are, questions such as that. And given the fact
10 that a new administration has a number of issues to
11 address and certainly the state budget is first and
12 foremost of those issues, I'm extremely encouraged
13 with the level of support and attention that we've
14 gotten, and I am convinced we'll continue to have
15 from the governor's office support for the
16 initiatives that we bring to them.

17 For example, the Governor has already
18 begun working with Congressional delegation on some
19 national legislation that could institutionalize
20 and enhance DOE's cleanup effort, so I wanted to
21 share that with you and hopefully you'll be
22 watching that as closely as we will.

23 The final issue that I wanted to
24 raise was that we in the State of Ohio are looking

1714

1 at opportunities to expand and enhance our
2 oversight and monitoring activities. As you're
3 probably aware, under our Consent Agreement with
4 the Department of Energy, we get some cost recovery
5 monies. But the bulk of the activities that we
6 expend at this site in addition to the Mound
7 Laboratory site, the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion
8 Plant near Piketon, the RMI site in Ashtabula, are
9 state resources that we expend, and we're taking a
10 look at that.

11 There is a funding mechanism that is
12 available that was started by Admiral Watkins that
13 would provide some funding to the states to enter
14 into a five-year funding agreement that would
15 significantly enhance the state's resources and the
16 state's capability at Fernald and the other four
17 DOE sites across the State of Ohio. We do intend
18 to pursue this and to enter into negotiations with
19 Leo Duffy's staff, and we would see these as
20 somewhat hard-nosed negotiations making sure that
21 we did not co-op our objectivity and that we were
22 indeed able to enhance and expand on the program
23 that we feel we've been providing, and that's the
24 independent assessment of activities at the site,

1714

1 and we feel that that's a service that is critical
2 over the long haul, and this is going to be a long
3 haul. It's very critical to the success of the
4 Fernald cleanup effort.

5 The final thing I did want to mention
6 is I have a number of other staff members that are
7 here from the district office that can assist in
8 answering questions. Our Alternate Site
9 Coordinator is Tom Schneider, and he is from our
10 Remedial Response Program, Andrea Butrell also from
11 that program is here. I have two people from our
12 Hazardous Waste Program, I have Mike Hayes and Phil
13 Harris. Mike Proffitt is here from our groundwater
14 section, and last, but not least, Rob Berger is
15 from here our Central Office, Public Interest
16 Center. So hopefully they can assist me in
17 answering the kind of questions that Graham
18 probably would have been able to field on his own
19 when we get to the questions and answers. Thank
20 you.

21 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you,
22 Catherine and Tom.

23 We now invite FRESH to offer us their
24 comments.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: I don't have a whole
2 lot because I've been out of town, so you're very
3 lucky tonight. The first thing I want to ask on
4 behalf of FRESH is that we get copies of all your
5 overheads from this evening. Usually somebody
6 makes us a copy and brings it to us, but we didn't
7 get one tonight.

8 The second thing, at the last RI/FS
9 meeting, Vicki Dastillung, who happens to be on a
10 wonderful vacation somewhere where it's nice and
11 warm and there's a beach, I understand, we had
12 asked about having a notebook put together to keep
13 us up-to-date with each operable unit. I'm
14 assuming that's what these are?

15 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Yes.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: This is great, this
17 is fine, but the only thing I would like to have
18 added is who's in charge of each one of these
19 somewhere on here.

20 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: You mean which
21 operable unit manager?

22 MS. CRAWFORD: I can't hear you.

23 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: By operable unit
24 manager you're saying?

1714

1 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, each one, maybe
2 somewhere at the top, maybe their name, their phone
3 number, something like that. I think that would be
4 real helpful. And one of the things we had talked
5 about a few weeks ago was some type of a cost
6 breakdown if that's possible. I don't know if
7 that's possible, but it's something we talked about
8 and thought about was a cost breakdown for each
9 operable unit.

10 MR. DUFFY: It's in the five-year
11 plan.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: It's in the five-year
13 plan?

14 MR. DUFFY: Activity data sheet. We
15 can put it on that.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, it would make
17 it a lot easier if it was somewhere attached to
18 each one of these pieces of paper.

19 The second thing I have is we all
20 received our Fernald Site Cleanup Report. We think
21 it's much better, we like it a lot better, there's
22 a lot more information in it. Vicki was very happy
23 that she got one in the mail on time.

24 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: We try. She was

1714

1 the first one that got in the mailbox.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: The third thing I
3 have is I received a report out of Seattle,
4 Washington last week that part of America Northwest
5 had put together called "The Dirt and the US DOE's
6 Nuclear Waste Cleanup Budget." I was very upset to
7 read in this report that under the -- I don't like
8 that -- under the Fernald plant it says,
9 "Litigation payments for damages to community from
10 production activities." I want to lodge a formal
11 complaint because I don't want that -- it says a
12 million dollars. I would like for this million
13 dollars not to come out of a cleanup budget, but to
14 come out of some other budget out of headquarters.
15 I think it's wrong for litigation payments, and I
16 was one of the class action people who was involved
17 in that, but I don't want to see cleanup money
18 being spent on litigation and payments to even
19 people in the community. I would like to see that
20 taken out of some other budget besides the cleanup
21 budget. We at FRESH tend to want to highly protect
22 the cleanup budget, and we don't want it wasted
23 frivolously, although if you read through this
24 report, there's a lot more wasted at a lot of the

1 other sites than there was at ours, many, many
2 millions more.

3 The last thing I want to talk a
4 little bit about, and then I'll sit down because I
5 have some real serious questions I want to ask
6 different people when we go to the question and
7 answer part, I talked to a lot of people who work
8 on the site, I talked to a lot of people who travel
9 on and off the site, people who go there maybe just
10 one day out of every two months or whatever, and I
11 heard -- I hear a lot of rumors, and that's what I
12 call them is rumors until I can get them verified
13 if they're not rumors anymore, they're actually
14 facts and true, and I began to write them all down
15 several months ago and decided this was probably
16 the best time for me to throw them out there
17 because I think we need a little bit of reaction to
18 them. Some of them are in the form of a question,
19 which I don't expect you to answer right this
20 minute. It's mainly just to make people stop and
21 think.

22 The first one is after we had the
23 contaminated bathroom issues, someone on the site
24 reported to me that in Plants 5, 8, and 9, they had

1714

1 actually raised the limits. You know, meeting the
2 limits, they had raised them to meet the
3 contamination levels that were found there, and
4 that now the limits are the same as for offices,
5 break rooms, et cetera, as the bathrooms. I would
6 like that clarified at some point and I would like
7 to know if that's true or not.

8 The second one was we hear all the
9 time from people who actually work on the site that
10 the workers don't do anything, that they loaf, that
11 they sit around, they goof off, they don't do their
12 jobs, and that angers us as taxpayers. This is a
13 site that needs to be cleaned up, and I would hate
14 to sit back and think that people are just sitting
15 over there goofing off and not doing their jobs.

16 We understand -- this is something
17 else that someone told me -- that a person who
18 works for IT and ASI, that the worker who is going
19 to be designing some remediation activities and
20 removal actions for the pit area, that he has never
21 ever been to the pit area. That just flabbergasts
22 me again. Westinghouse workers playing games on
23 their computers. We were told that a biologist
24 actually has a file on his computer that has all of

1714

1 the flea markets in the area. Please.

2 I understand that union workers have
3 been given 40 hours of training and that a lot of
4 guys are still standing in line waiting on a job,
5 and FRESH's stance here is let's put these guys to
6 work, we've got a lot of work to do, let's get
7 moving.

8 One other thing, another one is we've
9 heard that you've hired a ton of summer interns and
10 part-time workers, and again, it prompts us to sit
11 back and say why, if you're got all these people
12 working over there, they're standing around,
13 they're goofing off, they're not doing anything,
14 what in the world do we need with a bunch of summer
15 interns and a bunch of part-time people.

16 This is more in the form of a
17 question and it comes from Vicki and I, we would
18 like to know the cost of the new signs that you're
19 going to put up when you change the name of the
20 place, where they're going to be placed, and what's
21 the actual breakdown of the cost factor. Vicki,
22 one of her concerns was how much actual time and
23 effort are going to be put into this name change
24 that is going to take people away from actually

1714

1 working on cleanup projects.

2 I've also heard that there's now an
3 Inspector General on the site and he has his own
4 office and he's there, and if that's true, that's
5 news to all of us because we didn't know that. I
6 find it very interesting that we actually have an
7 Inspector General on the site.

8 Rumor has it that 50 to 100 new DOE
9 employees are coming and coming very, very soon.
10 Again, why do we need a ton more people if the
11 people that are there don't have any work to do
12 now?

13 The last thing I have, and I didn't
14 bring the newspaper clipping with me, I hear from a
15 lot of people who work through ASI/IT,
16 Westinghouse, and DOE, who tell us that they travel
17 all over the country to workshops, and I have heard
18 of Washington and Florida and South Carolina and
19 all these great places that have wonderful,
20 wonderful golf courses. And there was actually an
21 article in the Northwest Press that referred to a
22 reporter who happened to be down there and ran into
23 several people who were just having the time of
24 their life walking on the beach and golfing on this

1 great golf course in South Carolina. It's our
2 understanding that their airfare is paid, they stay
3 in the finest suites in these hotels, all their
4 expenses are paid, usually five to six people go
5 and they are usually gone for three to five days.
6 I look at that as a huge waste of money.

