

4608

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FERNALD
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
COMMUNITY MEETING TRANSCRIPT OF
PROCEEDINGS JUNE 22, 1993**

06/22/93

**DOE-FN
124
TRANSCRIPT**

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
COMMUNITY MEETING

- - -

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

- - -

The above-styled meeting was held at 7:00 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, June 22, 1993, at The Plantation, 9660 Dry Fork Road, Harrison, Ohio.

ORIGINAL

FORM CSH - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & SUPPLY CO. 800-850-0808

1 there is a copy of it in the back; and on the hand-
2 outs that are in the back, you can pick that up.

3 Just a few things that I'd like to point
4 out. First of all, on June 26th, it's the second
5 item down there, is our joint response exercise.
6 That's going to happen this next Saturday.

7 Once a year we run a drill of our emergency
8 response, so there will be a lot of activities going
9 on Saturday morning as we have emergency responders
10 practicing doing what they would need to do in case
11 of an emergency at Fernald, for that matter, or
12 somewhere else, for that matter. It's a wonderful
13 opportunity, because we test not only Fernald's
14 resources but county and state resources as well.

15 July 14th will be a workshop public meeting
16 on our new advisory committee; and in our last public
17 meeting I mentioned that. We've been talking about
18 how we felt a need to have a citizens advisory com-
19 mittee really help us grapple with some key issues
20 about the site: how clean is clean, what are we
21 ultimately going to do with the waste, what is the
22 ultimate use of the site.

23 Now, we still don't know what the composi-
24 tion of this group will be or what its charter will

1 be exactly. To help the Department of Energy and our
2 EPA and Ohio EPA form this committee, we've selected
3 a convener: Dr. Eula Bingham. She will be running
4 that meeting.

5 And let me tell you a little bit about Dr.
6 Bingham. She is a remarkable woman. She really
7 wanted to be here tonight but had business out of the
8 state. She is a professor at the University of Cin-
9 cinnati. She's also director of the Ohio Hazardous
10 Substance Research Identification and Management
11 Institute. She is a member of the National Academy
12 of Sciences.

13 She served on local, national and interna-
14 tional committees dealing with environmental and
15 public health issues. She is a voluntary investiga-
16 tor for the National Institute of Environmental
17 Health. She is a graduate of Eastern Kentucky Uni-
18 versity, and in 1977 through '81 she was a Secretary
19 of Labor for the Occupational Safety and Health
20 Administration, that's OSHA, in the Department of
21 Labor.

22 Awards for her work: American Lung Associa-
23 tion and the American Public Health Association, and
24 besides her own, her earned doctorate, she has two

1 honorary doctorates.

2 What Dr. Bingham is going to be about is
3 interviewing people in the community, opinion lead-
4 ers, members who are representative of, say, labor,
5 talking with folks from FRESH and other people.

6 She's been off to the Governor's Office to
7 try and talk about how do we form a citizen advisory
8 group that's really going to be effective, that's
9 really going to be objective and going to be useful.

10 She'll be making recommendations. Part of
11 that process will be this public meeting coming up on
12 July 14th.

13 One other item I want to point out that's
14 not on this list, but we're going to be having our
15 environmental education courses, community environ-
16 mental education courses that were quite popular last
17 year, again in the fall.

18 We have a sign-up sheet over at the table if
19 you would like to get direct mailing for our, what we
20 anticipate is the courses. We've got a lot of new
21 interesting things that we think would be very useful
22 to you, so if you want to get direct mailings, please
23 sign up.

24 With that, I want to introduce our current

1 acting manager of the site: Ray Hansen.

2 MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Ken.

3 You note that he did say acting manager. We
4 really don't have a permanent manager yet, but let me
5 at least fill you in on what's happened.

6 Bob Teller, the last permanent manager we
7 had at the site, retired effectively May 30th. What
8 that means is that now we can go ahead and officially
9 recruit for the permanent manager position at Fer-
10 nald.

11 Jerry Westerbeck, you remember, was the
12 deputy manager. He has now officially been trans-
13 ferred to headquarters, so that leaves open another
14 position of deputy manager at the site.

15 My tenure is roughly 90 days. At least
16 that's what my appointment letter says. Dependent on
17 how quickly headquarters can get out their recruit-
18 ment bulletin and select a man for the site, it might
19 be less than 90 days.

20 It might be longer, and typically we know
21 that it might be longer, but one thing I do want to
22 assure you of, during my 90 days I do intend to con-
23 tinue complete, open and candid communications with
24 all of you.

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 We've got these little cards, that Ken men-
2 tioned, in the back of the room for questions. I've
3 got one here already. It's a great segue to my next
4 subject, and that's the budget.

5 Headquarters basically has said that for
6 1994 we will have a 25 percent reduction in our
7 budget over what we had expected and had published in
8 our five-year plan. We expect from '95 through '98 a
9 further 30 percent reduction over what we had
10 expected and, again, what was in our five-year plan.

11 What that means in total is the budget we
12 had looked at in terms of 2.2 billion has now been
13 reduced to about \$1.6 billion. The impacts of that
14 are, of course, foremost in all your minds, certainly
15 in ours, and how does that impact remediation.

16 What we feel we can do, and this is impor-
17 tant, is meet all of the milestones that we have in
18 our consent agreement and consent agreement with the
19 State of Ohio. Meeting milestones, however, does not
20 mean remediation.

21 Basically, our milestones are paper exer-
22 cises, the RI/FS process that we're going through
23 right now. What we haven't evaluated and what we
24 won't be able to evaluate for a while is what we can

1 do in actual physical remediation after the records
2 of decision are announced.

3 We do have priorities at the site. Basi-
4 cally, our first number one priority is the safety
5 and health of our employees and of the public; and
6 the second priority, of course, is to meet our mile-
7 stones in our legal agreements.

8 And if I haven't answered whoever gave me
9 this question, I'll be glad to take more questions on
10 that.

11 How do we intend to cope with the budget?
12 If you look at our budget -- and I wish I had a slide
13 to show you, but I don't -- roughly half of the
14 budget is basically used for what we call base serv-
15 ices at the plant.

16 That's basically what is required to keep
17 the plant open, to do things like utilities, main-
18 taining and house the people that we have on site, do
19 maintenance, surveillance activity, which means we
20 walk around and make sure that there's no fire and
21 safety hazards, waste management activities.

22 And, of course, probably what is the most
23 trying and difficult to cope with is the housing and
24 warehousing of uranium materials. We still have a

1 lot of materials on site that are not waste.

2 Now, there is a sale going on, and I've
3 talked to you before about that. We still are look-
4 ing at a schedule that will look at June 25th for
5 making a whirl to sell the uranium that's on site.
6 But what we hope to do to reduce that base load is,
7 one, accelerate waste shipments, get the waste off
8 site as quickly as we can, get rid of the materials
9 on site as quickly as we can.

10 The reasoning behind that is if we can take
11 the materials out of the buildings that house those
12 materials, we can shut down those facilities. That
13 means a reduction in utilities, the power, the light,
14 the heat necessary to keep the buildings going. It
15 also means less surveillance activities, which use up
16 money.

17 Close down those facilities and, hopefully,
18 accelerate D and D of the facility. That's our
19 intent, and we'll keep you posted on progress along
20 those lines.

21 The future of the field office, well, I
22 already talked about the permanent manager. Whether
23 we will become a field office or not is in question
24 right now. We have basically an approval for 80

1 staffers right now. That approval has now been
2 reduced to 71.

3 We had nine more justifications in the head-
4 quarters, and headquarters are basically looking to
5 approve those nine additional people. Right now
6 that's in limbo, the additional nine staffers are in
7 limbo, and it's basically because the Secretary has
8 got a task force looking at DOE employee allotment
9 over the whole complex.

10 Whether we become a field office or not is
11 also going to be part of another task force that she
12 will assign in the near future, that really looks at
13 the complex-wide requirements for field offices and,
14 once again, the total staff of DOE employees.

15 But we'll keep you posted on anything we
16 hear. Once again, all of this is dependent on the
17 studies that the Secretary's initiated.

18 Now back to the reduction in our budget. I
19 hate to talk about this type of thing, but, in
20 essence, we have to. What that reduction in budget
21 means is that we'll have to have a reduction in our
22 work force. Nobody likes it less than I do, but
23 that's something we have to do.

24 On June 10th I sent out a letter basically

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 asking stakeholders in this process -- and, once
2 again, we're defining stakeholders not as Ken
3 defined them, which is the advisory committee stake-
4 holders, but basically the stakeholders we're look-
5 ing at now are our local government employees or
6 governments, let's say, elected officials, the
7 employees themselves that work at the site, you, the
8 public, and any interested organizations.

9 There are copies of the letter in the back
10 of the room, but essentially what we're doing is
11 asking you to participate in developing a future work
12 force with the proper skill mix so that we can do an
13 adequate job of remediation.

14 Our schedule right now looks at comments, at
15 least on the letter I sent out, due the 24th of this
16 week. The letter that will go out to the employees
17 and the stakeholders, the other stakeholders, the
18 subcontractors on site. We're asking for comments
19 back by June 30th on that, and basically your comment
20 now is just would you like to participate in this.

21 And the schedule we're looking at, we will
22 look at setting up a meeting for all the respondents,
23 those that would like to participate in this process,
24 hopefully set up a meeting by July 5th, the week of

1 July 5th. We intend at that meeting to pass out our
2 plan for reducing the work force on site. We would
3 like comments back by July 16th.

4 And then the schedule after that is we will
5 revise the plan, incorporate the comments where
6 they're meaningful and the right thing to do, and
7 then go ahead and send a revised plan to headquarters
8 for their approval.

9 And then headquarters, in turn, will take
10 the plan for all of the DOE complex and submit a
11 single plan for restructuring the work force in the
12 DOE complex to Congress by September the 7th, which
13 means, then, that actual reductions in force wouldn't
14 occur until about October the 7th, although we do
15 plan on making some notifications around August 7th.

16 Our intent, once again, is to retrain where
17 we can, to utilize early retirements if we can, and
18 also to look at normal attrition. And we'll keep you
19 posted on everything that goes on there.

20 Some good news, and there is some good news.
21 We recently made a grant of \$20,000 to local offi-
22 cials of the Cincinnati Zoo. This is part of their
23 program that they have with the youth.

24 The \$20,000 is intended to underwrite educa-

1 tion for environmentalists or, hopefully, people that
2 will be interested in the environment in the future.
3 There is a leadership, environmentalist leadership
4 training program and an inner city lab. The grant
5 will cover both of those projects.

6 Typically, this is for -- not typically.
7 This is for the inner city and to try to get them
8 interested in the environment. It will involve the
9 Rockdale Elementary School. It's a school located
10 near the Cincinnati Zoo, and it's predominantly
11 minority population.

12 The training program for environmentalist
13 leadership is a two-year course aimed at grades four
14 through six. The program will include weekly
15 classes, monthly field trips and a ten-day summer
16 field trip. The program also will offer students
17 training in organizing recycling and Earth Day
18 projects. So it's geared toward the environment.

19 The land lab project really will develop an
20 environmental laboratory on the Rockdale School
21 property and will supplement what is called the Cin-
22 cinnati Edzoocation Program. This land lab even-
23 tually will be used, can be used by other teachers
24 and students in the Cincinnati school system.

1 Some more good news on the public water
2 supply. We did our study. If you're not aware, let
3 me go ahead and go back a little bit.

4 As you know, the design included a large
5 line basically geared toward future growth in the
6 area, and there was some question about holdup of the
7 water supply, water usage in this large capacity
8 design pipeline, and the concern was with trichloro-
9 methanes.

10 Now, trichloromethanes are a known carcino-
11 gen and basically occur when chlorinated water or at
12 least natural biological organisms are in contact
13 with chlorinated water for any extended period of
14 time, so there is concern about the possible duct
15 time in the system.

16 Our study shows basically that we'll be able
17 to use the water, and we have sent a letter to the
18 Hamilton County informing them of our intent.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: When?

20 MR. HANSEN: I'm sorry?

21 MS. CRAWFORD: When are you going to send
22 that letter?

23 MR. MORGAN: Oh, we already have.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Can we get a copy?

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 MR. HANSEN: I have a copy with me, if you
2 would like.

3 MR. MORGAN: In the back of the room I think
4 we have a copy of it.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: Thank you.

6 MR. HANSEN: As you know, we are looking at
7 roughly four and a half million dollars grant to
8 Hamilton County for the public water supply.

9 You're all aware of the uranium problems we
10 had on site. Frank Peters of FERMCO will discuss
11 that later, but I just wanted to let you know that we
12 did get a copy of the investigation report today.

13 We haven't had a chance to really digest it.
14 We will make that available to the public reading
15 rooms by Friday, and I will also offer at least the
16 first 50 pages of the report. The rest are all
17 appendices with backup data for the report to anyone
18 who would like one.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: What report?

20 MR. HANSEN: The investigation report on the
21 UNH spill.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

23 MR. HANSEN: All right. If you're not
24 aware, we've had an investigation going on for quite

1 a while.

2 With that, I'll go ahead and finish, and I'd
3 like to introduce Sue Peterman. Sue Peterman is
4 acting in my old position, a very competent person.
5 I'm very proud of Sue, and she's going to take over
6 the areas that I covered in these meetings.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. PETERMAN: That's for me?

9 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

10 MS. PETERMAN: The topics I want to talk
11 about are waste shipments and some of the waste that
12 we've gotten off site. This is our kind of standard
13 graph for the waste shipments (indicating), and our
14 number to date is -- of course, I can't read it from
15 here -- 52,598.

16 I kept looking at my notes, saying I don't
17 find it.

18 Okay. This is a picture of our scrap metal
19 pile. We've currently shipped 54 shipments, which
20 equaled over 6,300 drum equivalents of scrap metal
21 for recycling as of May 31st. The recycling that
22 we're going to use the scrap metal for are shielding
23 blocks and then manufacture the white metal boxes
24 that you can put more material into.

1 That was before and this is the after pic-
2 ture. All the materials' been placed into the white
3 metal boxes. 750 tons of our scrap metal has been
4 shipped outside already.

5 One of the things that we're looking at is
6 compacting of residues. We mobilized a vendor back
7 in February. We've made seven shipments equaling
8 about 400 drum equivalents. We do have upwards of
9 50,000 drum equivalents that we need to take care of.

10 What we've done is we've been working with
11 SEG down in Oak Ridge for compacting of the drums and
12 the material, and right now we're showing that it's
13 capable of reducing nine drums down into one.

