

6139

G-000-1004.20

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COMMUNITY MEETING OCTOBER 18,
1994 - THE PLANTATION**

10/18/94

DOE-FN PUBLIC
106
TRANSCRIPT

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

COMMUNITY MEETING

OCTOBER 18, 1994

THE PLANTATION

- - -

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000001

1 MR. STEGNER: Good evening folks,
2 welcome. Thank you all for coming. My name is
3 Gary Stegner. I work in Public Affairs for the
4 Department of Energy at Fernald.

5 You notice a little bit different
6 look here tonight, it's a different room for one
7 thing than we're used to. We no longer have a
8 standing lease here on this building, so we pretty
9 much had to take what they gave us, but the
10 break-out sessions tonight, we'll use this room and
11 the room down the hall. You also see we have
12 tables. Someone suggested on their comment cards
13 at the last meeting that we use tables, and there,
14 you have tables.

15 The format for tonight's meeting you
16 see up here is going to be essentially the same as
17 we've had in the previous months. We'll start off
18 after I get finished, which I won't be very long,
19 with some remarks by Johnny Reising, kind of give
20 you an update on the cleanup status, and then we'll
21 go into break-out sessions. The break-out sessions
22 tonight will deal with the Draft Site Treatment
23 Plan and also the recommendations of the Fernald
24 Citizens Task Force, which is extremely important

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000002

1 and fundamental to our path forward at Fernald.

2 Let me see, the way we will do it
3 tonight is after we're done with this particular
4 session, after Johnny gets done with his remarks,
5 we will go into break-out sessions, which will be
6 more or less 30 minutes each. John Sattler from
7 DOE will sort of lead and Rod Warner will try to
8 facilitate the discussion on the Draft Site
9 Treatment Plan, and John Applegate and Dennis
10 Arnold will head the discussion on the
11 recommendations of the Fernald Citizens Task
12 Force.

13 You should all have comment cards on
14 your chairs, and I hope you all signed in when you
15 came in because the results of the meeting, results
16 of the discussion groups will be mailed to the
17 folks who have signed in tonight.

18 Let's see, as usual, following the
19 break-out sessions we will reconvene, we will take
20 about a ten-minute break after that, and we'll
21 reconvene in here hopefully about 8:40, 8:45 time
22 frame, and then, as has been the tradition here, we
23 will have comments from US and Ohio EPA, the
24 Fernald Citizens Task Force, and FRESH. And then

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000003

1 we will have an open mike period, and the only
2 thing we ask is that you do use the mikes.

3 We have a court reporter here
4 recording this tonight. Of course, the transcript
5 will be in the Public Reading Room very soon.

6 Before we get into anymore of the
7 program, why don't we kind of look at the upcoming
8 public involvement activities we're going to be
9 having. As you can see, it's a full schedule down
10 the road here. One thing I do want to point out, I
11 believe it's next Tuesday here at the Plantation,
12 we're going to be having kind of an availability
13 session with the Operable Unit 2 representatives on
14 the disposal cell for Fernald. That's something
15 that I think is of great interest to the
16 community. We urge you to put that on your
17 calendars. Shortly thereafter on the 8th, also
18 here at the Plantation, we'll have the public
19 meeting and take formal comments on the Operable
20 Unit 2 proposed plan.

21 Also in the back of the room you'll
22 see a lot of information there, including the
23 strategic plan, which is sort of the management
24 strategy the management put forward for Fernald.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000004

1 There's a lot of documents there. Look at them,
2 take what you want.

3 Before I introduce John, there's two
4 things I want to do. I want to bring you
5 up-to-date on some staff changes at Fernald and
6 broach a not so pleasant topic, at least from my
7 perspective, with you. Ray Hansen, who I think
8 most of you have come to know through the years,
9 has retired effective September 30th. Jack Craig
10 is now the acting area office director at Fernald.
11 Jack is in a series of meetings this week in
12 Washington and was not able to be here tonight.
13 Asked me to convey his regrets. He will be back in
14 town on Friday. Glenn Griffis has assumed Ray's
15 position as the acting deputy area office director
16 at Fernald. Simply removed Glenn from his previous
17 stint at Fernald and recently with the Ohio field
18 office. Johnny Reising is now the acting associate
19 director for environmental management, which is the
20 job that Jack Craig normally would have, and Johnny
21 will be doing, performing Jack's role here tonight,
22 and Ron Quador is the acting associate director for
23 safety assessment. So as usual, kind of a score
24 card at Fernald. I think actually we had a

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000005

1 permanent site manager for about eight or nine
2 months out of the last two and a half years, and he
3 was with the Ohio field office for Hamilton.

4 The subject I wanted to broach with
5 you that was not so pleasant from our perspective
6 was a story you may have heard on the radio on your
7 way in, you probably will read it maybe in this
8 evening's editions of the newspaper, that is a
9 letter that we received today from the Ohio EPA
10 threatening enforcement actions because they are
11 not pleased with our performance in handling the
12 uranyl nitrate hexahydrate situation at Fernald.
13 We refer to that as UNH. I think my second
14 community meeting here about two years ago this was
15 an issue. And quite honestly, I can understand the
16 position of the State of Ohio in this. We have not
17 performed particularly well in this, our path
18 forward has not been very quick, it has not been
19 very definite. Let me say, however, there are
20 ideas, proposals on the table that we are pursuing,
21 but in terms of the position of the State of Ohio,
22 they have not seen much tangible progress in the
23 last two years on UNH. Even as we speak today, I
24 mentioned Jack Craig was in Washington, DC. The

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000006

1 topic of his meeting today in Washington, DC was
2 UNH, what are we going to do, where do we stand.
3 Not only is Jack there, but several of the
4 management from DOE here at Fernald and also FERMCO
5 were there.

6 We're not prepared to discuss
7 in-depth the UNH situation here tonight simply
8 because the folks who are the experts are not
9 here. I did not want that -- I know there's some
10 concern, you hear something like this through the
11 press. We will afford you an opportunity to learn
12 more about UNH in a workshop that we promise to
13 have in the next 30 days on this. During this
14 workshop we will tell you exactly what the
15 situation is with UNH, we will tell you what the
16 problems are with UNH, why we have not been as
17 responsive as we should have been with the State of
18 Ohio on our handling of UNH, and we will give you
19 our proposed path forward on UNH.

20 Again, we feel we do owe you an
21 in-depth explanation on this. Johnny is going to
22 go through a lot of areas where I think we can take
23 a lot of pride in terms of our accomplishments on
24 getting close to the Record of Decision, but quite

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000007

1 honestly, our performance in this area is not one
2 we can take a lot of pride in. So stay tuned for
3 information on a workshop that will be added to
4 this mess on UNH.

5 So without further ado, let me
6 introduce Johnny Reising.

7 MR. REISING: Thank you, Gary.
8 Appreciate your opening remarks. As Gary did
9 indicate, Jack does send his regrets. Jack is in
10 Headquarters attending to a number of issues. As
11 Gary indicated, one of those is the UNH situation
12 and we're in the process of attempting to address
13 that and to try to charter a course forward as far
14 as moving forward on that operation.

15 In preparing my remarks for this
16 evening, it became quite obvious to me that since
17 our last community meeting, which I think took
18 place on June 14th, that a number of things have
19 happened I think that are extremely significant,
20 and I will run through those quite rapidly for you
21 in my opening remarks. But I think we're seeing a
22 tremendous amount of progress at the site in a
23 number of different areas, not that we haven't seen
24 progress in the past, but I think we're continuing

1 to gain momentum and continuing to move forward,
2 and I am personally very proud of that and very
3 proud of FERMCO and also proud of my DOE comrades
4 in relationship to that.

5 One of the areas that we've seen a
6 lot of progress has been in this removal and the
7 approval of primary RI/FS documents, RI's, FS's,
8 Proposed Plans, and the Record of Decision. We
9 continue to see implementation of the various
10 removal actions that we have ongoing. I think at
11 last count we have had 29 removal actions that were
12 actually on the books here at Fernald. Of those 29
13 removal actions, we have actually completed 19 of
14 those, which means that we have 10 that are still
15 outstanding or to be completed, and of that 10,
16 there are a number of them that are continuing,
17 they are yearly updates and yearly statuses,
18 continuing with the level of waste shipments and
19 those types of things. So I think we made a lot of
20 progress in relationship to that.

21 Also in the area of D&D, that's
22 decontamination and dismantling of structures, we
23 moved forward in relationship to that, and I will
24 be talking about three or so of those structures

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000009

1 that we've been able to actually break down
2 recently in a few moments.

3 We're actually starting to enter a
4 new phase here at Fernald, and something that I'm
5 very pleased to see. We're actually making a
6 transition, and for those of you who have watched
7 this for the last six, eight, or so years, I think
8 it's important to recognize this transition that we
9 have. We're actually going from the remedial
10 investigation and feasibility study portion to the
11 Records of Decision of the RI/FS process and
12 starting to move into the remediation, the remedial
13 design and the remedial action implementation
14 portions of CERCLA, which is really very exciting,
15 and I think we're going to see continued work in
16 remediation at the site.

17 Once again, we are making a
18 transition through the CERCLA process, and along
19 with this we're going to see some changes as far as
20 the various activities and hopefully we will be
21 getting into less investigation, less evaluation,
22 and much more actual remediation.

23 In doing a quick tally of the various
24 operable units and where we've been moving forward,

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000010

1 I think I show a score card of approximately three
2 RI's that we've had approved recently, we have
3 three FS's and Proposed Plans, we have one interim
4 Record of Decision, and one Record of Decision.

5 Quickly running through the operable
6 units and to give you a status update. Operable
7 Unit 1, as indicated by the slide, received the
8 final RI approval from the EPA's on August 1 of
9 this year. Subsequently the FS and Proposed Plan
10 was approved by EPA on July 27th. The public
11 comment period then on the proposed plan and
12 feasibility study ran from August 10th to September
13 8th. During that period, as required, we had a
14 public meeting on the proposed plan, which was held
15 August 23rd, 1994, at which a number of you
16 participated in and commented in relationship to
17 that document. We're in the process of preparing
18 to submit the draft record of decision and the
19 responsiveness summary to the EPA's on November
20 4th. I think it's important to recognize that the
21 responsiveness summary within the record of
22 decision is the document which addresses the
23 comments that were made during that formal process
24 and during that formal comment period on the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000011

1 proposed plan.

2 Operable Unit 2, we also show
3 continued progress. EPA conditionally approved the
4 RI's as it indicates here on August 1, and again
5 this approval is based on the incorporation of the
6 EPA's comments on that document. We also received
7 conditional approval of the FS and proposed plan as
8 recently as October 11 of this year, again subject
9 to incorporation of the comments. As Gary
10 indicated, there is a Round Table scheduled for
11 October 25th pertaining to Operable Unit 2,
12 specifically the cell design and on-site disposal
13 as it pertains to that recommended alternative that
14 is in the proposed plan for Operable Unit 2. The
15 30-day public comment period on the proposed plan
16 will be held October 26th through November 24th.
17 And as a result of having the public comment period
18 as required, we will be having a public meeting and
19 taking formal comments on the proposed plan, and
20 the date for that meeting is November 8th, 7:00
21 here. Also as indicated by the slide, the draft
22 records of decision, which includes responsiveness
23 summary, will be submitted to the EPA by January 5
24 as required by the Amended Consent Agreement.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000012

1 Operable Unit 3, glad to say that
2 we're able to live through the Operable Unit 3
3 Interim Record Of Decision, public comment period,
4 and Proposed Plan. We were able to effectuate the
5 signature of that document on July 22nd by the
6 EPA. So we do have a signed and approved Interim
7 Record Of Decision for Operable Unit 3. As a
8 result of having the approval of the Interim Record
9 Of Decision as required by the Amended Consent
10 Agreement, we had to submit the remedial design,
11 remedial action work plan to the EPA within 60 days
12 of the signature of that document. So we chose to
13 combine the remedial design and remedial action
14 work plan for the OU-3 IROD's and submitted that
15 document to EPA on September 19th.

16 In addition, we also submitted what
17 we refer to as the implementation plan for the D&D
18 of Building 4-A, which is the next complex that we
19 are attempting to go in and to D&D. This is the
20 green salt plant. It's the largest plant on the
21 site. Now that Plant 7 is down, it's quite obvious
22 in the skyline of Fernald. We're anticipating also
23 sometime in the relative near future, depending
24 upon our available funding for letting contracts,

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000013

1 submitting our second implementation plan for our
2 next complex. That next complex is anticipated to
3 be the Plant 1 complex, and depending upon funding
4 and letting of contracts, we will be submitting
5 that document also to the EPA.