7 It's much, much cheaper to bring the
8 trainer here and do the training here during these
9 people's work time than it is to fly five or six
10 people to wherever to stay three to five days and
11 buy their food, a place for them to sleep, and all
12 expenses paid basically. I think that's something
13 that we can -- I think you could save a lot of
14 money. I go to a lot of workshops and almost
15 always the workshop person is brought in here, and
16 there's no other cost entailed except to get that
17 person here, and then you can put 50 people in that
18 workshop and kill two birds with one stone.

19 The rest of my questions I'll hold
20 until we go into the question and answer period.
21 That's all I have right now. Thank you.

22 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you, Lisa.
23 Now we'll move on to the question and answer
24 section of this evening's meeting, and if there are

1714

1 anymore of the public comment cards, question
2 cards, if you could please bring them forward, but
3 we do have a few, so before we start off with
4 opening up the floor to questions, we would like to
5 address the ones that we just received.

6 We have a couple on the K-65 silos,
7 and I think I'll let Jack Craig, who is our
8 resident specialist, take care of those.

9 MR. CRAIG: I'll try to paraphrase
10 the question, if I don't paraphrase it correctly,
11 feel glad to correct me. The first question had to
12 do with the progress of making the K-65 silos
13 tornado proof, and as a follow-up to that, where
14 will the high level nuclear waste go if Yucca
15 Mountain is not developed.

16 The answer to the first question, the
17 progress that's being made on the K-65 area, like I
18 spoke of, there's a removal action plan which is
19 scheduled for completion in December of this year
20 which will address the problem of radon emissions.
21 The removal action involves placement of a one-foot
22 bentonite clay cap inside the silos and above the
23 silo residues. This will not make the silos
24 tornado proof. I don't know anything that's

1714

1 tornado proof, but this will certainly help out and
2 make the silos in a better condition to withstand
3 any type of weather event.

4 The question on the Yucca Mountain,
5 if it's not developed, where will this waste go,
6 the waste from all the operable units, whether it's
7 Operable Unit 4, the K-65 silos, or any other waste
8 on-site, the final disposal location of that waste
9 is determined through our CERCLA process, which
10 we're in the middle of right now. If Yucca
11 Mountain is not developed, a selection of another
12 alternative for disposal will have to be made,
13 whether that is an existing disposal site somewhere
14 in the US right now, that may be a candidate or it
15 may be another future disposal site. That question
16 can't be answered right now.

17 Another question had to do with the
18 K-65 silos, it says here that in 1986 FRESH was
19 told by Westinghouse that the sampling was underway
20 and that mining techniques would probably be
21 employed to remove the silo waste. Six years later
22 nothing has been done; in fact, the bentonite clay
23 material will be added only to increase what has to
24 be removed, the sampling is not complete. Please

1714

1 give the timetable for future activities. And,
2 meanwhile, radon is still a problem. There's no
3 safe threshold for effects of a low level
4 radiation.

5 I can't really comment on what was
6 told to FRESH in 1986 by anybody, whether it be
7 Westinghouse or DOE. It is true that the silos --
8 there have been several attempts to sample the K-65
9 silos. The first attempt was in the Spring of
10 1989. That attempt was unsuccessful. A second
11 attempt was made last year both in the summer and
12 in the fall. The problem being that the sampling
13 piece of equipment that was used would not retrieve
14 a full sample from top to bottom of the silo
15 residues. The sampling activities that are
16 underway right now, the goal is to do that. We
17 think we have a method where we can get an adequate
18 sample from the top to bottom of silo residues.

19 The timetable for those activities
20 are, like I spoke of before, we've initiated the
21 silo sampling today, as a matter of fact, and the
22 activity will be completed in August of this year.

23 As far as the radon problem, the
24 removal action is specifically being undertaken to

1714

1 address the radon emissions, and the timetable for
2 that is completion in December of this year. We're
3 making every effort to accelerate that; right now
4 it's on schedule for completion in December.

5 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thanks, Jack.

6 Ray, I understand you have a
7 question.

8 MR. HANSEN: Yes, I do. The
9 question is aren't you just shifting waste from one
10 site to another without resolution of the long-term
11 effects of environmentally dangerous materials? It
12 seems that you want to get it out of Fernald to a
13 quiet local concern without addressing health and
14 environmental impact to the area shipped to.

15 Well, that's just not true. One
16 thing you have to realize is that we sit over a
17 sole source aquifer that supplies a number of
18 communities in Ohio their drinking water supply.
19 That water level is some 20 to 30 feet below
20 surface.

21 The Nevada test site was a site
22 specially chosen to test atomic weapons. The water
23 level is some 800 feet below surface. It's a dry,
24 desert, arid area. Certainly the health effects of

71

1 putting that material there have been assessed.
2 It's quite a difference between where we have it
3 and where we're shipping it. It is an approved DOE
4 disposal site for waste.

5 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Okay.

6 MR. DUFFY: I think there's a major
7 problem with the lack of understanding in what
8 we're doing. We are doing a programmatic EIS.

9 I don't like that noise here.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: It makes your ears
11 ring.

12 MR. DUFFY: My ears ring a lot, but
13 it isn't from the mike.

14 The programmatic EIS is to look at
15 the total waste picture that's being generated from
16 19 sites and 35 some odd facilities. You're
17 talking about almost a million cubic meters of
18 material that is being generated, and we have to
19 develop a programmatic EIS to identify whether we
20 should have site specific disposal sites,
21 treatment, storage, or new technology disposal for
22 every waste that we're generating.

23 Unfortunately for the Department of
24 Energy and the United States, it wasn't done in a

1 timely fashion. We are doing it, we've had 30 some
2 -- well, 23 some odd cities that we visited. The
3 comments were identified by a majority of people
4 that had to do with whether or not the programmatic
5 EIS should be tied into the defense complex
6 expansion and whether or not there was enough
7 interface between us, the NPR, and the defense
8 complex. We've looked at what are the issues, how
9 are we going to address them in the programmatic as
10 the strategies for the Department of Energy.

11 As far as the near-term strategy for
12 five years, the five years on a running basis are
13 in the five-year plan and identifies where we are
14 going to send the material. In order to send it to
15 anyplace in the United States that hasn't been
16 evaluated as a site, we have to do an EIS for that
17 site specific operation. We have to do a safety
18 analysis; it has to be reviewed by the internal
19 department operation, the Defense Nuclear Safety
20 Board, the Office of Nuclear Safety, so we're not
21 just indiscriminately shifting waste from one site
22 to another.

23 But as a national problem, that is a
24 problem. I'm not here to tell you we're not

1 shifting waste from Fernald to Nevada or we're not
2 shifting waste from Mound to State of Washington or
3 we're not shifting waste from upstate New York to
4 Savannah River. That's a fact of life. The low
5 level compacts for the civilian low level waste
6 operation are behind schedule.

7 Nobody wants a low level waste site
8 in their state, even though they're generating low
9 level waste. Twenty to thirty percent of the low
10 level waste is generated by hospitals and private
11 sector. So you're not talking about the nuclear
12 industry. There are a lot of people that depend on
13 radioactive waste from a health effect standpoint.
14 There are 220,000 to 300,000 people whose life is
15 extended on the use of radioisotopes.

16 So there is a problem in the United
17 States on the disposal of nuclear waste and getting
18 a national commitment on how to do it right. So
19 don't kid yourselves that we have this problem
20 solved. The problem we have in Fernald is we have
21 a site that's in the middle of a very high
22 residential potential with the City of Cincinnati
23 around here. We have to move the waste off this
24 site. It's a fact of life. It has to go

1714

1 someplace. It's going at the present time on a low
 2 level basis to the State of Nevada. They don't
 3 want it. So we'll be in court with the State of
 4 Nevada I'm sure. We are in the court with the
 5 State of Idaho for not getting the waste out of
 6 Idaho fast enough.

7 We'll be in a court on almost any
 8 state that has a potential for a site with regard
 9 to disposal of waste, whether it's low level waste,
 10 mixed waste, or high level waste. So we're going
 11 to have to solve the problem, and there isn't any
 12 place to send it except the United States. We're
 13 not going to send it out of the country, we're not
 14 going to send it to the moon. So those are the
 15 kind of things that have to be solved. We
 16 shouldn't have generated as much as we did, but we
 17 did. It's too late to cry over that. The argument
 18 now is where we send it for the best safe place and
 19 how do we treat it safely in the transportation.
 20 It's an extremely difficult problem.

21 We don't have it resolved, but you'll
 22 be a party of the programmatic EIS when it comes
 23 out. You'll have the opportunity to comment on
 24 it. Every state that has a dedicated site is going

1 to comment on it, take it to court, and we¹⁷¹¹ll be in
2 litigation for a long period of time. We do have
3 the problem, there's a million cubic meters of
4 material that has to go someplace, and we're not
5 going to put it on trains and run it around the
6 country all the time. It's got to go and it's got
7 to be put safely in place. It may have to be
8 stored for 50 years until we have a solution. We
9 don't have a solution. It's a very, very important
10 subject for the United States. It's an important
11 subject to Japan, for Germany, for France, Taiwan,
12 Korea. They all have problems.

13 But put it into context, there's
14 290,000,000 tons of hazardous waste generated in
15 the United States every year, 290,000,000. We
16 generate 70,000 cubic meters, which represents
17 something less than about 500,000 tons out of the
18 total operation.

19 Now, every day, when you think about
20 what we're generating, think about the hazardous
21 waste. We're not doing anything without looking at
22 it from a safety standpoint. We don't have it
23 solved and we don't come here and tell you we do,
24 but you're going to be a participant in how we

1 solve it. I want you to know it's a very, very
2 sensitive subject in a lot of states.

