6164 U-004-1004.1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC MEETING FOR OPERABLE UNIT 2 PROPOSED PLAN NOVEMBER 8, 1994 - THE PLANTATION

11/08/94

DOE-FN PUBLIC
~~80~~ 60
TRANSCRIPT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC MEETING FOR OPERABLE UNIT 2

PROPOSED PLAN

NOVEMBER 8, 1994

THE PLANTATIONS

- - -

1 MR. WARNER: Good evening, welcome
2 to the public meeting on the Operable Unit 2
3 Proposed Plan for the remediation of this unit at
4 the Fernald facility. My name is Rod Warner. I'm
5 the DOE program manager charged with the
6 remediation of that unit at Fernald.
7 We realize that November is a real
8 busy month for those of you who are involved in the
9 public participation activities here, and coupled
10 with that there's some holidays and such that it's
11 a little difficult for us to try to pick the most
12 appropriate evening to have this meeting. We
13 wanted to do it as early into the public comment
14 period as we could, and with that period ending
15 basically the day after Thanksgiving, we opted for
16 this date. We appreciate your coming out on this
17 busy election day and taking the time to
18 participate in this meeting, and we apologize for
19 any inconvenience we may have caused you with this
20 date.
21 I think to start the meeting off I
22 would like to go over some ground rules and the
23 agenda that maybe will help the meeting flow a
24 little bit better and get us all out of here at a

1 decent hour. Hopefully you all remembered to
2 register at the back, and if you didn't, you can do
3 so at the break which will follow this session of
4 the meeting. When you register, if you would
5 please indicate if you would like to make a formal
6 comment during the formal part of this meeting.
7 That will just help that part of the session go a
8 little better.
9 On your chairs you should have found
10 some handouts. I believe there is an evaluation
11 form we would like to have you fill out before you
12 leave the meeting tonight, and also there was a
13 comment card. Now if you would like to submit a
14 comment during the formal session and you choose
15 not to make it verbally, please write it down on
16 the comment card and give it to one of the
17 individuals at the front desk, and we will read
18 that into the record during the formal part of this
19 session.
20 Since this is a formal meeting, we do
21 have a court transcriber here, and all of the
22 comments that we make here tonight will be
23 transcribed basically as accurately as they're
24 said, and we will have a full transcript of this

1 meeting available in about two weeks, and this
2 transcript will be placed in the Public Information
3 Center, which is located about a half a mile or so
4 south of the plant on Route 128.
5 Tonight's meeting is going to be
6 divided into two sessions. During the first
7 session we will give you an overview of all the
8 remedial investigation, a review of alternatives,
9 and also our proposed plan for the remediation of
10 this Operable Unit. This will be followed by a
11 question and answer period, an informal session.
12 Feel free to ask questions as they specifically
13 apply to Operable Unit 2.
14 After that then we'll have a short
15 break and we'll go into the formal session. We
16 encourage you during this particular question and
17 answer period to ask any questions that you have,
18 but we ask that you specifically limit them to the
19 Operable Unit 2 proposed plan. Anything that we
20 present tonight material wise is fair game for you
21 to question. We will try to answer them as best we
22 can, and this is a real opportunity for you to get
23 that informal response.
24 At the break then I think it would be

1 a good idea if you would try to interface with some
2 of the participants. That way you can get some
3 real face-to-face interaction with them and maybe
4 get an increased comfort level of our approaches.
5 We would ask you to remember that we cannot
6 presuppose the remedial activities that some of the
7 other operable units will be taking, but we have
8 tried to integrate our plan with them as a
9 contingency, so please, if you will focus your
10 concerns on specifically Operable Unit 2 this
11 evening.
12 Following a short break, then we will
13 proceed into the formal session of the meeting.
14 Those of you who signed up on the register
15 indicating that you wanted to make a verbal comment
16 will be called up in order to make your comment and
17 have it placed into the public record. After we
18 receive everyone's verbal comments, we'll open the
19 floor again -- everybody who has requested verbal
20 comments, we'll open the floor again for any
21 additional commenters, and then after that we will
22 read into the record any written comments that we
23 receive during the meeting. This part of the
24 meeting will not be interactive, and by that I mean

1 when you make a comment, it will not be responded
2 to this evening. Your responses will be presented
3 in the responsive summary document which will be
4 submitted with the draft Record of Decision on
5 January 5th, 1995. So you will locate your
6 responses to your formal comments there.
7 Remember that to get a response to
8 your comment in that document you must either make
9 a verbal comment this evening, submit a written
10 card to be read into the record this evening, or
11 submit a written comment sometime before the end of
12 November 26th to DOE, which is the end of the
13 public comment period. And I will put a slide up
14 here that shows you that address. We'll go back
15 over this formal session again before we start it
16 up.
17 So with that, I would like to
18 introduce Jim Williams, FERMCO Director for
19 Operable Unit 2. Jim is going to give you that
20 overview of Operable Unit 2 and our proposed plan,
21 and we hope that you agree with us that our
22 proposed plan does represent the best balance of
23 protectiveness, cost, and implementability. Jim.
24 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Rod. And