14 Okay. This is a picture of our copper scrap
15 pile, which is 1400 tons. We put a request for pro-
16 posal out to 60 bidders, and we're expecting the bids
17 due tomorrow and we expect to award the contract in
18 early August.

19 We had 252 drums of barium chloride shipped
20 to Envirocare of Utah back in May. I would like to
21 point out the professional photography in this pic-
22 ture. I happened to be in Salt Lake, and as part of
23 our seminar we went out to Envirocare. These are the
24 Fernald drums and I personally took the picture, so I

1 found them.

2 And just a second, if I can have that one.
3 This was the first time that Fernald received a vari-
4 ance to ship waste to a commercial disposal facility;
5 and the drums had been stored at NSSI in Texas.

6 Okay. We've had approval to ship magnesium
7 fluoride to the Nevada test site back in April.
8 We've currently shipped about 50 percent, which
9 equals 4,000 -- whoops, sorry -- 50 percent, which
10 equals 2,106 drum equivalents. We expect completion
11 of this waste by mid-August.

12 Okay. This is a picture of thorium being
13 overpacked. We've currently shipped 184 tons to the
14 Nevada test site. We plan on shipping 848 tons in
15 fiscal year '94. We're currently working with the
16 Nevada test site to ship two additional waste
17 streams.

18 Building 65 will be the last building to be
19 overpacked. That contains the thorium, and that's
20 expected to be completed in early 1994. Our applica-
21 tion was submitted on June 18th to ship the rest of
22 the thorium, and we expect to begin shipping in Feb-
23 ruary '94.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to ask

1 you a question. They have protective clothing on but
2 nothing on their face. Is there any hazards with the
3 working conditions there?

4 MS. PETERMAN: Those drums are overpacked.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But they have got
6 protective clothing, I notice that, and nothing on
7 their face. Is there anything they can inhale from
8 that?

9 MS. PETERMAN: I would say no, but I will
10 double-check on that and get back to you.

11 Okay. This is a picture of some of the
12 uranium. Ray mentioned that the contract for the
13 sale of the uranium is expected to be announced on
14 the 25th of June, and that's about the only update I
15 have on that one.

16 A couple of points I wanted to make about
17 our shipments to the Nevada test site. We are going
18 to have a review by Nevada at the end of July. After
19 that completion of the audit, we expect to receive
20 approval to ship the new waste streams, and we've
21 been praised by the Nevada site that we're the first
22 generator ever to develop and maintain a successful
23 shipping program.

24 One of the other things that we've started

1 shipping is the tribunin phosphate to the incinerator
2 in Oak Ridge. We shipped about 4,000 gallons, which
3 is the first of four bulk liquid waste transfers.
4 The remaining three shipments going to Oak Ridge have
5 to be timed so that the incinerator can take them.
6 So we're waiting for their approval to continue the
7 last couple of shipments.

8 One of the other wastes that we've gotten
9 off site is 80,000 pounds of lead batteries for recy-
10 cling. They were, the last part of it was shipped on
11 June 2nd, and both the lead and the acid in the bat-
12 teries will be recycled. They were shipped to, I
13 believe it was, Exide Corp. in Reading, Pennsylvania.

14 Do you want to get the other one.

15 One topic that I wanted to bring out is
16 we've been doing some local educational outreach.
17 This is a picture of the Oak Hills High School kids
18 from the scientific and technical writing course, and
19 I'm on the end. And we got to have a visit at The
20 White House, and we met with Tipper Gore. We also
21 met with the Secretary of Energy.

22 And what the high school kids did was, this
23 document is like 94 pages and it's supposed to be a
24 user-friendly guide on environmental restoration and

1 waste management. They did a test on it and deter-
2 mined that it was post-doctorate level. Not very
3 friendly, so the Department of Energy had a contest
4 that all the field offices could have local area high
5 schools prepare a document to match this. So we
6 prepared one, submitted it along with seven other
7 field offices, and ours was chosen as the document
8 that won.

9 So we have been working with headquarters.
10 We have now gotten a lot of the concurrences. It's
11 almost done, and it's a 25-page environmental resto-
12 ration and waste management and introduction.

13 It's much easier to read. We've had a lot
14 of positive feedback. I just wish we could get it
15 out of the draft form and into actual publication.
16 If you want to receive a copy once it is out, we will
17 take names for that. Like I said, the kids did an
18 excellent job, and we were quite proud of them.

19 One of the things that we did, or I worked
20 with, along with Jeff Ritchie and some of the other
21 people from the Fernald field office, is we took
22 apart the site specific plan from last year and did a
23 site history document to help explain what is the
24 purpose of Fernald.

1 I felt that in order for you to help us with
 2 our planning, you had to understand where we are, how
 3 did we get here and what do we need to do, and so
 4 we've got a draft of that document. I've worked with
 5 the second semester class. This one is currently in
 6 the field office for review. Once we get it
 7 approved, it will be out for public consumption.

8 And that's all I have.

9 Oh, I'm sorry. I'd like to introduce Frank
 10 Peters. He's going to cover the uranyl nitrate hexa-
 11 dryl spill.

12 MR. PETERS: Good evening. I am Frank
 13 Peters, and I serve at FERMCO Corporation as an oper-
 14 ations manager.

15 The area of the uranyl nitrate spill was in
 16 Plant 2 and Plant 3. However, the problem probably
 17 started in Plant 8, and I'd like to talk a few min-
 18 utes about what Plant 8 is, what it does, what its
 19 mission is.

20 The purpose of Plant 8 is collection and
 21 treatment of processed water to remove residual
 22 uranium and solids that may be in that water. The
 23 process is to collect water, neutralize the water
 24 with lime and then filter the water and lime mixture.

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 The filtered solids are packaged for disposal, and
2 the filtered water is then sent to other processes at
3 the plant for further purification.

4 On April the 27th of this year approximately
5 13,000 gallons of uranyl nitrate solution was acci-
6 dentally introduced into this water treatment system.
7 On April the 28th as we were attempting a recovery
8 operation from that incident, we had a spill that
9 consisted of about 30 gallons of this original uranyl
10 nitrate that had been diluted with processed water
11 when it was mixed in Plant 8.

12 I've chosen a simplified process flow dia-
13 gram to try to demonstrate what happened. This is
14 going to be a little awkward with the microphone here
15 and the picture there, but I'll jump back and forth.

16 Tank 601 here and next to it tank 608, 601
17 contained storm water and 608 contained uranyl
18 nitrate solution. On the afternoon shift of April
19 27th, a Plant 8 operator went to tank 601 and 608
20 and, believing that both tanks contained storm water,
21 valved both tanks to the Plant 8 process system.

22 The uranyl nitrate was equally distributed
23 in the tanks F-104 through D-101 through D-105. The
24 solution also passed through the filters and mixed

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 with filtered water that was in tank 25-A, 21-A,
2 22-A, and I believe that's 28-A on the end.

3 The operators in the facility noticed an
4 unusual odor with the solution in tanks 25, 21, 22
5 and 28 and also an unusual color. They stopped the
6 process at that point.

7 Our technical people came to the plant, late
8 on the afternoon shift, early on the midnight shift,
9 and determined that we had truly transferred UNH from
10 tank 608 into this process. The immediate corrective
11 actions were to neutralize the acidic solutions that
12 were in F-104, D-101 through D-105.

13 The next morning, with tank 25-A, 21-A, 22-A
14 and 28-A containing solution that was elevated in
15 uranium, an attempt was made to recycle that uranium,
16 to recycle that uranium back to tank 601 and 608.
17 During that transfer we did transfer a solution to
18 601 and 608.

19 But simultaneous with that, we had a -- we
20 had the filtrate passing through this line, in fact,
21 to the sump system, and the sump system overflowed
22 and approximately 30 gallons of that solution exited
23 Plant 2/3 on, if this was geographically correct, on
24 the north side of the facility.

1/2 1/2 2'

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 That spill was detected. It was contained.
 2 It was cleaned up on the 28th. Surveys were done of
 3 that area, and the residual background after cleanup
 4 was essentially what it was before the spill.

5 In traveling, in the attempt to recycle the
 6 solution back to 601 and 608, the filtered water that
 7 went back toward the sump passed through at least two
 8 check valves that failed during that process.

9 The sump pumps had been turned off as a
 10 result of the incident. We did not want the sump
 11 pumps to be pumping additional fluids into a system
 12 that was at that point constipated, at that point
 13 shut down. The pumps were turned off.

14 One of the things that is true is that,
 15 while they were turned off, they were probably not
 16 properly secured in that they do have isolation
 17 valves, and those isolation valves were not ade-
 18 quately turned off.

19 The status of the plant right now is that
 20 UNH solution continues in tanks F-104, D-101 through
 21 105, 25-A and 21-A. 22-A and 28-A were emptied dur-
 22 ing the process of recycling back to 601 and 608, and
 23 also -- well, that's when the spill occurred.

24 We are in the process of putting together a

1 recovery plan. We -- we are awaiting, I guess, the
2 results of the investigation board to make sure that
3 we incorporate all of the lessons learned. We need
4 to review that report diligently to be sure that when
5 we recover from this incident, we have the benefit of
6 that extensive investigation.

7 Now, we have started several actions. We're
8 looking very strongly at configuration control in
9 this area. The plant when it was in operation had
10 marvelous flexibilities. You could move anything
11 anywhere in that time, but in that flexibility comes
12 risk. We're looking at trying to create dedicated
13 paths for solution flow till we don't get surprised,
14 till we won't be surprised. We're also writing a
15 detailed procedure for this recovery.

16 Any questions?

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes, I have two.

18 MR. PETERS: Sure.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you use a mike,
20 please.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: Sure.

22 I want you to correct me, because I want to
23 make sure I'm understanding this. This is a water
24 treatment processing; this is where you do water

1 treatment processing?

2 MR. PETERS: Yes.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: What I don't understand is
4 why was UNH in tank 608 to begin with --

5 MR. PETERS: Okay.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: -- if this is a water treat-
7 ment processing area? Number two, why wasn't this
8 tank very clearly marked somewhere, whether it had a
9 sticker or a sign or whatever on it, saying what the
10 hell was in it? I think those are two real simple
11 basic questions that I know my folks are sitting here
12 asking themselves.

13 MR. PETERS: Sure.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: And I'd like some kind of an
15 answer, because I'm real confused.

16 MR. PETERS: Okay. The two tanks that I
17 didn't mention were 609 and 610. And as we talked
18 about the Plant 8 process, 609 and 610 are the reac-
19 tion tanks for the UNH project for the removal action
20 to treat the 200,000 gallons of UNH. 608 is a feed
21 tank to 609 and 610. It was intended that UNH be in
22 that tank.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: So it's typical for you to
24 store UNH in 609 and 610?

1 MR. PETERS: In 608, 609 and 610, yes, it
2 was typical that it be stored in those tanks.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

4 MR. PETERS: Yes.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: Shouldn't your employees have
6 been aware of that, that it was typical for it to be
7 there?

8 MR. PETERS: It's certainly one of the les-
9 sons that we have to learn. I can address it some-
10 what in the people who normally operated tank 601 and
11 608 were assigned to Plant 2 and 3. Typically, those
12 people are the ones who would discharge storm water
13 from 601 to the Plant 8 recovery.

14 On the afternoon of the incident, the opera-
15 tor in Plant 8 found F-104, D-101 through 105 begin-
16 ning to empty, and he went to 601 and 608 with the
17 intention of supplying additional feed material for
18 his process in Plant 8, and --

19 MS. CRAWFORD: So this is a process that has
20 to be kept, there needs to be kept a certain amount
21 of water in it at all times?

22 MR. PETERS: No, no. The water is -- the
23 water is the feed material. Whatever is there, we
24 process.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

2 MR. PETERS: It may vary, depending on what
3 we wash down that day, those types of things.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: And this little arrow here
5 that says "filtered water for further treatment,"
6 where does that go?

7 MR. PETERS: Well, it can go in several
8 routes. It can go to the biodenitrification facil-
9 ity. It can go to the general sump where it would
10 be --

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Go to the river?

12 MR. PETERS: Yeah, it ultimately would.
13 Yes, ma'am.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. Then the other ques-
15 tion I have you didn't answer for me yet is, why
16 wasn't this tank clearly marked?

17 MR. PETERS: Well, the tank was marked with
18 a standard code, but the markings on the tank were
19 confusing to the people. It's one of the things that
20 will, I'm sure, be pointed out in the investigation.
21 It was less than adequately marked.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: So when we get done here,
23 when you come back with a plan that probably 5,000
24 people are going to have to look at before we can

1 even implement it, what are we going to do with all
2 this stuff and what are we going to do with these
3 filters? Is this ultimately going to become waste?
4 Because now it's contaminated with uranium. Correct?

5 MR. PETERS: No, no.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: No. You just told me that it
7 had uranium in it a few minutes ago.

8 MR. PETERS: Yes, yes. The uranium that is
9 in F-104 -- well, the recovery plan will simply be to
10 take the uranium solutions that are in 25-A and 21-A
11 and to move them back to 601 and 608. And at that
12 point we will proceed -- well, the uranium in F-104
13 through F-- or D-105 is precipitated now. It was
14 part of the neutralization process that we went
15 through.

16 We will take the materials in F-104, et
17 cetera, and we will process it through those filters.
18 The uranium will exit on the sludge side and will be
19 put in drums and will be shipped for burial. The
20 process will cause the filtered water to meet our
21 discharge limits.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

23 MR. PETERS: There will be a couple of chal-
24 lenges. We have elevated uranium solutions in 25-A,

1 21-A and have had it in 22 and 28. We certainly will
2 have to clean those out and we will have to wash
3 those until the wash solutions are as low as we can
4 get them.

5 And at that point the collection tanks for
6 the, if you will allow me the term, clean water will
7 have been cleaned and the process -- it may be inter-
8 esting, if you look at the flow from 608 to 609 to
9 610, which is the UNH processing scheme, 610 feeds
10 these same filters that are used in the treatment of
11 water.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: So you have -- do you have a
13 valve at this filtered water to further treatment?
14 Is there some way to shut that off so then this
15 reroutes back to where you said it was going to
16 reroute back to?

17 MR. PETERS: Yes.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Back to 601?

19 MR. PETERS: Oh, yes, yes.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, I would like to see a
21 final copy of the 50-page report, and at some point I
22 would like to come and see this treatment process
23 thing.

