

2976

G-000-1004.12

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FERNALD
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
COMMUNITY MEETING FEBRUARY 25, 1992**

02/25/92

**PARSONS/DOE-FN
96
TRANSCRIPT**

2976

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
9 FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
10 COMMUNITY MEETING
11 FEBRUARY 25, 1992
12 - - -
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 MR. TILLER: Good evening. Can you
2 hear me in the back? We've got about a five-hour
3 program for you tonight, so if you could take your
4 seats, we might get out of here around midnight or
5 so.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: You'll be here all by
7 yourself.

8 MR. TILLER: We're going to save the
9 good stuff for last then.

10 It looks like most folks have their
11 chairs, so I suspect we ought to get on with it.
12 First, I am not Teresa. She's no longer here with
13 us right now, she's on a detail in Washington, and
14 we will try the best we can to fill in until either
15 she returns or we have a replacement. Those of you
16 in the news media who want a contact in the DOE
17 Fernald office, it's Jerry Westerbeck right here to
18 my left, and he will be filling in.

19 Second, I really am not trying to
20 disguise myself as a nonbureaucrat. I have all the
21 appropriate bureaucrat clothes, but my wife is with
22 me and a good friend of ours lost his wife and the
23 services are in Idaho Saturday, so we're going to
24 hit the road this evening and see if we can get a

1 few miles.

2 Personnel changes, maybe you've heard
3 or read that Bill Britton, the president of WMCO
4 here, is on his way to Savannah River to take a
5 position there. Hugh Daugherty, who has been the
6 number two person here, will move up to become the
7 president of WMCO, and Sam Schwartzman, who is on
8 the principal staff at WMCO, will take Hugh's job
9 as the number two guy.

10 I just made a terrible mistake when I
11 was in that little minute of sadness. My wife is
12 here with me and she's going to be riding across
13 the country, and I would like her to stand up
14 because she puts up with me a lot. Where is she?
15 There she is over there. Thank you, dear.

16 (Applause)

17 MR. TILLER: The first time I spent
18 a few minutes with you was the prior meeting and I
19 mentioned the DOE decision to build up the office
20 here, and that process is still working, they are
21 still committed to strengthening the DOE presence
22 here. I think today we have 29 federal employees
23 in this office. We have approval to go to 69 this
24 fiscal year. We're starting to advertise and

1 hire. And I'm an old technical program type
2 person, and believe it or not, the priority for us
3 hiring is not technical program people. For us to
4 get this office up and running we have got to hire
5 people with personnel experience, contracting
6 experience, and accounting experience. In the
7 process we will be strengthening the technical
8 staff here also, but we need those services to help
9 us perform the functions of hiring the rest of the
10 people and administering the contracts. That's all
11 I was going to say on the staffing.

12 On the ERMC, as you know, the RFP was
13 issued December 23rd. A preproposal conference was
14 January 16th. A lot of questions, good
15 attendance. Out of those questions a decision was
16 made to postpone the date the proposals were due.
17 They are due to the Department of Energy on
18 February 27, and I thought I would just spend a
19 minute telling you what those groups do.

20 The SEB is a Source Evaluation
21 Board. It's made up of right now four voting
22 members and two members who are full-time
23 advisors. When those proposals come in, that will
24 be essentially a full-time, more than full-time job

1 for a number of weeks. Out of that they will
2 recommend what is called a competitive range,
3 sometimes called a short list. If there is a
4 difference in their scoring, they will pick the
5 ones that appear to have the potential to be a
6 winner, and you don't know how many are going to be
7 in the short list until you've gone through the
8 process. And for your information, part of the
9 process is the members of the board individually
10 rank each of those proposals themselves, and then
11 they get together to compare the ranking with the
12 other members.

13 They then recommend the short list,
14 the competitive range to the Source Election
15 Official, and in this case the Source Election
16 Official is the manager of the Idaho operation,
17 Auggie Petrillo. If he approves that competitive
18 range, then they will enter into oral discussions
19 with each of the people on the short list.

20 After those discussions, which is a
21 give and take, each of the proposers on the short
22 list can submit what is called a best and final
23 offer. These are reviewed by the Source Evaluation
24 Board. They make a recommendation to the Source

1 Election Official as to who should win the
2 competition, and if he agrees with that
3 recommendation, a contract will be awarded, and
4 then there will be a three-month transition period
5 for the new contractors on board and Westinghouse
6 also stays on board.

7 Last item I would mention is we made
8 the news with a fire on January 19th. It started
9 with hot spots in the coal bunker. I've learned
10 since then -- I'm not a coal guy -- that hot spots
11 in coal bunkers are not uncommon and you have
12 various ways to take care of them. One is to
13 simply take the coal out of the bunker and let it
14 cool. Such an arrangement was provided in our coal
15 bunker. Unfortunately, the change rack which would
16 have carried the warm coal out didn't work. So it
17 sat there and became warmer and warmer and finally
18 had spontaneous combustion.

19 At 3:40 on Monday then the EOC was
20 activated and five off-site fire departments
21 responded, and it was well under control at 8 p.m.
22 After the EOC was activated, it's judged that it
23 performed very well.

24 The response to asking for help was

1 not as timely as it could have been. After the
2 change rack broke and as it continued to warm up,
3 we probably should have asked for help earlier and
4 taken some mitigating measures then. We were then
5 faced with a coal bunker that was damaged, and that
6 is basically the only source of energy to keep that
7 plant warm in the winter. Thank goodness we had a
8 couple of warm days. We got a small backup gaspar
9 boiler in while another larger one was on its way,
10 and after a couple of days we fired up the boiler
11 with the damaged bunker.

12 Rough estimates of damage to the
13 bunker, and this is not based on engineering
14 evaluations, are about a million dollars damage.
15 Before we repair that, we will do an engineering
16 analysis of whether to provide gaspar boilers, keep
17 the coal fire boilers as a backup and figure out
18 what is the most cost effective way to provide
19 energy to that site in the winter, as well as
20 provide some redundancy so if we lose our one
21 source of energy, we won't freeze the site.

22 I chartered what is called a Class A
23 investigating committee. When you have damage over
24 \$250,000 you do that, and we quickly guessed it

1 would probably be more than that. The report is
2 not complete. It will -- still in the final review
3 stages, but that report will be made available to
4 the public when it is completed, and I don't expect
5 that to be very long.

6 That's all the remarks I have about
7 staffing, the ERMC, and the coal, and next Jerry
8 Westerbeck is going to chat with you.

9 MR. WESTERBECK: Thanks, Bob. I
10 have about six items I will go over, and then I'll
11 turn it over to Jack.

12 In addition to the evening's agenda
13 that was at your place, I want to draw your
14 attention to the cards that we use. You can
15 either, when we get to the question and answer part
16 of the program, you can either come forward to a
17 mike and ask your question or jot down your
18 question on this card and then during the Q and A
19 session we'll read the questions from the card and
20 respond to those.

21 Good news, the annual Environmental
22 Monitoring Report is out. A little later than we
23 had planned. If all things happen properly, it
24 should be in the mail and available in the Public

1 Information Center around the late September, early
2 October time frame. As we reported at the last
3 meeting, we didn't -- I think on October 29th was
4 when our last meeting was, we did not have the
5 sample results all back yet. We got them a few
6 days later and a week after that, the 8th of
7 November, we sent the report to headquarters. They
8 turned it around rather quickly, in a little over a
9 month, about a month and a half we got their
10 approval, and, of course, we had to go to press and
11 reproduce the 2,000 copies or so that we made.

12 We mailed out about 300 copies of the
13 report to local community members, Congressmen,
14 local media, scientific groups, and organizations.
15 We also have copies available back there at the
16 registration table and copies are over at the
17 PEIC.

18 As we expected, there was good news
19 in the report. As a result of production shutting
20 down in July of '89, the airborne radium emissions
21 at Fernald were the lowest in the history of the
22 site. The number of contaminants going to the
23 river also declined somewhat in 1990, and we expect
24 that to decline further as a number of additional

2976

1 wastewater treatment capabilities and the
2 capacities are increased in the coming year.

3 The report also calculates a worst
4 case radiation dose scenario. In 1990 if a
5 hypothetical person living near the K-65 silos
6 drank water from the Great Miami River and ate
7 local produce, beef, and fish, they would have
8 received a maximum effective dose of 10 millirems,
9 which is less than 10 percent of the 100 millirem
10 yearly limit established by the International
11 Commission on Radiological Protection.

12 On Thursday night, Linda England
13 Farmer, head of the Westinghouse Environmental
14 Monitoring organization, she will give a
15 presentation on the 1990 Environmental Monitoring
16 Report at the FRESH meeting at the Venice
17 Presbyterian Church. At that time Linda and
18 several members of her staff will go into much
19 greater detail and be able to answer more detailed
20 questions about the report.

21 At the last meeting I also mentioned
22 that we had just gone through a Tiger Team
23 reassessment. Now we refer to it as a follow-up
24 Tiger Team probe, in that it was a much smaller

1 group of people and they did not do the broad base
2 assessment, but they probed certain areas. As a
3 reminder, that was conducted the 15th to the 25th
4 of October. It was an 11-man team out of
5 headquarters or other DOE organizations around the
6 complex. They concentrated on three areas.

7 First the team looked at our progress
8 on correcting the environmental safety and health
9 deficiencies that had been identified during the
10 previous Tiger Team assessment that had been
11 conducted in the July, August time frame of '89.

12 Secondly, the Tiger Team reviewed our
13 progress in establishing self-assessment programs,
14 both a DOE self-assessment program and a
15 Westinghouse self-assessment program. This is a
16 new recent initiative within the whole Department
17 of Energy, and we, like other DOE facilities, are
18 in the early stages of setting up the formal
19 self-assessment program.

20 Finally, the team looked at DOE and
21 WMCO management structures, resources and system
22 from top to bottom to evaluate their adequacy for
23 effectively addressing not only known environmental
24 safety and health problems but also new

29776

1 initiatives. So part of that assessment included
2 looking, as I say, from top to bottom. From the
3 DOE standpoint, they looked at it from headquarters
4 right on down through the support we were getting
5 from Oak Ridge down to our capabilities and so
6 forth at the site.

7 They issued a draft report before
8 they left on the 25th of October. It identified 26
9 concerns, 8 improvement areas, and 3 areas of
10 strength. The 3 areas of strength that they noted
11 was our In Vivo facility, the Public Information
12 Center and the corresponding public relations
13 program that we have, that being the meetings we
14 hold, the information we put out and so forth, and
15 our Asbestos Management Program. We tried to tell
16 them some other areas that we also were very proud
17 of, but they said they couldn't mention those in
18 their report because those weren't specific areas
19 that they were looking into and investigating, that
20 they were not probing, so we won't expand the brag
21 report. It was those three areas that they did
22 notice strengths.