1 good evening everyone.
2 First thing I'd like to do this
3 evening is briefly review where we are and where
4 we're going in the public participation process for
5 Operable Unit 2.
6 On May 10th of this year we held a
7 workshop to go over Remedial Investigation for
8 OU-2, and at that time we presented our initial
9 thoughts on a likely preferred remedial alternative
10 for OU-2.
11 On June 28th of this year we held a
12 public workshop for the Feasibility Study for
13 OU-2. Again we went over our thinking with regard
14 to a proposed plan for Operable Unit 2.
15 On September 13th OEPA had an
16 availability session to discuss the possibility of
17 siting an on-site low level waste facility at
18 Fernald.
19 On October 25th we had a workshop to
20 discuss the proposed design and location of the
21 disposal facility.
22 On November 3rd there was an
23 availability session sponsored by OEPA to discuss
24 the OU-2 proposed plan and preferred remedial

1 alternative.

2 Tonight is the public meeting on the

3 proposed plan for OU-2. And there are a couple of

4 things that I'd like for you to think about with

5 regard to public participation for OU-2. First is

6 that we've listened to your concerns and your ideas

7 through the process. Many of you who have been

8 involved since May realize that we modified our

9 approach substantially, significantly, in part due

10 to comments and questions and concerns by the

11 public and by the regulatory agencies.

12 Secondly, although this is the public

13 meeting for the proposed plan for OU-2, it's not

14 the end of the process. The public comment period

15 will extend until the 25th of this month, and even

16 following the close of the comment period, the

17 public participation process will continue into the

18 remedial design. FERMCO, the Department of Energy,

19 and the regulatory agencies are committed to

20 continued public involvement into the remedial

21 design process.

22 So the two things we'd like you to

23 take away are that we are listening to you; equally

24 importantly, we're responding, we're modifying our

1 proposed actions based on the input we receive, and
2 your opportunity to participate will continue.
3 Would it be possible to dim the
4 lights just a little bit?
5 Next thing I'd like to do is just
6 very briefly review the contamination, the hazards
7 at Operable Unit 2, and review the need for a
8 remedy for remedial action at Operable Unit 2.
9 This is a three-dimensional picture of
10 contamination at the solid waste landfill. The
11 image in the reddish color is uranium contamination
12 in the landfill. The more magenta color is a lower
13 level contamination in the landfill. It's about an
14 acre in size, and most of the volume within the
15 landfill is contaminated with uranium.
16 Contamination has not impacted the Great Miami
17 aquifer.
18 The next waste unit in Operable Unit
19 2 are the lime sludge ponds. Again the color
20 coding of the images is the same, where the
21 purplish or magenta color represents low level
22 uranium contamination at the lime sludge ponds.
23 It's scattered around in the dikes or the berms
24 that are made of earth and they contain the lime

1 sludge. Again, the contamination at the lime
2 sludge ponds has not affected the Great Miami
3 aquifer.
4 This is a picture of contamination at
5 the three contiguous southern waste units, and
6 these are the inactive flyash pile, the South
7 Field, and the active flyash pile. The reddish
8 blob to the left center where John is indicating
9 with the pointer is uranium contamination at the
10 inactive flyash pile. To the east, directly to the
11 east is another blob or volume of uranium
12 contamination in the South Field. The big
13 difference with these waste units is that the
14 contamination in OU-2 has in this area
15 significantly impacted the Great Miami aquifer, and
16 you're looking down the bird's-eye view on the
17 groundwater, and it's color coded to represent
18 uranium contamination in the Great Miami aquifer.
19 The most significant contamination in
20 the aquifer is directly below the inactive flyash
21 pile. I trust John is indicating that. The
22 contamination is approximately 1,000 parts per
23 billion in this area. And without remediation in
24 Operable Unit 2, there are numerous problems that