24 MR. PETERS: Yes, yes.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not a civil engi-
2 neer, but it seems to me that it's a simple matter
3 that when you have something in one tank that you
4 don't want getting into a system, you don't put a
5 valve in it; you block it off. You bolt a plate
6 across the flange so that there's no possible way
7 that the material can get into the wrong place. So
8 why wasn't that done, and do you plan to do it in the
9 future?

10 MR. PETERS: As a matter of fact, that's
11 exactly what we're doing in the future. That's what
12 we're doing today, is going into that plant and
13 flanging off all of the avenues of flow that do not
14 support the mission of the plant.

15 Your comment is right home to one of the
16 failures in the configuration control system that was
17 in place to prevent exactly what occurred.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you clarify
19 something for me.

20 MR. PETERS: Yes, ma'am.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought I under-
22 stood you to say that the normal personnel that oper-
23 ate 601 and 608 were in Plant 2/3.

24 MR. PETERS: That's correct.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And you had someone
2 from Plant 8 that opened the valve?

3 MR. PETERS: That's correct.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You had no one over-
5 seeing this person who opened that valve?

6 MR. PETERS: The supervisor sent him to
7 those areas, yes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The supervisor sent
9 him and told him to open them?

10 MR. PETERS: The supervisor and the operator
11 were in concurrence that he would go to 601 and 608
12 and transfer storm water to the Plant 8 process,
13 that's correct.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And was the supervi-
15 sor familiar with what was contained in there?

16 MR. PETERS: No.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, then, someone
18 should have checked with the people over in Plant
19 2/3. I mean, it's basic.

20 MR. PETERS: The Plant 2/3, Plant 2/3 is
21 manned on day shift, and historically they have oper-
22 ated that way. And on this particular case they
23 failed to transfer that water, and the fellow on
24 afternoon shift went and did what he thought he knew

1 how to do.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That was basically
3 one of my questions, but I still don't quite under-
4 stand the answer how that will be kept from happening
5 again.

6 MR. PETERS: Well, without question, one of
7 the first things that will occur, before we move any
8 UNH again on that plant site from where it's con-
9 tained now, we will ensure that we have configuration
10 control before we move any more.

11 Very simply, this gentleman's comment back
12 here, if we end up with this same processing equip-
13 ment, these same tanks, there's no question that
14 there will be a physical boundary between 608 and
15 601.

16 But more importantly than that, I think, is
17 we have to back up and look through the transfer
18 lines throughout that plant to make sure that there
19 aren't similar cases that are out there waiting to,
20 you know, do essentially the same thing. We have to
21 review that before we even consider restarting.

22 MR. MORGAN: Frank will be available for
23 questions and answers during our question-and-answer
24 period and also will be available afterwards. This

1 can get very technical, and those who have an inter-
2 est in it, we can follow it up, but we do need to
3 kind of stay on schedule.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much did that
5 mistake cost us?

6 MR. PETERS: I can't -- I don't have an
7 answer for that. I don't have a dollar figure for
8 that.

9 The people in the plant have basically been
10 reassigned to other things. Some of them are in the
11 process of upgrading that system with new valve tag-
12 ging and line labeling and color coding lines. Some
13 of those people have been reassigned to the waste
14 packaging efforts. So the personnel utilization has
15 cost us very little. We have spent a lot of money,
16 but most of that money has been spent in the upgrade
17 of the facility.

18 MR. KAUFMAN: Frank, if I could for a
19 moment.

20 MR. PETERS: Sir?

21 MR. KAUFMAN: Before this investigation is
22 all over, we will have figured out what it cost. To
23 the extent that the cost was due to the negligence of
24 the FERMCO personnel, FERMCO will pay for it.

1 MR. CRAIG: Good evening. I'm Jack Craig.
2 I'm going to speak for a few minutes tonight on the
3 status of cleanup activities at the site.

4 Ken mentioned in his opening remarks a few
5 of the handouts in the back of the room. One of the
6 things I wanted to have you particularly look at was
7 the Fernald cleanup report. Everything I'm going to
8 talk about tonight is contained in much more detail
9 in the report, along with a lot of additional things
10 that I'm not going to be able to have time to talk
11 about.

12 The first slide here, I can also talk about
13 that. It was a handout on your chair. This is a
14 schedule of the documentation milestones for all the
15 operable units at the site, and I'll talk about a few
16 changes that have happened to some of these over the
17 last, since the last meeting.

18 Start off with Operable Unit 1, which is the
19 waste pit area of the site. As we've discussed at
20 previous meetings, we have completed the characteri-
21 zation activities in the waste pit area, as you char-
22 acterize all the contamination in the area.

23 We are currently preparing the, what's
24 called the remedial investigation report for that

1 area. That report is undergoing DOE review right
2 now. It is on schedule to be submitted to the EPA
3 and will be available for public review in October of
4 this year, October 12th of this year. We are holding
5 early data reviews with both Ohio and USEPA to give
6 them as much information as possible prior to receiv-
7 ing that report.

8 We also have the removal actions on Operable
9 Unit 1. We have waste pit area containment removal
10 action, which is a removal action designed to prevent
11 or minimize the erosion of the waste pit area, this
12 is the roads and the drainage ditches and so forth,
13 from wind and water. That work plan has been submit-
14 ted to EPA. We have received comments and we'll
15 start work very soon.

16 On Operable Unit 2, a picture here of the
17 south field area and inactive flyash pile. As some
18 of you know, DOE and USEPA settled a dispute over the
19 Operable Unit 2 remedial investigation report dealing
20 with the adequacy of data. That dispute was resolved
21 in April of this year.

22 The dispute included DOE paying a monetary
23 penalty of \$50,000, DOE agreeing to do supplemental
24 projects in the amount of \$2 million, DOE agreeing to

1 change the milestones for the records of decision for
2 operable Plants 1, 3 and 5; and those are noted in
3 the handouts in your chair. In exchange for that,
4 the Operable Unit 2 schedule was revised, and the
5 revised schedule is also in the handout on your
6 chair.

7 As far as the RI/FS goes, according to the
8 new schedule, we have got the work plan for addi-
9 tional characterization approved by EPA, and that
10 fieldwork has been completed. Work is ongoing with
11 the remedial investigation report and reviewing of
12 the data from that sampling.

13 I spoke at the last meeting about a poten-
14 tial removal action having to do with the bank ero-
15 sion at Paddy's Run.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait, wait, wait.
17 Before you take that slide down, can I ask a question
18 about that for just a moment, please?

19 MR. CRAIG: Sure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I see a picture in
21 here and it shows it all real nice and everything.
22 We had our bank fixed at our house because of ero-
23 sion. During the last storm, a lot of that washed
24 out. Have you taken a picture since down here to see

1 what has happened down here? Has anyone?

2 MR. CRAIG: Since when?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Since that big storm,
4 since last Monday.

5 MR. CRAIG: I don't know. I don't think so.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You know, because it
7 was really, it really washed out a lot of my bank
8 that I had had stuff like this put in, and I'm won-
9 dering if it's done the same down there. I'd be
10 interested in seeing a picture.

11 MR. CRAIG: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

13 MR. CRAIG: Well, the next picture I have --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

15 MR. CRAIG: -- is the completed material on
16 the bank. This was completed in May of this year,
17 and this is the bank before the last storm.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I didn't
19 know you were going to show that.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Maybe we should take a pic-
21 ture and bring it to the FRESH meeting.

22 MR. CRAIG: Okay. Next we have Operable
23 Unit 3. This is all the facilities on site. A few
24 things going on in Operable Unit 3, we have the

1 RI/FS, which is ongoing, we have got a conditional
2 approval on the work plan for characterization of all
3 the buildings on site, and we will begin the detailed
4 characterization of the facilities this summer.

5 We've also been discussing with the EPA,
6 both the Ohio and the US, the concept of accelerating
7 what's called an interim record of decision for Oper-
8 able Unit 3, and that will potentially allow us to
9 accelerate the decontamination and decommissioning of
10 the facilities by up to three years by what's called
11 an interim record decision. We'll talk a little bit
12 more about that throughout the summer as we get
13 closer to finalizing an agreement with EPA.

14 What the interim record decision will do, it
15 will allow us to take down the buildings, and then
16 the original Operable Unit 3 schedule will deal with
17 where the material will be disposed of.

18 As far as removal actions we have, we dis-
19 cussed last meeting the Plant 1 ore silos that this
20 removal action includes, the D and D of 14 concrete
21 and tile silos on site, which is ongoing right now.
22 This is the first major D and D activity on site.

23 Shortly -- well, following this activity,
24 the next major D and D action will be the D and D of

1 Plant 7. We have a work plan which has been revised
2 by EPA for Plant 7, which, if you don't know, is the
3 tallest building on site, in the center of the site.
4 And, hopefully, we'll be able to start those activi-
5 ties within the calendar year.

6 This picture is a picture, an aerial view,
7 of the sewage treatment plant, which is on the west
8 side of the site. A picture of some areas where
9 we've moved some contaminated soils. We removed and
10 boxed 187 boxes of contaminated soil from this area
11 under what was phase one of this removal action.

12 Phase two includes some additional sampling
13 both on and off site. We have identified a small
14 area around this area here (indicating) where we have
15 found some low levels of contamination off site. We
16 are characterizing that and will be removing any
17 material required in that area.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where does that mate-
19 rial go now? Where does that soil go?

20 MR. CRAIG: After it's removed?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Nodding.)

22 MR. CRAIG: It's boxed and stored on site.

23 Operable Unit 4 includes four silos on site.
24 This is a picture of the two K-65 silos. We cur-

1 rently are -- we have documentation that we have
2 submitted to EPA, the RI report, which was submitted
3 on schedule back in April of this year.

4 We received comments from both Ohio and
5 USEPA on that report, and, in fact, talked about
6 those comments today. We are actively going to be
7 reviewing those comments, hopefully resubmitting, and
8 get approval on that document this summer.

9 As noted on your schedule, also, the feasi-
10 bility study and proposed plan for Operable Unit 4
11 will come out, will be submitted to EPA and be out
12 for public review in September of this year. That
13 will be the first major RI/FS document that goes
14 through the proposed plan phase leading to the RCRA
15 decision, and we'll talk to you about that as we come
16 up and probably schedule either a round table or
17 another meeting specifically on Operable Unit 4 and
18 the alternatives we're looking at.

19 Operable Unit 5, as some of you know, we did
20 get approval of the initial screening of alternatives
21 for Operable Unit 5. That was approved by the EPAs
22 back in April of this year. We did have a round
23 table on that document to discuss the alternatives
24 that are being considered for cleanup of the soil and

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-628-6313

1 the groundwater in Operable Unit 5.

2 The RI report, we are in the midst of doing
3 some additional characterization. I think we have
4 six or seven separate projects going on to do some
5 additional characterization which will be included in
6 that report which is due to EPA in June of next year.

7 On the south plume removal action, we talk
8 about this removal action every meeting. The major
9 portion, which is phase two of this removal action,
10 includes the installation of extraction wells in the
11 southern portion of the south plume area to prevent
12 the migration of groundwater further to the south.

13 The schedule for this project to be up in
14 operation, as far as phase two goes, is August 28th
15 of this year, and we are on schedule to start up on
16 that date. Dave Brettschneider, who is next on the
17 agenda, will talk a little bit more about this and
18 the supplemental environmental projects which we
19 agreed to in Operable Unit 2.

20 The final item, technology demonstration, we
21 have some information on the boards back in the back
22 about some other activities on site. Two of them I
23 wanted to mention shortly, having to do with what
24 we call the MAWS project, which is a Minimum Additive

1 Waste Stabilization Project.

2 Equipment for this project has been
3 installed in Plant 9 on site. It includes the combi-
4 nation of soil washing, water treatment and a vitri-
5 fication process, to blend the processes together to
6 try to reduce the volume of contamination, treated
7 waste and, therefore, reduce cost.

8 We have got approval on the work plan to
9 operate the MAWS system on site. We have soil wash-
10 ing scheduled to start up this month. We are looking
11 at doing some cold runs on some simulated material in
12 Plant 9 in July of this year and, hopefully, start
13 actual waste processing in August of this year.

14 The soil washing in Plant 8, also part of
15 the Operable Unit 5 treatability study, we are doing
16 some demonstrations on some techniques to remove
17 uranium from soils. This is pilot-scale operation.

18 We have started up the system in Plant 8,
19 and the results of the -- at least to date on the
20 system, looks very favorable to clean up contaminated
21 soils on site, and we'll keep you informed of any new
22 information we get on that, also.

23 Next I'd like to introduce Dave Brett-
24 schneider, who is an engineering manager for FERMCO

1 within Operable Unit 5, to talk a little bit more
2 about the south plume.

3 Thanks.

4 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: As Jack has mentioned,
5 there's really several activities that have occurred
6 recently in OU-5 at the site which led to a little
7 confusion, and I'd like to try to explain that
8 tonight as best I can so you have a better under-
9 standing of what we have negotiated over with the
10 EPAs over the last couple of years with this project.

11 As an order of background, as Jack men-
12 tioned, there are really several things. One is
13 south plume removal action, part two, which is what
14 we call hydraulic interception of the south plume and
15 then the plumbing of that plume to stop further
16 migration and then the discharge of that directly
17 into the Great Miami River after monitoring.

18 Secondly, the south plume pump test, which
19 was just done a couple of weeks ago to verify that
20 the design that we have on that project is adequate
21 or can be modified before we complete it, as Jack
22 said, at the August 28th deadline.

23 Another thing, in light of this, we had an
24 ISA public round table at which a number of questions

1 came up; and then lastly what I want to cover is the
 2 OU-2 dispute resolution which involved an agreement
 3 again concerning OU-5, which I'll come back and
 4 explain.

5 What came up from this is the fact that
 6 we've got a number of public input and received
 7 numerous concerns for questions over what the agree-
 8 ments were that we made, and there was understanding
 9 agreements on the south plume and the agreements on
 10 the supplemental project.

11 So with that background, I'd kind of like to
 12 walk you through what has been negotiated over the
 13 last couple, the last period of time, where we are
 14 and where we're proceeding.

15 This first slide, here again what we did
 16 back when we started the south plume project and
 17 realized both through with OEPA, USEPA, DOE and so
 18 forth, that there was a need to move forward on the
 19 south plume project, again, this is the uranium con-
 20 tamination in the Great Miami aquifer that has
 21 migrated off the property and is moving south.

22 There was a feeling that we needed to go in
 23 there and solve that migration at that point. So
 24 what we did is we prepared what we call an engineer-

FORM CSH - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 ing evaluation cost analysis, otherwise known as an
2 EE/CA document, which evaluated the alternatives for
3 the south plume project.