6 In addition, we have some other
7 activities in OU-3 as far as RI/FS is concerned.
8 Recently the EPA approved a modification of the
9 OU-3 RI/FS work plan addendum, and in this approval
10 it will allow DOE to submit the Remedial
11 Investigation and the Feasibility Study and
12 Proposed Plan upon the final Record of Decision for
13 OU-3 as a combined document. Also as a result of
14 negotiations and combining this document, we were
15 able to bring the ROD date in basically from April
16 of 1997 about nine months earlier into July of
17 1996. We were able to do this basically as a
18 result of having an approved Interim Record of
19 Decision to where a decision has been made
20 primarily to take all those structures that were in
21 Operable Unit 3 and to D&D those and to either
22 dispose of them on-site or keep it and dispose of
23 it until we can effectuate the final Record of
24 Decision. And the final Record of Decision is

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000014

1 where the decision as to either on-site or off-site
2 or possibly accommodation of both will be made.

3 Moving on to Operable Unit 4, a
4 couple of significant actions have taken place.
5 One of the most important being the Record of
6 Decision was submitted to the EPA on August 9th of
7 this year, and we obtained conditional approval of
8 the Record of Decision from the EPA's on September
9 6th. We anticipate the signing by the EPA of the
10 Record of Decision by December. In talking to
11 Randi Allen, she indicated this may happen as
12 quickly as November. So we're looking forward to
13 that. Again, as required by the Amended Consent
14 Agreement, the remedial design work plan will be
15 submitted to the EPA's within 60 days after the
16 signature of the Record of Decision.

17 As indicated by the slide, we also
18 initiated construction on June 23rd of '94 of the
19 OU-4 vitrification pilot plant. It's coming along
20 well. In talking to the group they indicate that
21 phase one, which is the surrogate process at the
22 vitrification plant, is due to initiate in June of
23 1995. So again, I think as you can see, in
24 Operable Unit 4 we continue to move forward.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000015

1 Operable Unit 5, the RI for OU-5 was
2 submitted to the EPA's on June 24th, 1994. The
3 OU-5 RI was disapproved with comments by the
4 agencies, and we're in the process of responding to
5 those comments and incorporating them back into the
6 document and anticipate submitting it back to the
7 agencies by November 1. Even though you see the
8 term "disapproved," this is a standard practice as
9 far as the review site is concerned. Very few of
10 our documents are normally approved first time
11 through because of clarifications, additions,
12 various modifications that we need to make to the
13 document. Again, it is important that you realize
14 that the document is disapproved with comments and
15 that we then address those comments, we incorporate
16 them into a revised document and submit them back
17 to the agencies to continue through the review
18 cycle.

19 In addition to that, the draft
20 Feasibility Study and the Proposed Plan is
21 scheduled for submittal on November 16th according
22 to the Amended Consent Agreement, and then
23 subsequently the Record of Decision will be
24 scheduled for submittal on July 3rd of 1995.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000016

1 That's a quick rundown of the various
2 operable units and a lot of the RI/FS activities
3 that have taken place. I would like to take just a
4 few minutes to go through some of the removal
5 actions and some of the D&D and the other
6 activities that we have taking place, some of the
7 other work, the additional work and some of the
8 remediation work that has taken place.

9 Takedown of Plant 7, this is Removal
10 Action 19. As indicated by the slide, we did
11 utilize shaped charges for using the implosion
12 technology. This had a number of beneficial
13 factors. Primarily we were able to minimize lead
14 radiological exposure to workers, we were able to
15 shave some time off the schedule itself, and in
16 addition we were able to save some money. We had a
17 lot less cuts as far as the potential for lead
18 exposure and radiological exposure. The second
19 bullet indicates we had zero lost time and
20 accidents. We considered this technique, this
21 technology was much safer. We had much less worker
22 time, we conducted high picks with the crane. This
23 structure was 114, 120 or so foot high. We did
24 have seven stories. Originally we wanted to take a

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000017

1 number of picks by crane and this will allow us to
2 take it down much more rapidly. We also employ a
3 washdown, lockdown technology, which allowed us to
4 minimize the amount of contamination that we had to
5 the environment. Proved to be very successful. We
6 evaluated this. We have a lot of lessons to learn
7 as a result of this removal action, and we're going
8 to be employing this in the future.

9 The overall schedule to dismantle
10 Plant 7 was reduced significantly by approximately
11 a year, and from the initial inception of the
12 removal action to presently we've been able to save
13 approximately \$5,000,000 off the entire project.
14 Plant 7, as we indicated, I think will be
15 duplicated as far as using that technology in the
16 future. Again, as the slide indicates, we feel
17 that it is safer for the workers, it allows us to
18 save time, it is quicker and does in actuality save
19 us money. We may also utilize implosion by shaped
20 charge mechanism in the future.

21 A couple of striking slides, you may
22 have seen these in earlier presentations, but to
23 make a long story short, it took us a couple of
24 tries in order to get it down completely, but in my

6139

1 mind it was a success. The first implosion took
2 place on September 10th at approximately 9:45,
3 something after that. With the first attempt we
4 were able to bring it partially down, approximately
5 half way down. In retrospect, in looking at the
6 situation, I think we underestimated the
7 construction of the building, the engineering
8 design of the building, and CEI, the sub who were
9 brought in to actually do the implosion, I think
10 was probably one of the most surprised individuals
11 on the site when the structure did not fall.

12 Subsequently we went in and were able
13 to re-evaluate the situation, to go back in. We
14 determined that it was safe for re-entry, people
15 were able to go back in to reset linear charges,
16 and on September 17th, approximately 9:45 or so in
17 the evening, we had this shot, which was basically
18 the second implosion, which in fact did bring it
19 down.

20 As you can see, there's the structure
21 as it has been brought down. The significance of
22 this is that we were able to bring the seven-story
23 building down to basically one story to where it is
24 able to be reached with hydraulic shears that

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000019

1 actually cut apart and then put into white metal
2 boxes which makes a much safer configuration and a
3 much safer process. Again, although it did take us
4 a couple of tries, we're very proud of this and we
5 may be utilizing this where appropriate in the
6 future.

7 Let me briefly talk about the Plant 1
8 ore silos, Removal Action 13. The Plant 1 ore silo
9 project contains, as indicated here, six concrete
10 silos and eight tile silos. I'm pleased to say
11 that all six of the concrete silos and the
12 associated scaffolding and protective shield that
13 we had on them have been removed. We initiated and
14 to date have been able to remove in addition to
15 that all eight of the tile silos and about half of
16 the protective scaffold and shield associated to
17 that. This material is being size reduced, put
18 into white metal boxes, and awaiting disposition.

19 We've got a couple of slides here
20 which depict the Plant 1 ore silos, as we
21 indicated. This is a before picture showing you
22 that we had the six top silos -- excuse me -- does
23 this pick up, can you hear this? Fine, great. So
24 we had the six concrete silos located in this area

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000020

1 there, and then we had the eight tile silos which
2 were located here. Unfortunately, these are a
3 couple of tanks which did contain UNH. Again, this
4 is prior to the D&D of the structure.

5 This next slide is approximately
6 about half way through the takedown. As you can
7 see, this was the six concrete silos. They have
8 been basically, about half of them taken down a
9 portion of the way. Here's some of the scaffolding
10 that was used in order to cut around the concrete
11 silos, and in the back you can see some of the
12 protective sheeting that was used. The protective
13 sheeting was used in an attempt to keep this under
14 negative pressure using HEPA filters in order to
15 prevent releases from the environment. Again you
16 can also see the erection that we have here of a
17 protective shield over the UNH tanks in case there
18 may have been some tile from the silos that may
19 have fallen potentially. This would be protected
20 also from various lists.

21 The next slide is one of my favorite
22 slides, I think it shows a lot of good work and
23 technology. As you can see, this is where the six
24 concrete silos have been. Those concrete silos

1 have in fact been eliminated. Here's some of the
2 remaining cones that are going to be size reduced
3 and shipped off or whatever.

4 These are the remaining eight tile
5 silos, two tall silos on each side with the four
6 smaller silos in the middle. Here you can see an
7 open structure, a mechanism realized to where we
8 actually have a large cone type shoot that went
9 down into white metal boxes so that we were able to
10 take the tile material, dump it into the shoot,
11 move it directly down into, here, these are the
12 white metal boxes. The white metal boxes then were
13 actually somewhat on a roller track and able to
14 come out. Very efficient, very effective
15 mechanism. It worked very, very well. And again,
16 employing here the use of negative pressure in
17 order to reduce or to hopefully eliminate the
18 release of anything to the environment.

19 This shows the demolition of the Fire
20 Training Facility. The Fire Training Facility is
21 exactly what it implies, it is a series of
22 structures, it was a two-story building that is
23 north of the production area, and you will see it
24 as you come in the north access road. Demolition

1 of the Fire Training Facility was completed on
2 September 12th. Debris from the building was
3 stored on-site, awaiting determination of the final
4 disposition of that material. Some of the tanks we
5 had in relationship to that structure have been
6 size reduced and will be put on the scrap metal
7 pile, and we hope to recycle those. I think we
8 still have one which still needs to be reduced.

9 So closing out of that, some
10 additional action that will take place is the
11 excavation of the asphalt pad and some of the
12 contaminated soils that we had in that area.
13 Again, this is a Fire Training Facility. They use
14 some of the solvents from the plant, TCE, TCA,
15 benzene. That would be either thrown on the
16 ground, possibly the first floor of the structure,
17 ignited, and then the fire force would come out and
18 practice utilizing training by extinguishing those
19 fires.

20 Again an attempt to give you a before
21 and after picture of this. This is in partial of
22 the cleanup here. This is the Fire Training
23 Facility, the two-story structure itself. This is
24 a small pond. This is a containment vessel that

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342
000023

1 would actually burn. Some small trenches in this
2 entire area, and various types of solvents and
3 other material placed on it. The constituents that
4 are concerned that we're dealing with here
5 primarily were volatiles, PCB's, and relatively
6 little landlock contamination.

7 Again, this is the two-story
8 building, basically one of two stories as far as
9 practice entering and exit and also to extinguish
10 fires on the first story. Went in and we scaffold
11 both the floor on the first floor and the floor on
12 the second floor in order to eliminate the
13 potential of any radiological contamination that
14 was there and also to get rid of any of the VOC's
15 or any material.

16 We looked at a number of different
17 techniques that we have employed, and here is a
18 fairly straightforward mechanism to where we took a
19 track off and simply said here she goes. They were
20 in the process as this was actually taking place,
21 they would spray this and wet this and try to
22 reduce the amount of emissions, but realizing
23 again, as I said, that the amount of radiological
24 contamination in relation to this structure was

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000024

6139

1 very, very small, very minimal. I think it's
2 important that if you contrast the Fire Training
3 Facility, the Plant 7, and the Plant 1 ore silos,
4 we have three very distinct mechanisms, three very
5 distinct technologies that have been employed.
6 Again the different technologies have been employed
7 based upon the time, the levels of contamination,
8 and the types of contamination that we had.

9 In the Plant 1 ore silos we saw a
10 complete encapsulation of machine, trying to reduce
11 and eliminate pressure potential for any release.
12 In Plant 7 we had the washdown, we had the lockdown
13 in order to take the transite out and take all the
14 material out the best we could. We were able to
15 have remaining structural steel skeleton and have
16 use of the shaped charges in order to bring that
17 down. In this situation the problem of
18 radiological is not as prevalent. Thus by wetting
19 the area and knocking it down we were able to take
20 it down, and presently this material is in a large
21 pile on this pad, has been tarped and protected as
22 a way of further disposition.

23 I would like to briefly discuss an
24 incident that we had as far as a low-level waste

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000025

1 transportation accident. You may have read about
2 this in the newspaper. As indicated by the slide,
3 it occurred on October 1 of this year. It occurred
4 approximately 5:45 in the afternoon near Rolla,
5 Missouri, which is about 90 minutes southwest of
6 St. Louis on I-44. I think it is important to note
7 as we go through this discussion that this is the
8 first accident we had as far as shipping is
9 concerned in over 3,320 shipments, and this is to
10 NTS and to various other sites, indicating that
11 this is the first accident that we had in over 6.3
12 million log miles.

13 This is an indication of the scene of
14 the accident itself. Primarily, as you can see,
15 this is a Sealand. The Sealands are normally put
16 on a flatbed truck and then taken from the site to
17 the Nevada test site, which is where this was
18 headed. What happened is the driver of the rig
19 basically wandered off the medium of the road in
20 this area there, off into the left side of the
21 road. There's approximately between an 8 to
22 10-inch drop in that medium. As his cab dropped
23 off, realizing that he was off the road, moving
24 forward attempted to bring the cab back onto the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000026

1 road. Unfortunately, at that point in time the
2 trailer, which was following naturally off on the
3 side, and as he attempted to move forward, the
4 movement of the trailer caused him to flip over so
5 both the trailer and the cab flipped on its side.
6 As you can see, this is the marks to where the rear
7 axles, the rear wheels were on their side. This
8 mark, I don't know if it shows up that well, is the
9 skid marks to where the Sealand itself was in
10 actuality on its side skidding near the bed of the
11 truck to where the straps were. At this point in
12 time the straps finally broke through, and when the
13 straps broke through, as you can see, it was on its
14 side and then it made another 90 degree and
15 basically landed on its top. So this Sealand
16 structure is in juxtaposition or turned over 180
17 degrees.