23 Once this report is approved for
24 release, of course, we will put a copy of it in the

1 PEIC. And we'll also publish a notice of
2 availability.

3 Also last time talked about the
4 status of the public water supply. Had some
5 movement in that area, not as quickly as you all
6 would like, nor as quickly as we would like. I
7 think I told you that we would soon be receiving
8 and reviewing a report done by a consultant for the
9 Hamilton County Department of Public Works. This
10 consultant was to evaluate the potential suppliers
11 in the area and the estimated costs associated with
12 having water supplied by these potential
13 suppliers.

14 Here's where we stand right now. The
15 City of Harrison somewhere along this process asked
16 that it also be considered as a potential
17 supplier. Therefore, the Hamilton County
18 Department of Public Works asked the consultant to
19 consider Harrison as a supplier and add that to the
20 study. The Department of Public Works has now
21 focused down to the cities of Cincinnati and
22 Harrison as the two potential suppliers, and they
23 have solicited proposals from each city.

24 Once they receive those proposals,

2076

1 they will present it to the Hamilton County
2 Commissioners, and it's my understanding that
3 process then will work to where the Commissioners
4 will make a selection of the supplier. They have
5 indicated to us that then they will send that
6 selected, the proposal from that selected supplier
7 to us for our review and essentially a renewal of
8 our commitment to come up to our fair share of the
9 cost.

10 It's also my understanding that they
11 have broken the project down into two phases, with
12 phase one being the so-called affected area. I
13 suppose somewhere along the line the decision will
14 be made whether to do phase one first and then at
15 some time later phase two or perhaps to just at one
16 time contract for the whole, both phases and
17 complete the work as one project.

18 Assuming everything goes smoothly,
19 then, of course, the way the process then moves,
20 the County Commissioners will enter into some form
21 of contract with the potential supplier, either the
22 City of Harrison or the City of Cincinnati, and
23 then that contract will provide for, of course,
24 designing the project and then actually doing the

2976

1 construction. I can't remember exactly what the
2 estimates are, but it's around a year and a half to
3 design and construct.

4 We are, have been, and continue to
5 work with our headquarters on how we can meet the
6 NEPA requirements. Since federal money is
7 involved, there's some sort of environmental
8 assessment documentation that will have to be
9 completed. We are trying to figure out a way to
10 not have that be the long pole in the tent or the
11 pacing factor, if you will. The other thing which
12 I think should be solved -- the other item that we
13 are working with our headquarters on, which I think
14 should be solved rather easily, is the instrument
15 by which we convey that money. I understand other
16 locations in the country, they've used a grant, so
17 that's probably what we'll be pursuing here.

18 Maybe it's not a good title, an
19 accurate title, but I wanted to bring to your
20 attention some of the various planning documents
21 that have been, are, and will be available for you
22 to participate in reviewing and commenting on. DOE
23 uses several planning documents, including the
24 Activity Data Sheets, the Site Specific Plan, the

2976

1 Five-Year Plan, and the Road Map to plan, program,
2 budget, and report on our progress towards meeting
3 our 30-year cleanup goal.

4 Activity Data Sheets, or ADS's,
5 provide detailed information on each specific site
6 activity or unit and form the basis for the
7 planning of funding. All of the activities at
8 Fernald are broken down, at least this past year
9 and for the coming year, into 17 different ADS's.
10 So if you go over to the PEIC, there should be 17
11 different ADS's that you can look at, an ADS for
12 each operable unit, for example. The 1993 ADS's
13 are in the PEIC, and if everything goes as planned,
14 the 1994 ADS's should be in there by the end of
15 April.

16 Here's the Site Specific Plan. It
17 focuses on activities to be undertaken at the site
18 during the upcoming fiscal year. The latest one,
19 issue is dated in September of '91, and it's
20 available for your review at the PEIC.

21 This big red book is called the
22 Five-Year Plan, that's the Five-Year Plan for '93
23 through '97. That's also available over in the
24 PEIC. It, of course, discusses current

1 accomplishments and sort of lays out our plans for
2 the next five years.

3 The Road Map is considered the top
4 level planning document that describes activities
5 that need to be accomplished and issues that need
6 to be resolved in order for the site to achieve its
7 long-term cleanup goals. The latest Road Map has
8 just been approved for release. We're going into
9 reproduction on that and should have copies of that
10 available in the PEIC too real soon.

11 Back on the -- perhaps most of you
12 already picked it up -- back on the back table back
13 there is a handout that pretty much explains these
14 documents and some other documents, how they all
15 tie into the overall process of planning our
16 activities and budgeting for the money and
17 reporting on the progress and so forth. So if you
18 didn't pick it up and you want to see how they all
19 fit together and feed into Congress to get the
20 money and then come out and help us to complete the
21 work, I encourage you to pick that up.

22 As I said in the beginning, these
23 plans, these booklets, the ADS's, they're for your
24 review, they're for your comment. We encourage you

1 to comment. In fact, this year the initial plan
2 was to have high school students at various
3 locations around the country actually review some
4 of these documents and provide comments on them,
5 primarily to make them more understandable, more
6 easily read. And we had some review conducted at
7 our site, and it was sort of enlightening the
8 comments that the students provided us. Should
9 help us to write better, more understandable
10 documents in the future.

11 Again, at the last meeting in October
12 we promised you a mailing to survey your interest
13 for courses that we might offer community residents
14 in 1992. In December we mailed out about a
15 thousand surveys to find out what you wanted to
16 know and when and where you would like to have the
17 courses taught. We got back 43 responses, and
18 generally people wanted to attend the classes at
19 the PEIC and have them last for about two hours a
20 week. Tuesday and Wednesday were the preferred
21 days. Most popular topics were air, soil, and
22 water sampling, methods, analysis, and results,
23 emergency planning, and community right-to-know act
24 and site emergency plans.

1 In case we missed you with the
2 mailing or maybe you threw it away, we have more
3 survey forms available back there tonight, and if
4 you want to fill out one, if we missed you or
5 perhaps you misplaced it, please pick a form up and
6 we would like for you to get it back to us by the
7 10th of March if you would.

8 By the end of April we will have a
9 mailing then back out to you that will give you the
10 details on the dates and time and location of, and
11 the topic that we'll cover for the course. If the
12 number of people involved is too many for the PEIC,
13 we'll move over to one of the bigger rooms in the
14 ERA building.

15 Give you an update on the School of
16 Environmental Excellence, we talked about that at a
17 couple of meetings. The next class, which is the
18 fourth class, the first two were here at Fernald,
19 then the third one was at Hanford, the fourth now
20 being held at Savannah River and begins on the 15th
21 of March. Forty people are scheduled to attend
22 that. It's becoming a very popular course for
23 contractor personnel within the complex. Primarily
24 focused on engineers, first line supervisors, and

2976

1 environment scientists, and so forth.

2 The second initiative that we started
3 here at Fernald, which is being popularly accepted
4 and we're encouraged by it, is the School for
5 Applied Remediation that's being held at the
6 University of Findlay. The second class, which
7 included 23 people from the site, graduated in
8 January. We have -- it's a three-week course, and
9 we have another class that includes 24 people up
10 there right now. They started on the 10th of
11 February. They actually go out and get their hands
12 dirty. They practice cleaning up various spills
13 and leaks on simulated sites. And in addition to
14 some of the hands on, they do get some training in
15 the environmental laws, which sort of gives reason
16 for why they're doing what they're training to do.

17 The last item I wanted to bring up is
18 as part of a national program, DOE will sponsor and
19 conduct the first Greater Cincinnati Regional
20 Science Bowl on March the 7th at the Cincinnati
21 Technical College. This is a national program. In
22 fact, I thought they were all held on the same day,
23 but I understand the one in the Dayton area was
24 held last Saturday. Ours will be on March the

1 7th. We invited high schools from the surrounding
2 area, and we have 32 teams, totaling -- 5 members
3 each, totaling 160 students from high schools in
4 Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana are going to be taking
5 part, and the winning team gets to go to Washington
6 and participate in the national competition. So I
7 volunteered to be a moderator, and my biggest
8 problem is learning how to pronounce some of the
9 words. So that just proves to me we have some
10 pretty smart students out there, who I suspect will
11 have most of the right answers.

12 That's all I have. I'll introduce
13 Jack Craig now, who will give you all an update on
14 the RI/FS program and so forth. Thank you.

15 MR. CRAIG: Thanks, Jerry, and good
16 evening again.

17 What I'd like to do tonight, similar
18 to what I did at the last meeting, was to go
19 through the, a review of the status of each of the
20 operable units in the RI/FS and then discuss the
21 current status of the existing remedial actions at
22 the site.

23 For the Remedial Investigation/
24 Feasibility Study, I'm going to be going through

1 each of the operable units, the status of where
2 we're at on the field program as far as sampling
3 activities go, and then the current status of any
4 treatability studies which are ongoing now.

5 Before I get into that, I think this
6 handout was passed out at the last meeting, which
7 really gives a general overview of the milestones
8 for each of the operable units and when reports are
9 due and will be available for public review. It's
10 important to note off of this slide for Operable
11 Unit 3, which is the third bar down, there will be
12 a document coming out in June which is called the
13 Operable Unit 3 Work Plan Addendum, and this
14 document will look at all the characterization
15 required in Operable Unit 3. Like I say, it will
16 be coming out in June.

17 The other thing to notice is the
18 first Remedial Investigation Report, or RI Report,
19 will be coming out in October, and that's for
20 Operable Unit 2, which is the second bar on the
21 chart there.

22 For Operable Unit 1, which is the
23 waste pit area at the site, the status of the field
24 work as it stands today, sampling of Pits 1, 2, 3

1 and 4 and Pit 6 have been completed. Those samples
2 were sent to the lab, have been analyzed, they are
3 waiting all the analysis packages back from the
4 lab. Validation has started on some of them and
5 validation is scheduled to be completed sometime in
6 March of this year on that data. There is some
7 sampling still ongoing at Pit 5 and the Clearwell.
8 Sampling for Pit 5 will be completed hopefully this
9 week and the sampling in the Clearwell will be
10 completed the first week of March of this year.

11 As far as treatability studies go,
12 they are ongoing. Some of the things we're looking
13 at in Operable Unit 1 are a solidification or
14 cementation of the wastes from the waste pits.
15 Those studies are ongoing right now. They're also
16 looking at vitrification or turning material into
17 glass form by heating it and melting it. Those
18 studies are scheduled to begin this week.

19 By the way, if you didn't check
20 before the meeting, there's a description and a
21 status of all the activities I'm going to talk
22 about on the charts in the back of the room.

23 For Operable Unit 2, which is areas
24 outlined in the first bullet there, status of field

1 work, we have completed all sampling which was
2 identified in our crude sampling analysis plan.
3 Those samples were analyzed. The results have been
4 returned from the lab. Validation of those results
5 was completed in February, February 13th. The
6 validation process or the review of the analysis
7 from the lab indicated we had a few problems with
8 some of the samples, so we did have to go out and
9 resample I believe 8 borings in Operable Unit 2.
10 That was done over the weekend. Those samples have
11 been sent to the lab and will be going through
12 analysis in the next few months. Don't see any
13 problem with it affecting the submittal of that
14 report to the EPA in October.

