

**3993**

**COMMUNITY MEETING NOVEMBER 9, 1992**

**11/09/92**

**DOE-FN**

**70**

**TRANSCRIPT**

3993

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

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 MR. MORGAN: Good evening. I think  
2 we're about ready to start.

3 Good evening and welcome to the  
4 Department of Energy's Community Meeting on  
5 Fernald, glad to have you here.

6 I'm Ken Morgan, Public Information  
7 Officer for the Department of Energy at Fernald. I  
8 would like to draw your attention to the paper that  
9 was on your seat. There is an agenda there. There  
10 is a meeting evaluation. And before you leave  
11 tonight, I would really appreciate it if you would  
12 let us know how we're doing.

13 We found that continuing evaluation  
14 helps us get better meetings. And I would really  
15 appreciate that. That's what this one is.

16 A little later on in the evening  
17 you'll see we have an opportunity for a public  
18 forum, where you'll be able to ask questions.

19 Not everybody is real comfortable  
20 coming up to a microphone and asking a question in  
21 front of everybody, but they might have a question  
22 that they want an answer to. And so we have a card  
23 there, and if you want to pose a question that way  
24 and if you can get it to me or one of the folks

1 over here at the tables during the break, we can  
2 try to answer it during that time, or if you can  
3 leave a phone number or an address so we can get  
4 back to you that way, however you might chose.

5 I would like to let you folks know  
6 about a couple of public involvement opportunities  
7 that are coming up. We have been having Community  
8 Environmental Education Courses, which have been  
9 well received. People have gotten a lot out of  
10 information they have gotten there and specific  
11 subjects they were interested in.

12 We have had them on personnel  
13 protective equipment, soil sampling, groundwater  
14 sampling, mixed and hazardous waste issues,  
15 Parsons' role in environmental remediation.

16 Tomorrow night there is going to be  
17 one on the remediation at the site. And November  
18 17th will be our last one for this season on the  
19 emergency planning and the Community Right-To-Know  
20 Act.

21 These classes are held in the  
22 Executive Resources Associates Alpha Building just  
23 down the road from the site. It's down on  
24 Hamilton-Cleves Road.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1           Those of you who have attended, if  
2 you have any ideas about classes that you would  
3 like to learn about, if you will jot those down on  
4 the evaluation sheet, let us know. We're looking  
5 at having another set of classes in the spring. We  
6 need those new ideas.

7           Another opportunity coming up is on  
8 November 16th we're going to have a round table on  
9 pre-college education programs. The Department of  
10 Energy has quite a program to develop new  
11 educational curriculums so that we grow up a  
12 generation of young people who will be prepared to  
13 take on the issues of the future, so we have the  
14 skill base necessary to manage our energy  
15 problems.

16           So that means educating our children  
17 better in science and education. So we'll be  
18 talking about that. If you would like to come to  
19 that round table on November 16th, could you sign  
20 up at the registration table. We would kind of  
21 like to know what size of group we're likely to  
22 have at those.

23           Now with that, I'm going to introduce  
24 Bill Adams, who has been our Interim Site Manager,

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 but it is his last day. And he will have an 3993  
2 opportunity to say good-bye and introduce the new  
3 interim manager. Bill.

4 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Ken. I want  
5 to thank all of you for coming out tonight. The  
6 last community meeting was on July 21st, I arrived  
7 about two weeks after that. So the things we're  
8 going to talk about tonight, essentially, all  
9 occurred during the three plus months that I was  
10 here.

11 We're going to also talk a little bit  
12 about the safe shutdown activities, Ray Hansen will  
13 be talking about that, and Jack Craig -- Good, Ray  
14 didn't leave, I thought he was going to sneak out  
15 on me -- Talk about some of the CERCLA activities.

16 Before we start, I think it's  
17 appropriate that I introduce with a few words the  
18 successor of the Fernald Field Office Manager's  
19 job. So I would like to introduce to you Jim  
20 Foire, who will be here as an Interim Fernald Field  
21 Office Manager. Jim.

22 MR. FOIRE: Thank you, Bill. I  
23 appreciate the opportunity to come out to the  
24 site. I think I have a big pair of shoes to fill.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 with the folks from FRESH and trying to identify  
2 and put in place things that provide information to  
3 the community.

4 I think we've done a lot better the  
5 last two or three years than we did previously.  
6 But my commitment is to try to take that and make  
7 that even a little bit better and try to eliminate  
8 some of the problems that we still have creeping up  
9 where you don't get information in a timely way or  
10 the information that you want. So that's one thing  
11 I will emphasize over the next few months.

12 Several other items that are of real  
13 importance to me are the safety of the workers and  
14 of the public. Safety is the most important  
15 mission that I believe we have at the site. And  
16 I'll be working with both the WMCO and FERMCO folks  
17 to be sure that safety is given the right emphasis.

18 The second thing is meeting our  
19 environmental commitments, our milestones in the  
20 consent decree or our consent agreement  
21 milestones. I think we have built up a little bit  
22 of credibility in the last six months to a year by  
23 meeting the milestones, doing the removal actions  
24 on schedule. And I think we need to continue that,

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 I think Bill has done an excellent job over the  
2 last three months.

3 For some of you who don't know me, I  
4 have been involved with the program back in  
5 Washington for the last two years. And as such,  
6 I'm familiar with the problems and the issues that  
7 together we've worked on with you folks over the  
8 last two or three years.

9 Let me say that relative to the issue  
10 of the permanent manager for the site, the  
11 Department of Energy is working very actively to  
12 try to resolve that whole issue so that we will no  
13 longer have interim or acting managers, it will get  
14 back to having a permanent manager.

15 And I'm optimistic that something  
16 will happen on that fairly quickly. And we'll all  
17 get back to a situation that we all want, which is  
18 a permanent manager.

19 I just wanted to stress a couple  
20 priorities that I have as I come to the job. We  
21 talked about one of them in the meeting we had  
22 immediately before this, and that is improving the  
23 community relations activities. I think we have an  
24 excellent program here already by working closely

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 even as we go through a major contractor  
2 transition.

3993

3                   The last thing is to make that  
4 transition as smooth and as effective as possible  
5 so that when we change contractors, we can still  
6 stay on schedule, we can do it without any real  
7 impact to the progress of the activities at the  
8 site. And I expect that contract to transition  
9 will be a major activity in my schedule over the  
10 next few months.

11                   The last item is simply to say that  
12 if any of you, any individual, any organization,  
13 has a question or a concern, feel free to call me  
14 in my office and I'll try to deal with it, myself,  
15 or have somebody get you an answer if I can't  
16 provide the answer. It's a genuine open-door  
17 policy of if you have got a problem or a question,  
18 feel free to give me a call.

19                   Other than that, I would just like to  
20 proceed into the program and get on with the  
21 scheduled topics and the scheduled information.

22                   MR. MORGAN: There was a car out in  
23 the parking lot that left the lights on. Its  
24 license plate is JYB 481.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What kind of  
2 car is it?

3 MR. MORGAN: I just got a note. Do  
4 we know? Somebody from the Plantation staff let us  
5 know. Why doesn't somebody go on out and see what  
6 kind of car it is and we'll announce that.

7 MR. ADAMS: Hugh Daugherty told me  
8 he has a set of jumper cables, so don't worry.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maroon  
10 Pontiac Grand AM.

11 MR. MORGAN: Maroon Pontiac Grand  
12 AM. No takers.

13 MR. ADAMS: Okay. There are several  
14 things I want to discuss of a general nature before  
15 we get into Ray and Jack's presentation. I want to  
16 encourage you if there are any questions that you  
17 have got, if you don't mind if you hold them till  
18 the end, we will have a question and answer session  
19 and this distinguished section of young gentlemen  
20 and ladies over here are all prepared to answer any  
21 question we got.

22 Ron Warner is all cocked and primed,  
23 he has a tie on tonight. Okay. If I could have  
24 the first slide, please.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1                   Okay. The first topic is the                   \$993  
2 transition to a field office and the staffing  
3 update. I read the minutes of the July 21st  
4 meeting, when Bob Tiller indicated that we were  
5 having some difficulty getting staff to -- enough  
6 slots to fill the Fernald field office positions.

7                   As a matter of fact, the very next  
8 day, on July 22nd, the Department of Energy put a  
9 freeze on all hiring within the Department of  
10 Energy.

11                   Now, subsequent to that date, there's  
12 been a partial falling of that freeze. At that  
13 time when he was talking to you, we had a total of  
14 57 slots for the Fernald field office. About 2  
15 weeks ago we received authorization to go up to 84  
16 positions. So we are now in the process of  
17 recruiting up to a total of 84.

18                   We're actually about one year behind  
19 the schedule that was originally set forth for the  
20 Fernald field office becoming self-sufficient. So  
21 in this interim period we will continue to get  
22 support and matrix type support, that's finance,  
23 legal, accounting, this kind of stuff, from Oak  
24 Ridge. But we are encouraged that we have the

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

3993

1 additional 27 positions.

2           There is some remote possibility that  
3 we would get a few additional ones, because the  
4 Department of Energy has shut down the new  
5 production reactor, so-called NPR. Talking about  
6 almost 300 positions that would be distributed  
7 around the Department of Energy. So we have our  
8 bids in to try to get some of those here at Fernald  
9 in the cleanup.

10           Okay. The second topic, union  
11 contract negotiations. I'm very pleased to tell  
12 you, you probably already know, but the Atomic  
13 Trades Labor Council, and the International Guards  
14 Union of America have both signed one-year  
15 extensions. And I believe the new contracts  
16 expire, Gene, correct me if I'm wrong, on September  
17 30th, '92 for ATLC and November 20th for the Guard  
18 Unit; is that correct?

19           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 'Ninety-three.

20           MR. ADAMS: 'Ninety-three, excuse,  
21 off by a year.

22           Okay, public water. As you all know,  
23 there's been negotiations between DOE and Hamilton  
24 County with regard to the Department of Energy's

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 share to provide alternate water supply to some of  
2 the residents that were potentially impacted by the  
3 south plume contamination.

4 DOE has identified 120 potential  
5 customers or residents, if you will, households,  
6 that were potentially impacted by the  
7 contamination. We have provided that information  
8 to Hamilton County, and propose our share at \$4.2  
9 million.

10 Hamilton County has engaged the  
11 services of an independent consultant to do a study  
12 and determine if that is a reasonable and equitable  
13 distribution of the liability. So as it stands  
14 right now, the ball is in the court of Hamilton  
15 County Commissioners. We'll hear more about that  
16 later.