18 Again, this gives you an indication
19 of close-up of the Sealand as it was sitting after
20 the accident.

21 The Emergency Operations Center at
22 the site was notified and was activated
23 approximately 6 p.m., 15 minutes or so after the
24 accident on October 1. The EOC advised the local

1 responders in Missouri to wait for the Fernald
2 assistance to get there. The plant recovery team,
3 which I think was composed of four individuals,
4 arrived on the scene at approximately 2:00 in the
5 morning on the 2nd.

6 The recovery team basically surveyed
7 the area from the impact to where the container
8 initially turned over until -- the truck turned
9 over until the actual area, from there to the
10 container. Finding that that was basically void of
11 any contamination, the survey team actually went up
12 then and inspected the container itself. After
13 they verified that there was solid containment, the
14 recovery team waited for daylight as a result of,
15 for safe precautions and safety reasons.

16 After determining that there was
17 containment and no release of material, cranes were
18 used to roll the container over approximately 90
19 degrees. As you can see in this picture, the top
20 is being surveyed by three individuals. These are
21 individuals from the Missouri Board of Health, the
22 Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and also
23 the recovery team. So we had our results as far as
24 our recovery team, the fact that there was not any

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000028

1 release of material, verified by two other state
2 emergency response agencies.

3 The Sealand container again was
4 rotated 90 degrees onto its bottom, it was
5 basically upright on its side. The Sealand, as you
6 can see in this slide, was lifted onto the trailer,
7 which took place at approximately 12 p.m. They
8 were able to move the trailer from there to a
9 wrecker storage yard. Unfortunately, they were not
10 able to use the same trailer, they had to procure
11 an additional trailer to put the Sealand on an
12 additional trailer and the new cab and to bring the
13 material back to Fernald. The Sealand in fact
14 returned back to the Fernald site on October 4th at
15 approximately 2:00 in the afternoon.

16 The last slide that I have is one
17 that Ray Hansen normally speaks to, so it's a
18 privilege to be able to talk to this slide.
19 Basically it's an indication of the shipment of
20 drum equivalents of low-level waste the various
21 years. A couple of things I would like to point
22 out, that in 1994, through 1994, fiscal year '94,
23 September, we were able to ship off over 78,000
24 drum equivalents of low-level waste. Significant

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000029

1 in that, and I asked Dave to get this information
2 for me, is that of this amount that we were able to
3 ship, we were able to ship over 15,000 drum
4 equivalents in September of '94 alone, which I
5 think speaks very, very well. In addition to this
6 there's also, we were able to reinitiate the old
7 shipments, thorium shipments were initiated again
8 in September of this year, and I think that in
9 September we were able to make approximately three
10 shipments, a total of about 364 or so drum
11 equivalents.

12 Another topic that Ray would point
13 out has to do with materials products that have
14 been shipped. In this case in fiscal year '94,
15 239,000 plus pounds of this material has been
16 shipped to Manufacturing Science Corp, and I
17 believe the majority of this material has been
18 converted. Thank you.

19 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Johnny. I
20 think what we ought to do right now is proceed into
21 the break-out sessions, and I want to reiterate the
22 fact that after the break-out sessions we will
23 reconvene in here for the comments by the four
24 organizations that I mentioned before, and we will

1 have an open mike. If you don't want to use the
2 microphone but you do have a question, you can use
3 the comment card and give it to me and I can see
4 that you get an answer to it.

5 Why don't we go ahead right now
6 directly to the break-out sessions. One is down
7 the hall, one is in the back of the room. We're
8 going to try to do both, everyone here will be able
9 to attend both sessions. So kind of divide
10 yourself evenly if you can. We'll reconvene in
11 about an hour.

12 (Off the record.)

13 MR. WARNER: I'm Rod Warner with the
14 Department of Energy here at Fernald, and we're
15 going to talk to you tonight a little bit about a
16 document called a Draft Site Treatment Plan. This
17 plan was generated in response to the Federal
18 Facilities Compliance Act, and we're going to
19 discuss it with you briefly. After we go through
20 the discussion, we will open it up for questions,
21 and I would appreciate it if you would kind of hold
22 the questions until we get through the
23 presentation. John Sattler from the Department of
24 Energy is going to be doing the presentation, and

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000031

1 we'll turn it over to John here. It should take,
2 what, about 10 or 15 minutes?

3 MR. SATTLER: Oh, yeah, no more than
4 that. We'll have plenty of time for questions.

5 I am John Sattler. I work with DOE
6 here at Fernald, and putting together the Draft
7 Site Treatment Plan is my project, and I work with
8 a lot of other people within DOE and FERMC0 to
9 assemble this.

10 The first thing we're going to do --
11 well, the second thing we're going to do is talk
12 about what is the Draft Site Treatment Plan. The
13 first thing, I want to make sure, there are a
14 couple of pieces of literature here, there were
15 some on the seats in the circle here. There's some
16 additional Fernald fact sheets about the Draft Site
17 Treatment Plan and Federal Facilities Compliance
18 Act. Also if you're interested when we're
19 finished, the State of Ohio has also put together a
20 fact sheet on the investigation of the Draft Site
21 Treatment Plan. So those are available to you.

22 What is the Draft Site Treatment
23 Plan? In short, the Draft Site Treatment Plan is a
24 summary of Fernald's plans, our projects for

1 treating mixed wastes. It is important to remember
2 that we're only talking about mixed wastes though.
3 Mixed wastes are those wastes that have a hazardous
4 component, they might be corrosive, they might have
5 metals, they might exhibit some type of toxicity as
6 well as a radioactive component. Most of the waste
7 that we're dealing with at Fernald has the
8 radioactive components; a much smaller amount
9 relatively speaking is mixed waste.

10 So why are we putting this document
11 together? The bottom line reason is we're required
12 to by law. In 1992 the Federal Facilities
13 Compliance Act was signed into law by President
14 Bush, and one of the requirements of that statute
15 was for Department of Energy facilities that stored
16 or handled mixed waste had to assemble, had to put
17 together this Draft Site Treatment Plan to display
18 what it was we were going to do with our mixed
19 waste. So 49 DOE sites have been working on
20 putting together the Site Treatment Plan.

21 DOE had come up with a plan of
22 issuing this plan in three steps. Last October, a
23 year ago, we issued what we called a Conceptual
24 Site Treatment Plan. It was very general. It

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000033

1 listed primarily all the various options we had for
2 dealing with our mixed waste. The end of August
3 the Draft Site Treatment Plan was issued, and it
4 really narrowed down all of those options listed in
5 the Conceptual Site Treatment Plan to what we
6 really think or what we think as of the end of
7 August of this year what our best options are for
8 treating those mixed wastes. In February of next
9 year we will be presenting what some people call
10 the Final Site Treatment Plan, other people are
11 calling the Proposed Site Treatment Plan, and that
12 will further define these options we've listed in
13 the Draft Site Treatment Plan.

14 Who are we submitting this plan to?
15 Well, we are submitting it to Ohio EPA, certainly
16 US EPA will be getting a copy of this too. This
17 particular plan will go to Ohio EPA, they will
18 review it, and they will approve it or they will
19 approve it with modifications, they will give it
20 back to us to make changes. The goal is that by
21 October of next year we will have an approved plan
22 and we will have some kind of consent order,
23 compliance order from the State of Ohio that says
24 go ahead and do this treatment of mixed waste.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000034

1 This table is here and it's also in
2 the second page of the handout that you have. It
3 lists what we identified in that Draft Site
4 Treatment Plan as our preferred options for dealing
5 with mixed waste, how we're going to treat it, and
6 what we have done is we have taken all of the mixed
7 waste on-site that we define as legacy waste, which
8 primarily is the mixed waste that's left over from
9 production operations or perhaps more recently
10 generated through site maintenance activities, some
11 of the safe shutdown activities, the stuff that we
12 have in containers in storage. What are we going
13 to do with it? These are the preferred options.

14 Now, you'll see here it's listed in
15 volumes of the waste, on this particular table it's
16 listed as cubic yards. In the table on your
17 handout it's listed in cubic meters. We have a
18 cubic meter here for you that was put together in
19 response to a comment that we received at a
20 previous meeting was when people talk about cubic
21 yards, cubic meters, we don't know what that means,
22 it's hard to visualize. This is a cubic meter. On
23 the table that Johnny Reising just showed you, on
24 the bottom of it the total amount of waste that was

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000035

1 shipped off-site, it was something on the order of
2 400,000 drum equivalents, 450,000 drum equivalents,
3 okay, that would equate approximately into 200,000
4 of these cubic meters. Now, his demonstration
5 there was not mixed waste, so I don't want to
6 confuse that point, but 200,000 cubic meters were
7 moved off the site for disposal disposition.

8 Okay. As you can see, if you add all
9 this up, we're talking about something on the order
10 of 3,000 or so cubic meters. A cubic yard is a
11 little bit less than a cubic meter, so we have
12 3,000 or so cubic meters to deal with with the
13 legacy waste. These are our options here. We have
14 the HF treatment, which we are planning on working
15 with Ohio right now to initiate that treatment of
16 that material, actually as a RCRA closure
17 activity.

18 One of the things that we decided
19 early on at Fernald was that we didn't want to
20 reinvent the wheel. A lot of this mixed waste was
21 to be dealt with with ongoing or planned
22 activities, like the HF; the RCRA closure activity,
23 and that's the regulatory vehicle, if you will,
24 that will guide the treatment of that material.

1 Johnny or Gary spoke to the UNH, there was a
2 removal action ongoing to deal with that, and that
3 will be the driver for the UNH treatment.

4 Other interesting things to note here
5 is that most of the treatment projects you will see
6 here show that the treatment is to be done
7 on-site. The only off-site treatment that was
8 identified is to ship some wastes to TSCA
9 Incinerator in Oak Ridge, and that's really a
10 continuation of some of the waste management plans
11 we had for some time. Down at the bottom it shows
12 Envirocare of Utah. That will be taking care of
13 some of our mixed waste, but they will not be
14 treating that particular mixed waste before final
15 disposal of that mixed waste. A lot of our
16 preferred options also show that we have plans for
17 mobile vendor treatment. Our goal is to have a
18 vendor come in, so some company will come in and
19 they will set up shop on-site to treat the waste,
20 and they will ideally have some kind of mobile
21 unit, might literally be a truck on wheels or might
22 be skid mounted, but in some form or fashion it
23 will be transportable.

24 One of the reasons we want to do that

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000037

1 is that we think we can get it done that way sooner
2 and cheaper. Another reason we're talking about
3 doing this is we've been having discussions with
4 other DOE facilities, especially those here in
5 Ohio, that have similar type of wastes, and if we
6 can set up a mobile unit here to do say our
7 stabilization project and then box that stuff up
8 and ship it off to the Portsmouth facility and have
9 them utilize that same equipment, that is going to
10 make the whole situation a lot better for all of us
11 involved.

12 Where we are right now in the process
13 is, as I mentioned, we issued the Draft Site
14 Treatment Plan. The Draft Site Treatment Plan is
15 available for public review and comment. As a
16 matter of fact, we are right now in the process in
17 the period where we are seeking comments from the
18 public, seeking comments from the regulatory
19 community as well on that plan so that we can take
20 those comments and we can roll them into
21 development of the final plan. That's to come out
22 in February. The plan is available in the Reading
23 Room. We have a copy of it up here. Comments are
24 welcome.

1 One thing I want to touch on here
2 this evening is why this plan is important.
3 Obviously it's important to us because it's
4 required for us to do it by law. If you take a
5 look at the volume of mixed waste compared to our
6 total waste volume, as I mentioned earlier, it's
7 relatively small volume. So as we've gone through
8 this process, all of us working on this, we are
9 finding out what's the real importance of this
10 particular issue. It's kind of dwarfed in scope by
11 the total waste volumes we have to deal with.
12 Well, there are a couple of reasons why this is
13 important. One reason is in this process, this
14 process of developing this site treatment plan is a
15 little bit unique when you compare it with a lot of
16 the other documents or a lot of the other plans
17 we've developed. While we have been working to
18 develop our own plan here at Fernald, at the same
19 time we've been working with DOE across the
20 complex. I mentioned that there were 49 site
21 treatment plans, draft site treatment plans
22 developed, over 49 conceptual site treatment plans
23 submitted. We've been having regular meetings with
24 DOE headquarters and representatives from the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000039

1 various DOE operations offices so that we can
2 develop these plans at least in a consistent
3 format, and that's important for the people who are
4 reviewing these plans, the people who are taking a
5 look at these plans so they can make some
6 comparisons on what's going on. If we're going to
7 be shipping our waste to the State of Tennessee for
8 incineration, the State of Tennessee is interested
9 in that.