4 Out of that came the preferred alternative
5 that we issued out of the draft document, and that
6 preferred alternative was to install the barrier,
7 hydraulic barrier, in the south plume area to prevent
8 further migration and then pump that up to the site,
9 monitor it and discharge it directly to the river,
10 the technology or the analysis being that the risk
11 assessments for the increase in the uranium to the
12 river were acceptable, okay, without treatment of
13 that water.

14 Okay. Then at that point we issued that
15 document out to the public, and, needless to say, the
16 public was not very happy with that. Okay?

17 So we went into what we called dispute reso-
18 lution with, of course, USEPA and OEPA; and USEPA and
19 we heard those public comments, and it came back to
20 us and rejected the document. Now the complication
21 was that again the public wanted us to treat that
22 water, and we're talking in the range of 2500 gallons
23 per minute, which is a very, very large and expensive
24 treatment system.

1 And at that point you might say that the
2 removal action basically came to a standstill,
3 because to get the design, the funding and the con-
4 struction done and to install a 2500-gallon-per-
5 minute treatment plan would take several years within
6 the DOE system to do. So it would delay the project.

7 Also, at this same time DOE had already been
8 moving the site, had already been moving and had
9 funding in place to move forward on an 1100-gallon-
10 per-minute advanced waste water treatment plan.

11 The 1100-gallon-per-minute advanced waste
12 water treatment plant was destined to treat -- we
13 called it advanced waste water treatment plan
14 because, as Frank explained, Plant 8 does primary
15 treatment, gets it down, down to a part per billion
16 level.

17 Advanced waste water treatment, we're going
18 with ion exchange and that stuff to take it down, to
19 take it down to 20 ppb, that type of -- down to a
20 very low parts per billion level. That part was
21 already on and in design as moving forth at the time
22 we put into dispute resolution on the south plume.

23 So with all these in mind, what we did is
24 turned around, knowing that the project would be held

1 up for several years, to go back and design that
2 treatment plan.

3 We came back with a proposal of an alternate
4 solution, and that solution would be that we would
5 provide interim treatment, what we refer to as
6 interim treatment, interim meaning we bring in some
7 kind of trailer-mounted unit, something a little more
8 crude than a plant that is going to be sitting there
9 for 20 years or so forth, and come in and treat some
10 of those existing discharge streams that, again, are
11 going to be -- were intended to be in the 1100 gpm
12 plant.

13 We'll treat, come in with the interim plants
14 as quickly as we could and set up those treatments,
15 so that what we would do is move, remove an equiva-
16 lent mass of uranium from our existing discharge.
17 Again, that discharge already existed and was per-
18 mitted.

19 We would go in there and remove uranium from
20 those existing discharges at a level sufficient so
21 that we would not increase the amount of uranium that
22 was discharged through the river over what it had
23 been before we implemented these removal actions.

24 The EPA agreed with us that it was important

1 to keep moving forward on this removal action, and,
2 indeed, when we put this together as a package, we
3 had a number of other removal actions that will also
4 increase the uranium discharge.

5 So the agreement, of course, EPA came back,
6 said, no, you can't keep it at existing levels;
7 you've got to drop it down and start to decrease
8 those levels, which we did.

9 We agreed then to a step-down to a 1700-
10 pound per year. At the time we negotiated, they were
11 at about 1852 pounds per year. We have negotiated a
12 first-step decrease to 1700 pounds per year, and
13 that's basically -- with that, then, we have reached
14 agreement on how to proceed forward with the south
15 plume project.

16 Okay. Now, what we have done recently,
17 again as Jack mentioned, in Operable Unit 2 the EPA
18 had problems with the OU-2 RI report and we went
19 into, again, dispute resolution. At that point basi-
20 cally the EPAs -- we could not reach agreement, and
21 the EPAs were basically going to come back and fine
22 the site \$2 million for these delays.

23 What we then at that point both -- again,
24 back into negotiations with EPA. We felt that,

FORM 100-1 - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-628-6313

1 rather than have a fine, that we together would pre-
2 fer to move forward on some type of action which
3 would be in the area of decreasing, again, risks to
4 the public, existing risk to the public.

5 So what we proposed was to implement a sup-
6 plemental project in an area of the range of \$2 mil-
7 lion; and that supplemental project would further
8 reduce the uranium discharged to the Great Miami
9 River by now going in, at least providing -- taking
10 that \$2 million, and providing whatever treatment we
11 could for south plume.

12 Again, the original agreement was we would
13 discharge the south plume without treatment with the
14 equivalent mass. With this one, we would then go
15 back in and treat some of the south plume, using that
16 \$2 million.

17 Now, what we did then with the supplemental
18 project, our proposal to the EPAs basically broke
19 down into four parts, and those four parts were what
20 you see here.

21 Bullet number one: Provide additional
22 interim advanced waste water treatment. Again, we
23 have two trailer-mounted units out front that you can
24 see out by the storm water retention basin if you

1 drive by the site.

2 We're basically going to bring in another
3 treatment trailer, basically a 200-gallon treatment
4 trailer, where we will bring in a little larger than
5 200 gallons per minute. And, again, that's the south
6 plume.

7 And we likewise are moving forward on the
8 phases one and two of the advanced waste water treat-
9 ment plan. In phase one of the advanced waste water
10 treatment plan, again, as I showed you, the 1100
11 gallons per minute, 700 gpm is phase one. Phase one
12 is to treat the existing storm water retention
13 basins.

14 Again, you've seen the large basins at the
15 south of our property where we collect all the storm
16 water runoff. The 700 gpm came out of the design
17 that, along with the storage capacity we have at the
18 basins, 700 gpm would keep those basins from over-
19 flowing in the future.

20 Okay. That was the idea, was to keep those
21 basins from overflowing. Now, the average storm
22 water runoff over the year averages 350 gallons per
23 minute, so eventually the plant will operate half the
24 time treating storm water runoff.

FORM U5H - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 What we agreed to do here in bullet number
2 two is to install some piping valves, so forth, so we
3 can get diverted part of the south plume flow over to
4 phase one and treat south plume whenever there is not
5 storm water being treated. So that averages about
6 350 gallons per minute of treatment.

7 Bullet number three, again, when we first --
8 when we designed the original AWWT, phases one and
9 two, our objective was to treat all waste water at
10 the site. We were treating it as a total stream.
11 What we have done in bullet number three is to go
12 back and say, okay, how can we get more uranium out
13 with what we've got?

14 What we've done now is gone back, and we
15 have two streams: the sewage treatment plant; and
16 what we call the clean side general sump, which is a
17 coal pile runoff, water treatment residuals, and so
18 forth, which has a uranium level that's essentially
19 already at less than, or 20 parts per billion or less
20 than 20 parts per billion, which is our goal for
21 treatment with these treatment plans.

22 We're going to pull those two streams out of
23 there and, instead, again put in piping and so forth
24 to divert south plume water over there and treat

1 approximately another 200 gallons per minute of this
2 south plume.

3 And then fourthly, the fourth bullet is
4 again, as I mentioned, the interim advanced waste
5 water treatments that we install just trailer-mounted
6 units. They were only intended for a short life
7 expectancy.

8 What we will do is, once we divert the storm
9 water over to the phase one of AWWT, which is what it
10 was designed for, we will go back in and refurbish
11 the storm water retention basin unit and upgrade it
12 enough that we can push out 200 gallons a minute up
13 there through south plume flow.

14 So, in fact, we should be able to treat with
15 this proposal roughly half of the south plume, which
16 will decrease from the 1700 pounds which we had nego-
17 tiated on the south plume down to another level.

18 So that, in essence, is the agreement that
19 we have negotiated with the EPA.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Can I ask one question?

21 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: I suppose so.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: I have permission?

23 MR. MORGAN: Sure.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: What kind of a time line --

1 do we have a time line on this?

2 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Yeah. What we
3 agreed -- I'm sorry. What we agreed to, the first
4 interim treatment plan, we've already got the engi-
5 neering started. Okay?

6 And, actually, we've already got two of the
7 tie-ins cut in before we turn on the south plume,
8 because it's critical, instead of hot-tapping them
9 later, we'll put them in there.

10 That system, the first bullet there, is
11 scheduled to go on line by March of 1995 -- I'm sor-
12 ry, March of 1994.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: Wait. When you give me a
14 copy of these, because you know I'm going to ask you
15 for a copy of these, could you put those dates on
16 there for me, please.

17 MR. MORGAN: Sure.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Thank you.

19 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Okay. So that's 1994.
20 Okay. Then again the next two -- excuse me. The
21 next two bullets are phases one and two of the AWWT.
22 That system is just started under construction.
23 We're going full bore for the last month or two.
24 That is scheduled to come on line in January of 1995.

1 Okay?

2 So with that, we are already starting to do
3 the design modifications and changes so we can divert
4 south plume water over to those two systems, as we've
5 explained here. Of course, we're already modifying
6 right now, modifying the AWWT contract to remove the
7 piping and stuff, to get the clean side general sump.
8 So it should shut the plant out of that system.

9 The third bullet is, once we get -- again,
10 storm water retention basin is designed permanently
11 over to phase one. So as soon as that transition is
12 made, then we will come back in and do bullet number
13 four. So I would assume that would be from January
14 '95, is when we start. It will probably take us a
15 couple of months to get that modified.

16 So you have three stages: first these two
17 and then this one (indicating).

18 MS. CRAWFORD: And there's money for this,
19 right?

20 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Yeah. There is a \$2
21 million penalty. What we're doing is taking the \$2
22 million --

23 MS. CRAWFORD: So this is not budget money
24 that can be cut; this is money that's there for this

1 project?

2 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Yes, but I'm not DOE.
3 Okay? I'm FERMCO, right? I'm on the receiving end.

4 MR. MORGAN: Yes. Ray says there is, so
5 there is.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: Ray, you can write that at
7 the bottom and sign your name by it.

8 MR. HANSEN: Yes, there is money.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't put it in pen-
10 cil.

11 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: We're already moving on
12 that, so we're already spending money on these. And,
13 of course, we need to keep track of that money,
14 because that's part of the \$2 million settlement
15 agreement.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is the cost of clean-
18 up worth the amount of uranium good that was pro-
19 duced? I don't think we should ever build another
20 uranium plant. Is the cost going to balance, or --

21 I mean, it just seems so terrible. It's
22 like trying to control the sun. Nobody's going to be
23 able to do it, and nobody's going to be able to con-
24 trol this stuff. You're going to have stuff sitting

1 on that land. You say you're going to store it in
2 boxes still on that land.

3 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Well, the reason they
4 mentioned the soil storage boxes is, again, we're
5 moving toward the soil washing in OU-5. And that
6 will be stored until, hopefully, we would process it
7 through the soil washing we would construct there.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there any way of
9 keeping track of the cleanup and the values of what
10 other stuff run to see if it was worth it? I can't
11 see it's worth this.

12 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Well, again --

13 MS. CRAWFORD: It has to be done.

14 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: I couldn't begin to
15 answer that question for you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is going on
17 until 1995, '96, '97?

18 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Which is that, now?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This project.

20 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: No. These facilities
21 will probably operate for about 20 years.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that cost could
23 be added onto the cost, the value of that uranium. I
24 just can't see it was worth it.

1 MR. MORGAN: Thanks, Dave.

2 We'll have more time for questions. As a
3 matter of fact, that's the next portion of our pre-
4 sentation. We'll hear some comments from Ohio EPA
5 and USEPA and from FRESH, but now it's time to take a
6 short break.

7 We've been sitting for a while, so I'll give
8 you about ten minutes and call you back to order.

9 Thank you.

10 (Recess taken: 8:15 p.m. - 8:38 p.m.)

11 MR. MORGAN: Well, I gave you little bit
12 more than ten minutes.

13 Traditionally we've taken this time for some
14 regular statements from our regulators and from
15 our --

16 MS. CRAWFORD: Irregulators.

17 MR. MORGAN: Irregulators. I like that
18 term.

19 All right. Our regulators are here. It's
20 all right. First of all, USEPA. Mr. Saric.

21 MR. SARIC: I guess, to kind of start off
22 tonight, there's a lot really going on at the site,
23 and I think that, you know, Jack very briefly went
24 over a lot of the activities that were going on, and

1 there is a lot of progress that's happening, I think,
2 before the next public meeting. That will probably
3 be in September. I think it will probably be.

4 It's very important to realize that the
5 feasibility study and the proposed plan document for
6 Operable Unit 5 K-65 silo is going to come out like
7 the 10th of September or sometime around that time,
8 and in that document there are going to be proposals
9 for DOE for different remedies, different alterna-
10 tives for the K-65 silos.

11 And it's pretty significant. We're talking
12 about decision documents coming forward there, so I
13 think everyone should try to participate on that. If
14 there's round tables or other discussions, I think
15 it's important that you be aware that's happening,
16 because these documents -- it's not just a paperwork
17 process that is going on here. We are moving toward
18 remediation, and the goal is to do some cleanup at
19 the site and move forward.

20 A couple of others things which I think are
21 happening are the MAWS project and some of the soil
22 washing treatability studies. These are activities,
23 actual testing activities, to see if certain remedies
24 are going to work -- okay? -- and, you know, what



1 will be potential alternatives.

2 And these are critical in the steps of if
3 you're going to select a remedy, has there been tests
4 to know something is going to work or is it not going
5 to work.

6 So if there's an opportunity to attend a
7 round table on the MAWS project or soil washing, or
8 if you hear other information regarding treatability
9 studies, I think that's important that everyone stays
10 involved in that, because this really comes forward
11 with the idea that things are going to happen at this
12 site, that key decisions are going to be made, all
13 right, and a lot of this is going to be based on
14 these treatability studies.

15 And some of the work that we're doing, it
16 may sound a like a lot of paperwork, and when you see
17 these thick documents, and believe me, we all review
18 these things on our desk, slowly but surely we're
19 making progress. There is some remedial activities
20 that are ongoing and we're making progress on the
21 site.

22 I am concerned that, on a different light
23 regarding the budget issues, people have asked me if
24 I'm concerned about it. There's no question about it

1 that the deadlines that are milestones in our cleanup
2 agreement we're going to hold very fast.

3 We've had no reports that they're going to
4 change their deadlines. DOE has not come forward
5 with changing these milestones, and at this point we
6 have no intention of changing these milestones for
7 allowing that to happen. You know, we all agreed
8 with DOE in good faith on these milestones at the
9 time, and we're going to continue moving forward on
10 those and to the best of our ability.