17 Okay, the next slide, please.  
18 Sirens. In response to requests from six local  
19 governments, such as Ross, Crosby, et cetera, and I  
20 think FRESH also made the request that we make it  
21 possible for the City of Harrison to activate the  
22 siren and warning system in the event of bad  
23 weather, such as tornadoes.

24 We have agreed with that request. We

1 have requested that Westinghouse proceed to make  
2 the necessary purchases to get the equipment in  
3 place that would allow Harrison to activate the  
4 alarm and give early warning to those communities  
5 that are east of here. We expect that to be in  
6 place and operable by the 1st of February next  
7 year.

8                   Okay. Now comes the one I really  
9 hate to talk about, as Lisa gave me a little  
10 lecture a while ago. Contaminated rail cars.

11                   MS. CRAWFORD: I don't have any  
12 tomatoes.

13                   MR. ADAMS: Good. As you all know,  
14 we have been in the process of shipping out uranium  
15 metal that was stored on this site that belonged to  
16 the Army. Shipments were taking place between  
17 Fernald and the defense -- what do you call it,  
18 consolidation facility, down in South Carolina for  
19 disposal. This is a uranium metal.

20                   It was placed on metal pallets inside  
21 of gondola cars on a nylon sheet, if you will. And  
22 the nylon sheet was pulled over the uranium bullets  
23 and a tarp placed over that. During four  
24 shipments, four cars, some of the cars came back

1 with uranium contamination on the gondola car  
2 itself, inside the gondola.

3           We, as we're prone to do in DOE, shot  
4 ourselves in the foot, we did not make adequate  
5 notifications to all the communities. And it  
6 caused some anxiety to some of the residents that  
7 lived in the townships where the trains rolled.  
8 And I sincerely apologize for any anxiety that this  
9 caused.

10           We met with the trustees -- I don't  
11 guess you call them trustees in the county -- the  
12 Commissioners of Butler County last Friday,  
13 represented from Congressman Bayner's office, the  
14 Ohio -- or Emergency Management Agency, and the  
15 Emergency Coordinator for Butler County to work out  
16 some notification procedures.

17           The agreements that we reached were  
18 that we, DOE, namely Ken Morgan, has got the  
19 responsibility to draft up some notification  
20 procedures for these type shipments or other  
21 events, if you will, that might cause these  
22 anxieties.

23           We have the ball in our court to turn  
24 around and get this set of procedures, draft

1 procedures in the hands of the Butler County 3993  
2 Commissioners for their review and comment. And  
3 we're going to try to turn that around fairly  
4 quickly.

5 Okay. The Environmental Restoration  
6 Management Contractor, so-called ERMC. As you  
7 know, the new contractor, FERMCO, was selected and  
8 came on board September 1st. Three weeks from  
9 tonight they will take over from WMCO.

10 And I am delighted at the cooperation  
11 by both parties that has existed in the last two  
12 months and one week. Both WMCO and FERMCO are  
13 working very, very hard to make this as smooth a  
14 transition as we possibly can. And I think we're  
15 going to pull it off. And come December 1st, I  
16 don't think you'll notice a blimp.

17 I know this has caused lots of  
18 anxiety for the Westinghouse employees, I  
19 appreciate that. And beg your patience that we're  
20 going to pull this thing off. And I think it's  
21 going to work fine.

22 With that, I noticed Hugh Daugherty,  
23 the WMCO President, out in the audience. And I  
24 would like to ask him to come up and say a very few

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 words. I underline "few."

3993

2 MR. DAUGHERTY: Thank you, Bill,  
3 I'll try to follow that advice, like I normally  
4 follow the DOE's advice.

5 MR. ADAMS: We have a long night.

6 MR. DAUGHERTY: Well, this being the  
7 last opportunity at Community Meeting for  
8 Westinghouse to talk to the community, I did want  
9 to take just a moment of your time and tell you  
10 that Westinghouse is very proud of our efforts here  
11 over our tenure here.

12 A lot has happened since 1986 when we  
13 came here. And certainly attendance at this  
14 community meeting and this community meeting  
15 certainly represent a large part of what we  
16 participated in.

17 During the time we were here, we did  
18 a lot of things to improve worker health and  
19 safety, monitoring of personnel, monitoring of  
20 contamination. Along the way we deconed over a  
21 million square feet of the plant. We did a lot of  
22 things to improve environmental monitoring. There  
23 were hundreds of wells and reports made that were  
24 made public, which you can all examine, there are

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 thousands of documents in the public reading room.

2           Along the way we negotiated with the  
3 DOE and the regulators a doable consent agreement  
4 covering the cleanup of the site. And we energized  
5 the process of some 27 removal actions for near  
6 term cleanup. We're proud of those activities.

7           And then, of course, we chose not to  
8 bid the ERMC contract, and that gave us an  
9 opportunity to take a look at how we would approach  
10 a transition. And our approach to life was to be a  
11 good corporate citizen, to do all that we could do  
12 to assure that a good transition occurred. And we  
13 have done that.

14           As a matter of fact, regularly, there  
15 is meetings in my office after hours where  
16 Westinghouse employees are working on the effort of  
17 making a good transition to FERMCO and putting in  
18 time of their own without getting compensated for  
19 it to assure this goes well. And for that matter,  
20 any Westinghouse engineers and scientists are here  
21 tonight, like any community meeting, without  
22 compensation, because they care about the community  
23 and they care about what they're doing to cleanup  
24 the Fernald site.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 I also would like to take this  
2 opportunity thank the Department of Energy and the  
3 community, most of all, of our work force for  
4 allowing us to serve here. It was a proud time for  
5 us, often difficult, but we would like to point to  
6 some of the good things we did, like the  
7 environmental training of our work force, the  
8 landmark labor agreements we have signed which  
9 condensed jurisdictions that make the work for  
10 efficient. Environmental schools we started in  
11 cooperation with DOE, which served the community in  
12 our work force.

13 So thank you for allowing us to serve  
14 you. And we certainly wish the new contractor,  
15 FERMCO, well in meeting these regulatory agreements  
16 and getting the site cleaned up. And if we can be  
17 of any further service, don't hesitate to call on  
18 us. Thank you.

19 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Doc. I think  
20 it would be appropriate, too, if we could have a  
21 few words from the President of FERMCO. And I  
22 think I see Nick Kaufman. Nick, would you like to  
23 say a few words.

24 MR. KAUFMAN: I would simply like to

1 acknowledge our debt of gratitude to Westinghouse  
2 and the Westinghouse employees, and to the DOE and  
3 the citizens, the labor unions and the contractors  
4 for making us feel very welcome.

5 We're absolutely committed to do a  
6 good job for you all, and we have been working very  
7 hard at it for the last 60 days.

8 I'm comfortable at this point that  
9 we'll be able to build on the accomplishments that  
10 have been obtained to date, we'll do everything  
11 possible not to make the same errors that have been  
12 made before, to learn from the lessons learned, and  
13 to find ways to cause the cleanup to move forward  
14 more effectively, quicker and at lesser cost. I  
15 think we're well on our way to do that.

16 And, again, I would like to thank you  
17 all for making us feel so very welcome. Thank you.

18 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Nick. I had  
19 about a 45-minute speech, but I don't think I'll  
20 use it since somebody may want to get home for  
21 Monday Nite Football.

22 So I think we ought to proceed and  
23 get Ray Hansen to talk about the safe shutdown of  
24 waste shipments. Ray.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Bill. Good  
2 evening, everybody.

3 Safe Shutdown Program. Once again,  
4 just a reminder of what this program is all about.  
5 It's designed to safely shut down all of the  
6 facilities at the site and get them ready for  
7 decommissioning, decontamination and, finally,  
8 dismantling.

9 That includes the clean out of  
10 equipment; equipment disposition; gross  
11 contamination level removal; isolation of  
12 buildings, that means take away all the energy  
13 that's in the facilities and, finally, to get them  
14 ready for D and D; it also includes removal of  
15 materials from the site, which I know you're all  
16 interested in.

17 Each of these subjects I'm going to  
18 discuss tonight. This is just kind of an update of  
19 where we were last time. If you would, please,  
20 next slide.

21 Production equipment. We have talked  
22 about getting rid of materials. I would like to  
23 tell you a little bit about some of the activities  
24 that are ongoing to try to get some of the

1 production equipment off site. You know, a lot of  
2 this equipment is reusable at other sites. And if  
3 it's not contaminated, we try to get rid of it.

4 To do this, we have taken a capital  
5 equipment inventory. We have inventoried some  
6 1,688 pieces of equipment. And then classified  
7 them into no future use, in use, or possible future  
8 use. We have identified some 1,146 to be excessed,  
9 pieces of equipment to be excessed.

10 To do this, we have established an  
11 integrated data base. And what this really is, is  
12 it's an equipment data base, partly the inventory.  
13 We combined that with the preliminary safe shutdown  
14 data base.

15 And the whole idea of this is to  
16 permit us assessment of materials in the equipment,  
17 identifies need for any applicable permits in the  
18 shutdown process, and it looks at any utilities  
19 that are connected to the facilities.

20 And the benefits of all this really  
21 is that we can assure complete disconnection and  
22 isolation of all the equipment prior to D and D,  
23 really, a safety concern. It's an old site, so we  
24 don't really have what are called as-built

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

3993

1 drawings. So a lot of that equipment out there we  
2 really don't know what the status is. And part of  
3 this process is to establish that status.

4           Some of the things we have done in  
5 equipment removal, Building 51, which you know as  
6 the Advanced Waste Water Treatment Facility, we  
7 have gotten rid of some equipment there; two vacuum  
8 pumps that essentially are going to Berkeley  
9 Livermore Laboratories in California, and two dust  
10 collectors that are going to the Indiana State  
11 Penitentiary. I understand they're going to use it  
12 in the Carpentry Shop.

13           But in the excess process of DOE what  
14 we do is offer any equipment that is excess to our  
15 needs first to the DOE, and then to all Federal  
16 Government agencies, and finally to state and local  
17 agencies. And the Indiana State Penitentiary got  
18 the two dust collectors.

19           All this equipment was new equipment,  
20 not contaminated. Next slide, please.

21           This, again, is a status of some of  
22 the materials that we have disposed of since  
23 transfer in October of 1990 from DP; 3,104 metric  
24 tons shipped off site since the transfer. And once

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 again, the footnote at the bottom of the slide  
2 defines what a MT is, that's a metric ton. Once  
3 again, 2,000 pounds.