15 Treatability on Operable Unit 2,
16 they're looking at mainly a cementation or
17 solidification of the waste form. Those activities
18 are ongoing right now. They are scheduled for
19 completion in July of this year.

20 As I said earlier, Operable Unit 3
21 has a major document coming out in June, which is
22 the Work Plan Addendum for Operable Unit 3. As we
23 discussed at the last meeting, this is the final
24 operable unit to have a Record of Decision. The

1 document coming out in June will review all the
2 characterization required in the production area
3 and facilities on-site.

4 For Operable Unit 4, the sampling and
5 analysis of that, of the field work, field program
6 has been completed. Validation of all the samples
7 that have come back from the lab is scheduled to be
8 completed this week, and those results will go in
9 the Remedial Investigation Report for OU-4.

10 Treatability studies, they're looking
11 at really three types of treatability for the K-65
12 waste and the Operable Unit 4 waste, looking at
13 some type of solidification or cementation, which
14 is ongoing right now, treatability is ongoing for
15 that. They're also looking at a chemical
16 extraction technique, which would essentially
17 remove the contaminants out of the material by
18 chemical extraction, and that is also ongoing right
19 now, and vitrification, as in Operable Unit 1,
20 which includes heating the material into a glass
21 form. Vitrification treatability is scheduled to
22 start in March of this year, and all treatability
23 on Operable Unit 4 is scheduled for completion in
24 September of this year.

2976

1 For Operable Unit 5, which
2 essentially includes groundwater and soils at the
3 site, we still have an ongoing field investigation
4 program which includes, I believe approximately 25
5 additional wells we're going to be drilling and a
6 number of soil samples which are scheduled to be
7 taken for Operable Unit 5. The well program is
8 ongoing. We have prepared a work plan which will
9 be submitted to EPA which will outline the number
10 of soil samples, additional soil samples that were
11 taken in Operable Unit 5.

12 Treatability studies, we have
13 submitted a treatability study work plan to EPA,
14 which essentially looked at soil washing or a
15 technology to clean soil. We have gotten some
16 comments back on that plan, and we're revising the
17 plan and will be resubmitting it in March of this
18 year.

19 Two other documents which really
20 aren't operable unit specific but are going to be
21 coming, one of them is already in the public
22 reading room, the other one will be coming out in
23 August of this year. First, the Risk Assessment
24 Work Plan Addendum. This is a document which is

1 available in the Administrative Record, and it is a
2 document which really sets forth the methodologies
3 that we're going to be using in each of the
4 operable units to do the risk assessments which
5 will be used to determine the selection of the
6 alternatives that we're going to be using for
7 remediation.

8 The Preliminary Site Characterization
9 Report is a document that is going to be coming out
10 in August of this year, and this document is going
11 to set forth and document the existing site
12 characterization data that we have as of December
13 of this year, but, more importantly, it will give a
14 first cut at what the leading candidate remedial
15 actions are for each of the operable units as it
16 stands today. So it will give a first snapshot of
17 what we think today will be the alternatives we are
18 going to select for remediation for each of the
19 operable units. That's scheduled to come out on
20 August 5th of this year.

21 Switch gears a little bit to removal
22 actions. I'm going to go through the order as
23 they're numbered in the Consent Agreement, so they
24 aren't in operable unit order. Perched

1 groundwater, this is a removal action that was set
2 forth in our first Consent Agreement with EPA.
3 This was an action which looked at removing
4 contaminated water which had been found in pockets
5 underneath some of the buildings on-site. There
6 were four buildings which were identified with
7 perched water. All of the equipment has been put
8 in place and is operational right now for removing
9 the water, and to date we have treated
10 approximately 100,000 gallons of water from
11 underneath the facilities, mainly treating for
12 volatile organic compounds. That will continue
13 essentially probably until final remediation.

14 The waste pit area runoff control,
15 this is a removal action which addresses the
16 control of runoff from the waste pits in Operable
17 Unit 1, collects it, and will send it through the
18 plant effluent treatment system to treat the
19 uranium. This removal action is approximately 75
20 percent complete. It is ahead of schedule and is
21 scheduled for completion on July 30th of this
22 year.

23 I have a few photos for some of
24 these. This is a photo for, what shows the

1 collection area or sump area, waste pit area that
2 is being constructed to collect the water from the
3 waste pits, and it will hold it until it can be
4 processed through the plant effluent treatment
5 system.

6 The south groundwater contamination
7 plume, this is an area of uranium contaminated
8 groundwater which is located south of the
9 facility. It's been broken into some specific
10 parts for convenience of completing the action.
11 Part 1, which looked at providing some alternate
12 water supplies to some industries in the area. A
13 construction package to do that work has been
14 issued. It is out for bid right now. We're
15 evaluating bids to do that work. Still having some
16 difficulties in obtaining all the accesses to the
17 private properties that are required for this
18 action.

19 The second part of the South Plume
20 involves the selection or extraction of
21 contaminated water from the plume area. This
22 removal action, parts of this are also out for
23 bid. What we tried to do was accelerate certain
24 portions of this package so we can complete this

2976

1 activity on schedule.

2 Part three involved the interim
3 advance wastewater treatment system, which is also
4 under review right now. I think a certified for
5 construction design is scheduled to be completed in
6 March of this year.

7 We have, I think since the last
8 meeting have gotten a revised schedule for the
9 completion of the first three parts. For part one,
10 the completion date of part one for the South Plume
11 is July 14th of this year. For part two it is
12 January 29th of 1993, and for part three it's July
13 30th of this year.

14 The K-65 silo removal action, this is
15 an action which included addressing radon emissions
16 from the K-65 silos. It included the addition of
17 some bentonite clay into the headspace of two of
18 the K-65 silos. This removal action was completed
19 in November of this year. The bentonite was added
20 and it was very successful.

21 I would like to point out that both
22 Randi Allen and Dennis Nixon from the Operable Unit
23 4 staff are here tonight and they can probably
24 answer your questions if you have any on that. It

2976

1 was done on schedule and below budget, so it was a
2 very successful activity. Some of the monitoring
3 that we've done before and after the addition of
4 the bentonite have shown that we have, from the
5 monitoring we have shown that the radon emissions
6 from the silos have decreased approximately 99
7 percent and the radiation levels on the silo dome
8 have decreased approximately 95 percent. Based on
9 those results, it's been very successful.

10 The decant sump tank was a removal
11 action which involved removal of some contaminated
12 water in the sump tank below the silo, and that
13 removal action was completed in April of last
14 year.

15 Waste Pit 6, this removal action was
16 completed in December of 1990, and it involved the
17 covering of the residues in Pit 6 to reduce
18 fugitive air emissions. Like I said, that was
19 completed in December of '90.

20 Plant 1 Pad continuing release
21 removal action is ongoing right now. There's a
22 picture of the Plant 1 Pad. I believe that picture
23 is about two months old. This removal action has
24 been broken into three phases.

1 Phase I, which involved the run-on
2 and runoff controls of the pad, was completed in
3 January of this year, which was ahead of schedule.
4 Part II of this action included construction of
5 some more covered facilities on the western side of
6 the pad, and Phase III involved the complete pad
7 renovation, and both of those phases are on
8 schedule right now.

9 The inactive flyash pile controls,
10 this was a removal action which has been completed
11 since our last meeting. The action involved
12 restriction of access to an area which is in
13 Operable Unit 2 to control the personnel, to
14 control personnel from entering the area. It's
15 been posted with signs and controlled through a
16 fenced barrier. This action was completed in
17 December of this year.

18 Removal of waste inventories. This
19 is an ongoing activity. Under our Consent
20 Agreement we agreed to submit procedures to EPA
21 this year, which we did in August. And I have a
22 slide on that, Chris. Talked a little bit the last
23 time about our waste shipments from the site over
24 the years. What this slide shows here is our goals

1 for fiscal year 1992 compared to what we did in
2 1991. As you can see, we exceeded our goals for
3 1991, and we have an aggressive step-up this year
4 in '92 to meet a 100,000 drum equivalence of waste
5 shipped off-site. We have to date shipped
6 approximately 32,000 drum equivalence, and that is
7 on schedule for meeting that 100,000 drum
8 equivalent goal. Also included, the footnote at
9 the bottom there, we are trying to subcontract to
10 ship off an additional 50,000 drum equivalence this
11 year.

12 The next project is the Pit 5
13 experimental treatment facility. This removal
14 action involves the demolition and decontamination
15 of an old greenhouse-type treatment facility which
16 was located near Pit 5, which was used as an
17 experimental building to dry some of the Pit 5
18 waste. Over the years it had become very
19 deteriorated, and this is an action that's going to
20 involve removing a facility. Today we're about 75
21 percent complete on that activity and it's on
22 schedule.

23 Safe Shutdown. This, similar to the
24 removal of waste inventories, is an ongoing program

1 at the site. We have submitted procedures to EPA.
2 We did have a community round table on the safe
3 shutdown program, I believe about a month ago, and
4 this program involves the cleanout of and
5 decontamination of some equipment that was formerly
6 used in production, and essentially is getting the
7 facilities ready for the D&D program or safe state
8 for demolition or decontamination.

9 Expedited Silo 3 Dust Collector.

10 This was an activity that was identified I believe
11 in December of this year. There were some
12 deteriorated portions of this dust collector which
13 had some exposed material identified. We took an
14 action to go out and remove the dust collector from
15 the top of Silo 3 and package it for shipment to
16 NTS. That activity was completed in January of
17 this year. So you will no longer see a dust
18 collector on Silo 3.

19 The uranyl nitrate stabilization. I
20 spoke a little bit about that the last time. It is
21 an activity which is going to involve the removal
22 of some uranyl nitrate from a storage tank on-site
23 to process it to a safer condition. Activities
24 that have taken place in the last few months, we

2976

1 did a complete systems evaluation and integrity
2 test of all the systems that are going to be used
3 to process this material. That was initiated in
4 December and completed this month. Following some
5 final safety reviews and safety checks, this
6 activity will be initiated, and we'll notify you
7 prior to start-up of that activity.

8 Now, for some planned removal
9 actions, these are some that are either in the work
10 plan stage, being commented on by EPA, or are
11 planned to be submitted to EPA very soon. The
12 active flyash pile, this was a project that
13 involved -- it's going to involve the collection of
14 runoff or the control of erosion and air emissions
15 from the active flyash pile. This removal action
16 work plan was submitted to EPA February 18th of
17 this year, which was about two weeks ahead of
18 schedule. It's being reviewed by EPA right now.

19 The Plant 1 ore silos involves the
20 decontamination/demolition of some silos south of
21 Plant 1. This removal action work plan was
22 submitted to EPA in January. We did receive some
23 comments very recently and we're revising that
24 plan, and it will be resubmitted to EPA in March of

2976

1 this year.