10 At the same time we've been working
11 with the other DOE facilities. We've been working
12 with not only the State of Ohio, but in many of
13 these meetings we've been meeting with Ohio and all
14 the other states, and many of the state
15 representatives feel that this is important because
16 they have, as they have expressed at these
17 meetings, they feel that coming to terms on this
18 mixed waste issue is somewhat representative or
19 maybe a precursor on how well DOE works on dealing
20 with the bigger issues of the low-level waste or
21 all of the regulatory waste. So it's important for
22 us to put together a successful plan and implement
23 a successful plan in dealing with mixed waste
24 because it's important to a lot of the people we're

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000040

1 going to be considering whether or not they want to
2 accept it. The State of Tennessee has some say in
3 this matter.

4 The other reason it's important is
5 because there are some issues associated with this
6 plan that you all need to be aware of. Because we
7 are working with all the other DOE sites across the
8 complex, we're not working in a vacuum. There are
9 other DOE facilities out there who are looking at
10 our mixed waste treatment capabilities and making
11 decisions on whether or not they want to send their
12 waste to Fernald for treatment.

13 Now to date what I can tell you is
14 that only one other facility has identified Fernald
15 as a treatment facility, remember the term we used,
16 preferred option, for some of their mixed waste,
17 and that's the Portsmouth facility here in Ohio.
18 They've identified three mixed waste streams
19 totaling something on the order of 84 or 85 cubic
20 meters of waste to come to Fernald to be processed
21 through the vitrification, the MAWS vitrification
22 plant at Fernald.

23 Now, that's not a done deal, and when
24 I say that, that cuts both ways. What I mean is

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000041

1 that we don't know for sure if that's going to
2 happen. On the other hand, DOE across the complex
3 as well as the DOE facilities within Ohio are now
4 going back and taking a look at all these various
5 site treatment plans and deciding whether or not
6 that all of these solutions that we've put on the
7 table make sense. For example, if we have
8 identified going, putting together a mobile
9 stabilization unit here at Fernald, and say
10 Portsmouth is identifying the same thing and a
11 facility in Paducah, Kentucky is identifying the
12 same thing and half a dozen or a dozen other
13 facilities the same preferred option, does that
14 make sense for us to do that. So we're trying to
15 come to terms with that, how can we get some kind
16 of economy of scale, how can we come up with the
17 best options that make the best sense for each
18 individual site like Fernald as well as across the
19 complex.

20 So we're doing that on, as I said, on
21 two levels. We're meeting with the Ohio sites for
22 an Ohio regional look and DOE also has a work group
23 put together to do that on an across the DOE
24 complex basis. And the results of that could be

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000042

1 that perhaps other facilities identify Fernald as a
2 place to treat some of their waste. Now as of
3 today I don't know what the results of that process
4 is. I don't have any information to offer to you
5 as far as that goes. I won't have any kind of
6 feedback from that work group until later this
7 month.

8 What I can tell you from working with
9 the Ohio regional group is that what we're looking
10 to do is to really explore further the idea of the
11 mobile treatment, and the mobile stabilization is a
12 good example of that. If we're putting together
13 that unit here, what we're exploring is taking that
14 unit, taking that technology and picking it up and
15 sending it off to Portsmouth, for example, because
16 they have some of the same types of waste, similar
17 types of problems that require similar treatment.

18 One other important issue if you do
19 take the time to sit down and open up the Draft
20 Site Treatment Plan and read through it, you will
21 see a discussion of disposal, and it's a similar
22 issue as the treatment issue inasmuch as DOE has a
23 work group -- when I say DOE, I don't mean Fernald
24 necessarily, I mean DOE headquarters and

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000043

1 representatives of the various field offices has a
2 work group to identify the best mixed low-level
3 waste disposal facilities, and they have developed
4 a process for doing that evaluation.

5 It started out with these 49 sites.
6 They have made one cut. Fernald was carried
7 through that cut, which means that Fernald is being
8 carried through this evaluation process. That work
9 group will be coming out and visiting us on-site
10 here sometime in November to collect the
11 information they need to go through their process.
12 When they are finished, what they will come up with
13 is a recommendation for the best candidate
14 facility. What that means is that those candidate
15 facilities are not necessarily identified as the
16 best low-level waste disposal facilities, but
17 they're saying these are the best candidates. So
18 they may, that study may result in one facility
19 being identified, could be two, could be six, any
20 number of facilities. That, too, I don't have a
21 lot of information beyond what I very briefly
22 summarized for you right here and now. But there
23 are a lot of factors that are going into that
24 process. So these are a couple of important issues

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000044

1 that we wanted to identify for you.

2 Questions?

3 PUBLIC: I assume the State of Ohio
4 has already bought into all the Draft Site
5 Treatment Plans developed by the Ohio sites?

6 MR. SATTLER: The question was Ohio
7 has bought into all of the Draft Site Treatment
8 Plans.

9 PUBLIC: Prepared by the Ohio sites.

10 MR. SATTLER: Prepared by the Ohio
11 sites.

12 PUBLIC: In other words, us people
13 in Ohio, are we together on this right now in
14 dealing with the DOE Headquarters and all the
15 people involved in this?

16 MR. SATTLER: I can't speak
17 necessarily for Ohio. We have some folks here from
18 Ohio. What I can tell you is where we are in the
19 process is getting comments from Ohio. Recently
20 we've received comments from the State of Ohio that
21 are kind of general. What I mean is that they are
22 applicable to all or most of the five DOE sites in
23 Ohio, and we're waiting to get from them the
24 specific comments for Fernald.

1 PUBLIC: So they have been
2 incorporated in the Draft Site Treatment Plan as
3 they were submitted to Headquarters?

4 MR. SATTLER: No yet, no. That's
5 where we are in the process. Those comments we
6 will address in the Final Site Treatment Plan.

7 MS. DASTILLUNG: Is there a list of
8 the criteria that this group will be looking at to
9 decide which sites become disposal sites for the
10 mixed waste?

11 MR. SATTLER: Yes, it's summarized
12 in the draft plan. If you want more detailed
13 information than that, I can get that for you. Or
14 I can attempt to get that for you. But what is in
15 the plan I think is a pretty good summary of what
16 they're going for.

17 MS. DASTILLUNG: Do you know offhand
18 which section? I have a copy at home, it's this
19 big.

20 MR. SATTLER: Section 8 I believe.
21 It's either Section 8 or Section 6 of the plan.

22 PUBLIC: Does Fernald meet the
23 criteria that you're describing in Section 8?

24 MR. SATTLER: Well, that's the

1 process they're going through right now to
2 determine that. What I can tell you is that there
3 are a couple of issues that will weigh heavily into
4 their evaluation process. Number one is the issue
5 of Fernald sitting on an aquifer. The other issue
6 is that -- and there's an important piece of
7 information that these folks did not have, and that
8 information is the information that's being
9 developed in our FS process, in particular for
10 Operable Unit 2, which is making some decisions for
11 disposal. So they only have that information now
12 in very general terms. They have yet to visit us
13 and collect all the detailed information. I can't
14 speak for that group, but I suspect that's going to
15 weigh heavily in the final recommendation.

16 PUBLIC: I have a question. Do you
17 expect to have an agreement signed by next October
18 with EPA?

19 MR. SATTLER: Yeah, that's the
20 goal. Do I think it's going to happen, yeah, I
21 do. I think Ohio has raised a lot of questions,
22 but I really think that they are things that we can
23 resolve.

24 PUBLIC: You have a schedule on the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000047

1 chart of completion of facilities by January of
2 '95.

3 MR. SATTLER: Yeah, that brings up a
4 good point. These were the schedules, and I left
5 these up intentionally because these are the ones
6 that were presented in the Draft Site Treatment
7 Plan. Are these going to change? Yeah, they will,
8 and there are any number of factors that are going
9 to cause them to change. Probably the number one
10 biggest factor right now is our funding and the
11 whole crisis that we're going through with funding
12 cuts. How much is it going to change? If you look
13 on here it shows that everything is going to be
14 dealt with by the end of '97. What it looks like
15 right now is that this will be pushed back until
16 '98, so we're still planning as of right now that
17 all these activities will be completed by the end
18 of '98. So that while it's going to be pushed
19 back, it's not like it's going to be pushed back
20 ten years.

21 MR. RAST: John, I think an
22 important point to bring up, and I'm Dave Rast with
23 DOE, is that in our discussions, any of our
24 progress towards treating mixed waste that we have

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000048

1 previously scheduled, we intended this process not
2 to delay or to hold up the implementation of any
3 kind of waste treatment or the treatment of mixed
4 waste that we could do. We were hoping, as John
5 said earlier, to mirror the actions that we had
6 intended to do in the Draft Site Treatment Plan,
7 not wait two or three years until this plan was
8 final before we take any action. So we are
9 continuing to go through the process and try to
10 implement mixed waste treatment and mixed waste
11 disposal on the site.

12 MR. SATTLER: Yeah, I guess another
13 way of saying that is if the HF treatment didn't
14 exist, would this still happen? Yeah. HF tank car
15 is a separate regulatory vehicle, we have a closure
16 plan that is driving it. UNH is a removal action.
17 The wastewater treatment is something that's
18 ongoing. What this really is is a subset of the
19 TSCA incinerator. As we go through and look at
20 those films before we send them off to TSCA, we
21 expect to find that some are not appropriate to
22 send for incineration, but we also expect that most
23 of those drums that aren't appropriate can be
24 readily treated in the wastewater treatment

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000049

1 system. So that's an ongoing project for
2 environmental removal action. Envirocare project,
3 off-site disposition being driven by a removal
4 action.

5 So the only ones that on this list
6 that are not covered are the mobile stabilization
7 and the mobile chemical treatment. The mobile
8 stabilization we've already initiated thoughts with
9 Ohio EPA about getting that started sooner rather
10 than waiting until October of '95. So I think
11 we've got a real opportunity here to actually
12 continue on and get some of this done. Which is a
13 little bit different than many of my colleagues at
14 the other DOE facilities, who are really struggling
15 and just getting started.

16 Any other comments or questions?

17 MR. WINSTON: I'm Tom Winston from
18 the State of Ohio, and I was just going to make a
19 few brief comments in terms of what the State feels
20 is important as we go through this. I think we
21 recognized pretty early that Ohio was going to be
22 an exporter of waste, and that put us in a
23 difficult situation considering the power that the
24 act gives governors of states to say yeah or nay on

1 waste coming into the state. We've looked at this
2 throughout this process as it being in our best
3 interest to try to get Fernald, Portsmouth, Mound,
4 Battelle, and RMI, the five sites in Ohio, to
5 maximize the amount of waste they were able to
6 manage at their own site and minimize the amount of
7 waste they would be shipping.

8 That's good for a number of reasons,
9 one just the accountability issues, it's more
10 convincing with other states that we're trying to
11 do what we can in Ohio. If we're managing as much
12 as we can, it will minimize risk of transportation
13 and the associated activities. We have been very
14 supportive of efforts to look at mobile treatment
15 because rather than moving the waste, we're moving
16 the treatment facility, whether it might be on
17 skids or small units.

18 The process has required all of the
19 states, there's 20 some states with these 49 sites,
20 to get together and talk about how can we create a
21 national framework for management of waste that is
22 not unfair to either a section of the country,
23 individual states, and this process is sort of
24 nearing its end point. I'm pleased at where we are

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000051

1 at this point, but I will also point out that in
2 the initial, the Draft Site Treatment Plans came
3 in, Ohio is still one of the largest exporters of
4 waste for treatment in other states. And we have
5 the actual, I think the highest shipment from one
6 state to another, Ohio and Tennessee to facilities
7 there. And that's not just Fernald, that's from
8 the other, two other sites as well.

9 We're committed to doing what we can
10 to make sure that Fernald is and the other sites
11 are clearly delineating what their rationale for
12 decision making, we're going to need to talk to
13 Tennessee, to possibly Utah, to the State of
14 Washington and some of the other sites about how we
15 took the sites to task to make sure they were on a
16 sound basis when they made their decision. It
17 wasn't just business as usual. We've sent waste to
18 the TSCA center in the past, we're going to do it
19 again. So those are things that we're looking at.

20 I know there was an earlier question
21 about whether or not the State of Ohio had bought
22 into that recommendation. We're certainly
23 satisfied so far, but it's going to be a dynamic
24 process, and one other component of this is input

1 from the public. This is not going to be a
2 finished project, if you will, until we approve the
3 final treatment plan sometime after submission in
4 February and then try to negotiate an order that
5 will set time lines and more specifics. We're
6 interested in any comments that you are interested
7 in either giving to us or to Fernald, and I guess I
8 would ask, John, any comments that you receive from
9 the public, if you could send us those comments as
10 well because we're very interested in that.