3 We're meeting with the Western
4 governors next week because they feel their geology
5 is such that it invites waste to go to the Western
6 states. So you look at where we have major
7 disposal facilities, it's New Mexico, Idaho,
8 Washington, and Nevada, and Nevada is being
9 evaluated for the high level waste. But the
10 geology is such that it's a dry climate. You don't
11 put it in a wet climate.

12 The reason that we have water
13 contamination in Oak Ridge and Savannah River and
14 here is because we're in a wet climate. We
15 shouldn't have identified sites over aquifers 50
16 years ago, but we did. So it's too late to cry
17 about that now. There's nothing you can do about
18 it. We did it, it's wrong, and we should have done
19 something different but we didn't.

20 Now we've got to solve the problem.
21 And a hundred billion dollars of taxpayers' money
22 is going to solve that problem, and that's a damn
23 lot of money, and there are a lot of other things
24 it could be used for if we had done the job right

1714

1 in the first place, but we didn't. So now the
2 objective is how do you do it right, and now you're
3 a participant, so we're looking for your comments
4 and we'll try to do what we can, but recognize this
5 is a long-term program.

6 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Now we can take
7 some questions from the floor. I think it would be
8 a lot easier for all of us to hear if you do have
9 questions to come up to the microphone. There's
10 one in the center aisle and there's one off to the
11 side by the windows. So let's open it for
12 discussion.

13 MS. YOCUM: I'm Edra Yocum and I
14 live on State Route 128 in Crosby Township.

15 I'm concerned with Operable Unit 5,
16 the South Plume groundwater contamination removal
17 action. It includes -- part one -- I see that it
18 has five parts to it. Part one is to include
19 installation of an alternate water source to two
20 industries that have been affected by this
21 groundwater contamination, and you are planning on
22 putting a distribution system, adding a
23 distribution system to these industries. What type
24 of distribution system are you planning and when

78

1 does this go into effect?

2 MR. CRAIG: Are you talking the
3 public water?

4 MS. YOCUM: No, this is for the two
5 industries.

6 MR. CRAIG: The alternate water
7 supply we're planning in this area to install a
8 production well to the west of the South Plume into
9 an area that's not contaminated and then pump clean
10 water to those facilities through a pipeline.

11 MS. YOCUM: And you have known about
12 giving them an alternate water supply since August
13 of 1990. Now, when will this go into effect, when
14 will this be completed?

15 MR. CRAIG: The current timetable
16 for completion of that is December of this year.

17 MS. YOCUM: Now, what I'm trying --
18 In the South Plume and with it having, the removal
19 action having five parts to it, I don't see
20 anything on there about a public water system to
21 the residents who have contaminated water. Now,
22 what is -- why isn't that in one of the parts as
23 one of the parts?

24 MS. CRAWFORD: What qualifies them

1714

1 to receive alternate water supply and not the
2 residents? That's the question.

3 MR. DUFFY: Basically we're drilling
4 wells on their property for production type
5 operations. You don't want a well, you want a city
6 water supply. There's no guarantee that the
7 migration of the plume if we gave you another
8 shallow well wouldn't have an indication of uranium
9 either from the river or from the South Plume.

10 So what we're waiting for is the
11 Hamilton County to complete its survey so we put in
12 the water supply to your operation as a result of
13 the total community operation that's being
14 evaluated. We guaranteed that we were going to be
15 a participant in this, and what we're doing is
16 waiting for the recommendation from the county.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Wouldn't it make more
18 sense to hook those private industries into a
19 public water system instead of going back and
20 digging wells that possibly might show up
21 contaminated?

22 MR. DUFFY: Not from a production
23 standpoint if they're going to use it as a
24 production chemical operation versus a drinking

80

1714

1 water supply. You're looking at a domestic
2 drinking water supply, not a production well, and
3 that's a deep well. It's going down into -- I
4 don't know how many hundred feet, but it's below
5 the present operation.

6 MR. CRAIG: It's below the site.

7 MS. YOCUM: I have one more
8 question. Has DOE been in touch with the township
9 trustees on their status of the public water system
10 from your part of involvement? Do you keep in
11 touch with the trustees and have you been in touch
12 with them?

13 MR. DUFFY: I kept in touch with
14 them tonight, I just met them for the first time.
15 They say keep in touch and what can we do, and
16 we'll be doing that. The thing we don't want to do
17 is we don't want to get into the situation before
18 the consultant does his thing for the county and
19 then we're interfering with their decision. We're
20 just a party to the decision.

21 THE WITNESS: The trustees are also
22 just a party also, but if everybody is working
23 together, it will be accomplished a lot faster, and
24 we do want it in here as soon as possible.

81

1714

1 MR. DUFFY: So do we.

2 MS. YOCUM: Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The well that
4 you're doing for those industries, and I am
5 assuming those are the three that are on Paddy's
6 Run Road between Willey and New Haven?

7 MR. DUFFY: Two that I know of.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, there's
9 Delta Steel, Albright & Wilson, and Ruetgers &
10 Nease, but two of those companies contaminated the
11 area also. Why should you have to pay the whole
12 bill when they're guilty of contamination as well?

13 MR. DUFFY: We had a litigation in
14 one case. We were forced by litigation to supply
15 them with water supply. We lost and that's it.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: So they actually sued
17 you and this is part of the --

18 MR. CRAIG: It was a settlement of
19 the suit, yes.

20 MR. DUFFY: And we were forced to
21 supply water supply.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: When did this occur?

23 MR. DUFFY: 1989 I believe.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Was that one of those

1 cases where you all can't talk about it?

2 MR. DUFFY: No. Anytime we lose a
3 case, it's not a secret. It's the one thing nobody
4 keeps secret is when the the Department of Energy
5 loses a lawsuit.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: Because I didn't know
7 anything about that. I don't think any of us did.

8 MR. DUFFY: Now you know.

9 MS. NUNGASTER: A quick follow-up to
10 that, when you dig that new well, won't that spread
11 contamination? They have contamination, too.

12 MR. DUFFY: Pardon?

13 MS. NUNGASTER: I understand the
14 contamination they have is chemical contamination.
15 If you dig a new deep well for them, won't that be
16 spreading contamination?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That
18 production well is being dug way to the west. That
19 would be the intersection of Crosby and Willey.

20 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Can I just say
21 something in the interest of everyone here
22 tonight. No one in the back can hear any of the
23 questions or answers, so if anyone has a question,
24 could they please kindly go up to the microphone

1 and anyone in the audience that may have an answer,
2 if they could also could go up to the microphone.
3 Thank you.

4 MS. NUNGASTER: I have a question on
5 Operable Unit 4, is it, the K-65 silos?

6 MR. CRAIG: Operable Unit 4.

7 MS. NUNGASTER: Jack, I don't
8 remember if you were there or not, but we met with
9 several of the operable unit managers on July 2nd
10 concerning the K-65 silos and --

11 MR. CRAIG: I know of the meeting, I
12 was not there.

13 MS. NUNGASTER: You weren't there,
14 but the new operable unit manager was there.

15 MR. CRAIG: Right.

16 MS. NUNGASTER: Mr. Bogard was
17 there, and he touched on the fact that they might
18 use vitrification at the site for some of the
19 materials, and I thought the fact that from the
20 little research I've been able to do, that
21 vitrification, you could only do small quantities
22 of material at a time and that it was very
23 expensive. Mr. Bogard gave me -- was very adamant
24 in telling me that vitrification was not expensive

1 and that it could be done in large quantities.
2 Since -- I don't know what his title is, he's over
3 all Westinghouse or something like that. Okay.
4 I'd like Catherine McCord to address this issue if
5 she would.

6 MR. DUFFY: Vittrification is
7 expensive, no doubt about it, and it's used in
8 large quantities, it's used in small quantities.
9 There are potentials, but I don't see that we've
10 gotten a Record of Decision yet from the EPA on
11 what we're going to do because we haven't submitted
12 a Record of Decision.

13 MS. McCORD: That's right.
14 Vittrification is one of the alternatives which are
15 going through detailed analysis. The first primary
16 document on the OU-4 is the Initial Screening of
17 Alternatives, which is just the general universe of
18 alternatives. Vittrification is one of the
19 techniques to solidify the material. There are
20 some other solidification techniques which are
21 being considered. But I agree with Leo,
22 vittrification is generally a very expensive
23 approach, but it also may have the desired effect
24 in that it immobilizes at least some of the

1 contaminants and puts it into solid form.

2 We still have a problem with radon
3 production. In fact, the radon that would be
4 produced during the heating up of this radium-
5 bearing waste is significant and would
6 significantly add to the cost of that vitrification
7 and probably limit the size of the batches of
8 material that could be vitrified because you
9 essentially have to treat all the off gassing or
10 the material that is thrown into the air when the
11 material is heated and melted.

12 Hanford -- well, Washington State,
13 there's the big project out there, some of the
14 material from the silos has actually been sent out
15 for vitrification testing and the tests appear to
16 be on a real small scale that that is a likely
17 possibility and vitrification is one of the
18 alternatives which is going through again this
19 detailed screening and one that is very seriously
20 being looked at. But it's a big ticket item.