2 The contaminated soils adjacent to
3 the sewage treatment plant incinerator, this
4 project involves the characterization and possible
5 removal of some contaminated soils near the sewage
6 treatment plant incinerator, which is on the
7 eastern side of the site. The work plan for this
8 activity was submitted to EPA in January. We have
9 received comments and we're revising the plan based
10 on those comments. That will go back to EPA in
11 March of this year.

12 Scrap metal piles, this involves the
13 segregation, possible processing of scrap metal
14 on-site through a subcontract. It will also
15 involve some containerization of some scrap copper
16 on-site. This work plan was submitted to EPA at
17 the end of January. It's being reviewed by EPA
18 now. I think comments are due back next week.

19 The next three activities on the
20 chart here are all planned. We have work plans due
21 to EPA in the next month. The collection of
22 production runoff. Runoff from production area is
23 a removal action that is going to address the
24 collection into our stormwater retention basin of

2976

1 any areas in the production area which are not
2 currently being collected, and this removal action
3 is due to EPA March 2nd, and we will get it to them
4 next week.

5 Improved storage of soil and debris
6 addresses the piles of soil and contaminated
7 construction level that we have around the site.
8 We're looking at ways to control runoff, possibly
9 provide some covered storage for those areas, and
10 this work plan will be submitted to EPA on the 25th
11 of next month.

12 And controlling of the exposed
13 material in Pit 5, similar to what we did in Pit 6,
14 we're looking at ways to reduce any possible
15 fugitive emissions from Pit 5. May involve a
16 cover, may involve raising the water levels similar
17 to what we did in Pit 6, and this work plan is due
18 to EPA at the end of next month, I believe March
19 30th.

20 The Phase 3 removal actions, we are
21 required under our Consent Agreement with US EPA to
22 provide annual updates or annual additional removal
23 actions at the site. This is the list that went in
24 January 15th of this year. We just got approval of

1 this list today. We're developing work plans --
2 I'll quickly go through the due dates of the work
3 plans and I can discuss the contents of them at the
4 next meeting.

5 Waste pit area containment
6 improvement involves containment of some
7 contaminants in the waste pit area. This work plan
8 is due to EPA on August 31st of this year.

9 The inactive flyash pile, phase 2,
10 we'll be looking at if there are any additional
11 controls needed. In the inactive flyash pile area
12 we have identified some hot areas of contamination,
13 small localized areas in the inactive flyash pile
14 that we'll be looking at. This work plan is due to
15 EPA June 30th of this year.

16 The pilot plant sump, we're looking
17 at some activities to renovate or remove an old
18 sump in the pilot plant. This work plan is due to
19 be submitted to EPA July 31st of this year.

20 The nitric acid tank car and area
21 involves an old abandoned railroad car on the
22 northern portion of the site which contains some
23 nitric acid. We will be addressing what controls
24 are needed in that area, and that's due to EPA

2976

1 October 30th of this year.

2 Asbestos removal. We're going to be
3 documenting our existing asbestos program,
4 submitting the procedures to EPA for their review
5 and approval. This is due to them on May 19th of
6 this year.

7 And the final one on the sheet
8 involves the management of contaminated structures
9 at the site. This is going to be another EE/CA
10 document. I think if you're familiar with some of
11 the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis
12 documents we've done for some of the other removal
13 actions, this is going to look at some of the --
14 it's going to look and outline how we're going to
15 D&D buildings at the site, give a general framework
16 of how we're going to do that, to conduct the D&D
17 on the facilities, and then we'll be submitting
18 specific work plans for each facility.

19 That's all I have. I'll be happy to
20 answer questions either at the break or during the
21 question and answer period.

22 MR. WESTERBECK: Now we move into
23 the portion of the program where we have comments
24 from the US EPA, Ohio EPA, and FRESH. US EPA

1 first, Jim Saric.

2 MR. SARIC: I'm going to keep this
3 real short as much as I can. As you probably have
4 seen by what Jack went over, there's a lot of
5 activities going on at the site right now, a lot of
6 removal actions, I counted 25, and it seems like
7 every time I get another letter from the folks from
8 the DOE asking to add another two or three more
9 that they want to do, which is great, because I
10 think that what we want to do is have the shorter
11 term actions or immediate actions which are going
12 to show some type of activity at the site, some
13 type of progress.

14 At EPA we spend a lot of time talking
15 to DOE a lot, meeting with them at a lot of
16 meetings, and try to keep them on their toes as far
17 as what they're doing and making sure things are
18 getting done and we're moving on with cleanup.
19 From the EPA standpoint that's what we want to see
20 and I think that's what the people here want to
21 see.

22 I want to be clear here that we're
23 doing a lot of things, and you can look at the back
24 of the room and you can see a lot of removal

1 actions. I really recommend if you haven't seen in
2 the back the K-65 silo removal action video that
3 they have in the back, I think that's an excellent
4 example of one of the removal actions that went on,
5 and it's really neat to see how the actual progress
6 went on with that project. Take a look at that.

7 Generally, you know, we at EPA, we're
8 also concerned, as a lot of the citizens are,
9 regarding the new contract, the ERMC contract, and
10 we're going to keep with DOE with this but we're
11 going to try to ensure and be confident that
12 although it may be a difficult transition time,
13 that we think we can work and we're going to work
14 with the new contractor and DOE to ensure that
15 there is a smooth transition, that deadlines are
16 met. We're going to stay on them for that, and I
17 think that's very important. We'll be behind
18 everyone, keeping track of that.

19 Finally, the supplemental
20 environmental projects, I talked with some of the
21 citizens regarding a river cleanup based on a lot
22 of public comments that came forward and some other
23 activities, and we're trying to finalize those with
24 DOE and look into some final things, and hopefully

1 activity will go on during the summer.

2 If you have any questions, I'll stick
3 around after the meeting when everyone else gets
4 done. Please feel free to come up and ask me
5 anything you have any problems with. Thanks.

6 MR. WESTERBECK: Thank you. Graham
7 Mitchell from the Ohio EPA.

8 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. I
9 guess the best news is that progress is occurring,
10 as both Jim and Jack have said, progress is
11 occurring on the site. Removal actions and RI/FS
12 activities are moving along on schedule. Over 25
13 removal actions have been identified. Technical
14 disagreements that we have with DOE and their
15 contractors are negotiated and resolved in a
16 cooperative manner that should result in the best
17 cleanup.

18 As also Jim stated, we are still
19 concerned about the transition process with ERMC.
20 We're hoping that will go smoothly. We're hoping
21 that DOE is taking all the proper steps to ensure a
22 smooth transition. As a point of clarification, I
23 want to make sure that the citizens are aware that
24 Ohio EPA is not involved in the ERMC selection.

2976

1 That's basically a -- it's strictly a DOE decision
2 that will be made.

3 At the last public meeting a
4 commitment was made -- this is getting a little bit
5 off on an associated area -- but a commitment was
6 made to hold a public meeting on the Paddy's Run
7 Road site. The Paddy's Run Road site is the
8 facility, the two industrial facilities to the
9 south of Fernald or to the south of the DOE
10 facility on Paddy's Run Road. That meeting will be
11 held on Tuesday, March 31st, at 7:00 at the Ross
12 High School. In addition, a fact sheet has been
13 prepared and some of you should have already gotten
14 that in the mail, including notification of this
15 meeting. If you do not have that fact sheet and
16 are interested in one, the site coordinator for
17 that is Donna Bohannon and she is here tonight. If
18 you could stand up Donna. You can see her for a
19 copy of the fact sheet and if you have any
20 questions, she will be available after the meeting
21 to answer any particular questions. We're shooting
22 for the main bulk of the public participation to be
23 on the March 31st meeting.

24 Also with me tonight are Tom.

2976

1 Schneider with Ohio EPA. Tom works on this site.
2 And also Jane Paft, Jane if you could stand up.
3 Jane is with our Public Information Center in
4 Columbus, and she is going to be working on public
5 relations meetings issues in the Southwest
6 District, so you will be seeing her associated with
7 this site. You'll also be seeing her, she will be
8 chairing the meeting on the 31st of March for the
9 Paddy's Run Road meeting.

10 As usual, we're here to answer your
11 questions tonight. If you have any of those during
12 the question and answer session, we would be glad
13 to answer those or after the meeting. Thank you
14 very much.

15 MR. WESTERBECK: Lisa. Lisa
16 Crawford from FRESH.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, but I ain't
18 coming up there. I'll stay back here, that way you
19 can't throw anything at me. I have quite a few
20 things.

21 First thing I wanted to talk a little
22 bit about was the Environmental Monitoring Report.
23 It looks a lot better this year. I was more
24 pleased with it than I ever have been before except

1 it took way too long for it to get here. One year
2 and one month to me is too long. If I turned in my
3 yearly report a year and a month later, they would
4 have fired me a long time ago. Mine is always due
5 by the end of January.

6 I also appreciate Linda England's
7 willingness to come to our FRESH meeting Thursday
8 night and explain it and answer some of our real
9 specific questions.

10 One of the things I'm real concerned
11 about is over 300 of those were mailed at 4.10
12 each, \$4.10 each, which adds up to, and I added it
13 up somewhere, like 1,300 and some dollars, and we
14 talked about this at our corporate meeting the
15 other night and said we would have rather you sent
16 us a 19 cent postcard that said the EMR for 1990 is
17 in the PEIC, and it would have saved you guys a lot
18 of money. Since I am a taxpayer, I tend to think
19 about taxpayers' money, and 1,300 some dollars to
20 me is a whole lot of money. In the future I would
21 like to see you not spend \$1,300 to send 300 of
22 these out. Just stack them up in the PEIC and
23 announce it or send a postcard or whatever.

24 The second thing I want to talk about

1 is the RFP, because the bids are due on Thursday.
2 I'm having a real problem understanding the RFP
3 process, and I have talked to Jerry Westerbeck
4 about this and I have talked to some other people
5 around the country about it, and I'm concerned
6 because there's no part in this whole process for
7 public participation anywhere. One of the first
8 things I'd like to ask is that -- I know the bids
9 are due Thursday, so I think a week or the end of
10 next week would be plenty of, sufficient amount of
11 time, I would like to know everybody who has bid on
12 that contract. I think people who live in this
13 community, people who are dealing with this issue
14 on a day-to-day basis deserve to know what's
15 happening, who's bidding, what they're asking, what
16 they're talking about in their bid.

17 I'm real disappointed that nowhere in
18 here -- Jerry, you talked a little bit earlier
19 about how everybody puts their bids in and then the
20 next thing they look at them all and they rank
21 them, and then you get a short list. When the
22 short list comes out, I, and I guess everybody else
23 in this room, would like to know who those three,
24 six, eight, however many people there are. In a

2976

1 real timely manner we would like to know who those
2 people on the short list are.