4 We have shipped 1,595 metric tons  
5 uranium of the Army metal to Barnwell for burial.  
6 Actually, we shipped to Defense Consolidated  
7 Facility. And they, in turn, send it on the  
8 Barnwell. And I'll talk a little more about the  
9 contaminated cars incident that Bill mentioned.

10 We have sent 547 metric tons of Army  
11 product to the customer; 602 metric tons recyclable  
12 bentonite Y-12; 8 metric tons of derby to Lawrence  
13 Livermore, this is for the AVLIS Program; that's  
14 the Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separator; 346  
15 metric tons of UF-4 to the Army; 6 metric tons of  
16 recyclable metal we have also gotten rid of.

17 This basically is a program to allow  
18 usable product to be used again in the United  
19 States.

20 Next slide, please. On the Army  
21 metal we completed transfer of 1,595 metric tons,  
22 as I mentioned before. 246 metric tons yet to  
23 ship, that will be 5 gondola cars to be shipped  
24 this week. And then there is 1,012 metric tons of

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 metal, usable metal, being shipped to Nevada.

2                   And the reason they're shipping it to  
3 Nevada is in case for some national emergency in  
4 the future, they may have to recover this metal,  
5 and it's all depleted uranium, it can be  
6 recovered. And we're scheduled to complete that in  
7 June of 1993.

8                   This graph shows where we are in the  
9 Army metal disposition. We are to ship off 1,841  
10 metric tons to Barnwell. And we had a goal set for  
11 December 15th, even though in the contaminated drum  
12 incident that we talked about at the last meeting,  
13 that put us behind schedule, you can see we're well  
14 ahead of schedule. And you see the red line at the  
15 top, we will beat the December 15 schedule and  
16 we'll get those off this week.

17                   Next slide, please. Further  
18 Materials Disposition. You know, we're looking to  
19 make a sale of uranium materials of some 6,500  
20 metric tons of depleted, normal and slightly  
21 enriched uranium. At a meeting in headquarters we  
22 decided we would need NEPA documentation to do  
23 this. That should not hold up the sale. And what  
24 we're looking at that schedule to get our RFP's on

1 the street and hope to make final award of the sale  
2 by the third quarter of FY '93.

3 On thorium. We're still looking at a  
4 pending sale. The company we're still trying to  
5 sell to still expects to get their license. We  
6 have contacted them to ensure that any packaging  
7 needs they require will not interfere with our  
8 over-packing goals for this year.

9 All of it's been declared waste now  
10 except the material for sale. And we have shipped  
11 off 167 metric tons to Nevada. We're now dealing  
12 with Nevada to identify and get approved new  
13 thorium waste streams. We expect to have that done  
14 by December of this year.

15 Next slide, please, Chris. I was  
16 still characterizing, we're still in the process of  
17 stabilizing the UNH on site. Continual overpacking  
18 and further shipments. I don't know if you  
19 remember or not, but we used to talk about 15,000  
20 containers of material on site. We now talk in  
21 terms of 12,000, because of some of the overpacking  
22 we have done. We have characterized 11 of those  
23 containers as RCRA. Two drums yet to be evaluated,  
24 and those are in Building 64 and will be part of

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 our overpacking process.

2 We intend to stabilize the UNH --  
3 excuse me, thorium nitrate. As you can see, the  
4 schedule for that, hope to have it started by  
5 October of '93, and completely stabilized by  
6 December of '93.

7 On the overpacking, our FY '92 goal  
8 we had hoped to complete Buildings 64, 67 and 68.  
9 64 and 68 were completed. Building 67 was held up  
10 because of the hydrogen drum incident. We hope to  
11 have that complete by the end of January.

12 This is a slide that I thought you  
13 might like to see what goes on in the overpacking  
14 process. Here people are overpacking thorium drums  
15 in Building 68 and putting them in the 6-pack  
16 container that we shipped to Nevada.

17 Another shot further away shows a  
18 little more of the overpacking process.

19 Waste shipments. September 24th of  
20 this year we were pleased to announce that we did  
21 meet our goal of 100,000 drum equivalents, and  
22 actually went over 595 drum equivalents. It was a  
23 good job done by Westinghouse.

24 This shows monitoring of some of the

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 drums of waste on site. And the next slide, Chris,  
2 shows the more important one packaging to get rid  
3 of it and send it to NTS.

4                   Since 1985 when we first began waste  
5 shipments, you'll see that there is a total of  
6 345,774 drum equivalents material shipped off site.

7                   For next year, our goal is 67,000  
8 drum equivalents. And you can see the breakdown  
9 there of what this material is. This does not  
10 include the material that we're -- the residues and  
11 scrap metal that we'll show on the next slide. Put  
12 that back a minute, Chris. You'll see that we're  
13 slightly behind schedule for this year, but no  
14 problem, we'll catch up easily on that.

15                   Now, we did tell you about two  
16 contracts we intended to put in place last year,  
17 last fiscal year, excuse me. Those were not  
18 awarded on time, they were held up. There was a  
19 certain conflict of interest. The winning party  
20 belongs to the Westinghouse Corporate Group, so  
21 there was a concern about conflict of interest,  
22 that's been resolved.

23                   We did give approval to go ahead with  
24 the procedure. We expect to have them on site and

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 the first shipment of that scrap metal to go off  
2 site the second week of December.

3 Now, don't shot the messenger, Lisa,  
4 but I'm going to talk about the contaminated  
5 gondola cars, try to tell you what really happened  
6 there. Actually, there were four cars that were  
7 contaminated.

8 And the reason there were four, you  
9 can see on this slide of the schedule. Three of  
10 the four cars arrived on June 12th at the Fernald  
11 site. On the 17th of June we had the hydrogen drum  
12 exploration incident and we stopped all drum  
13 handling and shipping on site.

14 The two cars identified as June 23rd,  
15 since we could no longer handle and ship drums, we  
16 went ahead and loaded these two cars with  
17 non-drummed materials, basically metal slabs. They  
18 were released for transfer to the Defense  
19 Consolidated Facility in Snelling, South Carolina  
20 on July 10th. The fourth car involved arrived July  
21 15th.

22 On July 16th those first two cars  
23 arrived at the defense consolidated facility. On  
24 the 24th we were loading cars 3 and 4. On the 27th

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 those were released for transfer to the Defense  
2 Consolidated Facility.

3           Four days later we were notified that  
4 the first two cars had arrived at the DCF  
5 contaminated. We did ask for the survey results  
6 from the contamination. And I have got a slide to  
7 show you later on that. But we were told that the  
8 cars would be decontaminated prior to the return to  
9 Fernald. And, in fact, according to DOT  
10 regulations, they had to be.

11           When we learned of that, we put a  
12 further halt on all packaging and shipments to  
13 DCF. And, of course, we already had four cars en  
14 route. Two had arrived and two were still about to  
15 arrive.

16           On August 4th, the final 2 cars  
17 arrived. We did send representatives down to watch  
18 the arrival and to watch the unloading process to  
19 see what, if anything, caused the contamination.  
20 We did find out what it was, and I'll show you some  
21 pictures of how that occurred. But, basically, on  
22 the 6th of August after watching the arrival at  
23 DCF, we instituted new packaging criteria.

24           MS. CRAWFORD: Can I ask a

1 question?

2 MR. HANSEN: Yes, Lisa.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: The 8401, I can't  
4 see. When you said they arrived at the DCF, when  
5 they arrived there and you sent people down to look  
6 at them, was there contamination on those railcars,  
7 too?

8 MR. HANSEN: Yes, those were  
9 contaminated. Actually, we didn't watch the  
10 unloading process, their crane had broken down.  
11 But we did identify what the problems were in the  
12 earlier two cars, so we corrected the thing.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: So, technically,  
14 there were four cars instead of two cars.

15 MR. HANSEN: Right, there were four  
16 cars, Lisa.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Thank you.

18 MR. HANSEN: Chris. This shows the  
19 way the materials were packaged originally on the  
20 first four cars. You'll notice that they're loaded  
21 on to a metal pallet. Those are rubber insulating  
22 mats placed between the uranium slabs. The intent  
23 there is to keep them from rubbing against each  
24 other. Uranium is pyrophoric.

3993

1                   We did identify that the  
2 contamination came from the nooks and crannies in  
3 the metal pallets.

4                   Next slide, please, Chris. This  
5 shows the metal pallets loaded and wrapped to go in  
6 the gondola cars. If you'll notice, at the bottom  
7 of each of the plastic packages, you'll see two  
8 holes in the plastic lining. Those were for the  
9 forklifts to lift the material. Obviously, if the  
10 pallets were contaminated and the material got off  
11 of the pallets, this is one of the reasons it got  
12 out.

13                   Next slide. When Bill mentioned that  
14 each of the cars that went down were lined, this  
15 shows the liner and the original packages in the  
16 gondola car. Now, no excuses, but DOT does allow  
17 direct bulk shipment. We could have just dumped  
18 all of this in the car and shipped it covered with  
19 a tarp and it would have been approved by the  
20 Department of Transportation. We chose, however,  
21 and it was Jerry Aug, and we give him credit for  
22 this idea, to put the liner in and that was to  
23 prevent contamination of the gondola car and to  
24 prevent leakage off the gondola car.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1                   You can't see it, but the packages  
2 are directly intact with the liner. You'll notice  
3 some wooden pieces of material in there, that's  
4 shoring to keep the material from shifting in the  
5 car. You'll notice the lacing at the side of the  
6 your right, the side of the liner, that lacing is  
7 used to tie down the liner which is folded in on  
8 these packages. And then, finally, a tarp is  
9 placed over that.

10                   Next slide, please. This is the new  
11 type of packaging, once again, that Jerry came up  
12 with. You'll notice we have done away with the  
13 metal pallet and gone to the wooden pallet.  
14 Everything is wrapped in hypolon and then strapped  
15 to the pallet.

16                   Go ahead, Chris, next slide. In  
17 addition to that, because the bottom of the liner  
18 tore, we don't know, either in shipping or  
19 unloading, nevertheless, it tore and the gondola  
20 car did get contaminated. You'll see the plywood  
21 that was placed in the bottom of the car to prevent  
22 tearing of the liner.

23                   You'll notice also that the shoring  
24 is much better in this configuration and everything

3993

1 is packaged so as not to leak. Since we have  
2 introduced this type of packaging, we have had 22  
3 cars more that have gone to DCF and come back with  
4 no contamination.