21 MR. CRAIG: Just to add a couple of
22 things, the treatability work plan that I spoke of
23 earlier tonight for Operable Unit 4 will include
24 some activities for treatment of the K-65 residues

1 through vitrification. That is one of the
2 treatment technologies they're looking at. One of
3 the other big advantages to vitrification is that
4 it looks like from the initial testing that it also
5 reduces the volume of waste, whereas a lot of the
6 other treatment technologies increase the volume of
7 waste through additives which are needed for the
8 treatment process. So it helps -- it may be
9 expensive but it may help in the final disposal
10 costs because it reduces the volume of waste.

11 MR. DUFFY: I think we have to look
12 at multiple treatments and they're all expensive.
13 There is no treatment that I know of with regard to
14 K-65 that isn't expensive. It's a relative amount,
15 and when we look at the total system, if we can
16 vitrify it and not release to the environment a
17 material that would be jeopardizing the area and
18 the long term is it extracts and it's less, then
19 we're okay. If we have to put it into a drum, ship
20 it someplace else and store it for a long period of
21 time, the expense to that is enormous. We're
22 looking at a very expensive project with regard to
23 K-65 silos. It's not an insurmountable problem,
24 but it's something that we're going to have to get

1 approval from the EPA on. They're the ones who
2 give us the alternative. We submit the Record of
3 Decision and they pick the alternative that they
4 think is best for the community and the project.

5 MS. McCORD: One alternative that
6 related to vitrification that we feel in our
7 agreement with DOE that probably wouldn't work is
8 vitrification which is done in place or in situ
9 vitrification. That looks like material most
10 likely will have to come out of those tanks prior
11 to any kind of treatment. So that is one
12 alternative which is not proceeding further through
13 detailed analysis.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: I think these can be
15 answered real quick, hopefully.

16 Jack, when you were talking about the
17 K-65 sump pump operations a little bit earlier, you
18 had a slide up there with a little truck on it
19 showing how you pumped it in there. Will you have
20 to do this on a regular basis, pump that out of
21 there, or was that a one shot deal?

22 MR. CRAIG: We didn't know at the
23 time when we started the operation whether or not
24 it was going to fill back up. There has been

1 routine monitoring done after the tank was emptied
2 and no water is collecting back in the tank. There
3 was a small amount of sludge in the bottom of that
4 tank which is being sampled right now and that will
5 also be analyzed, but as it looks right now, that
6 tank is not refilling, so there's no need to empty
7 it again.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: The second one is you
9 talked when a Paddy's Run Road Seepage Program?

10 MR. CRAIG: Right.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Don't we already know
12 that that's happened?

13 MR. CRAIG: It's not so much to
14 determine -- it's, number one, to determine if it
15 happened and, number two, to determine the nature
16 and extent of how far that contamination may have
17 migrated.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Don't we already know
19 that because of the South Plume?

20 MR. CRAIG: We know that it may have
21 migrated a certain distance, but we don't know how
22 far south. We're talking about the extent of the
23 contamination. We know that there's a South Plume
24 there and we have a removal action to address

1 that. The Paddy's Run Seepage Investigation ¹⁷¹⁴ will
2 determine if there's any further contamination on
3 down south of the South Plume, which has to be
4 addressed under Operable Unit 5.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: But aren't we doing
6 that with the well testing of the residents along
7 128? It seems like we're doing double duty here is
8 what I'm getting at.

9 MR. CRAIG: We're doing a well
10 testing also to better determine whether or not
11 Paddy's Run historically contributed contamination
12 or may be continuing to be providing contamination
13 in that area. That's why that study was
14 undertaken.

15 MS. McCORD: Lisa, they're a
16 complement, the sampling that would be along the
17 Paddy's Run is complementing or complements the
18 well monitoring sampling that is being done. It
19 depends on the location. You're using a different
20 approach because of where you are in influence or
21 suspected influence of the Paddy's Run. You
22 remember historically a lot of material was
23 discharged to the creek, and, as Jack just said, we
24 don't know if we're still just seeing an old plume

1 moving through the system or are we still seeing
2 continued source of contaminants migrating from the
3 creek bed.

4 South of the plant is where it
5 becomes a recharge zone where surface water
6 recharges groundwater, so that could have been the
7 point where most of the contaminated surface water
8 has entered into the groundwater system.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. It just seemed
10 like we were doing double duty there for a little
11 while, I didn't quite understand that.

12 The last thing I have there's been a
13 lot of talk here tonight about fly ash, inactive
14 and active. I don't know what the difference is,
15 to me it's fly ash. I know on July 2nd I was on my
16 way to a meeting with Lou Bogard and several other
17 people from the site about the K-65 silos, and I
18 come down Willey Road that night and a storm was
19 coming, the wind was blowing quite heavily, it
20 looked like we were going to get a thunderstorm,
21 and the closer I got to the site, the sky got real
22 dark and there was like all this black smoke
23 billowing across Willey Road. I went to Mag's and
24 called several people at the site and didn't get an

1714

1 answer and was kind of at loose ends as to where to
2 go from there, so I just went on to the meeting.

3 Mr. Bogard that night just said, oh,
4 it was just fly ash and it's no big deal. I'm
5 talking it looked like black billowing smoke, a lot
6 of it. By the time we got back over there, you
7 could still see a little bit, but it wasn't quite
8 as dark and black as it was the first time.

9 I think tonight people have played
10 down the hazards of the fly ash. I have a real
11 problem with this black fly ash blowing across
12 Willey Road, not only that I used to live over
13 there, but the fact that there are still people
14 living in that house and there are houses very,
15 very close to where this stuff blows across Willey
16 Road. And if you look on this piece of paper for
17 solid waste units, Operable Unit 2, it clearly says
18 on the back of here, "Fly ash is a waste residue
19 that results from burning coal in the boiler plant.
20 Results from sample analysis revealed locations
21 with slightly elevated concentrations of uranium in
22 the surface soils and the inactive fly ash in the
23 Southfield."

24 So we're talking about black fly ash

92

1 that was billowing across Willey Road that possibly
2 had some uranium contamination in it. I would like
3 to see that addressed, and I would like to have
4 some type of feedback on that. And I know that the
5 site had to know what was happening because when I
6 went through the billowing black cloud of smoke,
7 one of your guards was coming the opposite
8 direction going through it at the same time I was.
9 I don't think we need fly ash blowing across Willey
10 Road since there is a home directly across from
11 there.

12 MR. CRAIG: Just to comment on what
13 Lisa said, I hope I didn't, and I certainly don't
14 want to down play any problems with fly ash at the
15 site, but we have two fly ash piles, one is an
16 inactive, like Lisa said, and one is an active fly
17 ash, which is being used today for disposal of the
18 fly ash from the boiler plant. The inactive pile
19 is covered with a soil and vegetation. It is not
20 susceptible to fugitive emissions like the active
21 fly ash pile is. There's a removal action to
22 address access restrictions to the inactive pile,
23 and we're also looking at putting some type of a
24 cover or introducing some type of suppressant on

1 the active fly ash pile to make sure that problem
2 doesn't happen again.

3 MR. DUFFY: I hope there's no
4 confusion on the basis that the pile is
5 radioactive. It's active on current use. Both
6 piles are the same theory. So it's a matter of
7 maintaining a cover over it so you don't get the
8 blowing operation.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: According to this
10 blue piece of paper, there is some contamination in
11 it.

12 MR. DUFFY: All coal has uranium in
13 it and all fly ash has uranium in it. There's no
14 difference between the two piles. What we should
15 have is a cover that makes it impossible to blow
16 around the site.

17 MS. McCORD: As a clarification,
18 there appears to be some other materials that
19 historically must have been disposed of in the
20 inactive fly ash area. As Jack said, you wouldn't
21 know that fly ash pile is there, it looks like most
22 of it is woods. It's been overgrown for quite a
23 period of time, but there are some other
24 contaminants that are showing up in wells

1 surrounding that, indicating that historically
2 uncontrolled disposal practices and other material
3 went there, like some pesticides and PCB's showed
4 up. So there appears to be some difference in the
5 level of contaminants between the old versus new.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think one
7 thing we need to note is that all coal burning
8 generating plants have uranium that is being
9 emitted into the atmosphere, too, just from the
10 fact that coal is dug from the earth and it has
11 some uranium in it.

12 MR. DUFFY: It has cyanide, it has
13 arsenic, it has uranium, it has many aspects. If
14 there is PCB's, it was probably disposed of in a
15 poor manner and should have been disposed in that
16 case, but God knows when it was done, and PCB's
17 weren't outlawed until 1972, as I recall, and if
18 that fly ash pile was before 1972, then it was
19 disposed of in what was thought of at that time to
20 be a satisfactory manner, which is the case in most
21 of the PCB contaminated areas is that there was no
22 criteria on PCB's prior to 1972, I believe; is that
23 correct?

24 MS. McCORD: '76 I believe, right?

1 MR. DUFFY: Well, '72 is when they
2 notified and '76 is when they outlawed it, so they
3 stopped making it in '72 as I remember. But it's
4 something that we have to look at.

5 I think the key thing here is if we
6 do have a dust plume going across from an active
7 soot pile, we ought to do something about it to
8 prevent that. It doesn't take a hell of a lot. If
9 you take the garbage piles now, they have to cover
10 it over within 16 hours so you don't get that kind
11 of operation. We ought to be looking at how to do
12 that.

13 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Again, if I could
14 remind you, people in the back can't hear a thing
15 when some people here on the right are not using
16 the microphone.

17 MR. DUFFY: One of the other things
18 that we are looking at is the aspect of converting
19 to just a gas heat over at the boiler house and not
20 having to burn coal anymore. That would get that
21 out of the system right away.