3 Then it's my understanding they go
4 into negotiations with these people, which is
5 fine. But, before that final step of actually
6 naming who this new contractor is, I believe that
7 there should be someplace in there between those
8 two points that the community gets to hear who's up
9 for it and comment on these companies. You know,
10 some companies don't have a good track record, we
11 know that, we've done our homework. Some companies
12 are going to be bidding on this contract who know
13 zilch about the industry out here. I'm asking you
14 tonight for some public participation in this
15 process. If I don't get what I want here, I'll
16 guarantee you I'm going to keep going. If I have
17 to go all the way to the Alamo, I will, because I'm
18 very concerned with the way this issue is being
19 handled out here.

20 When we were doing the draft RFP,
21 everybody's comments were placed in the Public
22 Information Center, and I don't see why the same
23 kind of public participation can't be held
24 throughout this whole entire process. I have 50

2976

1 bucks laying on the table that we won't have a new
2 contractor by June 1st. I hope I'm wrong, but I
3 have \$50 that says I'm not. You gave them two
4 extra weeks to get their bids in, and I just don't
5 see how in the world you're ever going to meet this
6 June 1st deadline. Hopefully it will be done with
7 a lot of thought and a lot of care and a whole lot
8 of research on the backgrounds and qualifications
9 of these companies.

10 It's my understanding and I heard
11 today that Westinghouse has now been asked to stay
12 on three additional months until the end of
13 November of this year, and I didn't hear anybody
14 mention that earlier and I would just like to know
15 if that's true or not.

16 Since my last little tizzy fit, as I
17 like to call it, at the public meeting last year
18 the way the bidders were harassing us and making
19 promises in the community that we knew they
20 couldn't keep, things have quieted down a little
21 bit.

22 One of the third issues is the --
23 there's a report outlined called the PEIS
24 implementation plan, the draft implementation

1 plan. If you look at the inside of it, they're
2 going to hold some workshops around the country, I
3 think there's five of them altogether. Don't worry
4 about it, it's all right, I dropped things all day
5 long today. And I was real disappointed when I
6 opened this up and found nowhere in Ohio is there
7 going to be a workshop, nowhere. Ohio is the only
8 state in the country that has five DOE sites in the
9 country, five. No other state has five, and yet
10 the closest workshop is in Atlanta or Washington,
11 DC, which is totally unrealistic for any of us to
12 possibly be able to get there to participate in
13 again what is public participation.

14 It's my understanding in talking with
15 Mr. Sohngen and Mr. Bauer of the DOE headquarters,
16 who are implementing this whole process, that
17 Cincinnati was actually on the third cut list, but
18 that word between headquarters and our DOE site
19 came back to them that there was no interest in
20 Cincinnati regarding the PEIS process, which highly
21 concerns me. When the PEIS hearing was held here a
22 year ago January, I forget the exact number, but we
23 had well over a hundred people testify that day.
24 If that doesn't prove there's interest in

2976

1 Cincinnati regarding the PEIS process, I don't know
2 where in the hell you're going to find anymore
3 interest than that. I urge you to talk to
4 headquarters and see that Cincinnati's name be put
5 back on this list and see that a workshop be held
6 in Cincinnati through a national organization.

7 We actually wrote Mr. Sohngen, and I
8 can't pronounce his name correctly, it's spelled
9 kind of weird too, and Mr. Bauer, we wrote them a
10 letter on behalf of well over 50 organizations
11 across this country telling them they needed to add
12 at least seven more workshops, and we were totally
13 shot down and told no. I would like to see
14 somebody from this site talk to somebody at
15 headquarters and tell Mr. Sohngen and Mr. Bauer
16 that we should not have been cut from that list,
17 not when Ohio has five damn DOE sites, that is not
18 fair. And there is a lot of interest here in the
19 PEIS.

20 I'm going to need Graham Mitchell to
21 help me with this one. Nobody talked about this
22 tonight and maybe I missed it, but it's my
23 understanding that there's been a violation; is
24 that correct?

1 MR. MITCHELL: Well, do you want me
2 to discuss that now?

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, I think people
4 need to know that we have a violation on the
5 records here.

6 MR. MITCHELL: Basically through the
7 record groundwater monitoring program that DOE is
8 required to submit annual reports on their
9 progress. And through the groundwater people in
10 the Southwest District office, they've been
11 reviewing that report, they came up with some
12 concerns with, what they're referring to as
13 violation, in a lot of ways they are basically
14 deficient in the report. DOE has not failed to do
15 something, we just don't believe they have done it
16 to the fullest extent. Most of these are part of
17 the determining rate and transport of the
18 groundwater contamination, and the main issue here
19 is pump test, conduction of pump tests in various
20 locations in the groundwater on and around the
21 Fernald site. That's the main issue that has
22 resulted here. We have meeting this week in the
23 Southwest District office on Thursday to resolve
24 this issue, and I think it's going to be resolved

1 successfully. That's all I can say about that at
2 this point.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: I just felt like
4 people should know there was a problem. I'm almost
5 done.

6 I'm beginning to get a little bit
7 concerned about some of the top level Westinghouse
8 people being pulled out of here. It concerns us
9 that top level people are going to go and other
10 people are moving up and move up and they're going
11 to keep moving them all around and maybe things
12 aren't going to get done, maybe there isn't going
13 to be enough people and people who know exactly
14 what it is they are doing. Westinghouse has made a
15 commitment to extend their contract and stay here.
16 I think they need to look real seriously at
17 following through and following through on their
18 commitment.

19 I would like to know if we have a
20 status on our new PR person, and when the process
21 begins, I would like to volunteer to be one of the
22 people who sits on the interview panel to make sure
23 we get the right person.

24 In some of the presentations tonight

1 up on the board I saw the word "subcontractor"
2 several times and that scares me a little bit. We
3 have a lot of workers on this site, a lot of
4 laid-off workers have been called back. I feel
5 like a lot of things are subcontracted out that
6 don't need to be subcontracted out, that some of
7 the workers could be doing. I'm a union worker and
8 where I work we don't like the word subcontractor
9 very well. It takes jobs away from people who
10 originally worked there. I'm sure if it concerns
11 us, it probably concerns the union even more so.
12 I'd like to see the workers do as much of the work
13 on the site as possible. I think in the long run
14 you're going to get a better job and it is going to
15 save you a whole lot of money.

16 The last thing, I hate to revive
17 Lisa's rumor list, but I'm going to have to because
18 I've got a doozy here, and this one came in this
19 afternoon. I don't even think it's a rumor, but
20 I'll put it on Lisa's rumor list anyway. It's my
21 understanding that Pennsylvania Drilling Company,
22 who is a subsidiary or whatever you want to call it
23 of ASI/IT, that the drillers, the guys who actually
24 drill the well and take the samples and do all that

1 great stuff, that they were actually caught last
2 Saturday afternoon with alcohol in a controlled
3 area while they were working, and that ASI was the
4 one supposedly overseeing and supervising these
5 folks.

6 I'm concerned because I want to know
7 if when you're drunk and you're drinking alcohol on
8 the job if you're doing a competent job, if you're
9 getting correct samples and they're precise and you
10 know exactly what it is you're supposed to be doing
11 to those samples, because those samples are what
12 makes up that great big fat EMR, and it sends a
13 message to me that sends a red flag off that says
14 are they right, are the samples being collected
15 properly, are they being done right, and are we
16 getting correct and pertinent results. We talked
17 about alcohol at meetings before and it's scary.
18 Because, you know, you're not supposed to be
19 drinking on the job, and you're certainly not
20 supposed to be drinking out in the field working in
21 a controlled area.

22 I would like to see this as some type
23 of an unusual incident report on this issue. I
24 think ASI/IT has found themselves in some problems

1 here lately, with the Inspector General, with their
2 audits, and a whole lot of other things to add fuel
3 to the fire. It sends messages to the community
4 you have incompetent people on the job drinking
5 alcohol on the job and maybe not doing the work
6 correctly.

7 One of the other things that I feel
8 very strongly about, it's my understanding that
9 there's been \$1,000,000 spent on training our work
10 force out here, training the current workers.
11 That's a lot of money. These guys have been
12 trained, they're supposedly being sent out to
13 Findlay and all these workshops around the country
14 and everything. They need to be doing the jobs,
15 not all these other piddling little subcontractor
16 people. You have workers there, put them to work
17 and let them earn their money.

18 The last thing I want to add on
19 FRESH's rumor list or Lisa's rumor list is there's
20 been a couple of people out and about in the
21 community talking about how rich we're all getting
22 from doing this kind of work out there, how those
23 ladies in FRESH have earned a tremendous amount of
24 money doing this. I'm here to tell you we haven't

1 earned any money. We live off of a shoestring
2 budget, and there's been times when I wondered if
3 we shouldn't be getting government contracts, it
4 seems like that's where to go right now to get all
5 the money. They're Westinghouse employees, and I
6 am just here to send them a clear message tonight
7 that Lisa Crawford and none of the FRESH women have
8 gotten rich off what is being done here. It's all
9 volunteer, nobody gets paid. What little bit of
10 money we do have we spend on everything that you
11 can think of from telephone calls to xeroxing to
12 things like that. Everybody pays their own way in
13 this organization. And it really hurt my feelings,
14 to say the least.

15 I want to make sure that's all I
16 had. I want to talk to somebody about the RFP
17 stuff, I want some real clear-cut answers on that.
18 Thanks.

19 MR. WESTERBECK: Thank you, Lisa.
20 Now let's take about a 15-minute break and then
21 we'll come back to questions and answers, and
22 please if you have cards that you've written
23 questions down on, please bring them forward or you
24 can use your card and read your own question at the

2976

1 mike, however you choose. Thank you.

2 (Brief recess.)

3 MR. WESTERBECK: If you all could
4 take your seats, we'll get started on the questions
5 and answers. Do we have any other questions to be
6 submitted on the cards?

7 Let's get started with the
8 questions. If you would, whenever you have a
9 question, please come to a microphone that has been
10 placed out in the audience.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
12 question about when you were discussing the drum
13 equivalents that are waste that are shipped
14 off-site. What is the distribution, where are they
15 shipped, when are they shipped, and how are they
16 stored when they arrive there?

17 MR. CRAIG: The drums of waste
18 material that I talked about are shipped to the
19 Nevada test site. They're shipped in drums and
20 they're shipped by semi or truck and they're
21 buried.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there a
23 permit procedure? Because I know some of the stuff
24 is shipped by rail car I believe by industry -- I'm

1 from Nebraska, the Midwest, and the state there has
2 a permit procedure. What type of procedure do you
3 have to go through?

4 MR. CRAIG: The Nevada test site has
5 a permit.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But as to the
7 shipping procedure, is there a shipping procedure?

8 MR. CRAIG: I'm not sure I'm the
9 right one to answer that.

10 MR. TILLER: Nevada specifies the
11 requirements for packaging and receipt of those,
12 and they clearly meet all the DOE regulations,
13 every one.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have just a
16 couple of quick questions. What are the
17 contaminants in the soil around the sewage
18 treatment plant?