1 represent unacceptable risks to human health in the
2 environment. And we'll go over those in a little
3 more detail, but primarily they would involve risks
4 to users of the groundwater. As you can see, it's
5 contaminated. In the absence of remediation, it
6 will become more so and the contamination will
7 spread. In addition, there is potential exposure
8 through surface pathways on the ground through
9 direct radiation, inhalation of suspended dusts,
10 dermal exposure, and ingestion.
11 Before we can get into the proposed
12 remedy for Operable Unit 2, we need a definition,
13 and that definition is for federal ownership,
14 federal land use at Fernald. We need this
15 definition because the proposed remedy for Operable
16 Unit 2 will require continued federal ownership of
17 at least a portion of the Fernald site into the
18 future. So what we're talking about, and the
19 functional definition for our purposes of federal
20 land use are when the federal government retains
21 ownership of the FEMP, land use and site access are
22 restricted for authorized government purposes
23 only. The receptors, in other words, the
24 individuals who could receive risk in the future

1 under this scenario are trespassers who come onto
2 the property, off-property farmers who are primary
3 water users, and users of the Great Miami River
4 water. These are the people that have to be
5 protected in the remedy for Operable Unit 2.
6 And these are the specific pathways
7 through which these individuals can be exposed to
8 risks from Operable Unit 2. For the trespasser,
9 there's direct radiation, inhalation, again that
10 would be primarily of dust from the surface,
11 ingestion of dust or surface water, and dermal or
12 exposure to the skin from contaminated material.
13 For the off-property farmer, the
14 primary pathway, the most significant risk would be
15 ingestion primarily of groundwater.
16 Those pathways I just described are
17 what have to be controlled by any successful remedy
18 at Operable Unit 2. In the course of developing
19 and evaluating potential remedies for Operable Unit
20 2, we looked at, by my last count, 28 different
21 remedial alternatives. Some of these were specific
22 to a specific subunit, but the point is we
23 thoroughly exhausted our imaginations in terms of
24 developing and comparing reasonable and feasible

1 alternatives for the remediation of Operable Unit
2 2. After the process of studying and screening out
3 the less feasible alternatives, when the smoke had
4 cleared, we were left with four, one of which is
5 required by CERCLA or Superfund guidance, and
6 that's the no action alternative.
7 The other three alternatives that
8 were given a very detailed comparative analysis are
9 consolidation and containment, which many of you
10 will remember was the alternative in which we
11 consolidated the waste within the OU-2 waste units
12 where it presently is, basically moved it around
13 within the waste unit to the safest place, and then
14 contained it with a cap within the waste unit.
15 The next alternative is excavation
16 and off-site disposal. That's pretty clear. The
17 waste above cleanup levels within each Operable
18 Unit 2 waste unit would be excavated and shipped
19 off-site for disposal. The disposal facility that
20 we evaluated in this feasibility study was the
21 Envirocare facility in Utah.
22 The final alternative that was given
23 detailed comparative analysis was excavation and
24 on-site disposal with off-site disposal for the

1 fraction exceeding the waste acceptance criteria,
2 which would be the limits of contamination which
3 would be accepted at the on-site disposal
4 facility.
5 What I want to spend most of the time
6 on, and I think what is most important for us to
7 understand, is how do these alternatives compare
8 and why did we select one for recommendation to you
9 over the other two. I hope that it is clear based
10 on the discussion we had of the contamination in
11 the waste units that the no action alternative is
12 unacceptable.
13 This picture is a summary in very
14 brief form, one page of literally thousands of
15 pages of analysis, and somebody has called it our
16 consumer reports table because it's a kind of way
17 of comparing different alternatives that is I hope
18 legible and easy to understand. What we need to do
19 is spend a little bit of time going through this
20 table, both with respect to the criteria that we
21 use to evaluate these alternatives and the results
22 of the evaluation. I'm going to have to resort to
23 my pointer so you make sure what I'm talking
24 about.

1 These are the evaluation criteria.
2 Let's talk about them a little bit. In the first
3 place the evaluation criteria are given to us by
4 EPA, they're EPA guidance. They're the same for
5 every CERCLA site. These are the same criteria
6 that was used to evaluate and select remedial
7 alternatives for Operable Units 4 and Operable Unit
8 1. So the criteria are a given.
9 What do they mean? The first
10 criteria or criterium, which is singular, overall
11 protection of human health in the environment, is
12 an absolute or threshold requirement. If an
13 alternative doesn't meet this standard, it cannot
14 be carried forward for detailed comparative
15 analysis. So it's not useful to us in terms of
16 choosing the best alternative, but it's a threshold
17 that each of the alternatives must meet in order to
18 be considered any further.
19 The same thing is true for the second
20 criterium, which is compliance with ARARs. ARARs
21 are the laws, regulations, and policies that are
22 pertinent to this project. And again, all of the
23 alternatives must, must meet this standard. You'll
24 notice that one of our alternatives, on-site