22 As I understand it from the National
23 Energy Strategy, we're finding more gas than we
24 ever expected, so it's going to be an available

1 source at least through our cleanup efforts.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
3 question over here. I wanted to ask about
4 Westinghouse's contract. I understand that it
5 expires in 1991, this year, and I hadn't heard yet
6 anything about renewal, but I do understand there's
7 a possibility that there will be a renewal, but for
8 10 years rather than the usual five. Is this true?

9 MR. DUFFY: No, neither one of those
10 is correct. The expiration is September, 1991; we
11 extended it until March on the basis we're going
12 out for a new type of contract, an environmental
13 restoration and management contract. The
14 announcement in the Commerce Business daily is on
15 July 26th, which will announce that we are going
16 out for a new type of contract. There will be a
17 notice in the Federal Register of the same date.
18 Two hundred firms have seen our original
19 notification in the environmental restoration
20 contract and they have asked for draft copies of
21 the request for proposal, and that will be done
22 on July 26th also. We've asked for comments within
23 30 days from firms that are interested, and we've
24 asked for them to identify various unique ways that

1 they would be able to work on this site and show a
2 course defective manner in cleanup.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then I wanted
4 to ask about under the new contract and with the
5 trend toward the contractors assuming more of the
6 liability, what will be the situation for the -- in
7 the new contract, can you explain the additional
8 liability that the contractor assumes?

9 MR. DUFFY: That would be covered in
10 the request for proposal and it will probably be
11 similar to our rule-making operation, but we're
12 asking for comments from contractors on what kind
13 of liability they believe they need because it's a
14 situation where a new contractor coming on-site
15 should not be responsible for the past 40 years of
16 operation of the Department of Energy. So there
17 will be some liability differentiation on past
18 performance on-site or past actions on-site, but
19 each contractor that comes on-site will be liable
20 for his actions if he was negligent up to the cost
21 of the fee on the contract.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And will the
23 liability extend beyond what's under the Price
24 Anderson Act?

1 MR. DUFFY: The Price Anderson Act
2 covers only radioactive material, and there may be
3 some coverage for nonradioactive because it's a
4 situation here that you have an aquifer underneath
5 and if somebody wanted to sue on the basis of
6 contamination of an aquifer, it would be a fairly
7 extensive suit. So there has to be some
8 consideration for liability other than nuclear
9 accident liability. In fact, the majority of the
10 material that we have on-site, including uranium,
11 is not considered to be radioactive material, it's
12 heavy metal. Most of the standards are based on
13 heavy metal effects, not on radioactive effects.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One other
15 question in regard to the workers and in regard to
16 their re-employment. We're finding that workers
17 are having difficulty in getting other employment
18 if they have worked at a nuclear facility
19 previously any time.

20 MR. DUFFY: I don't know that to be
21 a fact, but I've heard that stated, and from the
22 standpoint of the nuclear industry, there are a
23 limited number of experienced people, and we have
24 not seen that to be the case in the utility

1 industry or in the defense industry because most of
2 the people will have to look at a reduction in the
3 defense network, and we expect to see a large
4 reduction in workers in the future. So there will
5 be a transfer from production to environmental
6 restoration, but I don't see that there's going to
7 be a shortage of positions for people who have
8 experience in nuclear industry.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They are not
10 being accepted by other industries readily.
11 There's insurance adjustment and so forth that's
12 there in case there's any health problem that shows
13 up.

14 MR. DUFFY: I don't know that to be
15 factual, but I think Senator Glenn and I know that
16 Congress is looking at that aspect of it.

17 MR. DAVIS: Let me add one thing
18 relative to the RFP. We will put some copies of
19 the RFP in the PEIC if anybody would like to come
20 and take a look at it. It will be there --

21 MS. CRAWFORD: You have to tell
22 everybody what the RFP is.

23 MR. DAVIS: Request For Proposal.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: A lot of people don't

1714

1 know that.

2 MR. DUFFY: It identifies what the
3 responsibilities of a contractor will be under an
4 environmental restoration management contract and
5 identifies the boilerplate associated with working
6 for the Department of Energy, which turns out to be
7 about five volumes. Those are the kind of things
8 in the RFP. What we really were looking for was
9 unique approaches from industry on how to clean up
10 the site, clean it up effectively, faster, cheaper,
11 and safely, and that's what we're looking for.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: As people give you
13 proposals -- and I'm not going to go to the mike,
14 I'll just talk really loud-- as people give you
15 proposals for the RFP, will those be made public?

16 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Or are they quiet
18 until one is chosen or whatever?

19 MR. DUFFY: No.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Those all can be made
21 public, okay.

22 MR. DUFFY: Yes. We try not to do
23 anything in secrecy anymore. If there's anything,
24 we're more open in the environmental restoration

101

1714

1 operation.

2 MR. WESTERBECK: Can I add just one
3 thing to that, I think it was stated. The RFP, the
4 Request For Proposal that will become available on
5 the 26th will be a draft for comment, so anyone can
6 comment on this draft RFP. All those comments will
7 be taken into consideration in modifying the final
8 RFP that will be put out on the street for
9 contractors to submit proposals to, so it will be a
10 draft RFP first that anybody, public, contractors,
11 anyone can respond to.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Do you have to be a
13 full-fledged firm to provide you with a proposal?

14 MR. DUFFY: Yeah, you have to have a
15 demonstrated capability in this operation. When I
16 stated about secrecy, once we receive the official
17 proposals from firms, then that goes into a source
18 evaluation board and that remains secret until the
19 source selection official makes his decision, makes
20 a recommendation to me, and then I make a
21 recommendation to the Secretary.

22 At that point everything that went
23 along with the evaluation becomes public from the
24 standpoint except proprietary information that a

102

1 company would have that said we have a unique
2 technology and this is the technology. We would
3 not release that. And each firm stamps in the
4 proposal what's proprietary, and if we don't agree
5 that it's a proprietary operation, we'll tell the
6 firm that we don't feel it's proprietary and we
7 would release that information. If they don't want
8 to participate, then that's their option.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: But they would have
10 to be a reputable company.

11 MR. DUFFY: Oh, yes.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Not any just fly by
13 night company could do this type of thing.

14 MR. DUFFY: That's a fact, and they
15 have to have the capability of insuring themselves
16 for their liability, which is somewhat significant
17 in insurance coverage.

18 MS. NUNGASTER: It could also be
19 companies other than ones that have worked for DOE
20 in the past?

21 MR. DUFFY: Oh, yes.

22 MS. NUNGASTER: You mentioned firms,
23 could this be several different firms?

24 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

1714

1 MS. NUNGASTER: So is just one
2 Westinghouse?

3 MR. DUFFY: Westinghouse is in with
4 Ralph Parsons and so forth.

5 MS. NUNGASTER: So, in other words,
6 you might have one company doing like the waste
7 pits?

8 MR. DUFFY: No, we would have one
9 company that was responsible for the Fernald site,
10 and he would be the environmental restoration
11 management contractor. He would then have the
12 option to have selected firms as part of his team
13 or he may select to have a subcontractor for
14 operating the facilities and not be involved in the
15 environmental restoration.

16 If you look at the various operating
17 units, they have unique requirements from a
18 restoration standpoint. What we're looking for is
19 a firm that understands the regulations,
20 understands the regulations in Ohio, understands
21 the working relationship with the Environmental
22 Protection Agency, understands the small businesses
23 in the area, such as the trucking firms and the
24 analytical firms. He has the capability of working

104

1 with these firms or has the capability of doing it
2 himself, depending on what is the most economic and
3 safest and best way of doing it, and that's the
4 thing we will be looking at.

5 One thing I didn't mention and I
6 failed to do, that we received a lot of help from
7 Congressman Luken, and he has taken a lot of hits
8 from supporting some of our positions. So he's
9 been working with us in trying to get this water
10 system into the area, and I think he should be
11 recognized for his dedication to making sure that
12 we are making it as fast as possible and
13 contributing to the Hamilton County and other water
14 supplies. I failed to mention that initially and I
15 am sorry about that.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Duffy has
17 very generously admitted our mistakes in the past,
18 I think that's pretty obvious. As we go about
19 merrily making bombs in the next century under the
20 direction of President Bush, since he seems to want
21 to do this, I'm wondering what assurances we have
22 that we won't continue to make these same mistakes
23 again.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: That's a good

1714

1 question.

2 MR. DUFFY: I can't say what the
3 problem was 40 years ago. The guys who were making
4 decisions at that time, there's an expression,
5 don't criticize a trail until you walk in a guy's
6 moccasins. We were in a very difficult situation.
7 President Kennedy in 1962, '60 time frame, in 1960
8 had some significant decisions to make with regard
9 to the history of the world. He fortunately came
10 out of it on the right side. So I don't know what
11 was going on then. I think the people that were
12 doing the job at that time thought they were doing
13 right in relationship to protecting democracy.

14 There were people in 1948, engineers
15 who looked at what the Atomic Energy Commission was
16 doing who said, hey, you're doing it wrong, all
17 right, and at the time it was not considered to be
18 the correct way to go and, you know, there's a
19 report out from the, I think it's the Radiological
20 Safety Committee for the Atomic Energy in 1948 that
21 identifies every problem that we have in the
22 defense community at the present time could have
23 been stopped by using different technology that was
24 available at the time. These people weren't atomic

106

1 scientists. Most of them were just straightforward
2 engineers, two of them came from Philadelphia in
3 the water supply system, one came from the sewage
4 system from the City of Washington, DC, one was a
5 radiologist from the University of Rochester, one
6 was an occupational safety doctor from General
7 Electric, another one was the commissioner of
8 police from the City of Los Angeles. And they
9 looked at what was going on and said it's the wrong
10 thing to do, you shouldn't put low level waste in
11 shallow land barriers and you shouldn't put high
12 level waste in single shell tanks, you shouldn't
13 discharge chemicals into the groundwater because
14 you're going to contaminate it, and when you return
15 these facilities to the general public, they're
16 going to be problems. I think that was the only
17 understatement they made.