19 MR. CRAIG: The major contaminants
20 are uranium. We're going to be doing some
21 additional sampling before removing any soil out
22 there. I think predominantly -- maybe some of the
23 OU-3 people -- Rob, is there anything we're looking
24 for?

1 MR. JANKE: The primary nuclide is
2 uranium and uranium 238. There's also some
3 elevated levels of radium, and we also see some
4 elevated levels of thorium I believe, but it's
5 primarily uranium 238.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How did those
7 wastes get there?

8 MR. JANKE: Well, through the
9 operation of the incinerator at the sewage
10 treatment plant, a little small incinerator there.
11 They burned contaminated trash over the years, and
12 this deposited over the area from the air.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that the
14 same way the flyash was contaminated by?

15 MR. JANKE: No. The flyash -- I
16 believe Johnny Reising, who is the Operable Unit 2
17 manager, the flyash is contaminated with low levels
18 of heavy metals and stuff just by virtue of the
19 fact it's dug up from the ground and burned and
20 those heavy metals stay in it.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All flyash
22 has that component?

23 MR. JANKE: Correct.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's

1 nothing unusual in terms of the site here?

2 MR. JANKE: No. That flyash is
3 nothing different from flyash you would find from
4 Cincinnati Gas & Electric.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So when hot
6 spots were mentioned this evening, you weren't
7 talking about hot radioactive spots?

8 MR. JANKE: That's become
9 contaminated with the flyash through operation in
10 that region. It's caused the flyash to become
11 contaminated. It's not just by virtue of the
12 flyash. In other words, the flyash would generate
13 from burning coal in the boiler. You didn't burn
14 things that were contaminated in the boiler. That
15 flyash was taken from the boiler plant down to the
16 Southfield to be disposed of, and it got
17 contaminated down there because there were other
18 things through the air.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The silo,
20 number 3, I knew about silo number 1 and 2, and
21 having never known about silo 3 and 4, what they
22 were used for, in fact I thought they had not been
23 used at all, but this evening you talked about a
24 dust collector and I guess it was thorium that was

2976

1 found in the dust collector?

2 MR. CRAIG: There was some thorium
3 metal residues which are intermittent through the
4 material in silo 3.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What was silo
6 3 used for?

7 MR. CRAIG: It's another storage
8 location for some waste, which is in a different
9 form than that in 1 and 2. It's this dry powdery,
10 calcite material that was put in there for storage.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uranium?

12 MR. CRAIG: Uranium and some
13 thorium, very little uranium. Silo 4 has never
14 been used.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And lastly,
16 I've been really interested to know what the
17 incline drilling under the silos 1 and 2 has shown
18 in terms of groundwater contamination, and on that
19 same line, I would like to know what groundwater
20 under some of the pits may show in terms of have
21 you done any incline drilling under the pits, and,
22 if not, why not? What do you know about movement
23 of groundwater under the pits, particularly the
24 underlying pits?

2976

1 MR. CRAIG: Under the K-65 silos,
2 the analysis of those samples has been completed.
3 That's going through a validation process now. We
4 should have some initial results in the next few
5 months of what is there, whether it be perched
6 groundwater, contaminated soil, or whatever. We
7 didn't do any borings underneath the waste pits.
8 We do have monitoring wells in the waste pit area,
9 and they have shown some levels of contamination
10 which we believe are attributable to the waste
11 pits, so we have seen what we think is some leakage
12 from the waste pit area.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that
14 contamination still within perched water bodies?

15 MR. CRAIG: We have found some in
16 the waste pit area.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Into the
18 underlying pits?

19 MR. CRAIG: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what are
21 you finding there?

22 MR. CRAIG: Contaminants?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

24 MR. CRAIG: Primarily uranium. I'm

1 not sure what the levels are we found out there,
2 but it is I think upwards nearly 200 parts per
3 billion of uranium in the waste pit area.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Way above
5 background.

6 MR. CRAIG: Yes.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: Jack, can you talk
9 about -- when you talked about validation, the
10 samples were sent, the samples are done, the
11 results have come back, when you talk about
12 validation, what do you mean?

13 MR. CRAIG: Well, it's a process
14 that's required to go through before the
15 information that we're getting can be used to make
16 decisions on for remediation. What really is the
17 process, it really involves looking at the
18 documentation that exists, how the sample is taken,
19 was it taken by trained people, did they follow
20 procedures, was it sent to a lab that was approved,
21 did the lab use the correct procedures, did the lab
22 use people that were trained to analyze the
23 samples, do we have all the documentation back from
24 the lab for each of the samples we said we were

1 going to take? Looking at the results of the 2976
2 sample, does it make sense, do we have reasonable
3 data that looks consistent? It's a process that we
4 go through to make sure the data is adequate. It's
5 been historically taking about a month to validate
6 a piece of data.

7 I have a written question here. What
8 happens to scrap metal and other contaminated
9 material that are being disposed of? Do you have
10 to crush them into bales?

11 Like I said, the drums of waste that
12 are shipped off-site are shipped off in drums.
13 There is some refuse scrap material that has been
14 shipped off-site in containers that is not
15 compacted. This is material that has no
16 reclaimable value, some of the scrap metal we have
17 on-site that will be addressed through the removal
18 action. We're looking at possible recycle of that
19 material and possibly decontaminating it through
20 some type of a high steam spray or some other
21 method to decontaminate the metal and possibly
22 reuse it. It's going to the Nevada test site if
23 it's shipped off-site as waste.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question

1 concerns about the RFP, why was it extended for two
2 more weeks?

3 MR. TILLER: One of the reasons and
4 one of the primary reasons were the number of
5 questions that were submitted during the question
6 and answer period.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You've had a
8 question and answer period with these companies
9 already or just what was on paper?

10 MR. TILLER: There was a public
11 comment period on the draft RFP. These were
12 considered and through the RFP that was issued, and
13 then potential offerors are allowed to submit
14 questions of clarification so they have a better
15 understanding of what the intent of the RFP was,
16 and there were a number of those questions that had
17 to be considered and answered and those answers
18 provided, yes. If an offeror asked a question,
19 that question and the answer was provided to all
20 offerors.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is them
22 if you want to see them.

23 MR. TILLER: It took a while.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Most of the questions

1 were about money. I read it. I mean, seriously,
2 most of the questions were about how are we going
3 to get paid, how long will it take.

4 MR. TILLER: Reimbursements, what's
5 accountable.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: It was about money.

7 MR. TILLER: Yeah.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jack, you
9 mentioned an old rail car that had nitric acid in
10 it. What do you plan to do with that and how will
11 that rail car be decontaminated, or can it be
12 decontaminated?

13 MR. CRAIG: I feel it can be. We
14 have a written work plan to submit to EPA on that.
15 I'm not sure what we're going to do on that yet.
16 There will be some activity outlined in our work
17 plan. I don't know -- Rob, do you want to address
18 that? I'm not sure we know yet.

19 MR. JANKE: I think we're looking
20 into it. Like you said, we have a date that we
21 propose to the EPA that we accepted on when we
22 would submit the work plan. Right now we're
23 scoping it out in terms of cleaning it up and the
24 area surrounding the rail car, but I don't think we

2976

1 have any definitive information on that right now.

2 MR. CRAIG: It will probably involve
3 removal of any material or sludges in the tank car,
4 sampling of any soils around the tank car, removing
5 them if need be.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: So in the meantime it
7 just kind of sits there until a decision is made?

8 MR. JANKE: Quite honestly, until we
9 can get the team that is working on writing the
10 work plan to develop it. There is, I think as
11 Graham and Jim pointed out and Jack did in his
12 presentation, we've got over 25 removal actions
13 along with all the RI/FS activities, and it's
14 tough, you sort of have to prioritize activities
15 and go with them as you can.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: It's okay that it
17 sits there and it's not causing imminent danger?

18 MR. JANKE: Right. We know it's not
19 leaking. It's an activity that we want to show
20 progress on in the site. It's an activity that we
21 feel that can be tackled and progress can be shown,
22 but it's not an imminent threat to the
23 environment.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What I want

1 to ask about is what is the difference between
2 inactive flyash pile and active flyash pile?

3 MR. CRAIG: Well, we have two flyash
4 piles, like I said, one is inactive which was
5 historically used and closed and it's been covered
6 with soil, it's no longer used. We have an active
7 flyash pile which we use today which we deposit our
8 flyash on from our coal fire boiler, so we use
9 that, we deposit flyash on that weekly. So one is
10 covered and one is uncovered.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now, on the
12 removal action number 8, the inactive flyash pile,
13 the other Southfield disposal area -- well, anyway,
14 it's radiologically surface contamination in the
15 inactive flyash pile. Okay. So you restrict the
16 area by not letting people come into that area, but
17 then when the wind is coming, you spray water on
18 it.

19 MR. CRAIG: That's the active flyash
20 pile.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're also
22 using that with the inactive, that's why -- wait a
23 minute -- well, anyway, what I'm trying to get at
24 is still you're putting water on this. It is, the

2976

1 contamination is going -- the water is taking it
2 down into the groundwater, and you're leaving it
3 there right now, you just mark them off as
4 restricted areas. You're not removing the flyash,
5 you're not doing anything with it. So while it's
6 sitting there and water is being put on it, it's
7 still putting contaminants into the ground.

8 MR. CRAIG: To my knowledge, we are
9 not adding water to the inactive flyash pile. That
10 area is covered with soil. There's no need to
11 spray water on it to control erosion. The active
12 flyash pile we are, and that's because it's
13 uncovered. The material is a light material.
14 Water is sprayed on that intermittently, I think
15 it's weekly, just to make sure a crust builds up on
16 top of it so the stuff doesn't blow with the wind.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you get
18 your water treatment plant going, are you still
19 going to leave those piles there and continue the
20 water squirting and continue the contamination into
21 the groundwater and have a complete vicious cycle
22 of pumping it out, putting it back in, pumping it
23 out, putting it back in? Do you know what I mean?

24 MR. CRAIG: There's not a whole lot

1 of water put on the flyash pile to control the
2 emissions. I'm not sure how it's monitored. There
3 are monitoring wells in the area, and I would
4 suspect that very little, if any, of that water
5 goes through the flyash and gets down into the
6 ground. You're talking about a very large pile and
7 that kind of material kind of soaks up water
8 anyway.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But I'm not
10 talking about only the water that gets squirted on
11 it, I'm talking about rain water.

12 MR. CRAIG: Erosion?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

14 MR. CRAIG: We're looking at -- as
15 the removal action says, we're looking at ways to
16 control runoff and erosion both from water and
17 wind, and your question is whether or not that
18 water can be treated?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, no, the
20 main thing is are you going to leave those piles
21 lay there and constantly be feeding contamination
22 into the water, you know, where you're going to
23 have the pumping station and you're going to be
24 cleaning the water, treating it, but still you're

1 going to have that constant cycle of contamination
2 going into the ground.