11 Paul Hardy, who is with me here, has
12 a copy of the State's general comments. Once again
13 they are for all five sites. It's just probably
14 two pages, which briefly outlines what we felt when
15 we got the drafts in a couple of weeks ago, what we
16 felt were some of the over-arching deficiencies
17 between the five sites that we want to make sure
18 were corrected or improved at the Final Site
19 Treatment Plan submission.

20 The final thing I was going to say,
21 certainly we're very concerned about the issue of
22 disposal. It is true that Fernald is on the list
23 of sites, the 16 or 17 sites that are undergoing
24 many performance assessments, but we feel very

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000053

1 clearly that Fernald would be a totally
2 inappropriate place for disposal. We will fight
3 that very strongly, and the process, though, that
4 we've gone through is that DOE has been forced
5 because we have all of these 20 some states
6 involved at the table, DOE has been forced to take
7 sites through the system unless all the states
8 agree that a site is not suitable.

9 We had a meeting a couple of months
10 ago, this summer where Ohio proposed that Fernald
11 and Mound be dropped off the list due to severe
12 deficiencies we felt would not make them suitable
13 for disposal site. We were successful in having
14 Mound considered a low priority level, though not
15 off the table. While most of the other states
16 agreed that Fernald has significant deficiencies
17 that would not make it a good site, we were not
18 successful in quite getting it off the table. We
19 will continue to keep you apprised of that process
20 as well.

21 One of the things John said earlier,
22 even though -- it is a very good point -- that even
23 though it is not a major component from a volume
24 standpoint, that is Fernald, this is the one area

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000054

1 where the states are in a sense in the driver's
2 seat and they are exerting as much influence over
3 this process because the Federal Facilities
4 Compliance Act gives the states, whether it's the
5 State of Tennessee, the State of Nevada, or the
6 State of Washington, gives them authority to say
7 yes or no on low-level waste. You normally are
8 using NEPA and environmental impact statements and
9 other techniques, so this is a great opportunity
10 for us to sort of build something that may help us
11 on waste management issues on Fernald down the
12 road, as long as we are playing fairly with other
13 states and doing a thorough job of justification.

14 MS. DASTILLUNG: What are you doing
15 to not create any more mixed waste that we'll have
16 to deal with?

17 MR. SATTLER: Part of the process --
18 I'm going to let John jump in here too -- part of
19 the process we're going through in the site
20 remediation is to generate some more waste. What I
21 mean is in particular we expect in the short term
22 that we will in fact be adding to some of the
23 volumes of some of the mixed waste streams. The
24 safe shutdown process is going through and cleaning

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000055

1 up, and we anticipate that some of that volume will
2 actually be added to what we have.

3 MR. WARNER: Can you talk a little
4 louder.

5 MR. SATTLER: I'm sorry. We expect
6 that will be added. Keep in mind too that most of
7 the mixed waste, almost all this mixed waste we're
8 dealing with here, what we call the legacy waste
9 from the production operations or from the
10 maintenance activities, we can impact those
11 maintenance activities utilizing materials that
12 when they become waste they don't become hazardous
13 waste and mix the waste by changing out whatever
14 the product is. Instead of using solvents for
15 cleaning parts, we use other types of cleaners.
16 That we have some impact over. The materials that
17 need to be cleaned out in the interim activities we
18 don't have much impact over.

19 Do you want to add anything to that?

20 MR. WITZEMAN: My name is John
21 Witzeman, I'm with FERMCO. I'm responsible for the
22 bottom five of these projects. In waste programs
23 where I work at FERMCO we have another organization
24 that operates next to mine called Waste Utilization

1 Pollution Prevention. Within that organization we
2 research and implement activities and techniques to
3 minimize the generation of waste, as you're
4 speaking, not only mixed waste but low-level waste,
5 just normal sanitary type waste, all types of
6 waste. And I can cite several examples of things
7 we have going on now that are beneficial, but we do
8 have a program specifically for that purpose.

9 One example recently is the fire
10 training ground that Johnny Reising spoke of
11 earlier. Certain portions of that project
12 contained PCB contamination, and we implemented
13 some techniques on that project through Crew 3 that
14 did the actual demolition of the building to create
15 a condition so that that entire building, all of
16 that rubble was not PCB waste, waste that needed to
17 be managed as being contaminated with PCB's or
18 being contaminated with other types of mixed
19 waste. Now that waste is only low-level waste and
20 is easily or more easily managed to a certain
21 degree. And we have other similar types of
22 programs. Does that --

23 MS. DASTILLUNG: Yeah, I guess some
24 point in the future I would like to hear more

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000057

1 details about that.

2 MR. SATTLER: Okay.

3 MR. RAST: Through this report
4 process, Vicky, through our annual reporting of our
5 hazardous and mixed waste, we have a good idea of
6 what our mixed waste treatment are. We have
7 implemented substitutions where we've gone from
8 chlorinated solvents to aciduric acid based
9 solvents. We've tried to substitute and eliminate
10 hazardous materials or mixed waste where they're
11 not feasible, and right now our big generation of
12 mixed waste actually comes from investigation
13 derived waste following the sample procedures for
14 the remedial investigation that we have to follow.
15 That's our largest generator. So we've gotten rid
16 of a lot of mixed generation, waste generation
17 where we can. But investigation derived waste,
18 there's not many substitutions for the different
19 solvents used in the lab and, unfortunately, motor
20 oil becomes mixed waste. There's no substitutes.
21 So we're trying.

22 MR. SATTLER: Excuse me, we're
23 getting the signal here.

24 MR. WARNER: Thank you all for your

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000058

1 interest.

2 (Off the record.)

3 MR. WARNER: We're going to go ahead
4 and get started here. I'm Rod Warner from DOE here
5 at Fernald, and we are going to tell you a little
6 bit tonight about a document called the Draft Site
7 Treatment Plan that we generated in response to the
8 Federal Facilities Compliance Act. John Sattler
9 from DOE is going to give you a briefing on that,
10 after which we will entertain any of your questions
11 and concerns. We'd appreciate if you'd hold your
12 questions until we get through the briefing here,
13 and then we're going to have all your questions
14 written down that we can't respond to, and we will
15 get back to you with formal responses if we don't
16 have an answer right now.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: In two days?

18 MR. WARNER: For you, Lisa,
19 tomorrow. So I'm going to turn it over to John,
20 and we'll take questions here in a few minutes.

21 MR. SATTLER: Did everyone get one
22 of the fact sheets, Fernald Fact Sheets? In
23 addition to -- Dave has more if anyone didn't get
24 one. When we're finished here for this evening,

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000059

1 there are a couple of other pieces of literature up
2 here you might be interested in as well. Feel free
3 to take one. The fact sheet that you have was
4 prepared by DOE at Fernald. This one is a fact
5 sheet on the FFCA Draft Site Treatment Plan
6 prepared by the State of Ohio. The other thing up
7 here are Ohio, State of Ohio's general comments on
8 the Draft Site Treatment Plan to the Ohio DOE
9 facility, not just Fernald but the five Ohio sites,
10 five DOE sites in Ohio.

11 The Draft Site Treatment Plan, let's
12 talk about what is the Draft Site Treatment Plan.
13 It is a document that was put together by DOE that
14 summarizes what our plans, what Fernald's plans are
15 for treating our mixed waste on-site. In
16 particular what we identify as our legacy waste.
17 In short, legacy wastes are the mixed wastes that
18 have been generated through production processes or
19 not so distant past maybe through maintenance
20 activities or maybe even through some of the
21 activities like the safe shutdown, which is one of
22 the processes on-site for removing materials from
23 tanks and pipes and what not.

24 What the Draft Site Treatment Plan

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000060

1 does is it lists what we call in the plan preferred
2 options. What this table does here is provide for
3 you what we have identified in the Fernald plant as
4 our preferred options. Those are nothing more than
5 our plans, our projects for dealing with mixed
6 waste. The important thing to remember is that
7 this plan deals only with mixed low-level wastes.
8 So those are the wastes that have a hazardous
9 component. They are corrosive or toxic, they're
10 heavy metals, as well as a radiological component.
11 By and large most of the wastes to be dealt with at
12 Fernald is not mixed waste but rather it's
13 low-level waste, has a radiological component
14 only.

15 So why do we do this, why did we
16 build this plan in the first place? The bottom
17 line reason is we are required to by law. In
18 October of 1992 the Federal Facilities Compliance
19 Act was signed into law by President Bush, and it
20 required DOE facilities that managed, that dealt
21 with mixed waste to generate a site treatment plan
22 for the mixed waste and submit those plans to the
23 state in which they're in. The state would then
24 take a look at those plans, they will review the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000061

1 plan, they will approve it or they will approve it
2 with some modifications or changes, give it back to
3 us, ask us to do further work.

4 The end point in this process for the
5 states' review and approval comes in October of
6 '95, so just a year from now. In the statute
7 itself the act requires for us to develop these
8 plans, issue them, the state to review them and
9 then issue a compliance order to us at Fernald to
10 implement the plan. So after the State of Ohio
11 reviews these preferred options, decides that
12 they're satisfied with them, then they will
13 implement an order to DOE at Fernald and say go
14 ahead and do these treatment projects you have
15 identified here.

16 Now before we talk about this table a
17 little bit more, this thing here is a
18 representation -- well, is a cubic meter. It's
19 built and put here because in one of our previous
20 sessions someone made the comment that we keep
21 talking about volumes, tossing out dimensions like
22 cubic yards, cubic meters, I don't know what a
23 cubic meter is. If you look at a Draft Site
24 Treatment Plan, it lists everything in cubic

1 meters. This is a cubic meter. If you were to add
2 up all this legacy waste that we talk about in the
3 Draft Site Treatment Plan, it would total up
4 something on the order of 3,000 cubic meters,
5 thereabouts. So that's the volume of legacy mixed
6 waste that we're trying to deal with in the Draft
7 Site Treatment Plan in compliance with the Federal
8 Facilities Compliance Act.

9 Taking a look at this table, the
10 first thing you'll notice if you have good eyesight
11 is that at the top it says cubic yards and this
12 says cubic meters. In your handout it lists cubic
13 meters, and what you'll see if you have a mind for
14 mathematics, that a cubic yard is a little bit
15 smaller than a cubic meter. These, as I said, are
16 preferred options. These represent the projects,
17 these are the projects we have on-site to deal with
18 the mixed wastes.

19 One of the first points I want to
20 make is that when we started building this Draft
21 Site Treatment Plan, we decided not to reinvent the
22 wheel, and what that means is that if we had
23 projects that were ongoing or in the planning
24 stages already existing for dealing with mixed

1 wastes, we didn't want to scrap those and start
2 over. We decided that we would just reflect those
3 in our Draft Site Treatment Plan. And many of
4 those projects on here are things that are ongoing
5 or in the planning.

6 Johnny Reising earlier and Gary
7 Stegner talked about many projects. One of them
8 that was mentioned was the UNH treatment process.
9 That's reflected in this particular plan. What
10 decisions are made on UNH treatment we will mirror
11 in this plan. The way the process is working is
12 you notice on your agenda and on here it says DSTP,
13 it says Draft Site Treatment Plan, DOE in response
14 to this law coming into being said the way we're
15 going to approach this is we will do it in three
16 steps. We'll issue a Conceptual Site Treatment
17 Plan, then a Draft Site Treatment Plan, and finally
18 a Final or some people call it Proposed Site
19 Treatment Plan.

20 The conceptual plan was issued a year
21 ago in October, and that was pretty broad in scope,
22 pretty general. It solicited really a whole
23 laundry list of potential options for treating our
24 mixed waste. The draft plan really is our first

1 cut at identifying what we think are the best
2 options.

3 Now the idea of where we are here of
4 leading into the final plan is we presented this,
5 we've sent it to the State of Ohio, we sent a copy
6 of it to US EPA, we put a copy of it in the Reading
7 Room. We are in a stage now, in the process where
8 we are soliciting comments both from the regulators
9 as well as the public. And ideally what we want to
10 do is sit down, go through all those comments and
11 that Final Site Treatment Plan that will be
12 submitted in February of next year, February of
13 '95, will reflect or address the comments that we
14 get from the regulators and from the public.

15 As I mentioned when we started out
16 here, that there are some general comments from the
17 State of Ohio. There are five DOE sites in Ohio,
18 so these comments are addressing issues that they
19 believe cut across the Draft Site Treatment Plans
20 for all five sites. Ohio is still going to provide
21 us with specific comments on the Fernald Draft Site
22 Treatment Plan, and I believe the schedule is by
23 the end of the month.