18 The public is a hell of a task master
19 right now, but it's not anything unique. The
20 problem is we were in a very war-like environment
21 then; we're not now. Desert Storm has given
22 everybody a boost in our capabilities, but we're
23 not talking nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons is
24 something that was talked about in the past.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to
2 follow-up on that because I talked to a DOE
3 official two years ago in Arizona who said one of
4 the plans -- now, you guys, I want you to answer if
5 you've changed your minds on this -- but two years
6 ago one of your own guys said one of the things
7 they wanted to do at Yuca Mountain is to be able to
8 assure that they can extract high level waste for a
9 hundred years out of there. Is that true or is
10 that not true? If that's not true -- if that's
11 true, then what you said is incorrect.

12 MR. DUFFY: What?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're saying
14 don't worry about the nuclear bomb future of the
15 country.

16 MR. DUFFY: I didn't say anything
17 about not worrying about nuclear bombs. I'm just
18 telling you that the nuclear bomb situation is
19 something of the past. Yuca Mountain is not
20 connected with nuclear bombs at all.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait a
22 minute, obviously if they're going to extract high
23 level nuclear waste --

24 MR. DUFFY: Well --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait a
2 minute, let me finish. Maybe I can rephrase my
3 question, make it more understandable. If this guy
4 is telling the truth two years ago and giving the
5 speech at Arizona State University, it was a DOE
6 guy, and saying that they want to be able to
7 extract high level nuclear waste out of Yuca
8 Mountain for a hundred years, we all know in this
9 room what they want to extract it for. They want
10 that bomb-grade material. They don't want to be
11 carrying it in and out of there for no reason. He
12 even admitted that at the time. What you're saying
13 is directly contrary.

14 MR. DUFFY: No, if he admitted it's
15 bomb-grade material going into the Yuca Mountain,
16 he misled whoever he told. There's no bomb-grade
17 material going to Yuca Mountain. The civilian
18 fuel, spent fuel from nuclear power plants, which
19 isn't bomb-grade material, number one. Number two,
20 from the defense standpoint, material is going in
21 there is vitrified waste, the material that we're
22 talking out of the silo here if it goes into glass,
23 what we're taking out of the tanks at Hanford,
24 which is chemically extracted material that cannot

1 be used. We're not extracting the bomb-grade
2 material out of there. And so what he's talking
3 about in a hundred years is if we made a mistake in
4 selecting Yuca Mountain, that the material can be
5 removed within a hundred years.

6 The guarantees for repositories is
7 10,000 years. The recorded history of man is
8 5,000. People weren't even writing 5,000 years ago
9 except in Mesopotamia on clay tablets, and we're
10 asking for a guarantee for 10,000 years. All he's
11 saying is in a hundred years if we know more about
12 it, we want to be able to extract it, and that's
13 all he said. And the material that is going down
14 there is not weapons grade material.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, but it
16 can be reprocessed, right?

17 MR. DUFFY: No. I mean, nuclear
18 fuel and power plants has to be reprocessed. We
19 have more weapons grade material at the present
20 time than we'll ever need. As far as I know, we're
21 not making any more plutonium. We're recycling the
22 present weapon system, and that's the intent. And
23 you have to take the present weapon system if
24 you're going to reduce the weapon and put that into

1714

1 a stable form, and that's another process
2 altogether.

3 All the work that is going on at
4 Rocky Flats takes existing weapons, disassembles
5 existing weapons, extracts the plutonium trigger
6 out of that and refigures it for a new weapon.
7 There's no more plutonium being generated, and each
8 time that goes through Techni Center, that material
9 comes off in a manufacturing process and we have to
10 take care of that. So the Yuca Mountain operation
11 is not to extract nuclear weapon material in a
12 hundred years.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will there be
15 some mixing then of commercial and nuclear energy
16 waste at Yuca Mountain?

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

18 MR. DUFFY: The question was is
19 there a mixing of civilian waste and defense waste
20 at Yuca Mountain, and the answer is yes.
21 Sixty-five percent of the material going into Yuca
22 Mountain at the present time is civilian spent fuel
23 and 35 percent with what we know of the material at
24 the Hanford, Savannah River, and West Valley

111

1 operation will be vitrified canisters of glass.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the
3 expenses will be shared?

4 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like
6 to talk a little bit about the K-65 silos and the
7 work that's being done on the evening shifts. I'm
8 reading from a fact sheet that was put out through
9 the Crosby Township Trustess, and I wonder -- I see
10 on here there were four workers that were
11 contaminated, they say they weren't contaminated
12 badly, that it was easily washed from the skin and
13 removed from the clothing. Are those workers being
14 followed up to see if there's any later
15 contamination?

16 MR. DUFFY: Are you talking about
17 the radon contamination?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, the K-65
19 silos.

20 MR. DUFFY: As I read the report,
21 the radon concentration accumulates usually in the
22 threaded areas of your clothing. From what I read
23 in the report, they did not have skin
24 contamination. They got a whole body count, and

1 there was no indication of any condition.

2 Radon is throughout the whole
3 Northern United States. It goes from the Ozark
4 Mountains up to Maine and comes out of the granite,
5 and in Pennsylvania at the site up in one of the
6 nuclear plants, that was the first time that they
7 found it, some guy came in and set off the alarm,
8 and it came from his basement, and that put the EPA
9 onto the fact that the radon was being emitted from
10 basements and the gas was accumulating. But from
11 what I know of the incident, there was no skin
12 contamination, no inhalation of the radon as
13 indicated by the whole body count.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When we met
15 with Mr. Bogard on the 2nd of July, we talked about
16 workers working through a glove bag. What is the
17 progress report on such operations at the K-65
18 silos?

19 MR. DUFFY: Jack can cover that.

20 MR. CRAIG: If you look at the
21 pictorial diagram of the sampling back here behind
22 us, there are examples of glove bags that they use
23 during the operation. Anytime that the K-65 silos
24 are open for anything, whether it be sampling,

1 whether it be the addition of the bentonite, glove
2 bags will be used. They're always used anytime the
3 silos are opened.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But has there
5 been any problems? That's the point of my
6 question. Has there been any problems through
7 working with the glove bags and through changing
8 these valves?

9 MR. CRAIG: Yes, the valve
10 replacement on the silo domes was completed through
11 glove bags, all eight manways were replaced through
12 glove bags. The sampling operation that took place
13 today was done through a glove bag, as was the
14 previous sampling that was done on the K-65 silos.
15 It's not a new thing.

16 MR. DUFFY: I think the problem was
17 that this contamination was due to an atmospheric
18 inversion, and what happened was the pressure kept
19 the radon at the ground level and they were walking
20 through it, and that happens throughout many areas
21 of the United States, and we just didn't have the
22 experience of that happening before. So now we
23 know it's a problem and what we identified is we'll
24 monitor the atmospheric changes and report when

1 we're going to get an version and take the
2 precautions on that basis.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: How did these workers
4 get contaminated?

5 MR. DUFFY: Walking through the
6 radon.

7 MR. CRAIG: I'm not familiar with
8 the data on what you're talking about there.

9 MR. DUFFY: It's the four guys.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: Not this weekend but
11 the weekend before.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: During the
13 installation of the manway.

14 MR. DUFFY: Oh, the manway covers,
15 that was another one.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: That was two weeks
17 ago.

18 MR. CRAIG: Maybe one of the
19 Operable Unit 4 managers can address that question.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My last
21 question is has there been increased levels of
22 radon at the fence line, at the boundaries?

23 MR. CRAIG: Not that I'm aware of
24 since the inversion that happened in February.

1714

1 MS. CRAWFORD: Even with working on
2 the manhole covers and all that?

3 MR. CRAIG: Right. There are
4 continuous monitors on the boundaries of the site
5 in that area.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

7 MS. CRAWFORD: Can you get one of
8 the operable unit people to address that last
9 question?

10 MR. CRAIG: Dennis Nixon, are you
11 available to answer that?

12 MR. NIXON: What's the question?

13 MR. DUFFY: How did they get the
14 radon contamination through the glove bag during
15 the manway removal?

16 MR. NIXON: As I understand, one of
17 the gentlemen that was working on the silos through
18 the glove bag, if you'll see one of the pictures in
19 the back, when they work through the glove bags
20 they actually have to -- when they're working, they
21 have to lay on the silo, and that direct contact
22 with the silo got the contamination on his clothing
23 and he was able to get that contamination on his
24 skin. It was washed off.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It said four.

2 MR. NIXON: Basically the same for
3 those four people.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How long did
5 it take them to install that manway if they were
6 all laying on the top of it; how long did they lay
7 in that position?

8 MR. NIXON: They install four
9 manways a day, approximately two hours a manway.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Eight hours?

11 MR. NIXON: It's not that they're
12 laying on the dome at all times. It's just some
13 operations require that they get down, and I can
14 show you on a picture in the back when they're
15 removing the manway for the sampling operation.