5 Now, the radiation levels themselves  
6 in the cars. This slide explains it. It's a lot  
7 of busy, and I apologize for that. But if you look  
8 at the sequence of events, the first two cars that  
9 arrived back on our site contaminated from DCF,  
10 when they left the site, there were no detectable  
11 activity, at least it was below minimum detectable  
12 activity. When they arrived at the DCF, the  
13 contamination levels found were less than DOT  
14 limits. And when they shipped them out, they  
15 reported to us that the levels of contamination  
16 were 549 disintegrations per minute removable and  
17 40 disintegrations per minute removable. This is  
18 per hundred square centimeters.

19 When they arrived at Defense, as we  
20 do with every incoming car, whether it be a  
21 vehicle, whether it be a railroad car, or a truck,  
22 we do a survey of it again. We found 14,000  
23 disintegrations per minute removable and 50,000  
24 disintegrations per minute fixed contamination. On

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 the one car, the second car, 48,000 removable and  
2 30,000 fixed. When they left the site again, they  
3 left again, because we decontaminated them less  
4 than minimum detectable.

5 And then the second two cars, cars 3  
6 and 4, once again, when they were on site, we  
7 detected nothing. When they got to DCF, it was  
8 less than DOT limits again. They reported back to  
9 us they had decontaminated. And their survey  
10 showed 35 removable and 63 removable.

11 Once again, when they got here and we  
12 did the survey, we found higher levels, again;  
13 3,100 removable and 3,900 removable.

14 Now, DOT limits for a free release  
15 car; that is, if we shipped the materials and then  
16 that car was released for any other use anywhere in  
17 the country, the Department of Transportation  
18 requirements are that the contamination levels be  
19 below 2,200 disintegrations per minute. If it's an  
20 exclusive use vehicle, which these were, and the  
21 railroad referred to those as designated usage, the  
22 limits are 22,000 disintegrations per minute. So  
23 none of the levels we found were above that limit.

24 The reason we reported it, even

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 though they were below Department of Transportation  
2 requirements, is that our requirements say that  
3 anything above 1,000 disintegrations per minute per  
4 100 square centimeters we report.

5                   Unfortunately, we considered that an  
6 off-normal and not an unusual occurrence. We have  
7 learned our lesson, we keep hearing that you people  
8 are very sensitive to contamination, but it doesn't  
9 ever seem to sink in. I think we have learned our  
10 lesson this time. We are going to report any  
11 levels of contamination to you. And I apologized  
12 that we have not. But I think everybody else has  
13 already apologized.

14                   With that, if you have no  
15 questions -- Yes, Vicki.

16                   MS. VICKI: Why is there such a low  
17 amount being picked up by DCF, but by the time it  
18 gets back here, we're up in the thousands?

19                   MR. HANSEN: We have asked ourselves  
20 the same question. And, in fact, we had a meeting  
21 with Morgan Township Trustees and Butler County  
22 Commissioners last Friday, they asked the same  
23 question.

24                   Basically, it's in survey

1 techniques. We're very, very careful about  
2 contamination. We have been caught a number of  
3 times. I think probably our surveys were a little  
4 more stringent than theirs, but I can't really  
5 confirm that. Also in the smearable -- when you  
6 say removable, that means you have to be able to  
7 remove it with an alcohol swipe. That's kind of an  
8 S swipe, which is a standard swipe. It's possible  
9 they missed the high peaks. We don't know. It did  
10 multiply from there to here.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Is somebody looking  
12 at DCF Barnwell whatever?

13 MR. HANSEN: It's a U.S. Army  
14 installation.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: Is there somebody  
16 there checking out why there is this discrepancy in  
17 numbers.

18 MR. HANSEN: We asked the question  
19 and we invited the DCF to come to our Morgan  
20 Township meeting, they couldn't come for one reason  
21 or another. But there was a discrepancy. We did  
22 report what we found.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Morgan  
24 Township Trustees involved John Baker's office and

1 he is pursuing that avenue, as far as contacting  
2 Barnwell to and see what happened. So, hopefully,  
3 that's forthcoming.

4 MR. HANSEN: This was Carl Dillhoff,  
5 Morgan Township Trustee -- I'm sorry, Tony Sears.

6 Okay, thank you very much. And I  
7 would like to introduce Jack Craig, who will talk  
8 about progress on the operable units.

9 MR. CRAIG: Thank you, Ray. I'll  
10 follow-up on some information that I presented at  
11 the last meeting, similar format to the last  
12 meeting; although, I got a couple of additional  
13 topics on technology development, an Agreement In  
14 Principle with the State of Ohio, and the Annual  
15 Environmental Report.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Yea.

17 MR. CRAIG: Just a refresher to most  
18 of you, the Fernald site is divided into five  
19 operable units. I'll speak about each one of those  
20 tonight.

21 Color coded on this chart, once  
22 again, Operable Unit 1 is the waste pit area;  
23 Operable Unit 2 includes things such as the flyash  
24 pile, the lime sludge ponds, sanitary landfill, and

3993

1 the south field area where construction rubble was  
2 disposed of; Operable Unit 3 includes the former  
3 production area and other facilities on site;  
4 Operable Unit 4 includes four storage silos; and  
5 Operable Unit 5 includes just about everything  
6 else, the environmental media, groundwater and the  
7 soil.

8                   This is a handout that's available in  
9 the back of the room on the table, shows the  
10 schedule for the document submittals of each of the  
11 operable units. I'll go through some of the status  
12 of those tonight. Once again, this chart is  
13 available in the back of the room.

14                   Operable Unit 1, once again, is the  
15 waste pit area. We do have one approved RI/FS  
16 document, major document, The Initial Screening Of  
17 Alternatives. The alternatives listed below here  
18 are the remedial alternatives that did make it  
19 through the initial screening phase. And they  
20 include alternatives such as capping the waste  
21 pits, treating the waste in place, treating the  
22 waste, removing and disposing it on site, and  
23 treating their waste and removing and disposing it  
24 off site.

1                   We do have treatability studies  
2 ongoing right now. We are investigating  
3 vitrification and cementation. Those activities  
4 are scheduled for completion in summer of '93.

5                   The Remedial Investigation Report,  
6 which basically documents the characterization data  
7 for the waste pit area is being prepared right  
8 now. It is a little bit ahead of schedule. And  
9 it's planned to be submitted to EPA and available  
10 for public review in October of next year.

11                   Operable Unit 2 is the first operable  
12 unit at the site in which we'll have a record of  
13 decision. Once again, we do have Initial Screening  
14 Of Alternatives Document approved. The  
15 alternatives carried forward and the feasibility  
16 study are also listed on this chart.

17                   One major activity which has happened  
18 since the last meeting, we do have a remedial  
19 investigation report, which was submitted to U.S.  
20 Ohio EPA on October 16th. And that document, once  
21 again, characterizes the environmental data from  
22 Operable Unit 2. That document is available in  
23 administrative record for public review. U.S. and  
24 Ohio EPA will be reviewing that document for a

1 60-day period. And then after which we will  
2 respond to comments.

3993

3 The feasibility study report, which  
4 we'll evaluate the alternatives listed on the chart  
5 here is under preparation, and is on schedule to be  
6 submitted to EPA in March of next year.

7 Once again, Operable Unit 3 includes  
8 all of the production facilities or former  
9 production facilities, and other man made  
10 facilities on site. We have submitted last June an  
11 RI/FS work plan, which outlined the  
12 characterization requirements for the production  
13 area.

14 We have had many discussions with the  
15 Ohio and U.S. EPA on this document. We have  
16 revised it once. We have given some examples of  
17 buildings and how we would characterize them. And  
18 the final work plan is due back to Ohio and U.S.  
19 EPA in December of this year.

20 Operable Unit 4, once again, we do  
21 have an approved Initial Screening of Alternatives  
22 Document, includes a combination of removal and  
23 non-removal alternatives. We are investigating  
24 three treatment technologies right now. They

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 include vitrification, cementation and chemical  
2 extraction.

3           Those treatability studies are  
4 scheduled for completion in February of next year.  
5 The Remedial Investigation Report is under internal  
6 review right now and is on schedule for submittal  
7 to EPA in April of next year.

8           The feasibility study report is  
9 basically on critical path right now. It's about a  
10 week or two behind schedule. As you can see, it's  
11 due to EPA in September of next year. We have had  
12 a few problems with the schedule in the  
13 vitrification treatability studies; although, we do  
14 have a significant amount of time to make up that  
15 schedule.

16           Once again, Operable Unit 4 includes  
17 the groundwater, surface water, soils and  
18 environmental media at the site. We do have an  
19 extensive characterization program ongoing in  
20 Operable Unit 5, including sampling of groundwater,  
21 surface and surface water and soils.

22           The Initial Screening Of Alternatives  
23 Document, as you can see, is due to EPA in April.  
24 That document is ahead of schedule, and will be

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 submitted to U.S. and Ohio EPA this month. So we  
2 are quite a bit ahead of schedule on that.

3           These are the alternatives which will  
4 be looked at in the initial screening phase.

5           The site-wide characterization  
6 report. We had, as the last bullet says there, we  
7 held a public round table on this document in  
8 October. This document was a -- came out of the  
9 negotiations we had with the U.S. and Ohio EPA last  
10 year ago summer. The agreement was signed in  
11 September, '91.

12           And the agreement we made was we  
13 would prepare this document to better integrate  
14 risk characterization among the Operable Units and  
15 to be used as information, and as we do the  
16 individual operable unit feasibility studies. The  
17 document included a summary of all the site-wide  
18 data which we had available as of December of 1991  
19 when the document was prepared. And will be  
20 updated as the individual remedial investigation  
21 reports come out with any new data that has been  
22 gathered since this document was prepared for each  
23 of the operable units.

24           The document did prepare a base line

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 risk assessment for the sites looking at the site  
2 as a whole and looking at the risk of contaminants,  
3 both the current land use of the site and with  
4 future land uses that can be foreseen at the site.  
5 The document sets forth a leading remedial  
6 alternative for each operable unit that will be  
7 used, as I said, in the feasibility study as an aid  
8 in the feasibility study for the operable units.  
9 So we can look at the risk on a site-wide basis.  
10 It was submitted on schedule to Ohio and U.S. EPA.  
11 We are responding to comments right now. And those  
12 are due back to EPA on December 1st of this year.