11 I think there's another issue coming on, and
12 a third light is the advisory committee. It's kind
13 of being developed and, you know, we're trying to
14 ourselves.

15 And, you know, Graham and Ohio EPA and the
16 folks at DOE know we're asking for input from people
17 who want to be getting involved in this group,
18 because, again, we're going to discuss -- some of the
19 big issues are what ultimately is going to happen at
20 this site, various cleanup alternatives and things of
21 that nature. So it's important to get involved in
22 that. It's all going to start coming together very
23 soon.

24 If you look on the schedule of activities

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 and especially if you look in that period starting
2 this fall going into next spring or next summer,
3 there are a lot of documents, a lot of key decisions
4 that are going to be made out here that are going to
5 affect everyone, and we all need to work together on
6 this to make sure this place gets cleaned up.

7 Have you got any questions? I'll be here
8 afterwards if you want to talk to me, and you can
9 always reach me at any time. Thanks.

10 MR. MORGAN: Graham Mitchell, Ohio EPA.

11 MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. I think, as
12 Jim said, a lot of progress is occurring at the site.
13 I think we need to all be aware of that. I think we
14 need to keep an eye on how things are going, but be
15 aware that we're really making some progress, really
16 beginning to do some cleanup.

17 We've been working closely with the DOE and
18 FERMCO to avoid the problems that occurred with OU-2,
19 to make sure that the next documents that are due
20 have all the field data collected and there's no data
21 gaps.

22 In a very short time the south plume will be
23 operating, by the next meeting. Plant 1 ore silos
24 are coming down. We're going to see some real prog-

1 ress at the site.

2 One other thing that was mentioned earlier
3 by Jack is that the interim record of decision that
4 we're going to be working on in the very near future
5 is going to be a very important document. It's going
6 to allow budgeting to proceed in the near future in
7 terms of bringing the buildings down on the Fernald
8 site that would have had to have waited until 1997.
9 We'll be able to start that process now.

10 As Jim said, Ohio is very concerned about
11 the budget process, and I know we're saying that
12 we're going to meet all our deadlines and I hope that
13 we can do that. We're going to really insist that
14 DOE stick to those deadlines.

15 But it was also said earlier that these
16 deadlines, most of these agreements between USEPA and
17 DOE just get us to the decision on how we're going to
18 clean the site up. If we are going to hold back on
19 our cleanup, it could cost a lot more money.

20 Right now DOE is talking about cutting the
21 budget \$450 million over the next five years, and
22 that's quite a bit of money. We understand that DOE
23 does not have unlimited funds, and we also understand
24 that DOE has other sites in the complex that need to

1 be cleaned up. However, one major concern we have is
2 that, in DOE's effort to save money over the short
3 term, that we actually spend more money cleaning it
4 up, because the cleanup is extended.

5 Almost any time that you avoid doing some-
6 thing now, it costs you more in the future to do it,
7 and DOE and FERMCO's own estimates for this site
8 indicate that this \$450 million short-term savings
9 will actually cost a billion dollars in the future
10 because of delayed cleanups.

11 Any time you delay cleanup, the contamina-
12 tion spreads. It becomes harder to pump. You've got
13 more groundwater to pump. It just really isn't a
14 very smart decision.

15 Another aspect that we're not closed about
16 the budget is, over the last few years as we've had
17 problems with the schedule, DOE proposed the MAC
18 concept to us as a way of going to solve problems:
19 this is the way we're going to clean this site up, a
20 faster, cheaper and better.

21 And we pretty much all embraced that idea
22 and felt it was a really good concept. We still feel
23 it's a good concept. However, if we don't fund that,
24 it's not going to work and FERMCO and DOE will not be

1 able to clean this site up as fast, as cheaply and
2 better as we all want it.

3 So the other down side of that is DOE has
4 proposed, DOE headquarters has proposed this contract
5 as a way of -- as a model to be used at other sites
6 across the complex. You know, if it fails here, no
7 one will know if it failed because it wasn't a good
8 idea or if it failed because it wasn't supported.
9 These are key issues that need to be dealt with.

10 We also talked about the site specific advi-
11 sory committee. I think this is going to be a real
12 valuable committee, further involve the residents,
13 local government, other stakeholders in the major
14 cleanup decisions that are going to be made actually
15 in the fairly near future.

16 I was asked to say something about the
17 Paddy's Run Road site. Most of you are aware that
18 the Paddy's Run Road site is another contaminated
19 site, located about a mile south of the DOE Fernald
20 facility, and it is an Ohio site and it has ground-
21 water contamination.

22 There has been some potential overlap
23 between DOE and the Paddy's Run Road site. At the
24 last meeting I reported that the remedial investiga-

1 tion had been submitted to Ohio EPA and there were
2 numerous problems that we needed to sit down and
3 discuss with that.

4 What has happened in the last few months is
5 that numerous meetings have taken place, a lot of
6 issues have been resolved, but there are still other
7 issues to be resolved, so at this point I cannot tell
8 you when there will be a final remedial investigation
9 submitted or when the next public meeting will be.

10 I'm sorry I can't give you any more good
11 information on that than this. If you have any other
12 questions, I suggest that you contact Donna Bohannon
13 of our office, and if you see me after the meeting, I
14 can give you her phone number.

15 We're here tonight to hear your thoughts,
16 get your questions and concerns. Tom Schneider is
17 also here tonight, Mike Proffitt, and Miles Davidson
18 is here with our public information center.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. MORGAN: Now, Lisa Crawford probably
21 doesn't have anything to say.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: Oh, yeah, right, sure. Sit
23 down.

24 MR. MORGAN: Thank you. We're happy to hear

1 from you.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: No, actually here's some work
3 for you to do.

4 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: Four big items on there. I
6 actually have quite a few things, if I can keep them
7 all straight.

8 The first thing, at the last RI/FS meeting,
9 which was three months ago, I had turned over some
10 letters, anonymous letters, that had been given to
11 FRESH, and they were then turned over to the IG and
12 we've heard nothing. I was told we would hear
13 nothing, but I have a real problem with not hearing
14 nothing.

15 And the other thing we asked for at the last
16 RI/FS meeting, or it even could have been a RI/FS
17 meeting before that, was a copy of DOE's and FERMCO's
18 agreement and contract information, and that has yet
19 to be given to us, neither. So I'm requesting that
20 when people ask for things, that somehow it's fol-
21 lowed up.

22 MR. HANSEN: You've got it, Lisa.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to request a

1 copy of that for the Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor
2 Council union.

3 I would like to have --

4 MR. HANSEN: You can't have it.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: I think --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We had previously
7 asked for that together.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: It was the last RI/FS or the
9 one before that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: And that has not been turned
12 over. And at the time I know somebody talked about
13 there may have been trade secrets or whatever, but
14 you can -- don't take the pages out, but you can
15 black out the trade secrets if there really are trade
16 secrets.

17 MR. HANSEN: We'd have to do that.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Huh? Right.

19 MR. HANSEN: We'd have to do that.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: That's fine. Just don't take
21 the page out; black them out. We don't want missing
22 pages.

23 The next thing I have is last Friday I got a
24 phone call about a meeting that was going to be held

1 in Washington, D.C., today. I understand that infor-
2 mation fell through the cracks between one interim
3 site manager and another interim site manager.

4 It was a -- I looked at this and thought it
5 was a pretty important meeting. It's benchmarking
6 for cost improvement. At which point I told Gary,
7 who called me, that there was no way. I could not go
8 to D.C. in four days' notice and a plane ticket would
9 cost a hell of a lot of money.

10 I mean, when I make plane tickets, I make
11 them three months in advance so I get the cheapest
12 one I can get. I don't make them four days in
13 advance where I pay probably five times more than I'd
14 probably have to pay.

15 And then when I came home from work yester-
16 day, all this benchmarking for cost improvement
17 information was on my fax machine, and it clearly
18 says at the bottom if you're not registered by June
19 11th, you couldn't come.

20 What I'd like, since I didn't get to go to
21 this, and they encourage every site to send a repre-
22 sentative from a community group, labor, industry,
23 all these regulators, people like that, what I'd
24 like, first of all, Ray, I want you to call Tom Grum-

1 bley in the morning and tell him why I wasn't there
2 today and tomorrow morning, because the information
3 wasn't disseminated in the proper amount of time.

4 And, secondly, I would like to be kept up to
5 date with what's happening with this benchmarking for
6 cost improvement stuff. They'll probably call it
7 BCI since they love initials. I particularly was
8 just a little bit upset, because I think it looked
9 to me like it was an important meeting that somebody
10 should have been at. And I'll bet you that somebody
11 from FERMCO or DOE here at this site was at this
12 meeting today. I'll bet my last dollar there was
13 somebody from there today.

14 MR. KAUFMAN: FERMCO was not invited,
15 either. Our invitation showed up yesterday in Cali-
16 fornia.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: I mean, Ray, come on. This
18 is ridiculous.

19 MR. HANSEN: Well, I'm not going to make
20 apologies for headquarters.

21 MS. CRAWFORD: Please don't.

22 MR. HANSEN: But it wasn't the transfer of
23 acting managers. Okay? Typically what happens is we
24 get a memo from headquarters. In fact, I've gotten

1 them a day after the meeting. But as soon as I saw
2 that, I did have Gary call you.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, that's not good enough,
4 and I will call them, headquarters, tomorrow and tell
5 them that's not good enough. I mean, how would you
6 like it if I send you something a day after it hap-
7 pened? You would be pretty pissed off at me, prob-
8 ably.

9 And I'm going to be real honest with you.
10 The message it sends to us is we weren't wanted
11 there. That's the message we get.

12 MR. HANSEN: Well, once again, as soon as I
13 got that message, I asked Gary to call you and I
14 think he did almost immediately.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, he did Friday, but you
16 know and I know that's --

17 MR. HANSEN: Well, also, I think I did ask
18 him or tell him that we would offer to pay your fare
19 up there.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. I mean, somebody,
21 people at headquarters need, their heads need to roll
22 over something like this. And I guess I owe Nick
23 Kaufman a buck since I bet him. I'll pay you, too.

24 MR. SCHWAB: Hey, Lisa, could I --

1 Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council
 2 wasn't even notified of this. Lisa made me aware of
 3 it this afternoon when she became aware of it a day
 4 or so ago. She assumed I knew of it. First time I
 5 heard about it. And I see that labor was invited on
 6 there. I'd like to go on that list, also, and regis-
 7 ter a complaint that we weren't invited.

8 MR. HANSEN: Okay. I appreciate that.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: I mean that specific case.

10 MR. HANSEN: Now, that probably was my
 11 fault, Bob. However, if you would keep your blasted
 12 meetings with me --

13 MR. SCHWAB: I apologize for that one, Ray.
 14 You got me.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: I mean, I just want to make
 16 sure we're kept up to date as future meetings happen.

17 MR. HANSEN: Yeah. We'll keep you informed
 18 if we get any feedback at all on those meetings.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: And I'd like, if there were
 20 minutes or notes or some major decisions came out of
 21 this thing today and tomorrow morning, you know, I
 22 would like to see that information.

23 Secondly, DOE needs to -- you know, I mean,
 24 they need to, if they're going to plan a meeting,

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 they need to do some more heads-up kind of stuff,
 2 because, like I said, a plane ticket on four days'
 3 notice, you're talking a whole lot of money. A plane
 4 ticket on three months', I can fly back and forth to
 5 D.C. on a hundred and 50 bucks.

6 MR. HANSEN: Lisa, I had them call me during
 7 a meeting asking why I wasn't there, and I hadn't
 8 received notification. Not this particular meeting.
 9 But I think that's the way it works. It is a failing
 10 we have.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: We need to put some new peo-
 12 ple at headquarters.

13 The next thing I have is I was, I think it
 14 was last month we were given a copy of the Inspector
 15 General's report on the project RI/FS, on all of the
 16 bad things the IG said about the RI/FS and how it was
 17 so overrun with money and cost and things weren't
 18 right and we had done all this stuff and we basically
 19 had nothing in the process. And I'm just curious if
 20 this BCI stuff is following up on -- is this like a
 21 follow-up from one to the other?

22 MR. HANSEN: (Shaking head.)

23 MS. CRAWFORD: No?

24 MR. HANSEN: I'm not familiar with the BCI

FORM CSR - LASER REPRODUCTION PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-826-6313

1 thing.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: So this RI/FS hit report on
3 us for the RI/FS process, I mean, what's -- is this
4 done? I mean, is there a follow-up to this report at
5 all?

6 MR. HANSEN: Well, hopefully, when we have
7 more cleanups, there will be lessons learned from
8 this one, and I think that's the intent. I don't
9 know what we can do about the total cost of the RI/FS
10 process as it occurred at our facility.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: So this is just a report that
12 goes up on a shelf somewhere, and that's it?

13 MR. HANSEN: Well, once again, I hoped les-
14 sons will be learned, and future cleanup sites, some-
15 body will learn from that report.

16 MR. CRAIG: Well, there are some recommenda-
17 tions made by the IG in the report, and we're agreed
18 with those and we're going to implement their recom-
19 mendations.

20 I think there was only one item in there we
21 took exception to, but there were exceptions to
22 improvement to help our project, too, so we're going
23 to go ahead and implement those.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: So did you have to respond

1 back to the IG?

2 MR. CRAIG: Yes.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Could we have a copy of your
4 comments back to the IG --

5 MR. CRAIG: Sure, yeah.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: -- so we can staple them all
7 together and keep them all together. Thanks. You
8 can add that to your list.

9 MR. MORGAN: Comments back from IG.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: Let's see. I want to talk a
11 little bit about budget stuff, too. I was briefed on
12 the budget a couple of months ago, and I've been to
13 headquarters once about a week and a half ago to talk
14 to Mr. Grumbley about budget stuff, put together a
15 lot of information from him.

16 I'll ditto a lot of what Graham said so I
17 don't have to say it over again.

18 We're real concerned about the budget. I
19 don't want any deadlines or milestones missed. We've
20 been talking to everybody and their brother that we
21 can talk to about this around here and in Washington.

22 One of the things I will tell you is when we
23 were given the information on the budget stuff, the
24 percentage rates were wrong; and I think Ray and I

1 have talked about this. The percentage rates don't
2 add up to the cuts. I don't know who put this infor-
3 mation together, but it's wrong.

4 We took -- I took it to Tom Grumbley a week
5 and a half ago, and he did agree with me that the
6 percentage rates were wrong. So the message I think
7 we're trying to send everybody is: Don't disseminate
8 information that's not correct.