3 MR. CRAIG: Well, in the new removal
4 action our objective is to structure it so we're
5 not going to be adding any more water to it. There
6 will be rain water and so forth fall on the flyash
7 pile, but hopefully through the controls we put in
8 the removal action work plan, which is number 10,
9 we'll control most of the runoff so those
10 contaminants, if any, in the pile don't go into the
11 ground near the flyash pile. That's one of the
12 objectives of doing the removal action. That water
13 is not planned to be collected and then sent
14 through the treatment system of the plant.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another
16 thing, your Fernald Project Cleanup Report was
17 really great this month.

18 MR. CRAIG: Johnny, you have
19 something to add?

20 MR. REISING: I think to clarify the
21 removal action, as one of the interim actions
22 announced as part of the definitive actions of that
23 removal action is to put a surfactant or a polymer
24 spray on the inactive portion of the flyash pile at

1 the flyash pile -- I know that sounds redundant --
2 and side slopes. So we're going to greatly reduce
3 the active area which should effectively in the
4 process reduce the amount of surface area where
5 you're going to have precipitation and potential
6 infiltration. So we are addressing that and trying
7 to reduce the amount.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you going
9 to do something so that the wind don't blow it
10 across the road again like it did last year?

11 MR. REISING: That's correct. As
12 mentioned previously, we are going to be putting a
13 polymer on the side slopes to greatly reduce the
14 potential of the wind blowing it, and a wind screen
15 or a wind barrier around the top of it also.
16 There's a number of different activities taking
17 place to greatly reduce the possibility of that
18 happening again.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Six months
20 from now, a year from now, two years from now, or
21 when?

22 MR. REISING: We're due to have an
23 interactivity probably by June 30th of this year to
24 inactivate the main portion of the pile and put on

1 the foam polymer.

2976

2 MR. CRAIG: There is a copy of that
3 work plan, if you're interested, in the
4 Administrative Record to review.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who do I talk
6 to about getting specific answers to my questions
7 that I have about past things rather than what's
8 going on now?

9 MR. WESTERBECK: Well, go ahead and
10 ask your question and if we can answer or if
11 there's someone in the audience who can answer --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
13 whole bunch of questions about that and I just
14 wanted to be brief about it. Do I contact you
15 people?

16 MR. WESTERBECK: Okay, yeah. Do you
17 want to submit them to us or do you want to read
18 them and they will be made part of the record and
19 then we can get back to you with the answers?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there a
21 telephone number who I can talk to about that?

22 MR. WESTERBECK: Sure, you can call
23 me at 738-6349.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And your name

1 again?

2976

2 MR. WESTERBECK: Is Jerry
3 Westerbeck.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I have
5 another question. At the very first meeting, I was
6 the fourth person to ask a question, and the people
7 from Oak Ridge said they would work on it and try
8 to get an answer, and the question being down there
9 they have a wind calculator down there to find your
10 airspeed and wind direction, and my question was on
11 the days that they have releases and leaks, I'm
12 sure it was recorded when they have releases and
13 what dates and the air speeds and which direction
14 all that kind of stuff went to. I never heard an
15 answer to that, where the stuff landed and where it
16 went to.

17 MR. WESTERBECK: This was a question
18 back at the meeting a long time ago?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir, the
20 very first one, and the people from Oak Ridge said
21 they would work on that. I never heard an answer,
22 never heard a report, never heard a thing on what
23 happened or where this stuff went to. I heard all
24 the cleanups and this and that, but what happened

1 and when and where did it go?

2976

2 MR. WESTERBECK: Do you remember,
3 was a record made of that meeting?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

5 MR. WESTERBECK: There was, okay. I
6 will commit to -- yes, Linda.

7 MS. ENGLAND: If you want, we can
8 work with the Environmental Monitoring Group and
9 get him the meteorological data from the old
10 environmental reports. We can provide the answers
11 to those questions now without having to really go
12 back and research the old meetings if you would
13 like.

14 MR. WESTERBECK: You just want to
15 know what the meteorological conditions were on the
16 days that releases occurred, correct?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

18 MS. ENGLAND: We can help with that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How far did
20 it go, where did it go, through the 1960's. I
21 don't know exactly --

22 MR. WESTERBECK: When you call me,
23 give me your name obviously, and I'll try to get
24 you as much of the answer to that question as I can

1 and we'll take it from there.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. 2976

3 MS. DASTILLUNG: At the end of the
4 Cleanup Report it talks about you are looking into
5 the feasibility of siting an above-ground
6 storage/disposal facility at the site. Exactly
7 what wastes are you thinking about storing on-site
8 and how much of that are you thinking about storing
9 on-site?

10 MR. CRAIG: For each of the operable
11 units we have to evaluate an on-site storage
12 alternative. We are evaluating an on-site storage
13 alternative, so we're really looking at on-site
14 storage for all the waste, all the operable unit
15 waste, and whether or not it's feasible for DOE to
16 do this will be determined through this study here
17 and also through the feasibility studies of each of
18 the operable units. So we have to look at all the
19 of the waste as an alternative.

20 MS. DASTILLUNG: Is there a priority
21 that you prefer it off-site or do you prefer it
22 on-site at this point in time?

23 MR. CRAIG: I don't know the answer
24 at this point in time, although a decision will be

2976

1 made through the process in the feasibility
2 studies. That's where on-site versus off-site is
3 evaluated. It's evaluated based on a number of
4 criteria.

5 MS. DASTILLUNG: The other question
6 I had is also in the report there's a proposed
7 limit of 20 parts per billion for uranium in
8 drinking water, and you're talking about figuring
9 out a way to meet those levels. Twenty parts per
10 billion is way above background for this area. If
11 it doesn't cost a whole lot more, will DOE try to
12 get the levels all the back down to the background
13 level, or are you going for the least, you know?

14 MR. CRAIG: That's also another
15 thing that is going to have to be decided in the
16 feasibility, but 20 parts per billion is a proposed
17 standard for drinking water. The way they got that
18 standard, as I understand it, is looking at only
19 the drinking water pathway and looking at the risk
20 from that, and our risks, we're looking at all the
21 pathways to the site, whether it be drinking water,
22 eating of food, there's a number of pathways we're
23 looking at. So it may be less than 20 parts per
24 billion. That's going to be decided through the

1 feasibility study. Twenty parts per billion is
2 determined as an applicable, relevant, and
3 appropriate requirement for this, so it will meet
4 the 20 definitely. That's a requirement that we've
5 been given.

6 MS. DASTILLUNG: Can you go lower
7 than that if --

8 MR. CRAIG: It's possible.

9 MS. DASTILLUNG: Or are you only
10 going to go where the limit says, only meet that
11 and no further below?

12 MR. CRAIG: It will all be based on
13 a risk assessment, and whatever number comes out of
14 that, if it's background, it's background, but that
15 will be determined through the feasibility study.

16 MS. DASTILLUNG: But is could be
17 also likely that it would not be back to a
18 background level for this area?

19 MR. CRAIG: I don't know the answer
20 to that. It's likely it may not be, but I don't
21 know the answer to that.

22 MR. MEYER: I'd like to follow up on
23 a point that was made by Lisa earlier this evening,
24 and I think it's a very important point. DOE is

1 about to make what is probably one of the most
2 important decisions that affects this community and
3 that has to do with who is going to succeed
4 Westinghouse as the contractor at the facility, and
5 as I understand it, the DOE is not interested, not
6 willing to accept input from the community on that
7 subject. I am concerned about why the DOE in this
8 most important decision is not willing or
9 interested in taking input from the community?

10 MR. TILLER: Why are you looking at
11 me, Jack?

12 It is not at all true that we are not
13 interested in taking input from the community. The
14 RFP was put out for public comment for anyone to
15 make comments on, on the clarity and what the goals
16 were and what we were trying to do. If you then
17 get with the process of selecting a major US
18 industrial offeror, I would say it has to be a very
19 squeaky clean process and, you know, questions on
20 who's running, who's going to be on the short list,
21 et cetera. I am really familiar with the process
22 as it exists now and as it existed a couple of
23 decades ago. Today DOE management, like myself,
24 has been made virtually immune from influences of

1 those businesses. The people who will make that
2 decision are essentially sequestered. The
3 documentation is kept secure, their deliberations
4 are kept secure, and until they get the
5 recommendations of the Source Selection Official,
6 the short list and the final list, it is kept very
7 structured. It is not in the sense of we have
8 three competitors or four or five and what does the
9 community opinion say.

10 Now I've heard Lisa herself complain
11 that some potential offerors have tried to
12 influence the community, for example. Am I
13 correct, Lisa?

14 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, you are.

15 MR. TILLER: And you thought that
16 was inappropriate.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes.

18 MR. TILLER: They have put together
19 a good proposal on how to manage this thing and be
20 evaluated on an objective basis, and I think that's
21 about all I can say.

22 MR. MEYER: Let me just comment, I
23 think one of the worst ways for Government to make
24 decisions is in a sequestered fashion. I think

1 what you ought to do, as Lisa suggested, and I
2 certainly would like your response to this, why you
3 couldn't provide the community with the names of
4 the companies on the short list so that we can
5 provide you with information that we feel is
6 relevant in order for you to make a decision, and I
7 think it's a dangerous process for you sit back
8 there in a sequestered fashion and block yourself
9 off from any comments the public might have
10 relative to the people who you have narrowed down
11 to be the potential contractors in our community.

12 MR. TILLER: This sequestered
13 process are those individuals making
14 recommendations. Those recommendations then go to
15 the Source Selection Official and are reviewed by
16 knowledgeable people in the Department. It is not
17 done in the sense of people out in the trailer. In
18 terms of the comment Lisa made that she would like
19 community input, I wish I had a lawyer here, they
20 could probably tell you why.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: He is a lawyer.

22 MR. TILLER: I mean one of my
23 lawyers.

24 MR. MEYER: We would be glad to talk

2976

1 to one of your lawyers. Make him available to us,
2 we would be glad to work with your lawyers in terms
3 of us getting you the information that we would
4 like to provide to you before you make that
5 decision. We have some information that we'd like
6 you to hear us tell you about these particular
7 contractors that you're considering. After all,
8 look what we've gone through in this community for
9 the last eight years, and here you are about to
10 make one of the most important decisions for the
11 future of this community and we can't have input,
12 and I don't understand why not.

13 MR. TILLER: I'm going to do my
14 lawyer, Beth Oshiem, a favor. Do you know Beth?

15 MR. MEYER: Not personally, no, sir.

16 MR. TILLER: I would refer you to
17 the counsel that works for me who is also an
18 advisor to the Source Evaluation Board on this
19 procurement, and I would request that you talk to
20 her.

21 MR. MEYER: I'd be interested in
22 having her name and phone number before we leave
23 this evening. Certainly you would philosophically
24 agree with what we're talking about here, wouldn't

1 you? Don't you see it's important?

2976

2 MR. TILLER: I don't think I want to
3 be in a position to say the community has no voice
4 and I don't know what the regulations are to
5 establish that process, and I really think --

6 MR. MEYER: But that's the reality,
7 let's face it. That's the reality. The problem --
8 I think people are always pointing at lawyers. The
9 lawyers are the guys that cause the problem. It
10 looks like here the lawyers, as far as DOE is
11 concerned, that's causing the problems. It's a
12 simple process to resolve. I don't know why
13 somebody can't simply tell us -- thank you.