13 On the removal actions, once again,  
14 there is a listing of the 27 identified removal  
15 actions on the table in the back of the room, gives  
16 a summary of whether or not they're completed,  
17 ongoing, under construction, or planned. Also, if  
18 you look in the back of the room, there is the  
19 Fernald Project Cleanup Report, which gives  
20 specific details on each of the removal actions  
21 ongoing at the site.

22 I wanted to talk about three of  
23 these. The south plume removal action, I  
24 apologize, as I was looking through here, there is

1 one mistake on this slide. But as some of you are  
2 aware, this project has been broken up in five  
3 phases. Part one was providing alternate water to  
4 an industry south of Fernald of the Fernald  
5 facility. That project has been under construction  
6 for awhile now. And it was scheduled and will meet  
7 the schedule for completion December 7th of this  
8 year.

9           The mistake on this slide is part 2  
10 and part 3 should be turned around. Part 2 was  
11 providing extraction wells in the south plume area  
12 to extract the contaminated groundwater, pump it  
13 back to the site and then monitor and discharge it  
14 to the Great Miami River. That project is also  
15 under construction. The date for the completion of  
16 that project is August 30th, 1993.

17           As some of you can see down off of  
18 128, the new effluent line is going in. You can  
19 see major construction ongoing down there. Some of  
20 the problems we have had with the schedule of this  
21 portion of the project had to do with access to the  
22 areas south of the site for installing the  
23 extraction wells. We are still working on gaining  
24 access to those areas.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

44  
43

1                   Part 3 is the construction of the  
2 treatment systems on site. Those were operational  
3 on the date of August 30th, '92.

4                   Part 4 includes institutional  
5 controls and the areas south of the site. And this  
6 includes frequent monitoring of individual private  
7 off-site wells, which is ongoing.

8                   Part 5, we have initiated and  
9 completed some of the sampling in the area south of  
10 the extraction well locations. We have completed  
11 the areas where we had access. And we're still  
12 awaiting to get access to some of the properties to  
13 complete that sampling.

14                   There are a couple pictures, I  
15 believe, to give you a little bit of idea, some of  
16 the excavations for the installation of the  
17 alternate water supply system to the industry south  
18 of the site. I think there is one more that shows  
19 the pipeline ready to go.

20                   The next one is the Plant 1 Pad  
21 Renovation. This project was broken up into three  
22 phases. The first phase had to do with the  
23 installation of runoff and run on controls and the  
24 existing pad. This phase was completed ahead of

1 schedule in January of this year.

2 Phase 2 had to do with the  
3 installation of some temporary covered storage for  
4 the storage pad. And I have a couple pictures of  
5 that in a second. This was to provide 80,000  
6 square feet of additional covered storage for the  
7 drums of the Plant 1 Pad. It also included curbing  
8 around the new covered structures.

9 Phase 3 has to do with upgrading and  
10 renovating the entire existing pad by pouring epoxy  
11 coding over the entire pad and providing upgraded  
12 curbing.

13 Some of you have seen this picture  
14 before. This is a picture of the Plant 1 Pad. I  
15 believe it was taken in early 1987. And you can  
16 see the number of drums on the pad. Basically,  
17 there is no room for inspection. They were stacked  
18 on one another and they're in very bad condition.

19 The next slide was taken about two  
20 weeks ago, I believe. And as you can see, we have  
21 provided actually five new covered storage  
22 locations for the drums in the Plant 1 Pad. The  
23 two on the right side of the picture were the ones  
24 installed under part two of this removal action to.

1 provide 80,000 square feet of storage.

2           The next removal action, which is  
3 ongoing today is the Plant 1 ore silos demolition.  
4 As some of you saw, there is a model of the ore  
5 silos in the back table here, which was made to aid  
6 in the design of the project. Design was completed  
7 this year. Field activities were initiated by the  
8 award of a construction contract last month. It is  
9 scheduled for completion in '94.

10           In summary, there are 14 storage  
11 silos and support structures that will be D and  
12 D'd. And there is a picture, give you a little bit  
13 idea of what it looks like. These structures are  
14 located just south of the Plant 1 Building on  
15 site.

16           Quick summary of some of the  
17 technology development activities ongoing at the  
18 site, some of these are part of the individual  
19 operable unit treatability studies and some of them  
20 are part of technology development initiatives on  
21 site that are not directly tied into feasibility  
22 studies.

23           Vitrification, we're looking at  
24 vitrification or the melting or turning waste into

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

47  
46

1 glass for three of the operable units right now,  
2 Operable Units 1; we investigated, I believe, for  
3 Operable Unit 2; and it's ongoing for Operable Unit  
4 4.

5           Solidification cementation is also an  
6 alternative for Operable Units 1, 2 and 4. Under  
7 the material recycling, one of the removal actions  
8 which is identified on the back boards in the back  
9 of the room is a scrap metal program recycling  
10 initiative. And that activity has been initiated  
11 with SEG Corporation in Knoxville, Tennessee.

12           We're also looking at the possibility  
13 of recycling asbestos and concrete, both recycling  
14 those materials and also using them as additives in  
15 other treatment processes.

16           Soil decontamination, we're looking  
17 at that on a small bench scale right now on site to  
18 see what methods will work best to remove hazardous  
19 and radiological constituents from the soil on  
20 site. And the minimum additive waste stabilization  
21 project, there are some more details also on that  
22 in the back of the room.

23           What this project is looking at doing  
24 is trying to use contaminated media on site as

1 additives in other treatment processes to reduce  
2 the volume of contaminated material that may have  
3 to be shipped off site. We're looking at things  
4 like using the residues of the contaminated  
5 residues that came out of things like soil washing  
6 and water treatment as additives in the  
7 vitrification process.

8           The last two things I want to talk  
9 about, the Agreement In Principle. Some of you may  
10 have seen some reports of this in the paper and  
11 there may have been some later on. The Department  
12 of Energy over the last few months has been  
13 negotiating what is called an Agreement In  
14 Principle with the State of Ohio to provide them  
15 with funding to aid in the oversight of the cleanup  
16 activities of Fernald.

17           And what we mean by aid, the  
18 Department will be providing resources, both,  
19 monetarily and training resources to aid the State  
20 of Ohio, in providing increased oversight of the  
21 environmental monitoring program, and activities  
22 like the Ohio Department of Health and other  
23 related activities to increase their oversight of  
24 activities of Fernald.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

49  
48

3993

1                   The Department has signed these  
2 Agreements In Principle with other states. And I  
3 believe Ohio is the last one to do that. The  
4 agreement has not been signed officially yet;  
5 although, DOE and Ohio have come to an agreement on  
6 what the language of the agreement would look like  
7 and what the dollar amount would be, but has not  
8 officially been signed yet.

9                   The last thing, the Annual  
10 Environmental Report. That document has been  
11 approved by headquarters. I was told tonight that  
12 the report will be out in December officially. I  
13 know a few people have gotten draft copies of that  
14 report. I think those who have any questions on  
15 it, we can try to answer those tonight.

16                   I guess one thing I would like to  
17 mention that I got out of the report by reading it  
18 quickly was the significant decrease in the amount  
19 of uranium that has been discharged to the river.

20                   We monitor all discharges through our  
21 effluent line to the river on an annual basis. And  
22 we calculate the amount of uranium released. If  
23 you look at the report this time and you compare  
24 that to the previous four years, you'll see a

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

50  
49

1 significant reduction in uranium, which is what  
2 we're trying to do in cleanup.

3 From 1988, just as a comparison,  
4 1988, there was 1,892 pounds of uranium released to  
5 the river. That decreased each year until what it  
6 was in 1991. And in the report you'll see the '91  
7 number was 1,489 pounds. And we're committed to  
8 continue reducing that as much as possible.

9 In closing, I would like to publicly  
10 thank Hugh Daugherty and his staff once again for  
11 their support to me and my staff in the last two or  
12 three years in the environmental restoration  
13 program. And I wish them well wherever they go.  
14 Thanks.

15 MR. MORGAN: We have been at this  
16 just a little over an hour, and it's customary to  
17 take a short break, stretch your legs. There is  
18 some soft drinks in the back.

19 Let's reconvene in about 10 minutes,  
20 at which time we'll hear statements from EPA and  
21 Ohio and FRESH, and we'll take questions and  
22 comments from the audience.

23 (Brief recess.)

24 MR. MORGAN: First we'll hear from

1 Jim Saric from the EPA.

2 MR. SARIC: Good evening. The first  
3 thing I would like to do would really kind of like  
4 to reiterate our position at EPA towards this  
5 project and where I think this is going to be going  
6 in the next few years.

7 We're going to continue our  
8 commitment, as always, to protect human health and  
9 the environment and I encourage any public input I  
10 have, citizens groups or people to talk with me or  
11 call me at work if you have any questions, need to  
12 discuss of the issues or keep up-to-date with  
13 what's going on. I want to make sure there is  
14 communication between myself and the agency and  
15 everyone in the public.

16 As a result, I think all the  
17 deadlines in the Amended Consent Agreement that we  
18 negotiated, U.S. EPA considers to be very serious  
19 deadlines and ones that we are very committed to  
20 meet and committed to make DOE meet those  
21 deadlines.

22 We have had an opportunity to meet  
23 with the FERMCO people and the Department of Energy  
24 and upper management to meet with my upper

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

52  
51

1 management to discuss what would go on in the  
2 future here. Are DOE and FERMCO, are they  
3 preparing for this transition period to meet that,  
4 and I think they are.

5 I think, in meeting with the people,  
6 and discussing their credentials, I think there are  
7 a lot of qualified individuals here. And, you  
8 know, let's not pass judgment on FERMCO too  
9 quickly. They're committed, they say they can do  
10 it faster, they say they can do a better job.  
11 Let's see what actions, actions speak louder than  
12 words. And let's let them show us what they can do  
13 here. And, hopefully, we can do that.

14 As far as progress on the site, I  
15 think if you look at the number of removal actions,  
16 we have 27 removal actions. And today myself and  
17 some of the other folks of the U.S. EPA, we went on  
18 site, we toured the site and looked with the folks  
19 with DOE on the some removal actions for next  
20 year. And I know there will be 3 or 4 or maybe  
21 more removal actions that will be added to this.

22 And that's a lot of work. There is  
23 ongoing activities that are very important to show,  
24 you can look at the number of waste shipments and

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

53  
52

1 things going off site. I think there is a lot of 3993  
2 activity that's going on that's critical to show  
3 towards progress.