24 As I started to say, many of these

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000065

1 projects are already ongoing. The HF tank car, HF
2 neutralization is really being driven as a RCRA
3 closure activity, and we have a plan in specific to
4 this to the State of Ohio that they are in the
5 process of reviewing, and once they approve that,
6 we will commence treatment of this hydrofluoric
7 acid in that rail car.

8 UNH, I already mentioned. The TSCA
9 incinerator down here at the bottom, that's a
10 continuation of an activity that has been going on
11 where we want to send mixed waste to Tennessee, Oak
12 Ridge, Tennessee to the TSCA incinerator for
13 incineration.

14 Envirocare, that really is not a
15 treatment option here, we're not sending it to
16 Envirocare for treatment, but we have some mixed
17 wastes that are ready for disposal at Envirocare.

18 These last two projects listed here
19 are, like the UNH, CERCLA removal actions which are
20 driving the process.

21 So for Fernald, if the FFCA didn't
22 come along and require us to put this plan
23 together, many of these activities were already
24 being driven by one regulatory mechanism or

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000066

1 another. We have had plans in place for the mobile
2 stabilization and mobile chemical treatment, and we
3 will reflect those in this draft section of the
4 plan.

5 I mentioned earlier that this is
6 dealing only with mixed low-level waste, and I also
7 said that in the grand scheme of things that most,
8 by far most of the wastes we're dealing with
9 on-site is not mixed low-level waste, but low-level
10 waste problem. So the logical question that comes
11 out of that is what's the real importance of this
12 or why is it important enough that we're presenting
13 this to you this evening and soliciting your
14 comments. There's a couple of reasons why it's
15 important. One of the reasons is that it's
16 important to the State of Ohio and the other states
17 across the nation. This process of building this
18 Draft Site Treatment Plan is not exactly the same
19 as the process for a lot of the other plans that
20 we've put together for a lot of the remediation
21 activities on-site. One of the big differences is
22 that while we have been building a plan that
23 reflects what we at Fernald want to do, through the
24 whole process we have been working with the other

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342
000057

1 DOE facilities and DOE headquarters across the DOE
2 complex. There are 49 sites that have turned in
3 Draft Site Treatment Plans or will turn in Final
4 Site Treatment Plans. We have regular meetings
5 with them through this process to develop a means
6 that is consistent so that if you pick up one plan
7 for Fernald compared to one say from Portsmouth,
8 that they will be similar, similar enough so that
9 you can compare what we're doing and what they're
10 doing.

11 One of the real importances of doing
12 that is that if we are proposing to send something
13 to Tennessee for Oak Ridge incinerator, the State
14 of Tennessee wants to know that, and they want to
15 be able to pick up our plan and be able to look
16 through that and relatively easily identify that we
17 plan on sending our waste to them for
18 incineration.

19 Now, in addition to working with the
20 other DOE facilities, we have been working with
21 Ohio and we have been having regular meetings
22 across the complex with the other states that are
23 involved in this process too, like the State of
24 Tennessee.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000068

1 Now getting back to the importance of
2 this issue, during these meetings many of the
3 states, in particular those states who will be
4 receiving wastes for treatment, have expressed to
5 DOE and to their colleagues in the other states
6 that they feel very strongly that it is important
7 for DOE to develop good Draft Site Treatment Plans
8 because they believe that if we can work
9 successfully with the other DOE facilities in the
10 other states, that this is going to set the stage,
11 so to speak, for dealing with the bigger rad waste
12 issues. So even though relatively speaking the
13 scale of mixed waste problems is small, we're
14 talking about volume, that this could have an
15 impact on future dealings on the rad waste issue as
16 a whole. So that's a good reason why we take this
17 to heart and are trying to work as best we can in
18 developing a good plan to justify what we want to
19 do.

20 The other reason it's important is
21 there's a couple of issues associated with the
22 Draft Site Treatment Plan that may be of interest
23 to you. Those issues are, number one, that other
24 sites may identify Fernald as a facility for

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000069

1 sending their waste to us for treatment. Okay. To
2 date what I can tell you is one other DOE facility
3 has done that, and that one facility is the
4 Portsmouth facility. That doesn't mean it's a done
5 deal. All I'm saying is that if you pick up their
6 Draft Site Treatment Plan, you will see that
7 they've identified Fernald to send three of their
8 mixed waste streams, totaling something on the
9 order of, I believe it's 84 cubic meters of waste
10 to come to Fernald to be treated in the MAWS
11 treatment system.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: You should add, too,
13 though that our understanding is if it was
14 agreeable that it be brought here to be treated or
15 whatever you call it, stabilized or whatever, that
16 it and any leftover gunk goes back to Portsmouth.

17 MR. WARNER: This is just a plan.
18 It is a draft that they are putting together right
19 now. That goes without saying.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: But you need to say
21 that because already people are --

22 MR. WARNER: We'll get to that.

23 MR. SATTLER: The purpose of the
24 Draft Site Treatment Plan was to identify these

1 options. From them identifying it, that's just one
2 of a whole host of issues we have to deal with if
3 that's going to occur, and that's where we are in
4 the process, is to start working out all those
5 kinds of issues.

6 MS. CRAWFORD: That's the only one
7 you've seen?

8 MR. SATTLE: That's the only one so
9 far.

10 MS. CRAWFORD: And we're still on
11 the list. You know, the list has been cut a couple
12 of times because we've been kind of watching that.

13 MR. WARNER: We're getting off the
14 issue here. We'll get to that.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

16 MR. SATTLE: We're talking about
17 wastes, about sites sending their waste to Fernald
18 for treatment. The list you referred to is the
19 other issue that's important, that's disposal.
20 Now, let me get back to the disposal issue. Let me
21 address the treatment.

22 Where we are in the process is now
23 that all the sites, those 49 sites have turned in
24 their Draft Site Treatment Plans, DOE across the

1 complex is looking at all these 49 Draft Site
2 Treatment Plans and saying does this make sense,
3 from a national perspective does this make sense.
4 If Fernald is saying we're going to build a mobile
5 on-site stabilization process, and say Portsmouth
6 identifies that and sites in Kentucky and Tennessee
7 and Washington or South Carolina all identify a
8 similar option, they want to stand back and say is
9 this making sense on a large scale, and they're
10 going to come back and make recommendations on
11 consolidating treatment or influence, possibly
12 changing some of these particular options. The
13 result of that could be that their recommendations
14 might wind up with other facilities identifying
15 Fernald as a place to treat mixed wastes.

16 To date I have no information to
17 offer to you from that particular work group, I
18 haven't gotten any feedback from them as of yet. I
19 expect to get feedback from them later this month
20 sometime with those recommendations. That is their
21 schedule to provide that information to us and to
22 Ohio at the same time.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: And that information
24 will be shared regularly?

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000072

1 MR. SATTLER: Sure, yes. The other
2 issue I mentioned was disposal. There is also a
3 work group within DOE that is looking at these 49
4 sites trying to identify the best candidates for a
5 disposal facility for mixed low-level waste, and
6 they're doing it in a series of cuts or stages.
7 Fernald passed the first cut, so they're still on
8 the list to be evaluated as a mixed low-level waste
9 disposal facility. Where that process is right now
10 is that that particular group that was doing that
11 evaluation, that work group will be coming to
12 Fernald and talking to people from DOE and FERMCO
13 and collecting information to do their performance
14 evaluation. We expect them to literally arrive
15 on-site sometime in November to do that process.

16 MS. CRAWFORD: They're not going to
17 talk to anybody else except DOE and the contractor?

18 MR. SATTLER: I don't know. I don't
19 know. I can relay that message back to them.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: I would very highly
21 recommend that you do that.

22 MR. RAST: That has been brought up,
23 Lisa, excuse me, at the different sessions for the
24 support group that the work group in their initial

1 plan and in their initial layoff of doing their
2 performance evaluation was strictly looking at the
3 scientific data and had not built into their plan
4 any opportunities for stakeholder input. Some
5 people are harder hitters than others, and we
6 emphasized at their last meeting that they should
7 talk to stakeholders.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: On top of talking to
9 stakeholders I would recommend they also talk to
10 regulators.

11 MR. SATTLER: The regulatory
12 community is very aware of this activity.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: We just want to make
14 sure.

15 MR. SATTLER: I'm going to let Tom
16 elaborate on that.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

18 MR. SATTLER: Now, the important
19 thing to remember is that the end result is that
20 they may identify one or two or six or twelve, I
21 don't know how many, candidate facilities. That
22 doesn't mean that one or two or six will in fact
23 become the DOE mixed level waste facilities.
24 That's kind of an exclusion process, whittle it

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000074

1 down. From that they will recommend, they will
2 make a recommendation that these are the best
3 candidate facilities for disposal.

4 So that is what the FFCA Draft Site
5 Treatment Plan is about, in 15 minutes. Did I cut
6 it a little bit shorter this time, Dave?

7 MS. YOCUM: If you're wanting
8 comments, how can we give comments if we don't have
9 enough information as far as whether we want mixed
10 low-level waste staying here at Fernald from other
11 sites or, you know, this is just an opening, the
12 first step, and what can we comment about it?

13 MR. SATTLER: Okay. The Draft Site
14 Treatment Plan is available, the document itself is
15 available for you on these issues and in particular
16 the issue on disposal. In that plan is what I
17 think is a pretty good summary of what that work
18 group, national work group is trying to do. So it
19 gives you basically the format or information of
20 where they're going. As far as their final
21 decisions go, you're right, you don't have that
22 information. I don't have that information. We
23 won't even have that information until about the
24 time that the Final Site Treatment Plan is due in

1 February.

2 MS. YOCUM: Well then, it's best to
3 give our comment as far as that we do not want
4 their other plants' waste stored on our site from
5 the very beginning if that's a comment to be made
6 from the very beginning.

7 MR. SATTLER: Absolutely.

8 MS. CRAWFORD: When are the comments
9 due?

10 MR. SATTLER: We would like to get
11 the comments by the end of October, October 30th.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Halloween.

13 MR. WARNER: Tom, could you
14 elaborate just a little bit on what you talked
15 about a little bit ago as far as your involvement.

16 MR. WINSTON: It's a real
17 interesting process because the first time that all
18 the states that are players in ultimately the
19 disposal issues and certainly the treatment issues
20 and being at the table together have been sitting
21 down and talking together. John made a good point
22 before where this is a small subset of the total
23 waste burden that Fernald is going to be worried
24 about. But this is really going to be the, I think

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000076

1 the harbinger of maybe some things that will help
2 this site and the State of Ohio. The act is very
3 clear that equity discussions are supposed to occur
4 between states. There was a recognition that all
5 of the treatment was not going to be able to occur
6 on-site or an expectation, and so Congress said
7 through the act that states would have to have
8 equity discussions because of a concern primarily
9 that there was going to be a lot of shipment to a
10 couple big sites or shipments west.

11 As we started to look at the
12 inventory at the five sites in Ohio, it was clear
13 to us that Ohio would probably be an exporter
14 through the five sites in the plan proposals to
15 export to other states. So from our vantage point,
16 we were best served by trying to push the issue of
17 on-site management to the extent possible, and I
18 think really all the states across the country have
19 felt that that was far superior than just massive
20 shipment of waste across the country, and they
21 wanted the sites to build the plans rather than
22 Washington, rather than headquarters in Washington
23 to say we want a configuration as for a site, they
24 wanted the sites to build from the ground up. I

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000077

1 think from my vantage point the sites have done
2 that, and in fact 93 percent of the toxic waste is
3 going to be managed on the site if you take a look
4 at the initial site treatment plans. The question
5 is, is that affordable, you know, would we be able
6 to tweak that a little bit, have a little bit more
7 shipment of waste and get a significant savings if
8 you go to other aspects of the cleanup. That's
9 what this group is looking at right now.

10 I think it's important that we
11 separate the issue of treatment from disposal. The
12 Federal Facilities Compliance Act only addresses
13 treatment, and yet at the same time every state
14 that might be a recipient, like Tennessee, South
15 Carolina, Washington, Idaho, they said early on
16 we're not going to allow waste to come in unless we
17 start to get a picture about what's the ultimate
18 resolution. If we were working towards trying to
19 push DOE to identify a number of disposal options
20 and move in that direction early on so that we can
21 take that into account in our discussions of
22 equity. The time line just isn't going to work out
23 and we're going to be forced to make some decisions
24 on the plans prior to knowing where the waste is

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000078

1 ultimately going to be disposed. Because of that,
2 we have come up with all of the residuals go back
3 to the generating site, which means, for example,
4 when wastes go to the TSCA incinerator from
5 Fernald, there would be an expectation that at
6 least for a time those wastes would come back to
7 Fernald. You may not like that, but that does
8 protect you from the issue of wastes from
9 Portsmouth coming in and being stuck at Fernald
10 with residuals if there's any treatment at the
11 site.