1 disposal, meets it with a footnote, and that
2 footnote is important. It meets the ARARs with
3 waiver of the OEPA restriction on disposal of solid
4 waste over a high yield sole source aquifer. EPA
5 has already stated its intent to grant such a
6 waiver in order for us to successfully implement
7 this project. It's important to realize that this
8 waiver will be specific to Operable Unit 2 waste
9 only, and that those wastes would be generated only
10 during the cleanup of this Superfund project at
11 Operable Unit 2. The disposal of waste from other
12 sites under this waiver would not be legal.
13 Now we're going to get into some
14 criteria that are useful in terms of comparing and
15 selecting the best alternative. The third one,
16 long-term effectiveness and permanence is very
17 important and it's self-explanatory, and for the
18 first time you see a difference among the three
19 action alternatives. And the difference is that
20 the consolidation and containment alternative
21 doesn't rate as highly as the other two, and the
22 reason for that is as follows: For off-site
23 disposal you excavate the material, you transport
24 it off-site, in this case we're talking about

1 shipping it to Utah and placing it in an engineered
2 facility. That's a relatively permanent,
3 long-range effective solution.
4 The same is true for Alternative 6,
5 on-site disposal. You excavate the material from
6 the OU-2 waste units, you put it in an engineered
7 facility that's engineered for a very long
8 lifetime.
9 With Alternative 2, consolidation and
10 containment, there's a difference, and that
11 difference is that it was not being placed in an
12 engineered facility. The material was being kept
13 in place and it wouldn't have the liner, the
14 underdrain, and the leak detection systems that are
15 to be engineered as a part of the recommended
16 alternative. By the way, I would point out that at
17 the back of the room there's a life-size
18 cross-section of both the conceptual design for the
19 proposed capping system and liner system for the
20 on-site disposal facility. It would be a nice idea
21 to take a look at it during the break or
22 afterwards. I believe that was in response to some
23 discussion we had at our last meeting.
24 So with respect to long-term

1 effectiveness and permanence, the on-site disposal
2 and off-site disposal alternatives are better than
3 the consolidation and containment, and I'll point
4 out also that the engineering features associated
5 with a proposed disposal facility at Fernald far
6 exceed those of the facility in Utah. The facility
7 in Utah, for example, doesn't have the complex
8 liner, leak detection, and leachate collection
9 systems that the facility here would have.
10 The fourth criterium, reduction of
11 toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment,
12 again it doesn't help us differentiate among the
13 alternatives because treatment is not effective for
14 OU-2 wastes. Concentrations are too low for an
15 effective treatment.
16 Short-term effectiveness, and this
17 one is a little bit of a misnomer that just comes
18 out of the lingo associated with feasibility
19 studies. What the short-term effectiveness really
20 is is a measure of the risk to workers and the
21 community during remediation itself. So the
22 consolidation and containment in place is the least
23 risky thing to do because you're not moving the
24 material around, so it ranks highest in that

1 regard.

2 I want to skip implementability

3 because I want to come back to that with a little

4 more of a detailed summary type of analysis on

5 that. So we'll skip over number 6 and come back

6 later.

7 Number 7 is cost, and that's measured

8 in terms of the present worth, the total present

9 worth of implementing each alternative.

10 Consolidation and containment is the least

11 expensive at about $70 million. Off-site disposal

12 is almost $213 million, and on-site disposal is

13 about $110 million in terms of present value.

14 State acceptance and community

15 acceptance is what we're doing now. You're part of

16 the process, and your input will be a part of the

17 decision making. However, through the process that

18 I explained when I started, we've heard quite a bit

19 of input from the community already. And it has I

20 would say highly discouraged our consideration of

21 consolidation and containment. Frankly, the idea

22 of consolidation and containment was not well

23 received by the community or by the State and that

24 has been given significant weight in the remainder

1 of our analysis.

2 However, it is important to keep in

3 mind when we talk about community acceptance and

4 State acceptance, we're not just talking about you,

5 we're not just talking about the Fernald community

6 because there's also a community in Utah and

7 communities in every state through which material

8 must pass for off-site disposal. Those individuals

9 are a part of this process as well. And those

10 states and state agencies are a part of the process

11 as well, and we have attempted to accommodate that

12 as a part of our analysis.