16 MR. DUFFY: The question was on how
17 long it took the men to install the manways, and he
18 indicated about two hours per manway. They were
19 laying on the soil on top of the silo and that
20 contaminated the clothing, which then contaminated
21 the skin operation, and I gather with the
22 experience gained on that, there will be
23 preparation of the site so that doesn't happen
24 again and change of clothing. So it's a situation

1 that happens in this working environment.

2 MR. WESTERBECK: In fact, after
3 those four people got contamination, I think two
4 got it on the skin, two of them only got it on
5 their clothing, Lou Bogard went out and talked to
6 all the workers on the project and explained extra
7 precautionary measures that they should take
8 because it was very hot and the people, you know,
9 had a tendency to I guess wipe their -- as they
10 were taking off their gloves and suits, that may
11 have been how they ended up getting some
12 contamination on their skin. As I said, Lou went
13 over the procedures again with them, and after that
14 there was no more incidents.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: Is that classified as
16 an unusual incident?

17 MR. DUFFY: Reportable.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: It was not on last
19 week's daily operations brief.

20 MR. WESTERBECK: Mark, wasn't that
21 an off normal?

22 That was an off normal, not an
23 unusual occurrence.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Even if it's an off

1 normal, it sometimes --

2 MR. DUFFY: It's reported as a
3 statistic on skin contamination or contamination
4 events, and there's a new set of reports coming out
5 for all facilities in the Department which will
6 include that. It won't be on a weekly report. It
7 will be identified by facility by skin
8 contamination or by other contamination. The first
9 set just came out from the Assistant Secretary of
10 Nuclear Energy for all his areas. Ours is due in
11 the September time frame, and we'll have a
12 performance evaluation with all our facilities, and
13 you will be able to see Fernald, how many skin
14 contaminations, how many abnormal occurrences,
15 unusual occurrences occurred.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Will that go in the
17 Public Reading Room?

18 MR. DUFFY: Yes. We found out it
19 doesn't pay to be secret.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Because we will find
21 out.

22 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Duffy, is
24 there any toxic waste being produced at Mounds

1 Laboratory at this time?

2 MR. DUFFY: There's mixed waste
3 being produced which has a toxic component. From
4 that standpoint, we do have some mixed waste. We
5 do have additives and toxic waste that's not
6 radioactive that goes to commercial treatment
7 operations. Every one of our manufacturing
8 facilities produces some material that's on the
9 list of toxic materials.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As much as
11 it's such a problem to get rid of this toxic waste,
12 why are you continuing to produce it?

13 MR. DUFFY: The whole situation
14 turns out we have a manufacturing process and the
15 process uses material that's classified as toxic or
16 hazardous, and what we're doing is trying to
17 eliminate the organic toxins such as
18 trichloroethylene that's used as solvents with
19 aqueous solvents. We just substituted at the Y-12
20 facility an aqueous solvent to replace all organic
21 solvents at Y-12. Saved us \$23,000,000 this year.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the
23 name of it?

24 MR. DUFFY: It's proprietary.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the
2 material being produced for?

3 MR. DUFFY: Pardon?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is this
5 material being produced for?

6 MR. DUFFY: Oh, it's not being
7 produced. It turns out in order to clean
8 components such as microchips, they make at Mound
9 electronic devices. Some of the material has to be
10 wiped down on a Chem Wipe, and Chem Wipe has a
11 solvent that's used to get the dirt off so that it
12 has a clean surface. That's basically it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What are
14 these electronic devices being produced for?

15 MR. DUFFY: They're part of the
16 trigger mechanisms, as I believe, for the nuclear
17 weapons system.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But I thought
19 you said earlier about 50 years ago we needed bombs
20 and now we don't.

21 MR. DUFFY: Still make them. I
22 don't know whether we need them, that's not my job.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you're
24 helping produce them. It looks like you would be

1 sympathetic with it or you wouldn't be helping
2 produce them.

3 MR. DUFFY: I'm not producing
4 anything in the weapons area. I'm cleaning up
5 sites. My job is strictly to clean up sites and
6 make sure they don't do it again. That's the job
7 that I have, to make sure we meet all the
8 regulations and requirements that are in the United
9 States at the present time, that's what I'm doing.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But as an
11 individual citizen, if you don't think we need more
12 nuclear bombs, it looks like you would be doing
13 something to prevent --

14 MR. DUFFY: I didn't say I didn't
15 think we needed any nuclear bombs. I said I don't
16 have anything to do with the production. That's
17 President Bush's job, that's not mine. That's
18 outside my pay rate.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just one
20 other question along a little different line. You
21 brought out very forcefully that a serious mistake
22 was made perhaps 50 years ago in locating this
23 here, and I'm just wondering with all the years
24 being spent to make these studies, if maybe a few

1714

1 years from now somebody won't say, well, a serious
2 mistake was made in spending so many years in
3 studying this thing and now we have too much toxic
4 waste in our aquifer. Do you think that's a
5 possibility?

6 MR. DUFFY: I hope not. We look and
7 I think we've identified where the source of
8 contamination is. It's from the surface runoff
9 into the sand land of Paddy's Run, and we're
10 confirming that with additional wells. We're at
11 the point where we've identified and confirmed the
12 identification of the source of in leakage. I
13 think we're monitoring enough wells at the present
14 time and we can see whether or not there's an
15 increase or decrease in the amount of material.
16 The site happens to have a unique clay lens
17 underneath it that's about 50 feet thick and
18 unfortunately for the site it was there. I think
19 the geological formation in Paddy's Run is a
20 situation that compounded the problem.

21 But I think in the present
22 regulations for any future facilities, you're going
23 to have to meet regulations, you're going to have
24 to get approval to put a production facility into

123

1 operation, and it just came back from looking at
2 similar facilities in France and they are not
3 contaminating anything over there outside the
4 facilities. There are methods for building
5 facilities to handle radioactive waste without
6 contaminating the site.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's a
8 little hard to believe. No contamination?

9 MR. DUFFY: Outside the facility.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe that's
11 true. Thank you.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: When I asked you
13 earlier about the Inspector General being on the
14 site and you all were shaking your heads, what's
15 his name? Is he here?

16 MR. HANSEN: The Inspector General
17 has been on-site now for almost a year and a half.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: How come we didn't
19 know?

20 MR. HANSEN: They have just recently
21 -- you weren't aware of that Lisa?

22 MS. CRAWFORD: No.

23 MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry. They just
24 recently increased their staff to a level of ten

1 people.

2 MR. DUFFY: It's a regional office
3 for the Inspector General. They're not all
4 dedicated to the Fernald site.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: He's on-site in an
6 office. What's he doing?

7 MR. HANSEN: Inspector Generaling.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: That's not a good
9 answer.

10 MR. HANSEN: Six of them are
11 auditors and four are investigator type. They are
12 responsible to look at DOE activities and make sure
13 that what we're doing is correct.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: What's his name?

15 MR. HANSEN: Mike Smith is the lead
16 for the investigation group.

17 MR. DUFFY: But again, these are not
18 dedicated to Fernald. This is a regional office
19 for the Inspector General since we had the office
20 space available and there are a lot of sites in the
21 Ohio area. It's a lot easier to dedicate ten
22 people out here to look at Portsmouth, Mound,
23 Fernald, and other areas out here than to ship them
24 out from Washington. If they're on-site, they can

1714

1 make it within a day to anything.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: So his name is Mike
3 Smith?

4 MR. HANSEN: Yes. We'll get you
5 names and phone numbers, Lisa.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does this
8 area cover all of Southern Ohio or all of Ohio?

9 MR. DUFFY: I think he was sent out
10 to cover most of the Ohio area.

11 MR. HANSEN: Well, southwestern
12 region.

13 MS. NUNGASTER: Some time ago, I
14 don't know, maybe as long as a year ago, there was
15 something said about they were searching for a
16 vault on-site near the old Administration Building
17 which they found out would have been north. We
18 haven't heard anything about that for months and
19 months now and I just wondered did they ever locate
20 that vault that's supposedly buried underground?

21 MR. CRAIG: That's being
22 investigated under Operable Unit 3. I think I'll
23 let one of the OU-3 managers talk about that.

24 MR. JANKE: I can talk about it.

126

1 Recently there's been an investigation ongoing on
2 the vault. I believe it was first brought up back
3 in the Fall to December time frame, 1990.
4 Currently we're reviewing a report, and it was put
5 together for the suspected vault region. What this
6 report in essence looked at was a historical
7 photograph search of the region, the suspected
8 vault region in a time frame of when the vault
9 construction was suspected. We hope to -- what we
10 plan on doing is putting forth proposals after this
11 report is fully evaluated to finalize any
12 additional studies so that we can put this issue
13 with respect to the vault to rest. At this point,
14 as I said, the report is under review. At this
15 point we don't have any hard data to indicate there
16 is a vault in that region.

17 MR. DUFFY: Wasn't there a
18 preliminary magnetometer and ground penetrating
19 radon survey conducted also of the area, which
20 indicated a major --

21 MR. JANKE: Yes. It indicated a
22 surface disturbance, which there are photos of that
23 region that have been uncovered in archives and
24 various areas of the country that indicate that

1714

1 there was some construction activity in terms of
2 trucks driving back and forth in a suspected
3 region, but no excavation to the extent we would
4 see a vault. In fact, if you look at photographs
5 taken of various aspects of the production area,
6 the description of the suspected vault from a
7 former construction worker would indicate that it's
8 possibly one of the plants that were under
9 operation. I think that description fit very well.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: Is that document
11 available for public review?