9 Because I'm not an accountant, but my treas-
10 urer is, and that was the -- I mean, she looked at
11 it. Two minutes later she said, "These percentage
12 rates are wrong." We're laypeople here, and that's
13 really bad.

14 The one thing about the budget that I fail
15 to understand here is, I know it's being bantered
16 around and talked about and looked at at appropria-
17 tions committees and all this gobbledygook stuff in
18 Washington, D.C., but we don't have any final numbers
19 here yet.

20 And those numbers could change very drasti-
21 cally. We could get money back maybe, because people
22 have yelled and screamed a lot for it. And I hear
23 people saying we might have to lay people off and we
24 might have to do this, and, you know, I think you

1 need to emphasize might or maybe, because I think the
2 community's sitting here going "They're going to lay
3 300 to 500 people off in four or five months from
4 now," and we don't even have final budget numbers
5 yet, you know, and it's almost like a scare tactic,
6 you know.

7 And we've screamed and yelled for money for
8 nine years and, you know, I think money has been
9 wasted and I do think DOE needs to be more cost
10 effective and to look at things a little better, and
11 I'll use the words cheaper, better, faster, quicker,
12 all the fueled stuff Duffy used to spew out at us at
13 these meetings, and just say I don't want to hear
14 next year that we don't have any money, and I don't
15 want to hear that, well, we can't make this deadline.

16 You're making a lot of promises, but I think
17 you're also making a lot of assumptions with budget
18 numbers; and I don't think we should talk about lay-
19 offs and cuts and we might be able to do this and we
20 might be able to do this, because we don't even know
21 what the damn budget is going to be yet, and that
22 really bothers me that it's all this if and maybe
23 stuff.

24 And, I mean, I really feel for the folks who

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 have to work on this site here and to go to work
 2 every single day and they don't know what's going on.
 3 And I think we're very premature in talking about
 4 budget cuts right now until we actually see some
 5 numbers on some pieces of paper.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. CRAWFORD: And then I have this letter,
 8 Ray, that you sent me on the work force restructuring
 9 stuff, which I thought was a little bit confusing and
 10 I didn't quite understand it at first.

11 And I talked to Bob Schwab about it today
 12 briefly, and I think I have a little better under-
 13 standing about it now. I really wish that -- maybe
 14 you didn't know at the time that you wrote this the
 15 dates of the meetings and when you needed comments
 16 in.

17 MR. HANSEN: No, we didn't.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Because I didn't know I had
 19 to have my comments to you by Thursday.

20 MR. HANSEN: I think that letter spoke to
 21 two weeks after receipt of the letter or after the
 22 date of the letter, but we've extended that to the
 23 30th of December.

24 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. Just I want to be

1 involved. I want to be a part of this.

2 MR. HANSEN: I was almost certain of that.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. I don't have to say
4 anything else about that one. I'm almost done. I'm
5 hurrying.

6 MR. MORGAN: It's okay, Lisa.

7 MS. CRAWFORD: Let's see. The other thing I
8 haven't -- I don't do this real often, but every once
9 in a while we pull out the good old rumor list. I
10 haven't done this to you guys in a while, but I've
11 got an anonymous phone call the other day from a
12 woman who said that all these people are going off to
13 seminars, they're going to Denver, and she gave me
14 the dates.

15 This July 12th through the 16th they're all,
16 a whole bunch of them is going to Denver, Colorado,
17 and July 26th through August the 3rd a whole bunch of
18 them are going to Albuquerque, New Mexico, and
19 they're going to seminars.

20 And she tells me that these are seminars
21 that could very easily be held right here, that we
22 could save a whole lot of money on plane tickets and
23 travel and food and hotel and rental cars and lodg-
24 ing. And she went on and on and on.

1 We all know that when folks travel from DOE,
2 and contract people, that they don't stay at cheap
3 hotels like FRESH people do when they travel, you
4 know, the Motel 6 for 9.99 a night. We also, like I
5 say, get cheap plane tickets and we eat cheap food.
6 So I would really like for somebody to put in writing
7 and have, you know, what are all these seminars, why
8 are people going to seminars, what are -- are they
9 really useful.

10 I mean, this looks to me as an angle that we
11 could save a lot of money on. It's cheaper to fly
12 two people in here than it is to fly 20 people to
13 Albuquerque, New Mexico, and if they're going, I want
14 to go to Albuquerque. I like it there.

15 But that's one of the rumor list things, and
16 I would like that addressed and I would like that
17 addressed very quickly and not at the next RI/FS
18 meeting in three months. By like the end of the
19 week.

20 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Help me. I mean, it's
21 clear. There's no rumor about it. We sent people to
22 go for training, to go for dialogue, to go to meet-
23 ings like the one that you just talked about earlier.

24 I'm going to go to San Francisco in a few

1 weeks where we have our EEM public affairs council,
2 or where we're trying to get all of DOE singing the
3 same song and operating and doing public involvement
4 together, because there's a great deal of variation.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: But is that a seminar? I
6 don't think these two seminars are the same as the
7 seminar you're telling me about.

8 MR. MORGAN: What I'm saying is we've got
9 2,000 employees on the site. There's a lot of semi-
10 nars, so what specifically would you like us to do?

11 MS. CRAWFORD: These two dates --

12 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Which are?

13 MS. CRAWFORD: July the 12th through the
14 16th in Denver, Colorado.

15 MR. MORGAN: July 12th.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: And July 26th through August
17 the 3rd in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

18 MR. MORGAN: Albuquerque, New Mexico. We'll
19 get back to you by the end of the week.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: By Friday, thank you.

21 I want to say, the last thing, I had a ques-
22 tion, Ray. You talked about earlier that we may not
23 become a field office. I thought we were already a
24 field office.

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 MR. HANSEN: Well, basically, the Secretary
2 of Energy in the restructuring of the DOE complex --
3 and although we're named a field office in there, it
4 is not clear that we are a stand-alone field office,
5 and we don't know what that terminology in this case
6 means.

7 There's three offices that basically were
8 kind of left out in the cold as to what we really
9 are. There's Rocky Flats, which has always been an
10 area office and is not called a field office.
11 There's an office in Golden, Colorado, that we're not
12 sure of what that means, either, and then our office,
13 and we're not certain where we stand. We asked for
14 clarification, and there is a task force going to
15 look at that. And the task force, you're right --

16 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm glad I don't have to --
17 if I had a task force for every damn decision I made,
18 we'd never get nothing done. I'm never seen an
19 organization who has a task force who decides how
20 many times somebody goes to the bathroom. That's how
21 ridiculous this all sounds to us, I mean.

22 MR. HANSEN: Well, I'm not going to apolo-
23 gize for that, because I don't have anything to do
24 with those appointments. Okay? But in reality we

1 will let you know as soon as we find out, because
2 it's very important to us.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: Because I really think every-
4 body here thought we were a field office. I thought
5 three or four or five months ago we were a field
6 office.

7 MR. HANSEN: Well, remember we were a field
8 office that was going to grow to 200 employees,
9 roughly 200, and we're looking now at -- well, we've
10 got 70 on site, with one more approved position. We
11 just have to wait and see.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. You can add that to
13 the list, too, Ken. I think they're playing games.

14 The last thing I had is something that was
15 on my fax machine yesterday, a letter to all employ-
16 ees which talked about apparently FERMCO and DOE had
17 a two-day, for lack of a better word, seminar at
18 Huston Woods last week or something like that, and
19 you guys hammered out a new mission statement and
20 some goals, if I'm reading this correctly.

21 MR. HANSEN: You've got it.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: I think that's goals down
23 there.

24 Didn't we already have this stuff? When

1 FERMCO came in on December 1st, didn't we have a
2 mission statement and goals at that time? And if so,
3 why -- how many months has it been now? -- six, seven
4 months later you have to hammer them out and do them
5 all over again?

6 MR. HANSEN: We did the same thing when
7 Westinghouse came in, if you remember, Lisa. A new
8 contractor coming in has their idea of how they
9 should operate, and, of course, DOE has our idea of
10 how we should operate.

11 And in reality, after much discussion on
12 site, we really felt we had to firmly define our
13 roles and responsibilities, and the only way we could
14 do that was to get away from the site, and we did
15 that.

16 It took us two and a half days to do it.
17 We did hammer out a joint mission statement which
18 includes concerns from the stakeholders, which wasn't
19 in the original mission statement.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Is there a way -- do you
21 guys; do you have notes or something from your meet-
22 ing? I mean, are those public?

23 MR. HANSEN: We had a facilitator who basi-
24 cally --

1 MS. CRAWFORD: Oh, I'll bet that was a real
2 nice job.

3 MR. HANSEN: -- who took us through the
4 whole process, and there are some charts that he kept
5 that we'll be glad to give you copies of.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: Because, you know, a lot of
7 the goals or whatever these things are, responsibili-
8 ties that are listed, the seven of them, I mean,
9 they're pretty basic.

10 And I just find it a little bit weird that
11 this had to be put on a piece of paper and signed by
12 headquarters and you and Mr. Kaufman. And this just
13 seems so basic to me and it's like seven months down
14 the road. And, I don't know, I'm looking at this, it
15 just looks like a big waste of time.

16 MR. HANSEN: Well, honestly, I think it was
17 worth it.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: You think so?

19 MR. HANSEN: Yes, I really do. There was a
20 lot of confusion and frustration both on FERMCO's
21 part and certainly on our employees' parts.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: What happens if one of you
23 guys screw up and you guys don't meet these responsi-
24 bilities?

1 MR. HANSEN: The other two guys beat up on
2 them.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

4 MS. PETERMAN: Can you stand up at a mike,
5 please. We can't hear you.

6 MR. HANSEN: Basically what she asked, can
7 we see what those roles and responsibilities are on
8 our mission statements, and, yes, we can make copies
9 available. Are any of those in the back of the room?

10 MS. CRAWFORD: Have the employees actually
11 gotten this?

12 MR. KAUFMAN: I sent it out yesterday to all
13 of our employees.

14 MR. SCHWAB: I don't think it's out yet.
15 Nick may have passed that. The copies haven't been
16 run.

17 MR. KAUFMAN: It's in the process of distri-
18 bution to all employees and all subcontractors'
19 employees.

20 MR. HANSEN: Nick, did you want to say any-
21 thing about the retreat? Anything you want to say?

22 MR. KAUFMAN: No. I would agree with Ray
23 that it was necessary. The working relationship
24 between FERMCO and DOE Fernald and between DOE Fer-

1 nald and DOE headquarters hasn't been as smooth as I
2 think we would all like.

3 The root of some of the problem is we didn't
4 necessarily share the same definition of success and
5 the same understanding of the rules and responsibili-
6 ties, and what was involved was simply getting all of
7 the parties together and having it out, if there was
8 any disagreement.

9 And that represents the conclusion of the
10 meeting. It looks very basic, but it was a result of
11 some rather heated conversation.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, now, when we get a new
13 site manager in three or four, however many months
14 down the road, is this going to change?

15 MR. HANSEN: Quite honestly, I would have
16 preferred that the permanent manager was here to do
17 that. In fact, the reason we hadn't done that sooner
18 is we have not had a permanent manager. And we felt
19 we had to do that now. We couldn't delay any longer.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. That's it.

21 MR. MORGAN: Lisa, you asked me to put one
22 more thing down on the list, and that had to do with
23 the site office. What specifically?

24 MS. CRAWFORD: When you get a final decision

1 on whether we're an office or whether we're not an
2 office --

3 MR. MORGAN: Oh, of course. All right.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: -- please let us know.

5 MR. HANSEN: We are an office. We're not
6 sure what kind of office.

7 MS. CRAWFORD: A field office.

8 Oh, no wait. One more, one more, and I need
9 to do this one. We took February of 1993's cleanup
10 report and June of 1993's cleanup report and we laid
11 them side by side, and they are virtually exactly
12 almost the same word for word.

13 Very little changes in here, and it strikes
14 us as a waste of money to publish this every three
15 months with virtually the same exact information word
16 for word in here with a few things dropped off and
17 maybe one or two sentences added on to it. It's like
18 save a tree, you know.

19 And maybe in the future all this needs to be
20 is what we've accomplished, or what you've accom-
21 plished, hopefully, from June of 1993 through Septem-
22 ber of 1993, or until the next one comes out.

23 It just strikes us as being very wasteful as
24 far as paper goes. And, you know, probably somebody

1 has to sit down and spend days kind of looking at
2 this and taking it in and putting it out. And I
3 mean, when we do a newsletter and it's a lot of work
4 and it's very repetitive --

5 MR. MORGAN: Well, I agree with you, Lisa,
6 and this gives me a wonderful opportunity to make
7 some changes to that report. In fact, I thought it
8 was kind of repetitive, but people have found it very
9 useful. We need to keep that around as a historical
10 document, but the new document that is put out, get
11 some new material in there.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just expand on it.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: Just expand on it. And, you
14 know, this was --

15 MR. HANSEN: What's new, what's different.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: What's new, what different.
17 And you can look back at the old ones.

18 MR. MORGAN: Yea.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just give us an up-
20 date from the last public meeting that we had, not
21 repeat the same thing over.

22 MR. MORGAN: Not everything since.

23 MR. HANSEN: Yeah, Maggie, I hear you. But,
24 quite honestly, we do have to keep the historical

1 perspective. What I would suggest we do next time is
2 we go ahead and put a section in there what is new
3 and different or really an update.

4 Now, that should be an update. It's a
5 cleanup report which basically lays the ground rules
6 for all the operating units again and again and
7 again. And we do that for everybody who is not as
8 familiar as you people are with the whole project.

9 But we can add a section says this is new,
10 this is different, this is what we've accomplished.
11 We will do that.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: You can even keep the older
13 ones. Just make sure we keep lots of extra copies of
14 those always here, always at public meetings, and
15 then you have an update sheet, which would probably
16 be one piece of paper, maybe, front and back.

17 MR. HANSEN: Let's hope two, two pieces of
18 paper.

19 MR. MORGAN: Ken, let me field some ideas.
20 There's more than one way to skin a cat and there's
21 more than one way to write a report, and let me run
22 some ideas by on that.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: Yes. We perceive that's
24 being real wasteful.

1 MR. MORGAN: This is a time when we take
2 questions from the audience. I have some comments
3 that are received from the audience here, but I usu-
4 ally like to save those till last. So the floor is
5 open and we would like you to come to the mikes. We
6 have a reporter getting down everybody's comments, so
7 it's important that we hear questions.