13 So let's come back to

14 implementability. With respect to the darkened

15 circles, it looks like a drawing, but it's really a

16 little more subtle than that. We believe that the

17 on-site disposal is the most implementable of the

18 alternatives when we consider cost and the

19 political realities of the situation, political

20 realities of attempting to send all material off

21 Fernald and into Utah and Nevada. And furthermore,

22 this on-site disposal recommendation is a part of a

23 consolidated comprehensive strategy for waste

24 management at the Fernald project. This won't be

1 the first time you've heard it whereby the most
2 hazardous materials are shipped off site. They
3 also happen to be a lower quantity of material, and
4 the large quantities of not so hazardous materials
5 would stay behind and be placed in an engineered
6 facility at the Fernald site.
7 So to summarize this table and our
8 analysis, I would say that we believe that on-site
9 disposal is worth the extra cost compared to
10 consolidation and containment due to its superior
11 long-term effectiveness and community acceptance.
12 We believe that on-site disposal is preferable to
13 off-site disposal due to its superior
14 implementability and its large favorable cost
15 difference to achieve the same total
16 protectiveness. So that's basically how we boil it
17 down.
18 For the record, the preferred
19 alternative is excavation and on-site disposal with
20 off-site disposal of the fraction exceeding waste
21 acceptance criteria.
22 I want to take just a few minutes and
23 sort of help you visualize what that means, and in
24 particular what this waste acceptance criteria

1 means. If we could dim the lights one more time, I
2 think that will be the last time.
3 We have calculated that the waste
4 acceptance criteria for uranium for the on-site
5 disposal facility should be on the order of 1,000
6 parts per million total uranium. That's very
7 close. We have identified a couple places in the
8 OU-2 waste units where we have contamination
9 exceeding that level and, therefore, this material
10 would have to be disposed of off-site, and again
11 we're planning on the Envirocare facility in Utah.
12 This is a picture of where that contamination is
13 that exceeds the waste acceptance criteria at the
14 solid waste landfill. We also have a picture of
15 the material exceeding the waste acceptance
16 criteria; in other words, the material exceeding a
17 thousand parts per million, which is about 360
18 picocuries per gram of U238, those are roughly
19 equivalent. And John is pointing to it at the
20 inactive flyash pile. In total there's about 3,000
21 cubic yards of material in the OU-2 waste units
22 that would have to be sent off-site. Thank you,
23 John.
24 For those of you who are more linear

1 brain and like things in tabular form, this table
2 presents the volume of material that would be
3 disposed of in the on-site facility by subunit in
4 OU-2. You can see that the total is approximately
5 300,000 cubic yards. The total that would go
6 off-site is about 1 percent of that or 3,000 cubic
7 yards. The average contamination that would be put
8 in the disposal facility is very, very low. As you
9 can see, the highest subunit is the inactive flyash
10 pile, and that's only 50 picocuries per gram. The
11 maximum concentrations are also pointed out, and
12 the cleanup levels are also there for reference.
13 Implementation of this alternative is
14 relatively straightforward. We would have to
15 prepare the site, which means preparing for
16 stormwater control, transportation, and so forth.
17 We would excavate the waste material that exceeds
18 cleanup levels at the subunits from OU-2 waste
19 units, we would carry it either to the on-site
20 disposal facility if it's below the waste
21 acceptance criteria, if it's above, we take it to
22 the railhead for off-site shipment. We'll restore
23 the excavated waste units with backfilling and
24 grading, revegetation, and we will control any

1 groundwater that's encountered during construction
2 and any what we call construction water or
3 stormwater that comes in contact with contaminated
4 material. That water will be collected, tested,
5 and treated.
6 And then in final summary, a concept
7 of the remedy, if you think back to the receptors
8 and the pathways that we have to manage at Operable
9 Unit 2, the strategy is to consolidate the material
10 exceeding cleanup levels into a single place,
11 locate that consolidated material in the most
12 suitable place on the site, isolate the material
13 from potential human environmental receptors,
14 monitor the facility to insure that protectiveness
15 performance is maintained over time, and finally to
16 integrate remediation at Operable Unit 2 with the
17 overall site remediation strategy.
18 That concludes my presentation and I
19 think Rod has the podium next.
20 MR. WARNER: Thanks, Jim. Before we
21 go into the question and answer period, I would
22 like to ask some representatives from our
23 regulatory agencies to come up and say a few
24 words. I think Jim Saric is here from US EPA,

1 Region 5, he's our regional program manager. Jim.
2 MR. SARIC: I think what you've seen
3 today, what Jim has gone forward explaining, some
4 of the preferred alternatives here, the preferred
5 remedy is really something that has gone through a
6 lot of discussion with our agencies, both the Ohio
7 EPA and US EPA looking at a large number of
8 alternatives. When this first Feasibility Study
9 and Proposed Plan came forward, it was presented
10 having the capping containment alternative, and it
11 really was through our own looking at the situation
12 here, we didn't feel real comfortable with that
13 particular alternative, talking to various
14 citizens, members of the Task Force, that I think
15 we all together pushed DOE into saying this needed
16 to be changed, something else needed to come
17 forward. We also were all under the understanding
18 that this site-wide kind of conceptual idea of the
19 most hazardous stuff, if you will, material being
20 disposed of off-site which represents a smaller
21 volume and certainly felt that was probably most
22 important, but yet the idea of having much larger
23 volume of materials of lower concentrations being
24 disposed on-site in a more managed form.