12 MR. JANKE: It will be upon review.

13 MR. WESTERBECK: Yeah, I see no
14 reason why we can't make it available.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

16 MR. WESTERBECK: Based on all the
17 record search of all the drawings, the photographs,
18 the magnetometry, the ground penetrating radar, it
19 seems like what he just said may be the case, that
20 the location that the individual remembers may have
21 been confused with Plant 6, because there was a
22 tremendous amount of excavation done there and a
23 tremendous amount of concrete work done to create
24 the basement portion of that facility. As I say,

128

1714

1 very likely that's where the confusion lies.

2 MR. JANKE: It's difficult in that
3 particular worker, and I haven't spoken with him
4 myself, but from what I heard of the conversation,
5 he's recalling something that happened 40 some
6 years ago.

7 MS. NUNGASTER: Couldn't something
8 like this be put in an update so we don't have to
9 try to remember these things to ask you at these
10 type meetings? This is the type thing we're
11 looking for information on. It's brought all out
12 and then we hear nothing about it for months.

13 MR. JANKE: I sat in on a community,
14 I guess one of your FRESH meetings with Teresa a
15 few weeks back. There were some issues addressed
16 at that meeting that I didn't immediately have
17 answers for. I know one of your suggestions was to
18 put the operable unit managers' names on the
19 handouts for the OU's. You're free to call me on
20 any of these issues. I don't know any better
21 direct mechanism than that to answer your
22 comments. It's difficult to issue reports or
23 anything on these issues daily or weekly.

24 MR. WESTERBECK: We will put a copy

129

1 of that report in -- it's about a half inch thick,
2 not too big.

3 MR. JANKE: Most of it is
4 photographs during that time frame.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know
6 if I have my information right, but did you say
7 something about a clay lens being under the site?

8 MR. DUFFY: Yes, about 50 feet thick
9 as I remember the geology.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you know
11 how large this is?

12 MR. DUFFY: It covers most of the
13 thousand acres, as I recall, and it goes further
14 north and over to the west.

15 MR. CRAIG: Maybe it would be better
16 if one of the geologists for ASI/IT could talk
17 about that.

18 MR. DUFFY: There are documents that
19 show it, they're in the reading room, and it gives
20 you a complete layout of the clay lens.

21 MR. AVEL: The clay that Leo is
22 talking about is a large formation that -- you
23 asked the question, that is a glacial till, which
24 covers the entire site or which is under the entire

1714

1 site for several thousands of feet in both the east
2 and west directions. That clay layer ends just
3 south or at least it reaches the surface just south
4 of the plant, and to understand the geology of the
5 site and understand the contamination in the
6 environment, you get a real clear picture of why we
7 have a South Plume. When rainfall washed across
8 the site, went down to Paddy's Run, Paddy's Run
9 carried a lot of the contamination past the clay
10 layer where it then got into the aquifer. So the
11 clay layer varies in thickness, it's about 15 feet,
12 I believe, deep, maybe not even that, and extends
13 for about 35, 40 feet.

14 MS. McCORD: And to clarify that,
15 it's not continuous. Drilling has shown that it's
16 actually a discontinuous lens that is broken up,
17 depending on where -- its thickness varies
18 depending on where you are within the site
19 boundaries.

20 MR. AVEL: That's right, and
21 probably it's fair to mention as well that within
22 that clay are several smaller what are called
23 perched systems of groundwater, and they are ground
24 as a small system that is isolated from the main

131

1 aquifer. You heard us talk about the removal
2 action, the first part of the removal action.
3 That's what that removal action addresses is
4 contaminated perched water that is within that clay
5 lens.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would that
7 cause excessive runoff?

8 MR. AVEL: The question was would it
9 cause excessive runoff.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In a heavy
11 period of rain.

12 MR. AVEL: You would get more runoff
13 in an area that has a clay layer on the surface
14 than you would further south; for instance, where
15 there's not a clay layer where the water just goes
16 directly into the ground.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So is that
18 yes?

19 MR. DUFFY: Clay is impermeable.

20 MR. AVEL: I have a problem with
21 your term excessive runoff. It would result in
22 more runoff. I really don't know how to quantify
23 that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: During

1714

1 extreme periods of time it would cause pooling on
2 top of the surface and maybe cause excessive runoff
3 into Paddy's Run?

4 MR. AVEL: I don't know if it's
5 excessive; it's just that you would have more
6 runoff in an area that has clay than one that does
7 not. Whether or not that's excessive, I can't
8 say.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is Amy here?
11 She was here earlier, the one that came to our
12 Trustees meeting last night.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm here.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Amy, what is
15 the gentleman's name, the geologist that you
16 brought to our Trustees' meeting?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tim Rober.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is he here
19 this evening?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think
21 so.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is his map
23 here this evening, the map that he brought to the
24 Trustees' meeting?

133

1714

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't
2 believe it is.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think
4 people would really appreciate seeing that map as
5 we did at the Trustees' meeting. That might be
6 incorporated some time.

7 MR. DUFFY: I think there's a book
8 called the South Plume that identifies the total
9 geology of the site and it's probably in the
10 reading room over here.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've not seen
12 it before and I have been in this organization a
13 long time.

14 MR. DUFFY: It's a public document.
15 If you want, I'll give you my copy, how's that.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Fine.

17 MR. DUFFY: It identifies everything
18 associated with the Plume and the geology and the
19 various operations. It was put out in what, '89,
20 '89 or 90.

21 MS. McCORD: Are you talking about
22 the EE/CA?

23 MR. DUFFY: Yes. South Plume.

24 MS. McCORD: That was done after

134

1714

1 '90.

2 MR. DUFFY: Yes. Isn't that a
3 public document?

4 MS. McCORD: Yes. We had a meeting,
5 remember, in the Summer of '90 on that EE/CA.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: We have those, we
7 have the EE/CA's.

8 MR. DUFFY: It has all the geology
9 of the Plume, it has the geology of the site, it
10 has the geology of the river, it identifies why the
11 clay lens extends and why it comes to a river
12 section down here. It's about the most detailed
13 thing you ever wanted to know about the geology of
14 this area.

15 MS. McCORD: The data gap are the
16 wells that weren't installed yet because we still
17 didn't haven't have the boundary of the Plume.

18 MR. DUFFY: Yes, but it does
19 identify the geology under the site.

20 MS. McCORD: You're right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The question
22 I had was you talked about selling some of the
23 materials that are stored on the site. Does
24 Fernald get to keep that money to put back into

135

1 cleanup or does that go back into overall DOE
2 funds?

3 MR. DUFFY: It doesn't go to DOE at
4 all. It goes to the United States Treasury.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't you
6 get to keep it for cleanup at Fernald?

7 MR. DUFFY: No.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why?

9 MR. DUFFY: I don't know, that's the
10 way the Government runs. It's a bureaucracy that's
11 composed of many facets.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it's your
13 materials and you need the money for cleanup. I
14 don't understand.

15 MR. DUFFY: It belongs to the United
16 States Government, not necessarily the Department
17 of Energy. We don't have a way of keeping track of
18 revenues coming in. We're only a spendthrift
19 operation.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: You got that right.

21 MR. DUFFY: We never thought we'd
22 make any money. Seriously, all monies that come in
23 as a result of licenses, fees, and things of that
24 nature go into the Treasury and the general fund.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: But wouldn't it make
2 a lot of sense for them to give it right back to
3 you guys?

4 MR. DUFFY: There are a lot of
5 things in government that would make a lot of sense
6 if they did it differently. Hopefully some of
7 those will take place in the next two years.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
9 question about the storm runoff into Paddy's Run,
10 the project that you're under right now. Will
11 Paddy's Run have a berm positively so it won't
12 drain off into Paddy's Run in the future? Are they
13 berming the creek under the contract?

14 MR. CRAIG: Around the area of the
15 waste pits, we're talking about near Paddy's Run,
16 there will be berms constructed and also collection
17 ditches on the inside of that berm to make sure the
18 runoff does not get to Paddy's Run. It will be a
19 combination of berms, ditches, and sumps.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How do you
21 prevent serious erosion collecting in your catch
22 basins?

23 MR. CRAIG: That's part of the
24 design of the removal action. I imagine they're

1 like any other runoff controls for drainage basins
2 like that, there will be some type of riffraff or
3 rock material put in place for erosion control.

4 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Any more
5 questions? I just want one last request, Lisa
6 Crawford asked me to introduce some of the staff
7 members and community relations from Parsons. If I
8 could just have Greg Osmond, Community Relations
9 Manager for Parsons, step up to the microphone for
10 a minute, identify himself, and introduce the
11 people that work with him.

12 MR. OSMOND: As Teresa said, I am
13 Greg Osmond, Community Relations Manager for
14 Parsons, and tonight I have with me, if they'll
15 stand up, Chris Hertz, Lynn St. Clair, and Andrea
16 Williams. All in the Community Relations
17 Department at Parsons. Thank you.

18 MS. KWIATKOWSKI: Thank you. Well,
19 if we are all wrapped up with our questions, some
20 of us will still remain around the exhibit area if
21 there are any further questions to be asked on a
22 personal basis, and I just want to say thank you
23 very much for your participation. We enjoyed it
24 all very much. Thank you.

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, RPR, 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 with computer-aided transcription the within (138), one hundred thirty-eight pages, and that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

Lois A. Roell

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

PUBLIC ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION CENTER
% Westinghouse Mat'l. Co. of Ohio
P. O. Box 398704
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8704

139

Spangler Reporting Service

1 (513) 381-3330