8 My, these meetings -- oh, here we go.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not that weak.
10 Okay. I have a question on cleanup report. I have
11 several, as a matter of fact. I probably should go
12 to Jack Craig since he gave most of the background on
13 it, and he did kind of skim over everything tonight.

14 And for some of the questions maybe I'll
15 have to talk to him individually, but over on Opera-
16 ble Unit 1 on page 3, the "Waste Pit Area" and the
17 "Encapsulation studies," I find a problem with this
18 wording here, and, I don't know, maybe it's your
19 technical wording or whatever, but "uses commonly
20 available nontoxic plastics such as polyethylene (the
21 same material used in milk and food containers)."

22 Now, I want to know, you know, why do you
23 compare it to that? Because some of these materials,
24 the dried waste that you're going to be putting in

1 with this polyethylene may interact with each other
2 differently than the common milk container, because
3 you're going to be talking about the low level radio-
4 active materials, mixed waste, hazardous waste.

5 MR. CRAIG: Right.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And plastic is not
7 all that safe, as a lot of us have learned over the
8 last several years. It has dioxins in it.

9 MR. CRAIG: I would disagree with you. I
10 think that's one of the purposes of the study, to see
11 if that stuff does react with the plastic. I think
12 the reason they use those terms is to give a picture
13 in your mind of what it was.

14 We could have somebody talk to you in detail
15 on that after the meeting if you'd like.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. But, still, it
17 gives the average citizen, let's say, the impression
18 that this is a very safe way to do something.

19 There was something else on these. Oh.
20 yeah. It's on the silos. I'm on page 9. It's on
21 the cementation study of the materials in the silos
22 that, Jack, will be coming out. "The resulting waste
23 volume is much as triple its original volume." Well,
24 that kind of defeats the purpose, doesn't it?

1 MR. CRAIG: Yeah, it does. And that's one
2 of the other goals of the study, is to see how much
3 additional waste you produce by using cementation,
4 and that's one of the criteria used whether or not
5 that's a viable treatment technology. You want to do
6 something that will reduce the volume versus increase
7 the volume, so that's why you do the study, and
8 that's one of the results we found.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. Well, nobody
10 wants you to succeed more than we do. We want you to
11 come up with a method. But if it's going to increase
12 the volume, that just means more storage area, you
13 know.

14 MR. CRAIG: Right. We discussed that, as a
15 matter of fact, with EPA today. And the other tech-
16 nology we're looking at, vitrification, does the
17 opposite. It reduces the volume, and that's one of
18 the things we're looking to do.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then I had one ques-
20 tion back in the presentation that was showing the
21 drums being compacted. Now, this has waste in it?

22 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And they're squishing
24 it down like nine drums?

-4608

1 MR. HANSEN: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That worries me.
3 Doesn't some of that material escape out of that when
4 they do that?

5 MR. HANSEN: Well, what we're really squeez-
6 ing, if you will, is wet residues. And, yes, the
7 water does come out of that, but in terms of does
8 anything escape to the atmosphere, no. It's a --

9 I don't know what the capacity of that press
10 is, but it's enormous, the pressures are enormous,
11 and it actually squeezes that material together,
12 probably as hard as you would imagine rock is. I
13 mean, it's that much pressure that it actually forms
14 a solid piece inside that drum, and we're getting
15 fantastic reductions in waste volume.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I have one more
17 question. I didn't bring that document up with me.

18 Ken, we were talking about the site specific
19 report and they contact you at the site office, and I
20 was wondering why you were put in charge of that.

21 MR. MORGAN: I'm not in charge of it. All
22 I'm going to do is provide you more information if
23 you want to know, if you want to talk to Eula or
24 ~~90~~ whatever. I'm just -- DOE is going to be providing

1 administrative support as we get this thing going.
2 That's all.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Well, I guess
4 I got the wrong impression from you.

5 MR. MORGAN: I'm sorry. I didn't mean that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

7 MR. MORGAN: Yes, sir?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We were wondering if
9 you know who the customers are for the uranium. Or
10 who are we going to sell it to?

11 MR. HANSEN: We do know. We do know the
12 bidders. There were three bidders. We cannot
13 divulge that. It's part of the Procurement Act. We
14 cannot divulge that until we name the final bidder,
15 and we do expect that final bidder to be named June
16 25th.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it international
18 or national or --

19 MR. HANSEN: I can't answer that.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You can't answer
21 that?

22 MR. HANSEN: No. My lawyer is sitting some-
23 where in the back row and would hit me with something
24 if I did try.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We were hoping it
2 wasn't one of our enemies.

3 MR. MORGAN: Iran or Iraq? Probably not
4 that, hey, Ray?

5 MR. HANSEN: No, it's not one of our ene-
6 mies.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sue, I asked you a
8 question while you were showing your slides concern-
9 ing the worker that had protective clothing and had
10 nothing protecting their face. I want to know an
11 answer about that, because if that job requires
12 coveralls, hand covering and all that, it certainly
13 should -- I think the worker needs something for
14 their face. And I want to know what they were work-
15 ing with.

16 MS. PETERMAN: Okay. Well, we talked with
17 Dave.

18 Are you going to help me with this one?

19 We did talk about that. The radiation con-
20 tamination manual has specific guidance.

21 Dave.

22 MR. RAST: Yeah, our book does have specific
23 guidance on work protection.

24 The coveralls were utilized in the repackag-

1 ing process in that particular instance to prevent
2 the spread of any further contamination. The mate-
3 rial inside the drums was solid, the drums were not
4 contaminated on the outside, so there was no free or
5 airborne contamination.

6 The face mask or any air respirator protec-
7 tion from airborne contamination, if you only have
8 fixed surface contamination and no airborne contami-
9 nation, you don't need a respirator. But in case any
10 of the rust or anything came off of the drum, they
11 did need some protection to prevent the spread of
12 that contamination.

13 When they exited the area where they were
14 doing the work, they would leave that protective
15 clothing in a container to stop any contamination
16 from leaving inside their work area.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't accept what
18 you're saying, but --

19 MS. PETERMAN: Well, the other thing is I
20 will go back and I will get our radiation work proce-
21 dure for that activity and show you that there was
22 analysis done and that determined what the require-
23 ments were. That's about the best I can give you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If it doesn't require

1 facial covering, then it's a waste to have these
2 workers wearing all these coveralls and all those
3 other clothes.

4 MS. PETERMAN: Okay. But they were dressed
5 like that to do a prior activity, so rather than
6 going, changing out, going into the other coveralls,
7 they kept those on. So that was to keep from dirty-
8 ing up two sets of coveralls.

9 MR. HANSEN: Sue, the question is did they
10 require respirators in that activity.

11 And we'll get you the answer to that, Mag-
12 gie.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. HANSEN: But I wonder if you remember, I
15 think it was at the last community meeting we had, we
16 showed you overpacking of the thorium going on and
17 those people were in full face respirators. So it's
18 dependent on the conditions that they're exposed to.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

20 MR. HANSEN: But we'll get you an answer.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. MORGAN: Yes, sir?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yesterday on the
24 front page of The New York Times was an article about

1 the Hanford site, which, granted, is much bigger than
2 the Fernald site. But it discussed vitrification,
3 and they estimated that, based on the amount of waste
4 that they were planning to do that to and the size of
5 the facility that they were constructing, that to
6 complete the process at Hanford would take 120 years.
7 I'm wondering how long you expect it to take here.

8 MR. MORGAN: The problem when you talk about
9 vitrification is it means different things at differ-
10 ent places. The Hanford vitrification, there are two
11 processes that are being looked at there. One is the
12 vitrification of high-level waste and a great big
13 factory, and it's a gigantic plant.

14 There's another kind of vitrification, which
15 is melting contamination, melting soil where there's
16 contamination in the soil. Two different operations.
17 One is a low-level hazard; one is an extremely dan-
18 gerous hazard. We're looking at yet another technol-
19 ogy here.

20 And we don't know the answer to that yet, do
21 we?

22 MR. CRAIG: No.

23 MR. MORGAN: I mean, that's why we're look-
24 ing at the technology: is that a viable solution?

1 And you look back at the exhibits in the
2 back, those aren't answers. Those are explorations
3 of "will this technology work," and we need to answer
4 exactly that kind of question as we go through a
5 process of discovery.

6 Make sense? Other questions?

7 All right. I will read a couple here.
8 Here's a comment relating to the potential, posed,
9 possible layoffs if we get the budget that we think
10 we might get.

11 After early retirement and weeding out of
12 nonessential personnel, have you considered, instead
13 of layoffs for 300 or so individuals, to have all
14 employees on site stay home one day with no pay? The
15 cost of shutdown for a one day a year for the next
16 five or six years should equal the cost reduction.
17 This should also be done on a Friday or Monday in the
18 summer. Employees should be understanding that way
19 and the schedule should not split at all, because you
20 will have enough personnel to continue business as
21 usual. What do you think about that idea?

22 MR. HANSEN: Well, that's exactly the kind
23 of comments we're looking for in this stakeholders'
24 proposal. Quite frankly, that would not do it. It

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 would not make up the difference in the budget.

2 However, it's a good idea.

3 Nick and I were just talking about it, and
4 he suggested that if we were to do that, send every-
5 body home with no pay for one day, we wouldn't get
6 any work done that day; so maybe what we do, instead,
7 is turn that around and say one day we come to work
8 but we don't get paid. That's an even better sugges-
9 tion.

10 But those are the kind of comments we're
11 looking for, and we will consider those things.

12 But remember, in the case of the DOE employ-
13 ees, we are already getting no raise next year. And,
14 in fact, they're going to do over the whole complex,
15 and that no-raise saving for one year, really taken
16 over a period of five years, they expect to save
17 \$1.55 billion.

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Don't complain, Ray. I
19 haven't had a raise in three years, so we're even.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have any idea
21 what area those layoffs are going to be in, if it's
22 your salary and wage, or one or the other?

23 MR. KAUFMAN: It's a mixture of where those
24 layoffs are going to be. Quite honestly, that's not

1 all worked out yet. It depends, as Lisa said, on
2 what the final budget cut is.

3 What has to happen, because the regulatory
4 milestones are fixed, as the budget comes down we
5 have to replan the work. When you replan the work,
6 you need a different mix of skills to do the work
7 relative to where we were before, and so until I know
8 the budget level and I've got the fixed regulatory
9 milestones, I can't finally determine on what the
10 change of work is.

11 In the planning we did associated with the
12 first budget marks the DOE gave us, it would come out
13 that about, and again, this is very general, but
14 about 80 percent of the impacted people would be
15 salaried people and about 20 percent would be wage
16 people.

17 But that's not a firm number. That just
18 happened to be the outcome on that particular study.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. There's situa-
20 tions out there that, for example, that there's
21 things being shipped off site, white boxes. There's
22 subcontractors doing this. If it's done with people
23 that are actually Fernald people, which I think
24 should be to us and not subcontractors coming in to

1 do what we do.

2 Why can't we do that with the people that
3 are already there that already have training? We
4 have to say we have to have this training and that
5 training. We have to do so much to work there. Why
6 can't the people that you have already there do that
7 job rather than have somebody else come off site?

8 And I know they pay a lot more money than
9 what the people that are actually there get paid. So
10 why can't you just utilize the people that you
11 already have? You wouldn't have to lay anybody off.

12 That's one particular job, and I'm sure
13 there's others.

14 MR. KAUFMAN: That's what Ray was referring.
15 We're putting together a FERMCO restructuring program
16 that will lay out how we make the decisions and what
17 the balance is, for example, how we choose between
18 subcontractors and our own employees, how we choose
19 between people who are embedded subcontractors versus
20 long term employees. And that's the document that
21 comes out for input from all of the stakeholders.

22 I can tell you as part of that process for
23 sure that as we determine how many people are
24 impacted, they automatically get reviewed against

1 work being done by others and against any open requi-
2 sitions so that we can try to move people over into
3 other activities that they can do or can be reasona-
4 bly trained to do.

5 But all of that is going to be laid out in
6 this reconfiguration plan, and that's what we're
7 asking for public input on.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I hope -- I
9 hope that one particular job that I was talking
10 about, I do know there are employees that are there
11 are trained to do that job. They're doing the same
12 thing during the daytime that we're not allowed to do
13 during the eveningtime. Somebody else does it.

14 I don't see why they have to do it that way.
15 Why can't our people work a second shift and keep the
16 employees that we have and not have to have that
17 layoff in any department back there?

18 MS. CRAWFORD: Nick, if we would --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's okay.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: If we were to get funded on
21 the -- you know, there was a full funding level, then
22 there was a target level and then there was what they
23 were going to give us; and I don't remember what
24 those three, you know, which one. I'm talking about

1 that piece of paper.

2 MR. HANSEN: (Nodding.)

3 MS. CRAWFORD: If we get funded on that
4 target level, do you still perceive there will be
5 layoffs? Or with the target funding would we be
6 okay?

7 MR. KAUFMAN: It depends on what happens.
8 If we were funded for what's called the requirements
9 case all the way out or through most of that period,
10 we'll be okay.

11 That's the program we were working against
12 which would have caused us to have about \$370 million
13 next year versus the 298 that they're currently talk-
14 ing about. It would have us still more in fiscal
15 '95.

16 If you told me that I was going to be
17 made whole in fiscal '94 but I was going to be cut
18 severely in fiscal '95, it doesn't help the situation
19 very much, because I certainly wouldn't build up the
20 work force only to have to bring it down again the
21 next fiscal year.

22 So it isn't a simple year by year, but if we
23 can get that closer to the original funding profile,
24 clearly we don't have to do near as much and we come

1 within the range of what we can handle by attrition,
2 normal quits and retirements and that sort of thing.

3 Typically, each year at the current rate
4 about 140 people quit for retirements or find other
5 work or whatever, and if we can pull back into that
6 kind of a band, then we can better manage the level
7 of employment.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: But didn't -- on the piece of
9 paper I have had, and I don't have it with me, it
10 talked about, you know, full funding, target funding
11 and then what they were, apparently they're looking
12 at giving us. If they -- if we got those target
13 levels for five years, would we be okay as far as not
14 laying people off?

15 MR. KAUFMAN: No. If we got the funding
16 level -- and they called it full funding level, but
17 it's the level that has been forecast for the last
18 two years. If we could get back to close to what had
19 been forecast for the last two years, then, in fact,
20 we don't have to lay people off. The further we fall
21 off of that, the more difficulty we have. And it's
22 really that simple.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: So, I mean, are you pretty
24 much done hiring people and, I mean, you're staffed

1 up the way you need to be staffed up right now?