12 Now on the issue of disposal, DOE has
13 49 sites and they quickly pared that down to about
14 26 sites based on some of them are in college labs,
15 some of these sites are not what you would even
16 think of at a site like Fernald. And then there
17 was an effort to try to get the states to agree
18 amongst themselves to drop that number down
19 further. We were hopeful that we would get Fernald
20 dropped off that list. We were at a meeting in
21 July where we argued strongly for both Mound and
22 Fernald to be dropped from the list. More due to
23 the dynamics of the meeting, the only way it could
24 be dropped off the list is if every other state,

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000079

1 all 26 states in the room agreed it was not worthy
2 of any further consideration. Because of that, the
3 dynamics of the meeting, only Mound was dropped
4 from the list, and it wasn't totally dropped, it
5 was made a lower priority.

6 What I can tell you is that the
7 Fernald site offers severe limitations to the point
8 where I do not feel it will at all be in the cards
9 appropriate, anything that the State of Ohio would
10 stand for to have disposal at the site, have
11 Fernald designated as a disposal site. To be
12 frank, I'm not terribly worried about that. We're
13 going to watch it closely and let this process take
14 its course, but at the same time the only way --
15 DOE has a tough job right now because they have to
16 try to satisfy all of the states, all of the states
17 that came together, and those states that
18 ultimately are more likely to be disposal sites are
19 being very stingy about moving quickly to having
20 them being designated as a site.

21 So those are kind of the two issues.
22 One is just the waste treatment that we're talking
23 about and the other is disposal, which most people
24 are much more concerned about.

1 PUBLIC: I'm Darrell. I'm sort of
2 concerned with both of them, Tom, but I guess the
3 one, just what you were saying, being a disposal
4 site, I thought at one time that we would never be
5 considered and it isn't even legal that we should
6 be considered because of the aquifer situation. Is
7 it legal that --

8 MR. WINSTON: And that's why I'm
9 saying the State of Ohio would not stand for that.

10 PUBLIC: Then why don't they take us
11 off the list?

12 MR. WINSTON: Well, because the only
13 way they can take us off the list is if the other
14 25 states agree to take us off the list. So in a
15 sense it's an exercise. There's no way that we can
16 force them and say it doesn't satisfy our siting
17 criteria in Ohio, because they would say, well, we
18 haven't looked at your siting criteria, there
19 wasn't enough time and effort put into it. So what
20 the agreement was, that these sites would be
21 carried along. What it means is that DOE has to
22 put in a lot of effort on something that has no
23 chance of ever getting the blessing of the State of
24 Ohio.

1 MR. SATTLER: DOE's concern in this
2 process is pretty much what Tom was saying. What
3 we're afraid of is by not carrying through in the
4 process, that it will jeopardize what we want to do
5 here and even beyond what's listed on here, that we
6 will be perceived as not playing fairly.

7 PUBLIC: You can see how it makes us
8 nervous.

9 MR. SATTLER: Absolutely.

10 PUBLIC: It's just not happening,
11 We're still on the list and still being considered.

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Personally I think
13 we'll be okay. I agree with Tom, I think we'll be
14 okay. It makes me nervous that our name is still
15 on the list too.

16 MR. WINSTON: From our vantage
17 point, do we consider just walking out of meetings
18 and saying, no, we're not going to play fair with
19 the other states. We are probably the largest
20 exporter from the Draft Site Treatment Plan,
21 exporter of any state in the country, shipments of
22 DOE waste from one state to another. So it's a
23 very fragile dynamic, and we're trying to gingerly
24 kind of walk on egg shells to get accomplished what

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000082

1 we need to get accomplished, and once again, this
2 is a small portion of the total waste. We've got
3 issues relating to shipments to Nevada, just purely
4 low-level waste, and all of this is very, very
5 fragile. We're trying to -- I guess our goal is to
6 push DOE to do as much as they can locally,
7 communicate constantly with the other states,
8 especially states like Tennessee, Nevada, and Utah,
9 that are going to be players from a regulatory
10 sense so there's no surprises, to know what's
11 happening, in constant communication, talk to the
12 public and see what we can share with you, what
13 ideas.

14 Your strong comments that Fernald is
15 totally unacceptable for a disposal site is
16 excellent, and I would urge you to take that kind
17 of stand. I would also urge you to be cautious of
18 saying those 83 cubic meters from Portsmouth -- you
19 don't want to put up a barrier and say we don't
20 want to have anything happening that might bring a
21 small amount in because we're sending so much out.
22 So you have to try to consider all those things.

23 MR. WARNER: Edwa, can I let Jim
24 Saric make a comment?

1 MS. YOCUM: Oh, yes.

2 MR. SARIC: I think what Tom was
3 saying about the disposal issues, and they really
4 have them down to the real criteria as far as the
5 site, is the site good enough, does it meet
6 regulatory, they haven't gotten to that point.
7 This really is a RCRA waste and, you know, that we
8 look at it and it's very important that waste be
9 managed from cradle to grave as we say, so what DOE
10 is addressing here is that part of a big nationwide
11 problem. There's only one commercial and operating
12 mixed waste facility in the country, and that's
13 Envirocare, that can take that material as it
14 exists now. But DOE complex-wide, nationwide does
15 generate a large volume of mixed waste. So what
16 we're seeing here is every site has their own
17 burden of figuring out how can we treat this waste
18 first to make it in a more stabilized form and then
19 determine the fact where is it all going to end
20 up. And obviously you can't bombard Envirocare
21 with all that material.

22 So I think you're looking at DOE
23 looking at it complex-wide how to manage this
24 problem on their own. It is a real concern. I

1 think the issue of the landfill siting criteria
2 that you talked about before, that's something that
3 I think -- this is a different scenario, would be
4 to have a facility to store this waste or dispose
5 of this waste is different than the other
6 discussions we talked about, taking Superfund waste
7 or cleanup waste and disposing of it, two different
8 situations.

9 MR. SATTLER: What I can tell you is
10 that we hear the message. We, DOE site office,
11 hear loud and clear and we're trying to relay this
12 message as well.

13 Following what Jim said, the folks
14 performing the evaluation haven't been here yet, so
15 they aren't privy to all the information yet, and I
16 think we can make a real strong case.

17 MS. YOCUM: Well, what I was
18 concerned about, too, is Ohio may be the largest
19 exporter of mixed low-level waste, but we soon will
20 be the importer too if we have that low-level
21 radioactive waste disposal site put in Ohio that
22 will be taking it from, low-level waste from seven
23 other states, and that is quite a lot, and that's
24 -- the site possibly might be in, what, near

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000085

1 Scioto, Adams County, somewhere around there, which
2 will be closer to Tennessee than what we are, and
3 is that going to be open for mixed low-level waste
4 from DOE facilities?

5 MR. WINSTON: No. The steams are
6 separate and they are kept separate, so DOE waste
7 cannot go to a compact site. I know in the equity
8 discussions, certainly our governor would certainly
9 raise the issue that certainly we're doing our
10 share as far as the low-level problem, being a
11 low-level site with the compact. The problem is
12 that would not be persuasive to Tennessee. That's
13 in a different compact. They would not be sending
14 waste into the Ohio site. As it turns out, there's
15 not an awful lot, other than the five sites in
16 Ohio, there's not many DOE sites within the rest of
17 the compact. So I've been trying to think of the
18 kinds of issues that would be persuasive with other
19 states that would not be quite so persuasive with
20 the States of Washington, Tennessee, Utah, the
21 people we're --

22 MS. YOCUM: Like you were saying, we
23 already have five DOE sites within Ohio and then
24 with Ohio being, our main resource is the aquifer

1 because Ohio is almost, what, three-fourths
2 aquifer, underground aquifer?

3 MR. WINSTON: Certainly the two
4 sites that are under this aquifer.

5 MS. YOCUM: No, I'm talking about
6 the whole State of Ohio as far as the water
7 resources we have, the underground water resources,
8 and then putting low-level radioactive disposal
9 sites in the State of Ohio is, I mean that's kind
10 of scary, especially when it comes to the
11 groundwater situation. I'm not one of these don't
12 put it in my back yard, I'm willing to take my
13 share. I mean some other people don't believe
14 that, but I mean we can't be sticking it other
15 people's back yards either.

16 MR. WINSTON: Well, one of the
17 issues I have been raising from an equity
18 standpoint is continuing operation. This facility
19 has a mission to close, and so I think that those
20 facilities are going to be part of the continuing
21 complex at DOE, have a different responsibility
22 because of their continued mission there, and
23 that's something I've raised with my counterparts
24 in other states.

1 So there's a lot of issues, a variety
2 of issues. Compact is a big issue since a lot of
3 the same folks are in the compact that are dealing
4 with the DOE sites in their states as well. But it
5 can also be solid waste treatment. Ohio is an
6 importer of solid waste. That's something that our
7 governor would be very, very interested in pursuing
8 with other governors.

9 MR. WARNER: We've got time for a
10 couple more quick ones. Treatment technologies,
11 waste streams.

12 MR. WINSTON: I have one question.

13 PUBLIC: I just have one. Why
14 aren't the numbers on that different than the
15 numbers we've received?

16 MR. SATTLER: These numbers are
17 cubic meters. I don't know why, but whoever made
18 up this table put in cubic yards.

19 PUBLIC: Well, the estimated cost
20 was the same, and that's where I got a little
21 confused. If it was more, why was it costing the
22 same. That was my --

23 MR. SATTLER: Yes, it's two
24 different units of measure.

1 MR. WARNER: We have to watch out
2 for her.

3 MR. WINSTON: I just have one quick
4 question. What is the funding status of anything
5 you propose out of this, how would you fund that?

6 MR. SATTLER: That's a good
7 question. These are the costs and these are the
8 schedules that were listed in the draft plan, and
9 frankly, over the last month or so that was the \$64
10 question, is where does the funding for all of this
11 as well as the overall funding at the site stand,
12 and because the real impact is going to be if we
13 don't have the funding, it's going to impact the
14 schedules. Where it stands right now as of today
15 for FY-95 the money that we needed to implement
16 these plans, most of it -- I would be hard pressed
17 to tell you exactly how much is there. What it
18 looks like right now is that these schedules, if
19 you look at the latest, what this says is that all
20 this legacy mixed waste will be treated by the end
21 of 1997. These schedules will be slipped back it
22 looks like a little bit, but not beyond 1998. It's
23 not the situation where we're looking like we can
24 push it back many years.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000089

1 MR. REISING: I think Tom raises an
2 excellent question, something we have been
3 grappling with site-wise as far as the budgeting is
4 concerned, but what we're trying to meet before we
5 get to the compliance case is the fact that we are
6 in compliance with all the requirements in the
7 Amended Consent Decree and also the Consent
8 Agreement. Now we have the other regulatory driver
9 as far as the FFCA and the site treatment plan
10 because once that is signed, properly incorporated
11 into our plans, then it becomes an enforceable
12 document and has to be addressed.

13 MR. WINSTON: That's another issue
14 we're going to be very interested in the comments
15 of stakeholders about how long you feel this is
16 appropriate given other activities at the site.
17 This fits in with other things as well, and I think
18 that's a discussion we're going to have to have
19 next spring of how long and where does it come out
20 of the budget. It's going to fit into a lot of
21 other things, and those are tough issues.

22 MR. RAST: As John pointed out, a
23 lot of these are plans that we had initiated
24 earlier, we're planning to do. I think this year

1 we're about at 90 or 95 percent of our anticipated
2 funding level just because we are a compliance
3 program driven by RCRA and some of its laws and
4 that we have an opportunity here to stay in
5 compliance. We've got a lot of our funding this
6 year.

7 MS. CRAWFORD: I would really
8 encourage you to, I know a lot of us have site
9 treatment plan documents, they're hard to read,
10 they're kind of confusing to some of us. I have
11 not read mine, to be honest with you, you know, in
12 between 5,000,000 other things we're doing these
13 days, but I think a lot of people probably have
14 forgotten that these are due at the end of October,
15 and we may need to make a real concerted effort to
16 deal with that.

17 MR. SATTLER: What we want to do is
18 check the comments by the end of October so that we
19 can incorporate those comments into the final plan
20 in February. So there's going to be another
21 opportunity to --

22 MS. CRAWFORD: If you don't make the
23 October deadline, you can come back in February and
24 make like your final comments then?

1 MR. SATTLER: Yeah. We will have
2 more opportunity.

3 MR. WINSTON: This doesn't mean it's
4 approved, when it says final plan it's not finally
5 approved. It's the final submittal, and we will
6 hold a public hearing and solicit comments.

7 MS. CRAWFORD: So technically we
8 could miss the end of October deadline and shoot
9 for the February?

10 MR. WINSTON: Right, and I would
11 also say as you get comments in over, even prior to
12 February, it's going to be a dynamic process, and I
13 want to see, I have asked in the earlier session to
14 see all the public comments as well because we're
15 sending them our comments, but we're, you know,
16 there will be additional information coming in
17 based on the evaluation complex-wide so, you know,
18 there will be several additional points to comment
19 between now and the end of this process.