14 MR. TILLER: If Kim did her job, you
15 have Beth Oshiem's name now.

16 MR. MEYER: I do, thank you. What
17 I'm trying to do is enlist your support for the
18 concept here. I'd like you to call Beth Oshiem
19 tomorrow and tell her how the community feels about
20 our input into this process and get Beth to support
21 what we're arguing here tonight.

22 MR. TILLER: I understand your
23 position.

24 MR. MEYER: Thank you.

2976

1 MS. NUNGESTER: I hope the people
2 who decide on the contractor aren't the same people
3 who decide on the PEIS workshops because they
4 certainly didn't take us into consideration when
5 they did that, and I reiterate what Lisa said, Ohio
6 should have a workshop here. People in Washington
7 can afford to take the airplane to go to other
8 areas for one of these workshops, we can't.

9 MR. TILLER: I will assure that --
10 I'm not familiar with the conversations, requests
11 that were made. I assure you we will look into
12 that and see what the process was and what the
13 options are.

14 MS. NUNGESTER: I did place a call,
15 and I talked to a lady and she got my wrath, I'm
16 sorry to say, but I did tell her that I thought we
17 should have one here.

18 A question that I have, maybe the
19 first question, is on the vitrification that you're
20 sending the samples to Hanford, Washington to see
21 how that would work on some of the waste material
22 we have out here at Fernald. I don't know what
23 their weather conditions are up in Hanford, I've
24 never been there, but I do know we have a very high

2976

1 humidity in the Ohio Valley here, and it's my
2 understanding that some of this vitrification,
3 glass as you call it, can erode or break apart when
4 there's a high humidity in the area.

5 MR. CRAIG: Is your question --

6 MS. NUNGESTER: Well, my question is
7 will it be tested for high humidity or is that
8 true, do you echo that sentiment?

9 MR. CRAIG: Yeah, they will look at
10 the site specific conditions here and evaluate
11 whatever waste form we're talking about, whether it
12 be vitrified waste, cementation, any type of
13 solidification, they'll look at our site specific
14 conditions and determine whether or not that waste
15 form would be effective as the best waste form.
16 They're not going to evaluate it based on the
17 conditions of Hanford or out in Washington.

18 MS. NUNGESTER: All right, thank
19 you.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Bob, is somebody
21 going to get back to us on the report of the
22 incident that happened Saturday?

23 MR. TILLER: Yes.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: We'll get a report on

1 that like soon?

2976

2 MR. TILLER: Yes. Since you brought
3 it up and you put it on the record, that means
4 we'll get back to you. My understanding is that a
5 person had two or three cans of beer in his truck.
6 I don't know what testing was done. It's also my
7 understanding there was no at least obvious or
8 visible indication that he had consumed any, but we
9 will get back to you with the individuals that know
10 the situation firsthand.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Because it's my
12 understanding there were two empty ones and two
13 cold ones that were ready to be opened.

14 MR. TILLER: I was pretty close, two
15 or three. We'll have to get back to you.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: I really think this
17 is very important. I think this is unconscionable
18 behavior on their part, and I am concerned about
19 making sure that things are done right and they're
20 done properly, and we don't have to go back and
21 question reports from years ago.

22 MR. TILLER: It was reported to the
23 EOC. I saw the report, or heard of the report the
24 next day. It is a sub to ASI and we will follow-up

2976

1 on that.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: I need to follow-up
3 on one other issue that I didn't talk about, which
4 is Teresa is now gone, who am I supposed to -- am
5 I supposed to deal with you now, Jerry, until we
6 get a replacement?

7 MR. WESTERBECK: Yes. We have put
8 position descriptions together and we will soon be
9 putting announcement out on the street looking for,
10 as part of our staff increase looking for two
11 public relations people.

12 In the meantime, yes, I will be
13 picking up her load. Of course, working with
14 Westinghouse and Parsons and ASI, and Steve Wyatt
15 from Oak Ridge will be providing us support as
16 well.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: And you are going to
18 adhere to our 24-hour notification agreement that
19 we had?

20 MR. WESTERBECK: Yes.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: And you are going to
22 let me sit on the interviewing board for hiring?

23 MR. WESTERBECK: I thought when you
24 brought that up that you said and I want to be

1 considered for the job, and now you say you want to
2 interview. I don't know. I jotted that note down
3 and that might even be possible, I don't know.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: Very good. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. WESTERBECK: If there isn't a
7 rule --

8 MS. CRAWFORD: There probably is,
9 you probably have like this big red scratch mark
10 through my name. Just want to let you know that
11 we're watching very closely. I still think it
12 should be a woman.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the
14 requisite for the new contractor for Fernald? I
15 guess these other plants in the United States that
16 Westinghouse is running, are they always the
17 primary contractor of the plants? Also would this
18 new contractor be just a subcontractor that they
19 have the power to select all the other subs
20 underneath them and they'll come in with no force
21 at all like Westinghouse has?

22 MR. TILLER: Let me take that. The
23 first part was are the other Westinghouse prime
24 contracts?

2976

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. Do
2 they have a lot of employees, like the Westinghouse
3 here at Fernald?

4 MR. TILLER: They're primary
5 contracts are Hanford, the waste isolation pilot
6 plant, Savannah River, West Valley, they run the
7 Chem Plant at Idaho, WMCO, are their prime
8 contracts and here. In all instances they do both
9 parts of the on-site work with their own forces and
10 they subcontract those parts of the work which are
11 judged to be most economical to carry out that
12 way. So they do both in every instance.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the last
14 resource, if we can't find one that is capable of
15 bringing in a force like Westinghouse, we may wind
16 up with a contractor that would be capable of
17 getting the outside subcontractors to do the total
18 work then?

19 MR. TILLER: In a very overview
20 fashion, the contractor requested in the Request
21 For Proposals is to manage the work here, be in
22 charge of the site operations, and to do the RI/FS
23 work responsible. The rest they're encouraged to
24 subcontract out.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think most
2 of the people worry that we don't ever get another
3 National Lead down here because we've got so many
4 instances and proof about what they did, and
5 Westinghouse seemed to do such a good job. We're
6 quite concerned who the new one is going to be.

7 MR. TILLER: Here Westinghouse does
8 work of both types, they do some of the work with
9 their own forces and they subcontract out what
10 looks to be more economical or takes a high
11 specialty that you can't afford to maintain, or a
12 type of work that is periodic, that comes and
13 goes. Those decisions are made on a case basis, in
14 an attempt to get a good job at best utilization of
15 the taxpayers' resources.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want
18 to make a statement. I notice you're using budget
19 rental trucks over there, and I am wondering if
20 those trucks before they're sent back to the port
21 where they belong, are they being decommissioned
22 and decontaminated before someone else uses those
23 to move their furniture or food or whatever? I'm
24 concerned about this. As big as DOE is, I don't

1 know why they don't have their own fleet.

2 MR. TILLER: Any of the vehicles
3 that have entered the contaminated area are
4 carefully monitored before they're released.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: Can I gripe one more
6 time about taxpayer money. I just thought of this
7 too. Whenever the amendments come through for the
8 RFP, sometimes they're real fat and most of them
9 are just two pages, they put them in a great big
10 brown envelope that probably costs at least a buck
11 apiece at least, if you went out to the store it
12 would cost a buck apiece. They put two pieces of
13 paper in this great big brown envelope and it costs
14 \$1.25 to mail it. Fold it up, put it in a white
15 envelope, it costs 29 cents. These are the kind of
16 things that just irritate me to no end. I'd be
17 damned if I would pay \$1.25 for something I could
18 send for 29 cents. I want that in the official
19 record because I want somebody to call Oak Ridge
20 and tell them don't mail Lisa Crawford anything in
21 a big brown envelope anymore. Put it in an
22 envelope and put a 29 cent stamp on it.

23 MR. TILLER: So noted.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's a hell

1 of a lot of paper to make up for the million dollar
2 boo-boo in the coal pile.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: And they should use
4 recycled paper too, and they don't.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
6 question. At the last RI/FS this was brought up,
7 you were having problems getting property rights
8 from some private citizens for the South Plume.
9 You didn't touch on that tonight. How is that
10 progressing?

11 MR. CRAIG: We're still having some
12 problems. There are three or four pieces of
13 property which we're still experiencing some
14 problems with. We do have the core of engineers
15 which is helping us, they're experts in the field
16 of getting access for this type of work. They're
17 working with the property owners, and if need be,
18 we're going to have to file some of those cases in
19 court through the Department of Justice to force
20 entry into the property. We have started the
21 process on some of the properties.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: Is that going to back
23 you up as far as your Consent Agreement, is that
24 going to mess you up?

1 MR. CRAIG: Right now we don't think
2 it will. We factored some of that into our
3 schedules. Right now we don't think it will.

4 MR. MEYER: That water is going to
5 just those two chemical plants; is that correct?

6 MR. CRAIG: Yes, for part one of the
7 South Plume removal action, it is, yes.

8 MR. MEYER: It's not going to any
9 residence use?

10 MR. CRAIG: No, it's not.

11 I want to correct something. It's
12 only going to one of the companies now, one of the
13 other companies did not want the water, so we are
14 not providing it to them.

15 MR. MEYER: Who is it going to,
16 Albright Wilson?

17 MR. CRAIG: Yes, it is.

18 MR. WESTERBECK: The other company
19 has stated they will wait until the public water
20 supply comes to the area.

21 MR. MEYER: Which will be soon,
22 right?

23 MR. WESTERBECK: Hope so.

24 MR. WESTERBECK: Are there any other

2976

1 questions?

2 One last item, remember I mentioned
3 earlier how several of these documents and said
4 that they would be over at the PEIC and we were
5 going to be putting additional ones in there, new
6 ones and so forth, looking for public comment,
7 public participation. We are interested in
8 actually getting people to volunteer for that, and
9 I'm told tomorrow we'll have a sign-up list over at
10 the PEIC. We'll leave it over there because if we
11 can get your name and phone number, then we'll
12 contact you and when we do get the various
13 documents, we'll have a little more structure than
14 just putting the documents in there in the less
15 formal way of getting comments from you. So if you
16 would and you're interested in providing comment on
17 the various documents, whether it's ADS's or Site
18 Specific Plan or the Road Map or what have you,
19 please put your name down. You can always change
20 your mind later if time doesn't allow.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: Put my name on the
22 list.

23 MR. WESTERBECK: Okay. Got that,
24 Sue.

2976

1 If there are no other questions,
 2 we'll adjourn for this evening and we'll let you
 3 know when the next meeting is. Thank you very
 4 much.

- - -

COMMUNITY MEETING CONCLUDED

- - -

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 (95) ninety-five pages, and that the foregoing transcript of the Community Meeting is a complete and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

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