

5541

**QUESTIONS DURING THE Q&A PORTION OF THE OPERABLE UNIT 2  
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION WORKSHOP MAY 10, 1994**

05/10/94

DOE-FN      PUBLIC  
3  
COMMENTS

**PUBLIC WORKSHOP MAY 11, 1994  
QUESTIONS DURING THE Q&A PORTION OF THE MEETING**

**1. How many acres of cap are being recommended?**

The acres of cap and service roads would be approximately 16 acres for the Operable Unit 2 alternative that considers consolidation and capping in place. The alternative that considers a centralized disposal area would be approximately 13 acres.

**2. Are these caps to be designed to allow for some future use?**

No. The caps are not designed for any future use. They have been designed to be protective of a trespasser and an off-site farmer. To maintain protection of the off-site farmer and the trespasser, activities that would be intrusive in the cap (e.g., dirt biking) would not be allowed.

**3. Can the community comment on the alternatives?**

Yes. The Proposed Plan has been written to summarize the Operable Unit 2 FS. The Proposed Plan includes specific discussions on the risk associated with each subunit without any remedial actions, a description and comparison of each of the remedial alternatives being considered, and identification of a preferred remedial alternative. The Proposed Plan is written especially as a tool to be used by the public to facilitate review and comment on the alternatives. The public comment period on the FS/PP is planned for the Fall 1994.

Also the Fernald Citizens Task Force will be making recommendations on future land uses. DOE and FERMCO offered to delay the Record of Decision (ROD) for Operable Unit 2 until the Task Force makes their recommendation, but the Task Force declined.

**4. Since the caps are not contiguous and will require some buffer zone, how many acres of land are effectively rendered unusable by this option?**

A buffer zone has not yet been established. It depends on the uses of the areas around the Operable Unit 2 subunits or the centralized disposal facility. For reference, the OEPA Solid Waste Regulations require a 300 foot buffer between a disposal area and the property line. Therefore, if each of the subunits are isolated properties owned by the Federal government, an additional 34.85 acres would be used as a buffer. The alternative that considers a centralized disposal facility would require approximately 21 additional acres for this type of buffer.

**5. Future use will be limited in 3 distinct areas of the site?**

For the Operable Unit 2 preferred remedial alternatives, the future land uses of the three consolidated and capped areas would be limited. The total number of areas and acreage for the site that would have limited future use would depend on the RODs for Operable Units 3 and 5.

**6. Specifically, how will this capping alternative affect access to Paddys Run?**

Not at all. The Inactive Flyash Pile is the nearest subunit to Paddys Run and the remedial alternatives propose consolidating or removing the Inactive Flyash Pile material away from Paddys Run.

**QUESTIONS DURING THE Q&A PORTION OF THE MEETING  
(CONTINUED)**

7. **Since the proposed plan states that these remedies are only protective under a Federal ownership scenario, are we to assume that the ownership and control issue has been settled?**

No. See discussion in comment 3.

8. **What is the level of thinking that has been given to institutional controls?**

Institutional controls specific to the Operable Unit 2 RI/FS documents are continued federal control of the property and its uses.

9. **Since the baseline risk for expanded trespasser (the apparent future use of these areas) is already within EPA's acceptable risk range and we are not improving the current land use, what are the benefits we are achieving for this \$64.4 million capping option?**

The baseline risks (no remedial action) to a trespasser and to an off-site farmer from Operable Unit 2 subunits do fall within the generally acceptable incremental lifetime cancer risk range of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  (1 in 10,000) to  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  (1 in 1,000,000). However, this range needs to be met not only for Operable Unit 2, but also for the entire site. Therefore, residual risk (risk after remediation) from each of the other operable units needs to be added to Operable Unit 2 residual risk.

This is one of the purposes of the Comprehensive Response Action Risk Evaluation (CRARE) assessment that is updated for each Operable Unit's FS. The CRARE determines the total risk from the Leading Remedial Alternative and/or Preferred Remedial Alternative for each operable unit.

Each ROD for Fernald will be based on meeting this range and the other CERCLA criteria that balances such things as long term and short term effectiveness, cost and reduction of mobility, toxicity and volume of wastes.

In addition, various laws and regulations require actions for closure of some of the Operable Unit 2 subunits.

10. **What will the process be for consolidation and capping – will you just make a higher cap rather than spreading it out?**

We will excavate down to clean levels and then consolidate to make a higher cap that covers less area.

11. **Does the solid block modeling have capability to show the cap facility?**

Yes, it does. Plan and profile views of the consolidated and capped areas and the centralized disposal area were shown in the workshop. (A copy of the plan views of these units are provided in the Operable Unit 2 Proposed Plan.)

**QUESTIONS DURING THE Q&A PORTION OF THE MEETING  
(CONTINUED)**

12. **If the alternative is private ownership, what land use would be acceptable?**

The Private Ownership alternative would allow any use of the property. An extremely conservative case of a farmer who lives, grows crops, raises animals, and drinks and irrigates with groundwater was considered in the development of proposed remedial levels.

13. **Will other OUs be looking at a greater range of exposure levels?**

Yes, Operable Units 1, 2, 3, and 4 (which together make up 30% of the site area) contain or will contain alternatives that, when considering continued Federal ownership, would consider only trespasser scenarios. Operable Unit 5, which covers the remaining area, will consider additional alternatives that will allow less restrictive uses, such as recreational use. Please note, all operable units will consider an alternative that will allow private ownership and no restrictions on land use.

14. **How many years will it take to remediate OU2?**

Based on current expected funding and the preferred remedial alternatives, if we start in late 1996 then it will probably take 10 years, finishing in approximately 2006. We would like to start with the Inactive Flyash Pile, because it poses the largest risk among the Operable Unit 2 subunits.