20 PUBLIC: The final plan, is that the
21 same as the -- you've got conceptual, you've got
22 the draft which you're talking about now, did I not
23 hear you say proposed?

24 MR. SATTLER: Some people are going

1 to find the thing that's due next February, some
2 folks are calling it the Final Site Treatment
3 Plan. Some people are going to define it the
4 Proposed Site Treatment Plan. The reason for the
5 difference --

6 MR. WINSTON: Proposed is probably
7 more accurate in the sense that we still have to --

8 MS. CRAWFORD: Final leads us to
9 believe it's final, it's binding, and that's it.

10 MR. SATTLER: And it's not.

11 MR. WINSTON: We ought to start
12 calling it proposed.

13 MR. RAST: One more comment here, we
14 will try to put together a better summary document
15 that describes your comments than this document.

16 MR. CRAWFORD: You may want to think
17 about a workshop or something. Not now.

18 MR. RAST: Maybe in February.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah.

20 (Brief recess.)

21 MR. STEGNER: Let's go ahead and get
22 started again. We're way behind schedule tonight,
23 so let's everyone take their seats. The last part
24 here is reserved for comments by the regulatory

1 agencies and Citizens Task Force and FRESH, and we
2 have an open mike also. We're going to ask Jim
3 Saric to lead off, US EPA. You can use one of the
4 microphones out there or come up here, Jim.

5 MR. SARIC: I'll try to make this
6 quick as I always do when I come up here. The
7 break-out sessions were kind of interesting because
8 they really represented two distinctly different
9 issues. I think it is really exciting to see what
10 the Task Force is coming forth with, and for those
11 of you who know other people who typically come to
12 these meetings and didn't have an opportunity to
13 come tonight, I really encourage you to talk to
14 them about some of the things and some of the
15 issues that were proposed by the Task Force because
16 I think they're really going to key in and
17 formulate some key decisions and help bring forth
18 some of the things that will happen in the future,
19 so I really want if you can to kind of spread the
20 word over what some of the recommendations of the
21 Task Force are to help inform others on that.

22 The other issue is the Site Treatment
23 Plan is just the beginning. You know, there's a
24 lot of constantly generated efforts and beginning

1 of this whole mixed waste storage disposal problem,
2 and what we're going to do with that. It doesn't
3 just affect DOE, but it really does indicate what
4 other facilities, other entities throughout the
5 country will do.

6 I guess on another note, something
7 that's real interesting that Johnny touched on, if
8 you looked when he went through a bunch of the
9 successes earlier, he talked about a lot of the
10 Records of Decisions coming forward and being made
11 and the facility changing from a RI/FS type
12 facility to one of RDRA and doing action. That's
13 really true, and I know for years, you look at
14 these schedules, and I can look back in '91 and
15 when we renegotiated these schedules and said we're
16 going to have all these Records of Decision coming
17 out and they're going to come one after another.
18 Well, they're here, and I fully anticipate in our
19 next fiscal year, which would be by October 1st of
20 next year, that four of the five decisions as far
21 as what's going to be done at the site to clean up
22 the place will probably be officially and legally
23 binding and made by then if things go according to
24 schedule. And the fifth one being with the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000095

1 buildings in Operable Unit 3, we already have an
2 Interim Record of Decision for that. So in my kind
3 of view, really by October of next year at the
4 latest, I really imagine a lot of the decisions
5 will be made, and it's a question of going out and
6 implementing those things. And that's a lot of
7 work, and there will be budgetary issues and other
8 issues.

9 So I guess now is the time to really
10 stay active and keep on top of what's going on, and
11 if you really have concerns, to voice them. I know
12 there's a lot of meetings that come on the schedule
13 for everybody to be a lot of different ones that
14 seem to be thrown at you left and right, but the
15 next few months is really the time to stay
16 involved.

17 If you have any questions, as always
18 I'm available after the meeting or you can always
19 get in touch with me and I can discuss these things
20 with you. It's really been an interesting process
21 in seeing how the public involvement and all us
22 working together to really come forward with
23 decisions so quickly and hopefully we can continue
24 in the future as far as actually continuing on with

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000096

1 the remediation. Thanks.

2 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Jim. Laura
3 Hegge will speak tonight on behalf of Ohio EPA.

4 MS. HEGGE: Hi. I'm not going to
5 talk too long, I know everyone wants to get out of
6 here. Tom Schneider, the Fernald group leader,
7 sends his regards. He's in Phoenix. I would just
8 like to introduce a couple of people we have here
9 tonight with the Ohio EPA. We have three gentlemen
10 with our Commission on Hazardous Waste Management,
11 Paul Hardy, Phil Harris, and Mark Retkamp are all
12 sitting back there. You guys want to raise your
13 hand. Tom Winston, our District Chief in charge of
14 the Southwest District up in Dayton is here, and a
15 few more members from the newly formed office of
16 Federal Facilities Oversight, Graham Mitchell, the
17 chief also, John Alcoach, Tim Hall, and Jim Coon.
18 They may be a couple of new faces with the office
19 of Federal Facilities Oversight.

20 As we have seen tonight, there's lots
21 of issues going on here, there's Citizens Task
22 Force issues we talked about, FFCA issues, there's
23 newly formed issues that are coming up every day,
24 and we just really, the regulators here, we

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000097

1 encourage everybody to keep abreast of these
2 issues. There's lots of opportunities for public
3 participation, and we fully encourage everybody to
4 come out to all these opportunities.

5 Coming up we have OU-2 opportunities,
6 that will take up I know the next several weeks for
7 public participation.

8 I'd like to take this time tonight to
9 announce an Ohio EPA Operable Unit 2 availability
10 session. We have tentatively scheduled this for
11 November 3rd, that's a Thursday night at 7 p.m.
12 This is just an opportunity for the regulators to
13 talk one on one with members of FRESH, members of
14 the Task Force, and other members of the community
15 about the decisions that are being proposed in the
16 Operable Unit 2 Proposed Plan. This is going to be
17 held tentatively, as I said, at the Venice
18 Presbyterian Church in Ross. I'm going to be
19 sending out some invitations to members of the
20 community about this, and we encourage you all to
21 come. And I know this is an issue that's near and
22 dear to the hearts of a lot of people. It's where
23 the first disposal cell is going to be first
24 proposed, so we would like to really hear your

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000098

1 input on this issue.

2 We are moving forward, as Jim
3 reinforced the idea, we've seen process. We have
4 the Plant 1 ore silos coming down, we had the Plant
5 7, that was a success after a couple of tries, it
6 wound up being a success, but there are still
7 issues that we're confronting. The UNH issue, I
8 know Gary Stegner announced that and he announced
9 that there will be a workshop to address this. The
10 State of Ohio has issued a notice of enforcement
11 referral. We just really want to enhance our
12 enforcement process. We referred this issue to our
13 Attorney General's Office, and the measures beyond
14 this, they're still up in the air. There are
15 negotiations going on. We have a couple of members
16 back here from Hazardous Waste that if you'd like
17 to talk to them after the meeting, they would be
18 happy to answer any of your questions.

19 And I guess that's about all. One
20 thing I did want to let you guys know, in lieu of
21 having another meeting, we talked about having yet
22 another meeting to introduce the Office of Federal
23 Facilities staff, we've prepared a booklet, and we
24 have copies of it back here on the information

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000099

1 table. In it we have all the members of the
2 Fernald team listed. There's our phone numbers,
3 our job descriptions, what you as the public, you
4 as the DOE community might want to contact us at
5 the State of Ohio about. So please pick up a copy
6 of that, and like I said, please stay involved and
7 come to some more of the public participation
8 opportunities. Thank you.

9 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Laura.
10 John Applegate, Fernald Citizens Task Force.

11 MR. APPLGATE: After those
12 break-out sessions, I can't imagine anyone wants to
13 hear another word from me, so I will just once
14 again invite any public comment on our
15 recommendations, and if you didn't get one of those
16 green handouts about our interim report, please do
17 pick one up before you leave. It gives our phone
18 number and address, and once again we really would
19 like as much comment on that as possible. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, John.
22 Lisa, Lisa Crawford, FRESH.

23 MS. CRAWFORD: Vicky and I are going
24 to do this together. We're going to share

1 tonight. The first thing we wanted to bring up
2 again was just to remind and encourage DOE that we
3 want the public participation to proceed beyond the
4 RODs into the RDRA stuff, since I don't remember
5 all those technoweeny term you guys use. We want
6 that officially on the record because we're going
7 to keep reminding you of that until we see it in
8 writing somewhere.

9 The second thing I want to talk a
10 tiny bit about is the UNH, and I want to encourage
11 the Department of Energy to move forward, you all
12 have been dragging your feet for two years.
13 Somebody needs to go to Headquarters, and if it has
14 to be us, it won't be a pretty scene, and cut the
15 bureaucracy and let's move on. We back the Ohio
16 EPA's decision in their letter fully because this
17 is not good. And we want you to do it, but we want
18 you to do it now.

19 The third thing -- well, Vicky, you
20 do this one now.

21 MS. DASTILLUNG: The other thing we
22 want to emphasize is with OU-2 there is a
23 discussion of a disposal cell on-site, and it is
24 really going to be the critical point with the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000101

1 community as to whether the community as a whole
2 wants to accept the idea of the site becoming a
3 permanent waste disposal site. You may feel that
4 you like that idea or you don't like that idea, and
5 now is the time to say your piece and to make
6 comments and come to the workshops because now is
7 when you can have impact on that decision. Also if
8 you are for having it, the criteria that will be
9 set up for such a disposal cell would also be very
10 important, how nasty a stuff can you live with
11 being on that site. These two issues are very
12 critical. While the Task Force is important and
13 FRESH has worked on these issues, finding consensus
14 within the community is probably going to be a
15 difficult one on that particular issue, and we
16 don't want to presume that we are voicing the
17 opinion of the entire community. So it's up to
18 everybody to get involved on that.

19 MS. CRAWFORD: And the last and the
20 most important thing is we want to remind everybody
21 that on November 17th will be our next FRESH
22 meeting. It's a week early because of
23 Thanksgiving, and we will be celebrating our
24 ten-year anniversary, and we will be having a very

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 brief FRESH meeting, and a guy by the name of Joe
2 Shoemaker is going to come in and do a presentation
3 for us on the Native American burial grounds that
4 some of the water lines are going to be going
5 through, and he is going to talk about the
6 artifacts that are being found and how they are
7 going to deal with that. We have asked the members
8 of the Native American Council of Ohio to come to
9 this meeting, which we have not got an acceptance
10 but it looks real good, and to be a part of this
11 presentation, and Joe has said that if you have
12 Native American artifacts that you would like to
13 bring with you, he would be more than willing to
14 try to give you a little bit of history on them.

15 When that's all said and done, we're
16 going to have cake and punch. We've already talked
17 about spiking the punch but we won't be able to do
18 that because it's a church. We would like to take
19 the opportunity to invite everybody here. All
20 FRESH meetings are open to the public, and come in
21 and celebrate with us. Ten years is a long time to
22 work on something, and we're all a little grayer
23 and a little tired, but we're hanging in there
24 though. In the Task Force room we talked a little

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000103

1 bit about being workshop junkies. So, you know,
2 please feel free to join us that evening. I think
3 it will be a real exciting evening for all of us to
4 hear some good talk and learn a few things and
5 celebrate and to have some of Edwa's mother's
6 homemade came and some unspiced punch and a little
7 fun. Thanks.

8 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Lisa. And
9 congratulations on ten years in advance. A lot of
10 hard work and a lot of hours you ladies have given
11 and gentlemen to this cause. I think we all owe
12 you a lot of thanks for keeping us in the public
13 eye.

14 You mentioned public involvement
15 through the remedial design, we can guarantee that
16 is going to happen. At the next community meeting
17 we should have copies of the new community
18 relations plan available for everyone. It's in the
19 review process right now. We ran it by both the US
20 and Ohio EPA's and some of the stakeholder groups,
21 and we think we have a good document and you will
22 be able to see it at the next community meeting.

23 Does anyone else have anything you
24 want to say before we adjourn for the night? I

1 apologize for keeping you so late, longer than we
2 anticipated. We have an open mike.

3 Going once. Twice.

4 MS. CRAWFORD: We're out of here.

5 MR. STEGNER: We're out of here.

6 Thank you all for coming.

7 - - -

8 COMMUNITY MEETING CONCLUDED

9 - - -

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000105

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, LOIS A. ROELL, RPR, the undersigned, a notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify that at the time and place stated herein, I recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had transcribed with computer-aided transcription the within (105) one hundred five pages, and that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.



MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL, RPR
AUGUST 12, 1997. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO

Spangler Reporting Services

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