I think from our perspective, US EPA, we support this alternative. We've done a lot of review of looking into this thing and the big picture of how things must go. I think if you look at the idea of leaving waste in place or looking at wastes as they sit today, and you take that waste material and you put it in an engineered cell, I think you're in a lot better state than you would be by leaving the units in place.

Obviously we're here to hear your comments, and this is by no means a final decision today, and that's why we're here. We're going to listen to all the comments, we're going to address them, and we're going to look at DOE's responses to them, so if you have any questions now or if you have any questions afterwards, feel free to ask me and tonight is the night to participate. This is a very important stage in this cleanup, in the idea of the concept of a disposal facility on-site. So with that, I'll take any questions later. Thank you.

MR. WARNER: Thanks, Jim. Now I would like to bring up Tom Schneider from Ohio EPA.

1 MR. SCHNEIDER: Good evening. I
2 would like to express our appreciation for all of
3 you coming out tonight to this very important
4 public comment period with regard to this
5 alternative and this operable unit and the future
6 of this site.
7 We would like to concur with what Jim
8 said. It's been certainly a long process by which
9 we got to this alternative and this plan or
10 approach for the waste at Fernald and what we have
11 been referring to at the agency as the balanced
12 approach, and that's where we get the worst waste
13 off site and manage the large volume of low level
14 waste on-site in a safe facility.
15 So we support DOE's preferred
16 alternative for Operable Unit 2, and especially in
17 light of those preferred alternatives for Operable
18 Unit 1 and Operable Unit 4, and on that note we
19 would like to express our appreciation for DOE
20 wrapping up today the exemption for the OU-1 waste
21 to go to Envirocare. That was going to be a big
22 concern of mine tonight and they took care of that
23 at the last second this afternoon. We're okay to
24 get the waste from OU-1 out to Envirocare from

1 DOE's own internal processes, so that's a good
2 point to tack on to what we're proposing here
3 tonight.
4 We look forward to your comments.
5 Like I said, this alternative addresses the future
6 of the Fernald site and the cleanups here and your
7 comments should address those, your comments should
8 address what you think the site should be in the
9 future, and particularly the State is concerned
10 with, as is a number of the public, off-site waste
11 potentially coming to this cell. I'm here to tell
12 you it's going to be the State's -- we're going to
13 use all the tools in our chest to make sure that
14 that doesn't happen. That will be our effort with
15 regard to how the ROD is written, that will be our
16 effort with regard to how enforcement is taken at
17 the site to be sure that off-site waste doesn't
18 come to this cell.
19 But your comments during this public
20 comment period can only reinforce the fact that
21 we're willing to take care of our problems here but
22 we are certainly not willing to accept additional
23 waste at the site. I just recommend that you use
24 this public comment period to the best of your

1 ability. We look forward to your comments tonight.
2 The public comment period extends on through the
3 Friday after Thanksgiving, the 28th, something like
4 that -- the 25th. So if you don't public comment
5 tonight, be sure and send something in in writing
6 if you want to go home and think about it for a
7 while. Thanks for coming out.
8 MR. WARNER: I would like to thank
9 Tom and Jim for all their support to this process.
10 It's been tedious, we've had a lot of meetings and
11 a lot of discussions, but I think where we are
12 tonight indicates we've come an awful long way.
13 With that I would like to open up the
14 question and answer period and use this opportunity
15 to fire away.
16 MR. WILLIAMS: I've been designated
17 to accept your questions.
18 MS. DASTILLUNG: On Alternative 6
19 when you have the costs there, it's only going out
20 30 years with the operations and maintenance. How
21 much is it approximately in today's dollars per
22 year that we'll have to pay to monitor that out
23 into infinity?
24 MR. WILLIAMS: Like from the 31st

1 year on?

2 MS. DASTILLUNG: Uh-huh.

3 MR. WILLIAMS: In today's dollars,

4 those amounts depreciate to almost nothing because

5 of the discount rate. That's present net value

6 accounting. If somebody offered you a hundred

7 dollars now or a hundred dollars in 31 years, which

8 would you take?

9 MS. DASTILLUNG: Okay, well then how

10 much is it going to cost to operate and maintain it

11 in the year say 15?

12 MR. WILLIAMS: What's our annual

13 budget for operations and maintenance roughly?

14 MR. JONES: Well, the annual budget

15 in the earlier years I think is somewhere about a

16 million dollars a year.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: But that's actual

18 operating.