4 As far as documents, we have got the  
5 Site-Wide Characterization Report that's out right  
6 now. And for those of you who really want to learn  
7 something about the site or get a handle over  
8 what's going on or what the history, if you will,  
9 of this site, that document is an excellent  
10 document as a catchall, if you will, to understand  
11 what is going.

12 The OU-2 Remedial Investigation  
13 Report was submitted to us. And that's a very  
14 important document. It's one of the first major  
15 milestones that we consider it, it's really going  
16 to show the OU-2, the first decision we're going to  
17 make for cleaning up this site, the OU-2. So it's  
18 important to stay informed and to look at these  
19 documents, if you have a chance.

20 Another thing I think that's  
21 interesting are these remedial investigation  
22 feasibility sheets, the different colored ones in  
23 the back of the room, make sure you all get a  
24 chance to read these, the short synopsis that are

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

54  
53

1 there. And you'll also notice that all of them, or  
2 most of them, here have a listing of potential  
3 cleanup alternatives. And it's important to look  
4 at these cleanup alternatives that are there.

5           They are there for a couple reasons.  
6 Number one, in doing any project like this you have  
7 to think about what are your potential alternatives  
8 to cleanup the site or to cleanup a given operable  
9 unit and think about what potential remedies could  
10 be used. And not say this is the one we're going  
11 to use, but think about the potential  
12 opportunities. And then you'll gear what type of  
13 sampling or what type of needs do we have to take  
14 to potentially look at remedies to make sure they  
15 can work.

16           So although there is remedies listed  
17 in here or potential alternatives listed, those  
18 don't necessarily mean those are the ones we're  
19 going to select. It could be a different remedy  
20 going to select or it could be one of these.

21           We're taking data, we're gaining  
22 information now through this project so we can make  
23 informed decisions. If we knew exactly what remedy  
24 was best at this time, we wouldn't be going through

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

1 all the paper work process. We would try to avoid  
2 that as much as possible to cut to the chase and  
3 come up with a remedy. But it's important to go  
4 and get the work done as far as the data and put it  
5 all together in this process.

6 So pay attention to some of these  
7 documents here. I think they're going to help us.  
8 Because as the community and as in the future,  
9 there are a lot of important decisions that can be  
10 made out here. And I think it's important the  
11 public is informed and involved in decisions.

12 Again, if you have any questions, go  
13 ahead and ask me later. Thanks.

14 MR. MORGAN: Graham Mitchell from  
15 the State of Ohio.

16 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. I  
17 think the good news is that progress is continuing  
18 at the site, both on removal actions and in the  
19 final cleanup, towards the final cleanup. The  
20 first Remedial Investigation Report has been  
21 submitted and is under review. And as Jim said, we  
22 met this afternoon to discuss even further removal  
23 actions. This is where progress on the site is  
24 really taking place. You can see actual cleanup.

1 Ohio EPA is also very interested in  
2 the transition process. We have met with FERMCO  
3 staff on numerous occasions. We feel that they're  
4 committed to cleaning the site up. As we said at  
5 the last meeting, we're looking forward to working  
6 with them and we will assist in the transition  
7 process in any way possible.

8 I would also like to take the  
9 opportunity to thank WMCO for the job that they  
10 have done in the time I have been working here,  
11 which dates back to 1986.

12 Jack mentioned the Agreement In  
13 Principle, I wanted to just elaborate a little bit  
14 more on that. The State of Ohio has been  
15 negotiating an Agreement In Principle with the  
16 Department of Energy for some time. The cost of  
17 oversight of these facilities is tremendous, and is  
18 probably going to get even higher in the future as  
19 we get more and more detail.

20 The agencies, the Ohio agencies  
21 involved in this process are the Ohio Emergency  
22 Management Agency, the Ohio Department of Health,  
23 and Ohio EPA. Tom Winston, my supervisor, has been  
24 heading up the negotiations on this important

3933

1 agreement. This agreement involves not just the  
2 Fernald site, it involves the three major sites in  
3 the State of Ohio that DOE has, the Mound facility  
4 up near Dayton near Miamisburg, the Portsmouth  
5 facility over near Piketon and, of course, the  
6 Fernald facility here.

7 The details on this, as Jack said,  
8 are still being negotiated. And so, you know, the  
9 rest of the details of this agreement should come  
10 out in the near future, in the next month or so.

11 We are here tonight to answer your  
12 questions. I would like to hear your concerns,  
13 anything you have, I will be available during the  
14 question and answer session, and also available  
15 afterwards to answer any of your questions. If you  
16 have any other questions outside this meeting, feel  
17 free to call me, I would be glad to give you my  
18 phone number.

19 Also with me tonight is Kurt  
20 Collier. Kurt, will you stand up. He's also with  
21 Ohio EPA working on this project. Thank you very  
22 much.

23 MR. MORGAN: Thank you. Lisa  
24 Crawford, President of FRESH.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

58  
57

1 MS. CRAWFORD: I don't have a whole  
2 lot of comments for this evening. One of the  
3 things I do want to say, is I feel like people in  
4 this room need to know that we did have a 6:00  
5 meeting with several of the DOE people, the WMCO  
6 folks, the FERMC0 folks, all the public relations  
7 types, those kind of folks.

8 And one of the things we wanted to  
9 talk about was lay out our expectations for  
10 communications with the public, and to kind of get  
11 their expectations of us at the same time. Several  
12 people have commented on that this evening. We're  
13 glad that we had the opportunity to do that.  
14 Promises are great, we'll see if they work. And  
15 the apologies are very much accepted.

16 Couple of things, I want copies of  
17 the slides that were presented tonight. It's too  
18 much to write down. We talked about that in our  
19 meeting earlier. Maybe it would be a good idea to  
20 have copies of those at this meeting. Because it's  
21 real hard to try to write things down as you're  
22 flashing them cards up there. I didn't see them, I  
23 don't think they were here tonight.

24 One of things that I didn't hear

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

59

58

1 talked about tonight was the contamination in the  
2 line going to the river.

3 First, I have a question, and I don't  
4 know, Jack, you might be able to answer this: Has  
5 a sign been put up down there like we talked  
6 about? There is a sign up there. Is there a way  
7 you can get us a picture of that?

8 MR. CRAIG: Sure.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: We kept asking to put  
10 up a sign, put up a sign, nobody ever called to say  
11 we put up a sign. We want to see a picture to make  
12 sure there is a sign there.

13 The other thing is I think, people,  
14 there was an illusion made to the line to the river  
15 tonight, but there was really no explanation as to  
16 what we're doing regarding the contamination that  
17 was found and how we're going to deal with it, and  
18 those kind of things.

19 You know, I got a phone call, I don't  
20 know if it was last Saturday or the Saturday  
21 before, that part of the road had caved in on 128  
22 and the road had to be shut down. There was no  
23 mention of that tonight either.

24 I think they may seem insignificant

1 and unimportant, but to folks in the community,  
2 they're very important. You know there were calls  
3 came in that there was contamination under the  
4 road, that was found not to be true, you know, but  
5 these kind of things need to be talked about in an  
6 open forum like this forum tonight.

7           The other thing that I want to  
8 impress upon you is that we have found this  
9 contamination along this pipeline to the river that  
10 apparently was brought from the site down there to  
11 shore up the banks and stuff like that, never ever  
12 ever, ever, ever take anything off of this site to  
13 use off site. Don't take it from on site to use it  
14 off site anywhere, especially after the problems we  
15 have been finding with things that were taken off  
16 site to use for shore up and brick back and riff  
17 rack or whatever all them technowienie words are.

18           We have had a lot of discussions  
19 about the railroad. What's his -- Ray, I think you  
20 went through it very well. The little charts are a  
21 little bit confusing to all of us.

22           MR. HANSEN: I'll get you copies of  
23 those, Lisa.

24           MS. CRAWFORD: I think that would

1 help significantly.

3993

2 I sound like a broken record, but,  
3 Jim, I want you to know, again, in my comments for  
4 this meeting was we have had -- you're our fourth  
5 site manager in, like, a year and a half. And it  
6 gets a little confusing to people. Every time we  
7 have a RI/FS meeting, we have a new site manager it  
8 seems like.

9 And, you know, we need a leader, we  
10 need somebody who is here and is here full time and  
11 knows what is going on and basically is going to  
12 lead us. You know, I'm not knocking you. You and  
13 Bill and everybody else are probably very, very  
14 qualified for these jobs and that's great, but 90  
15 days isn't enough time. About the time we think we  
16 get to know somebody and begin to trust them and  
17 begin to feel comfortable in calling them, puff  
18 they're gone and we have some other new person to  
19 deal with. And it's real hard.

20 So I would encourage you to tell  
21 headquarters to get on the ball and get us  
22 somebody.

23 Jack, you referred to the Site-Wide  
24 Characterization Report a little bit earlier this

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

62  
61

1 evening, and I know there were copies of it back  
2 there. And at the bottom of your slide there was a  
3 notation that there was a round table held on  
4 that. And Vicki and I asked a lot of questions at  
5 the round table and we haven't gotten any answers.  
6 And I know it hasn't been that long, a couple weeks  
7 maybe, a week, I don't know. The meetings just all  
8 kind of flow together here.

9                   Those are very legitimate concerns  
10 that we raised and we really feel like we need some  
11 good concrete answers before we can proceed on  
12 that.

13                   The last thing I want to tell  
14 everybody is that at the next FRESH meeting, which  
15 is next Thursday night at 7:30 at the Venus  
16 Presbyterian Church in Ross, the Department of  
17 Energy will be our speaker and they'll be talking  
18 about the MAWS project. And, Bill, would you  
19 please tell everybody what MAWS stands for, because  
20 I can never remember.

21                   MR. ADAMS: Minimum Additive Waste  
22 Solidification.

23                   MS. CRAWFORD: Thank you. And it's  
24 the 19th of November. And we're looking -- a lot

1 of people in the FRESH group are looking forward to  
2 this workshop, or this presentation, or whatever  
3 you want to call it.

4 That's all I really have. I want to  
5 say thanks to Westinghouse. You know, some of the  
6 Westinghouse people have been a real pleasure to  
7 work with, some are okay, some are great. We have  
8 had our fair share of problems, too.

9 I want to welcome FERMCO, with a  
10 caution, we're watching, we're here, we're not  
11 going anywhere, we're going to be dogging you all  
12 the way. And you need to know that. And I think I  
13 told you that on many occasions. But I'll continue  
14 to say that over and over again.