2 MR. KAUFMAN: No.

3 MS. CRAWFORD: You need more people, less
4 people?

5 MR. KAUFMAN: It depends on what the final
6 budget level is and the skill mix that comes with it,
7 as this lady talked about. We were in the process of
8 staffing towards a budget level of \$370 million,
9 which would have been, between FERMCO and the subcon-
10 tractors, about 4,000 people.

11 Today we're at about 3300. If the original
12 plan had held, we would continue to build up staff
13 slowly and hiring people in the skills that were
14 required to carry out that program.

15 As we fall below that budget level, then the
16 needed skill mix changes, and we find ourselves in
17 the position, if, in fact, we receive the cuts that
18 have been forecast, to having to reduce the total
19 number of people and still be hiring in a few key
20 skill areas that we don't have people for.

21 Human risk and health assessment is one that
22 we're very short of skill on and have to hire no
23 matter what happens to the overall level of people,
24 because it's a very specialized skill that we don't

1 have and we're not going to retrain any of our cur-
2 rent employees to do it. It's a very specialized
3 discipline.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: So where are you going to get
5 these very specialized skill people from?

6 MR. KAUFMAN: We are recruiting all over the
7 United States for human health risk assessment peo-
8 ple. It's a very specialized skill.

9 MS. CRAWFORD: And, well, maybe you and I
10 can talk afterwards, because I'm not sure I under-
11 stand what a human health assessor is.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Me, either.

13 MR. KAUFMAN: Well, they are people who do
14 statistical risk assessment, that look at all of the
15 health threats on the site and all of the pathways to
16 human health and do statistical and probabilistic
17 analysis.

18 The typical individual will have a Ph.D., 15
19 to 20 years' experience, and have a minimum, a good
20 degree of training in medical activities. It's a
21 very specialized skill, and --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To help prevent, to
23 prevent people from getting health problems on site;
24 is that it?

1 MR. KAUFMAN: No. What it is is to be able
2 to calculate the probabilities required under the
3 regulatory process. The regulatory process requires
4 us to study alternative ways of cleaning up and do
5 statistical calculations about what the effect on the
6 population would be of different choices.

7 And that's a very specialized skill. It's
8 demanded in the regulatory process and regulatory
9 reviews, and, quite frankly, we just don't have the
10 number of people that we need do to do that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mean plot contam-
12 ination on site, what the effect would have on peo-
13 ple? Is that what you're trying to say?

14 MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah. That's right.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What happens if some-
16 one has a problem there and the issue isn't really
17 followed up on or --

18 MR. KAUFMAN: In fact, that's what the regu-
19 lators want to know, is if you're going do these
20 things, what's the effect on the population. And
21 that's a very complicated calculation, but they
22 demand that as part of the approval for a given
23 course of action, and there are few people in the
24 United States that do that work.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nick, you might want
2 to suggest that if the public has a concern about
3 what risk assessment people do, simply look at the OU
4 4 RI, and it's got the risk assessment in it and it
5 shows the need for hiring of people on it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I have no
7 qualms at all about hiring those people. I don't
8 think there's enough of them there as it is. I
9 totally agree with that.

10 MR. CRAIG: Ken, before you go on, just to
11 clarify one thing, we talk about the funding. The
12 target levels are the reductions. Those are the
13 numbers that we've been given as the reductions.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, now, see, that's not
15 the way it was explained to me, Jack. See, it was
16 explained to me --

17 MR. HANSEN: Well, there is a detriment case
18 from the target that they're looking at, too.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: I mean, it was the requested
20 numbers. You know, this is what we need from, I
21 guess, whoever. This is what we asked and what we
22 need.

23 Then there was another -- and I wish I would
24 have brought that with me. There was another level

1 called a target level, which was something they felt
2 like it was going to give us a little breathing room.

3 MR. CRAIG: Where did that report come from?
4 How long have you had it?

5 MS. CRAWFORD: Tom Rowland gave it to me.

6 MR. HANSEN: You're talking about target
7 planning case and requirements case?

8 MS. CRAWFORD: It was like something we
9 could live with, a little breathing room, other than
10 what we're saying we would --

11 MR. CRAIG: I think it was on that require-
12 ments case, which was the highest number, the number
13 out of the DOE's five-year plan and the target case.
14 Those are the three numbers on that chart, I believe.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: And they're at the bottom.
16 There were handwritten ones in as to what they were
17 going to give us, and the target would be like ten
18 percent more than that or like something like that.
19 Ray Hansen has all that stuff.

20 MR. HANSEN: That's the plan numbers. But
21 recognize, too, there is a detriment to the target
22 that is being considered.

23 MR. MORGAN: It's 9:30, but I've got a few
24 more questions here that we'll try to raise. This :

1 one actually came in two parts.

2 How do you intend to evaluate and remedy the
3 horrendous waste and mismanagement in the RI/FS?
4 Please be specific and address shortages of equipment
5 and vehicles, inadequate safety and decontamination
6 practices, scheduling logistical waste, failure of
7 off-site laboratories to meet prescribed sample-hold-
8 ing requirements, and frequent changes in work plans
9 resulting in redundant or worthless data.

10 We've already spoke about the IG has identi-
11 fied some problems with the RI/FS program. Also
12 implied in here is the whole issue of fraud, waste
13 and abuse. We take these very seriously. We would
14 invite the commenter here to take two approaches.

15 One, Jack would really enjoy talking and
16 dealing with these specific by specific, because we
17 would have to address specifically what incidents.
18 Or if you would prefer to remain anonymous, we would,
19 if you could follow up with some specific instances
20 that we could track.

21 The second part of that question is: What
22 is the current expected date of completion of OU-5
23 snapshot investigation, what was the original planned
114⁴ date of completion, and how do you account for the

1 delay?

2 Pete, can you tell us what the OU-5 snapshot
3 is and what the schedule is?

4 MR. YERACE: My name is Pete Yerace. I'm
5 OU-5 manager, the manager for the site.

6 The snapshot -- and I would like to refer to
7 what the galvanized snapshot is. Some of the things
8 we saw in the operable unit where there was addi-
9 tional data needs, we went back and evaluated what
10 additional needs that be might on the OU-5.

11 And some of those came from OEPA comments
12 and along with our own FERMCO people, which shows
13 additional samplings of wells across the site to get
14 a real present-day condition of what's going on with
15 all the wells across the site, where we selected and
16 optimized approximately 300 wells across the site to
17 sample, and not just for uranium contamination but a
18 suite of different contaminants, to see what present-
19 day conditions are.

20 Initially the schedule was to be looked at
21 somewhere around June time frame. Now, right now
22 we're looking at July to make up that.

23 First thing we had to do was to find out was
24 that going to impact the RI schedule, and what we did

1 is we had a technical information exchange with EPAs,
 2 presented to them a draft copy of the work plan and
 3 asked them for some preliminary comments and told
 4 them we would have to get out in the field without
 5 getting approval of that document, and if any comment
 6 could come during that time frame, we would appreci-
 7 ate it.

8 And that was when we have said it was sched-
 9 uled, and right now any additional comments we can
 10 get during the process we will take, but it's looking
 11 like July now is. The impact assessment that FERMC
 12 gave us is that they'll still meet the RI schedule.

13 MR. MORGAN: Thanks, Pete.

14 A question about the south plume. In the
 15 discussion about how that is we're going to be treat-
 16 ing the water, a concern about the entanglement with
 17 the chemical plant down there. There's some non-
 18 Fernald material that's in that plume. Are we going
 19 to be sucking that up, and are we going to be able to
 20 treat that, or is that a problem?

21 And maybe, Dave, can you handle that.

22 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Yeah, yes.

23 At the present time we've had some problems
 24 with the well field. In the original EE/CA document,

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 to be conservative, the intent was to capture any-
2 thing above 30, or 20 parts per billion, and conser-
3 vatively we had the well field down here at New Haven
4 Road.

5 As we got into the design, completed design,
6 OEPA's information came through from the Paddy's Run
7 Road site. That showed where, the well field we had,
8 we would have collected at the Paddy's Run Road site
9 contaminants.

10 What we did at that time is worked with OEPA
11 and USEPA and we relocated the well field to its cur-
12 rent position. Now, at that position we are very
13 comfortable that we will not pull in any of the
14 Paddy's Run Road site contamination.

15 What we're not comfortable with is, have we
16 totally captured all uranium above 20 parts per bil-
17 lion? We have may have to turn around and add a well
18 or so south of that to pick up that area. But we do
19 know that we will not, with the well field where it's
20 at, we would not collect any of Paddy's Run Road site
21 contamination.

22 The only question is, have we been a little
23 too conservative and will we collect all the uranium
24 above 20 parts per billion? And now we're doing part

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 five investigation, Hydropunching and so forth, south
2 of the well field.

3 Right now it's looking pretty good, at least
4 on the east side, that we have captured or we will
5 capture everything above 20 parts per billion up and
6 above.

7 Again, the idea was it was very conservative
8 the first time; and now we're cutting back to bare
9 bones, are we going to get exactly the ppb or not?
10 But we will not per the agreement.

11 Of course, the uranium equivalent mask, we
12 only had permit, we only had an agreement on uranium
13 discharge. We cannot discharge other contaminants.
14 And where the well field is, we will not pick up
15 those other contaminants.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: How do we know that? How do
17 you absolutely for positive certain know that we're
18 not going to pick any of that stuff up?

19 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: Well, it's a combina-
20 tion. We have the information from the Paddy's Run
21 Road site, that, you know, with their information
22 that they've got, we put that in the computer models
23 and run various particle tracking and so forth.

24 What we also have is, with the well field,

1 we have tremendous monitoring programs set up. We
2 will constantly readjust the flow rates from those
3 wells so that it does work as a hydraulic barrier.

4 The intent is not to overpump so we draw a
5 larger or underpump so we miss the hydraulic barrier.
6 So we will constantly monitor that well field as long
7 as it operates. And we also have wells strategically
8 placed where we would monitor the Paddy's Run Road.
9 So we'll be constantly monitoring.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: And as you're monitoring
11 whatever you're sucking up from underneath the ground
12 and shipping up the site to go to the river, are you
13 going to be testing that to make absolutely certain
14 we're not picking up any of that stuff from that?

15 MR. BRETTSCHEIDER: That's correct. But we
16 also take some strategically placed wells down closer
17 to the Paddy's Run Road site that we have in the plan
18 and monitor those specifically to see if we're
19 reversing the direction of flow.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

21 MR. YERACE: I would like to add something.
22 The comment that I don't think was stated is when we
23 said that the Paddy's Run Road site contamination
24 would have been down into our wells we had at New

1 Haven Road, I don't think the DOE's position at that
2 time was we wouldn't treat that water that came up to
3 the site.

4 We don't have a treatment system right now
5 in place that has a capacity to treat that contamina-
6 tion. If we did, we would probably at least discuss
7 the option of treating that water if we had advanced
8 water treatment on site, which maybe would solve some
9 additional problems that the State is having along
10 with us.

11 But since we don't have that treatment con-
12 dition, we definitely cannot have that water going
13 directly out to the river.

14 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Also, then there was a
15 question from Crosby Township about identifying some
16 of the vehicles and personnel out doing the monitor-
17 ing. We'll need to talk with you about coming up
18 with a good solution to make sure that the people are
19 well identified and nobody's surprised. And if
20 that's all right with you, we'll get back to you
21 about that.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ken, I made the com-
23 ment. I suggested on the card that magnetic signs be
24 used. That would be very helpful.

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 MR. MORGAN: Yes, sure.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Also, I would like to
3 make a suggestion. In my attendance at many of these
4 meetings, I've seen a pattern develop, and a possible
5 suggestion might be helpful.

6 The organizations, FRESH in particular, seem
7 to have to come in here and when question-and-answer
8 periods come or when their comments are entertained,
9 have to ask or beg for reports from special meetings
10 or major findings and that type of thing. Lisa has
11 to get up and ask for these reports.

12 I'd like to see that change a little bit. I
13 mean, certainly when you have these major meetings,
14 someone there has to be thinking that, gee, wouldn't
15 FRESH be interested in the outcome of this meeting;
16 maybe the board of trustees, also. I don't feel like
17 I should have to stand up here and beg for these
18 reports.

19 And the reason this concern comes up is
20 because when the manager of this site and the DOE
21 people get together and have a meeting, these man-
22 agers get together and change the goals and objec-
23 tives for the site.

24 I think somebody there at that meeting ought

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-626-6313

1 to understand that FRESH would certainly be inter-
2 ested in that information and the board of trustees
3 would. I think there's another gentleman up here
4 that's stressing concern.

5 I mean, there's only four or five groups
6 that would be interested. I would like to see this
7 information just voluntarily be given out to these
8 organizations rather than them having to stand up and
9 beg for it. Certainly the board of trustees would be
10 interested.

11 MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that out of line?
13 Lisa, does that pretty well cover it?

14 MS. CRAWFORD: No. Everybody up here is
15 going (nodding head). Right?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It just seems like at
17 these meetings that's what they have to do, and I
18 think that you need to wake up and realize that
19 they're automatically going to be interested in the
20 outcome of these reports, in your finding. I mean,
21 just automatically send it to them.

22 And you gentlemen seem to be surprised when
23 she stands up there and says we're interested in this
24 information. Well, they've been doing that for

1 years, so I think the shock factor should be over by
2 now. They're interested; so are we.

3 MR. HANSEN: No, I think that's a great
4 suggestion. I guess one concern we've had in the
5 past is overwhelming you with all the information
6 that flows across our desks. I apologize.

7 Quite frankly, there's an awful lot of
8 information that we see every day all the time that
9 becomes so routine to us that we don't think of it in
10 terms of the way you look at things. And maybe we
11 need to correct that, but I'm willing to work with
12 you on how we do that.

13 But, quite frankly, I think there's an awful
14 lot of information that goes across our desks that
15 you just don't want to see because you would have to
16 hire subcontractors to help you go through and sift
17 all that information. There's an awful lot of paper-
18 work on site.

19 I recognize and I hear your plea and it
20 makes sense, and we'll be glad to work with you.

21 MR. MORGAN: Well, thank you, folks, for
22 coming. Good evening.

23 (At 9:50 o'clock p.m., the meeting was
24 adjourned.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Luke T. Lavin, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I reported in stenotypy the foregoing community meeting held by the United States Department of Energy, Fernald Environmental Management Project, at The Plantation, 9660 Dry Fork Road, Harrison, Ohio, at 7:00 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, June 25, 1993, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript thereof from my stenotype notes.

Luke T. Lavin, Registered Professional Reporter