19 MR. JONES: That's the operation and

20 maintenance amount.

21 MR. WILLIAMS: Your question gets

22 more at like after all the waste is in it, it's

23 closed up and it's just sitting there?

24 MS. DASTILLUNG: Right. It would be

about a million dollars a year to maintain it?

MR. JONES: Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: About a million a year.

MS. DASTILLUNG: So in a hundred years beyond that 30 we will have broken even on the cost then approximately between three and six or less?

MR. WILLIAMS: You can't do that kind of accounting in your head. It's a problem because of the time value of money. It's not intuitive.

MS. DASTILLUNG: Okay.

MR. WILLSEY: Yes, I heard a few words that kind of brought some questions to mind. You said that you were going to have a permanent site and it will be a lifelong housing of the contamination. I think that's probably the same words they used when they built the K-65 silos probably, and that was probably 30 years or 40 years ago, but I think the same technology that was available today was probably as important back then as it is today. I think they thought they were state of the art back then like you do today. So

1 when you say permanent and you say lifelong, I
2 don't understand that terminology because I don't
3 know what that means.
4 MR. WILLIAMS: I don't recall using
5 those exact words.
6 MR. WILLSEY: You did because I
7 wrote them down.
8 MR. WILLIAMS: I did refer to a
9 design life, and a design life at a disposal
10 facility, which is the -- is an engineering goal
11 for the thing to be essentially perfect for that
12 length of time, is 500 years. The design life for
13 the K-65 silos was 30 years.
14 MR. WILLSEY: I think they had that
15 one pretty well pegged, didn't they?
16 MR. WILLIAMS: They have exceeded
17 their projected design life.
18 MR. WILLSEY: You know, lifelong and
19 permanent, we have a permanent aquifer that that
20 plant sits on and it is permanent, and I understand
21 what that means. That will be our source of water
22 forever. I don't know how permanent your liners
23 are going to be, but I know that we have to drink
24 that water forever.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Right. The intent is
2 not to construct the facility and close it and walk
3 away. The intent is and the requirement will be to
4 continuously monitor the facility, and in the event
5 that the facility begins to need attention, it will
6 receive that attention. That might be in 500 or a
7 thousand years, but the intent and the design is
8 not one that can be walked away from. That's why
9 continued federal ownership, continued federal
10 control is an integral part of the alternative.
11 MR. WILLSEY: Quite frankly, I don't
12 think the ownership is what we're concerned about.
13 I really don't think anyone wants the site. I
14 think what we're concerned about is who owns the
15 site and if they'll be there 500 years from now or
16 40 years from now when this thing, if it goes
17 sour. As I said before, we've lived with this
18 thing since the plant was built, and it was state
19 of the art when it was built, and all this that
20 happened was not going to happen. That's why we're
21 here. Personally I want to get rid of it. We've
22 had it for a long time, and our residents have
23 suffered for a long time. But as I said, my
24 question for you, I would like to know what your

1 definition of permanent is because you keep using
2 that word.
3 MR. WILLIAMS: Long-term
4 effectiveness and permanence is one of the criteria
5 that we evaluate, and you're talking about an
6 engineering facility here versus an engineered
7 facility in Utah, okay. They're both engineered
8 facilities. The engineering design of this
9 facility is more rigorous and more protected than
10 the one in Utah. The environments are different.
11 I'm not going to cloud over the issue that the Utah
12 environment is very different than the Ohio
13 environment, but the design life of the Fernald
14 facility was on the order of 30 years. Most of the
15 material that we're cleaning up now is not the
16 result of any engineered effort at all. In OU-2,
17 the material that I showed you, it was simply
18 dumped on the ground and covered up. So again
19 that's not something that is comparable to the
20 alternative we're proposing, which is an engineered
21 facility, the design life of 500 years, and
22 continuous monitoring, continuous review, and a
23 responsibility for continued maintenance of the
24 facility.

1 MS. YOCUM: Mine is on the fact
2 sheet that we received in the mail and as you came
3 through the door. On page 5 in the last paragraph
4 of selecting the preferred remedial alternative, it
5 says by combining all the waste into one disposal
6 location, Alternative 6 will allow reduced buffer
7 zone, and I'm concerned about the buffer zone. So
8 what does that mean reduced buffer zone, what is
9 the, do you have one like 300 yards or 300 feet, is
10 there a special number that is a buffer zone and if
11 it's a smaller area?
12 MR. WILLIAMS: It's 300 feet and
13 that's a minimum. That's a minimum from Ohio
14 regulations.
15 MS. YOCUM: Then you're talking
16 about reducing it?
17 MR. WILLIAMS: No, we're talking
18 about, you know, by putting all the material in one
19 place, you reduce, you know, the places that waste
20 exists, and so, therefore, you reduce the overall
21 impact on site land use. Basically you have the
22 least perimeter possible, you know, for a disposal
23 facility by putting it in one place. By
24 concentrating it in one place, it gives you more