15 We're the public and you want to get  
16 down right nitty-gritty about it, we pay you guys'  
17 salary and we're here to be watching how money is  
18 spent, and we're going to be watching how things  
19 are done, and we're going to be part of the public  
20 participation process come hell or high water.

21 Thanks.

22 MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Lisa. Jack,  
23 you want to speak a little bit about the outfall  
24 project.

1 MR. CRAIG: I think Lisa mentioned  
2 three items on the project. One had to do with the  
3 initial finding of the contamination, why they were  
4 doing the excavation down by the river for the new  
5 effluent line.

6 What we did with that material, the  
7 material that was part of the excavation, that  
8 material was boxed, put into the metal container  
9 boxes and brought back to the site for storage.  
10 There is an area of what we believe to be  
11 contamination outside of that construction area,  
12 which we will have to go characterize, and may take  
13 additional actions based on the characterization.

14 In any event, that characterization  
15 information will be put in the Operable Unit 5 RI  
16 report.

17 The collapse of the roadway Lisa  
18 mentioned had to do with some boring that was  
19 taking place under the roadway for, once again,  
20 that's dilution of the effluent line piping. There  
21 was no contamination in that area. I think  
22 somebody may have mistaken some -- they did stage  
23 some of the white metal boxes near the roadway  
24 there, but that was not for that material and was

3993

1 not contaminated.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: I think the reason I  
3 brought that up was so you would say that, because  
4 too many times people in the community see the  
5 white boxes or the yellow tape and they think oh,  
6 no, you know. And I think that's why it's  
7 important to keep the dialogue moving and people  
8 know what is going on so those kind of  
9 misinterpretations are not interpreted.

10 MR. CRAIG: I understand. I  
11 apologize. A lot of that information and most of  
12 that stuff I talked about tonight, and even the  
13 south plume contamination, is in the Cleanup Report  
14 in the back of the room if you would like to read  
15 it after the meeting also.

16 MR. MORGAN: All right. We can take  
17 questions from the audience, comments.

18 Yes, sir.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. The  
20 other day when I drove past Warner-Ross Road where  
21 the west side of plant where the railroad tracks  
22 are. It looked like I could have taken a stone and  
23 thrown it into those gondolas.

24 It seems like they're awful close to

1 the highway out there. And we have an awful lot of  
2 trouble with vandalism. It seems like the gondolas  
3 should at least be parked back beyond the  
4 construction site or the plant proper. I don't  
5 know why they're out so far close to the road.

6 Can you come up with an answer on  
7 that one?

8 MR. MORGAN: So you're concerned  
9 about the proximity of the railcars to where public  
10 access could be.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.  
12 Vandalism could occur down there. We have all  
13 pipes in our county and our state and that, seemed  
14 like the railroad cars should be left back into the  
15 plant more beyond the construction site. Follow  
16 me?

17 MR. MORGAN: Ray, can you speak to  
18 that?

19 MR. HANSEN: Typically what happens  
20 is when those cars arrive, they are to notify our  
21 security people, have them unlock the fence and put  
22 them inside.

23 Now, obviously, that didn't happen in  
24 this case. I think we just need to contact CSX and

1 make sure that does happen.

2 Is there anybody out there in the  
3 audience that has any more information on that?

4 But typically that's what happened.  
5 They should be left inside the gate.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My concern is  
7 vandalism. Boy, you're doing a nice job of sealing  
8 the cars up, I don't know if they're empty or  
9 loaded, you know, but if they're loaded --

10 MR. HANSEN: If they were outside,  
11 they were empty. But, nevertheless, it's a valid  
12 concern.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, thank  
14 you.

15 MR. MORGAN: Tony.

16 MR. SEARS: Tony Sears, Morgan  
17 Township Trustee. As we know, we have had some  
18 problems with the railcars. And that's what my  
19 questions are directed to.

20 First of all, I would like to direct  
21 this to the Department of Energy and the new  
22 contractor. What's the probability that the rail  
23 lines at College Grove, Indiana will be utilized  
24 for cleanup in the future?

1                   And is there the potential in the  
2 future that any level of cleanup materials may be  
3 shipped via this route?

4                   MR. MORGAN: The question was the  
5 use of the rail line for future shipments of waste  
6 from this site; is that correct?

7                   MR. SEARS: Correct.

8                   MR. MORGAN: Ray.

9                   MR. HANSEN: Right now there are no  
10 definite plans to use the rail for any more  
11 shipments. We will get the last five gondola cars  
12 to BCF out this week. After that there are no  
13 definite plans.

14                   However, I do want to tell you that  
15 there is the possibility that they could be used in  
16 the future. One of the things we're looking at is  
17 commercial disposal out west. And it is by rail.  
18 Most of our shipments, as you know, have been by  
19 truck. We intend to continue doing that, but there  
20 is the possibility of future use for shipping  
21 waste.

22                   MR. SEARS: Okay.

23                   MR. HANSEN: Yes, Vicki.

24                   MS. DASTILLUNG: Commercial disposal

3993

1 where out west?

2 MR. HANSEN: Right now we're looking  
3 at Envirocare in Utah. Yes, Tony.

4 MR. SEARS: Now, this is question is  
5 not intended to be nasty. What is the -- And this  
6 is directed to the National EPA and Ohio EPA --  
7 What is both EPA's involvement in an incident like  
8 the contaminated railcars in confirming the  
9 contractor's findings that no environmental  
10 contamination occurred or harmed to anyone like  
11 discharge or leakage along the route of the rail  
12 lines?

13 In other words, is the fox guarding  
14 the hen house again?

15 MR. MORGAN: All right. EPA and  
16 Ohio, are you prepared to speak to the issue of  
17 verifying what the Army and CSX and DOE is saying  
18 about the shipments.

19 MR. SARIC: Unfortunately, that's  
20 something that's not directly covered on U.S. EPA's  
21 jurisdiction, what we would do. Department of  
22 Transportation, that's part of their regulations.  
23 It's their job to look into that.

24 If there was a spill of a reportable

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

70  
89

1 quantity greater than a certain amount, we have an  
2 emergency response branch that would come out on  
3 scene and address an emergency situation like that  
4 if it was reported.

5           And, likewise, the state has the same  
6 thing. But as far as general tracking or keeping  
7 an eye on, you know, transportation of railcars,  
8 that's Department of Transportation, for the most  
9 part, to handle that, I believe.

10           MR. SEARS: So, in other words, if  
11 the Department of Transportation says there was no  
12 contamination, you take their word for it?

13           MR. SARIC: Yeah. I mean, right now  
14 we have no, I guess, it's not a policy or doesn't  
15 seem to be a position where we go back and we  
16 double check the Department of Transportation in  
17 their work.

18           But if there is a concern, we could  
19 definitely try to get into it and look into it to  
20 see if we can address it.

21           I'll go back and look into it further  
22 to see how our emergency response group handles,  
23 you know, issues like this. But I'm not exactly  
24 sure on how that would work in working with

1 Department of Transportation.

3993

2 MR. MORGAN: Lisa.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Can I follow-up on  
4 his question? On the slides that were up there, I  
5 noticed that DOT's levels were much higher than  
6 DOE's levels.

7 MR. HANSEN: That's right, Lisa.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: I think we need to  
9 get some clarification on that. You're shipping  
10 things and DOE is shipping things, they have to  
11 meet this level, which I think that's too high,  
12 that's my opinion. But DOT's level is twice as  
13 high or a little more. There is confusion, it's  
14 apples and oranges, as DOE likes to tell us all the  
15 time, that's apples and oranges, you can't compare  
16 the two. It's almost the same exact thing with DOT  
17 and DOE.

18 MR. SARIC: I agree. There is  
19 different levels, different organizations have what  
20 they consider different levels to be a free-release  
21 material or whatever. And, you know, we can go  
22 back and look into that and see how that worked.

23 But I think it is the Department of  
24 Transportation that would regulate that type of

1 thing. And it hasn't been our position to go back  
2 and double check what DOT is doing. But we can go  
3 back and look into it.

4 MR. HANSEN: Let me emphasize when  
5 we did check, we found no contamination, no reason  
6 to be that there was any loss of materials.

7 Secondly, the dose corresponding to  
8 the levels, we found is a very minimal dose,  
9 granted it's a dose that nobody needs to get. But  
10 we were looking at six-tenths of a millirem. And  
11 that's compared to the average person getting 360  
12 millirem per year. So it was a very, very small  
13 dose assignable, if there had been any release to  
14 the environment.

15 Vicki, you had your hand up.

16 MS. DASTILLUNG: You just answered  
17 my question.

18 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Yes, sir.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On this foot  
20 line that's going down to the Miami River, I asked  
21 earlier back there on the charts, I'm concerned  
22 about where it starts. It starts back on the west  
23 side of the plant where the old administration  
24 building in there; is that where it starts? This

1 new line they're putting to the Miami River, where  
2 does it start in the plant proper?

3 MR. MORGAN: Jack.

4 MR. CRAIG: We do our monitoring,  
5 effluent monitoring at manhole 175, which is near  
6 the eastern boundary of the site. If you're  
7 familiar with the Water Treatment Plant and Sewage  
8 Treatment Plant area, that's manhole 175, and  
9 that's where the monitoring is done. That's where  
10 the new effluent line will start.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. So we  
12 have an accident in the plant and all of a sudden  
13 contamination gets into the line, what procedure do  
14 you have of stopping it from going into the river;  
15 is there any such thing in the plant?

16 MR. MORGAN: The question is what  
17 safeguard do we have to make sure that something  
18 doesn't go down the drain that's not good.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or once it  
20 hits the drain, is it gone, is it in the river?

21 MR. MORGAN: Jack.

22 MR. CRAIG: Most of the runoff from  
23 the site, practically all the runoff from the  
24 production area, goes to a facility called the

3993

1 Stormwater Retention Basin.

2 It's a basin south of the production  
3 area that's used to store runoff from the site.  
4 That only goes to the effluent line if we pump it  
5 to the effluent line. So if there was an accident  
6 where we thought there was a large amount of  
7 contamination that had runoff from the site, we  
8 could hold it in that basin until we determine what  
9 to do.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the near  
11 future the water that they're going to be pumping  
12 out, is that going to be used in that line then?

13 MR. CRAIG: Yes, it is.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

15 MR. CRAIG: Graham, you want to --

16 MR. MITCHELL: I was just going to  
17 add to that, that the first Stormwater Retention  
18 Basin that was built actually had this spill  
19 prevention section to that, that was actually  
20 designed to hold a higher concentration of a spill,  
21 to hold it and then it could be capped, treated and  
22 pumped out separately before it got diluted with  
23 the rest of water.

24 MS. NUNGESTER: At the last RI/FS

1 meeting I asked about a cleaning update when you  
2 had done sampling on the silos and I wanted to know  
3 what you found in the samples of that material.  
4 And Pete did give copies to us at the FRESH  
5 meeting.

6           But in this one also you have got a  
7 lot of information which is good and that, but I  
8 find in Operable Unit 1 you say the sampling is  
9 completed, but it doesn't say anything about what  
10 you found. Again, we would like to know what was  
11 found in that sampling.

12           And also on your 740,000 cubic feet  
13 of low level radioactive waste that has been  
14 shipped off site in 1992, is this all mixed waste,  
15 hazardous waste, or what? It might be nice to  
16 know, you know, so many thousand barrels of one  
17 thing or whatever, break it down for us.

18           MR. CRAIG: Are you going to answer  
19 that, Ray, or --

20           MR. HANSEN: Yeah. No, there was no  
21 mixed waste that went to Nevada; and, no, no  
22 hazardous waste, at least as we know it, RCRA  
23 hazardous waste.

24           Most of this was construction rubble,

3993

1 old process residues, materials that could no  
2 longer be used for production, scraps, old used  
3 work gloves that are contaminated, just you name  
4 it, it's that kind of thing. But no RCRA materials  
5 at all.

6 MS. NUNGESTER: Well, I would  
7 suggest that you need to include that in the update  
8 so that we know exactly what you're talking about.

9 MR. HANSEN: Sure.

10 MS. NUNGESTER: Thank you.

11 MR. CRAIG: We will make the OU-1  
12 data available to you before the next meeting.

13 MR. MORGAN: Other questions? Yes.

14 MS. DASTILLUNG: I'm not going to  
15 stand up. In the Cleanup Report you talk on the  
16 silos, cementation, isn't that just going to create  
17 more waste that you're going to have to deal with  
18 later? Have you thought about this process?

19 And my other question on that, you  
20 talk about -- Where is it -- removing certain radio  
21 nuclei and heavy metals K-65 residues? I don't  
22 understand exactly what that is going to do. If  
23 that junk is all mixed up in there for all these  
24 years, I'm sorry, how is just removing certain

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

77  
78

1 parts of it, it's still going to all be  
2 contaminated, right? I don't understand the  
3 reasoning and the effect to try to do this certain  
4 thing from a mass of contaminated junk that's been  
5 sitting there.

6 MR. MORGAN: Seems like we have two  
7 questions there. One is --

8 MS. DASTILLUNG: Well, it's the  
9 K-65's.

10 MR. MORGAN: What is cementation all  
11 about, and won't that cause more problems than its  
12 solves. Why don't we deal with that first.

13 MR. CRAIG: Cementation that we  
14 found so far during treatability does provide an  
15 additive to the material to make a cement. So it  
16 does, from what we found so far, it does increase  
17 the volume of waste you have to dispose of.

18 That factor is put into the equation  
19 of, do you select cementation versus  
20 vitrification. What we found so far is  
21 vitrification actually reduces the volume.

22 So the answer to your question is,  
23 yes, it does, from what we found, increase the  
24 volume.

1                   Chemical extraction question, I'm not  
2 an expert in chemical extraction, but there are  
3 certain chemicals you can add to the material to  
4 extract the highly contaminated contaminants from  
5 the material. What you'll end up with is a, maybe  
6 a larger amount of slightly contaminated material,  
7 and a very small amount of highly contaminated  
8 material. And you have different options for  
9 disposing of the highly contaminated material and  
10 the low level contaminated material.

11                   MS. DASTILLUNG: But the high level  
12 stuff is still going to have contamination.

13                   MR. CRAIG: Yes, it is.

14                   MS. DASTILLUNG: You're not going to  
15 be able to get all that stuff out of there. I  
16 don't understand why that stuff is --

17                   MR. CRAIG: Maybe Randy Janke can  
18 explain that to us or suggest somebody else.

19                   MR. JANKE: This particular question  
20 is -- The reason we're trying to pass the buck here  
21 is because nobody likes to get into that kind of  
22 detail but me.

23                   What Jack said is exactly correct.  
24 There are processes you can do to extract the high

1 activity radio nuclei. What that means is there <sup>3993</sup>  
2 are a couple of constituents or contaminants in the  
3 K-65 material that causes the biggest problems from  
4 risk and from a, where do you put it concept.

5 Those particular contaminants, the  
6 principal one being radium, can be extracted out of  
7 the waste. So what we end up with, as Jack  
8 indicated, is a small volume, because there is less  
9 than about 6 kilograms of uranium in those silos --  
10 radium, sorry. We're talking about 6 kilograms or  
11 less.

12 And radium is fairly dense material,  
13 so you're talking about a very small volume. If  
14 you have the ability to get extremely high  
15 efficiencies out of this process, you will end up  
16 with this very small contact volume of radium and  
17 scratch your head and say, gee, what am I going to  
18 do with it.

19 Then you have about 19 million pounds  
20 of other material that would still have a certain  
21 quantity of uranium, a much smaller quantity of  
22 radium and some thorium. And there, as Jack  
23 indicated, you have different options.

24 Why is it being thought of? I guess

3993

1 the best answer to that is what Jim Saric said  
2 earlier, we have to go through these processes,  
3 evaluate all the different options for examining  
4 the materials from a treatability standpoint in  
5 order to evaluate what is best in terms of public  
6 health and safety for the long run. And that's why  
7 it's being considered.

8 It will not necessarily be the option  
9 chosen, because we have to go through the FS  
10 first. That document, as Jack indicated, is more  
11 than a year away. So after we get through the FS,  
12 the feasibility study, we will weigh all the  
13 factors, effectiveness, implementability, et  
14 cetera, et cetera, and come up with the preferred  
15 alternative.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Will the public be  
17 asked what their options or comments are on that?

18 MR. JANKE: Yes. In fact, the  
19 proposed plan, there is a comment period by the  
20 public. And we have to wait to get comments back  
21 before proceeding.

22 MS. DASTILLUNG: I guess my next  
23 question is: If you figure out how to get into  
24 those silos and extract the radon, why won't you

1 just get all of it out of there, once you figure  
2 out how to get in there?

3 MR. JANKE: Well, that's part of the  
4 extraction process and chemical separation  
5 technology. And as I indicated, it really requires  
6 extremely high efficiencies.

7 In other words, if we reduce the  
8 amount of radium by over a factor of a thousand,  
9 you will be approximately on par with what is in  
10 the waste pits, okay.

11 Waste Pit 5 has been reported through  
12 various data sources that have numbers on the order  
13 of about 550 picocuries per gram. That's a high  
14 number. The high number for radium in the K-65  
15 material is on the order of 4 or 500 nanocuries per  
16 gram, so factor a thousand decrease, we're looking  
17 at 99 percent plus efficiencies to do that.

18 We would have essentially what was  
19 remaining, 19 million pounds, would be equivalent  
20 to what we're dealing with in Waste Pit 5. So all  
21 the alternatives you're evaluating for OU-1 could  
22 then be considered in evaluating for waste  
23 materials in the K-65 silos. And that's a summary  
24 of that process.

3993

1 MS. DASTILLUNG: Okay.

2 MR. JANKE: As I indicated with this  
3 discussion, nobody really wants to tackle those  
4 kind of things here, except me.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you say  
6 6 kilograms, that's 6,000 grams?

7 MR. JANKE: Yes, that's 6,000  
8 grams. The reason I say 6 kilograms is you  
9 generally multiply by 2.2. So you're looking at  
10 somewhere in the neighborhood of less than 18  
11 pounds of material.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you  
13 extracting any radon out of those two silos now?

14 MR. JANKE: Radon is not being  
15 extracted. Radon is the principal daughter product  
16 to the decay of radium. And that's the element I  
17 was talking about, radium.

18 We have put bentonite in the silos to  
19 reduce or mitigate the diffusion of radon out of  
20 waste material and into the head space. We have  
21 achieved factors of over 90 percent reduction in  
22 that radon.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's what  
24 the diagram in the back was talking about, the 90

3993

1 percent?

2 MR. JANKE: That is correct.

3 MR. MORGAN: I got one question  
4 turned in. Are the crop samples from the field  
5 near the new effluent line back yet.

6 When we did discover that we found  
7 that the contaminated rubble down by the river  
8 folks were concerned whether or not the crops that  
9 were in that area had been sampled, samples were  
10 taken, we expect results January, February.

11 Other questions? Yes, sir.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I have  
13 a question. I'm a citizen that lived in the  
14 five-mile radius. And I have listened to all the  
15 presentations you have made here tonight and seen  
16 all the beautiful slides and pictures and  
17 everything you had, but I still didn't get the  
18 answer: When do you think you'll finally be all  
19 cleaned up?

20 MR. MORGAN: Oh, when are we going  
21 to be done with this, Jack?

22 MR. CRAIG: We don't have a good  
23 answer for that. The final record decision we  
24 have, according to our existing schedules, are not

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

83  
84

1 supposed to come out till June of 1997. It could  
2 be anywhere from 10 to 20 years after that till the  
3 whole site is cleaned up.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You don't  
5 have a goal?

6 MR. CRAIG: We don't know what the  
7 alternatives are yet for cleanup, so we really  
8 can't put a schedule forth until we know that.

9 MR. MORGAN: The Department of  
10 Energy has a Department of Energy wide goal of 30  
11 years from irradiation of these sites, that's a  
12 goal.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: I think the numbers  
14 we've been hearing are 20 years and \$10 million or  
15 something like that. Wasn't that in the five-year  
16 plan, the most recent one?

17 MR. MORGAN: Yes, ma'am.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: And every year we  
19 increase in cleanup years and money.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Job security.

21 MR. MORGAN: Other questions? Well,  
22 we're coming up here on 9:00. I sure appreciate  
23 you folks coming out and showing this interest in  
24 our cleanup effort. Thank you.

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

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:00 P.M.

C E R T I F I C A T E

1 I, LISA STEINHEISER, RPR, the undersigned, a  
 2 notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify  
 3 that at the time and place stated herein, I  
 4 recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had  
 5 transcribed with computer-aided transcription the  
 6 within (86), Eighty-six pages, and that the  
 7 foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete  
 8 and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.  
 9

10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LISA STEINHEISER, RPR  
 FEBRUARY 21, 1995. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO

87  