1 conceptual flexibility of moving it around, and
2 that 300 feet is a minimum, it's not necessarily a
3 target that we're shooting for. It all depends on
4 the ultimate geometry, and it can be any shape
5 within engineering responsibility. There's a
6 degree of flexibility with regard to the shape. So
7 the 300 foot buffer zone is a minimum. And we will
8 not be able to have any less of a buffer on any
9 order than that. But we would only, only
10 conceptually be at most within 300 feet would be on
11 one border. You wouldn't be talking about
12 impacting multiple borders, which you would if you
13 didn't consolidate it.
14 MS. YOCUM: I have one more
15 question. With the design of the disposal cell --
16 do you have a picture of it on file?
17 MR. WILLIAMS: Do we have a picture
18 of it? We have a rendition.
19 MS. YOCUM: I just want to explain
20 the slope, there's going to be water laying on the
21 sides and there's going to be filtration.
22 MR. WILLIAMS: No, that's why the
23 sides are sloped.
24 MS. YOCUM: But if you constantly

have a downpour, I mean the water is going to settle, it's not all going to run off the hill and just be --

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, as a matter of fact, that's one of the reasons that the cap, which is depicted on the back wall there, the cap extends down the sides as well as on top.

MS. YOCUM: It does extend down the sides? Because in one of the drawings it didn't look like it extended down the sides and that's why I was wondering.

MR. WILLIAMS: Once again we have heard input along those lines, and we have responded.

MS. YOCUM: Okay.

MS. CRAWFORD: I have a couple questions, and I need you to put this slide up on your overhead.

MR. WILLIAMS: The comparison?

MS. CRAWFORD: Whatever, the one with the little colorful dots on it. At the bottom it says total present worth cost, and off-site it says 212.8 and on-site it says 110.3 million or billion, whatever.

MR. WILLIAMS: Those are millions.

MS. CRAWFORD: Millions. Does that include the cost of the cell or does the cost of the cell fall under OU-5?

MR. WILLIAMS: That includes the cost of the cell for Operable Unit 2, for Operable Unit 2 volumes, that's correct.

MS. CRAWFORD: So to get an overall cost of the cell itself, are we able to do that yet?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, we can, and in fact OU-5 will be submitting their Feasibility Study next week, and that will have the official comparable cost estimates for the OU-5 volumes of material as well as they're also looking at the off-site alternative. So on more of a site-wide perspective, it will have the capability of looking at on-site versus off-site for a wider range of cleanup volumes. This is specific to the 300,000 cubic yards for OU-2.

MS. CRAWFORD: Now, I need your little computer man to put up his other little thing that he had up there with them two little hot pink boxes on it. My question is what's in them

1 two little pink boxes?
2 MR. WILLIAMS: No, no, those aren't
3 boxes.
4 MS. CRAWFORD: You know what I mean,
5 what's in those two hot pink areas?
6 MR. WILLIAMS: It's simply a higher
7 level of uranium.
8 MS. CRAWFORD: Yeah, I understand
9 that. I guess my question is -- I don't mean to
10 interrupt you -- what was it, what was buried there
11 that was way higher than the rest of the stuff?
12 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I guess, I
13 don't mean to quibble, but when you're talking
14 about way higher, you're talking about maybe 500
15 picocuries per gram versus 50.
16 MS. CRAWFORD: It would seem to me
17 that's way higher, I'm sorry, but it is. We don't
18 need to argue about that.
19 MR. WILLIAMS: Let me show you --
20 where's that -- just for some comparison. Average
21 OU-2 stuff is about 25, average OU-5 stuff is about
22 the same. The waste acceptance criteria, as I
23 mentioned, is 360. The average OU-4 stuff is about
24 12,000, and the average OU-1 stuff -- I'm sorry,

1 1200, and the average OU-1 stuff is about 5500. So
2 what you're talking about is about one-tenth the
3 activity of OU-1 stuff. Just for perspective. The
4 reason it's higher is that there was not a
5 systematic process of putting stuff over time in
6 the landfill, it took odds and ends, so there's
7 just differences, there's variations within the
8 landfill. Parts of it are clean, parts of it are
9 25, parts of it are 50, and there's a couple little
10 areas that are 500. There's nothing particularly
11 remarkable about those samples.
12 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, let me quibble
13 back with you. And say that OU-4 is not going to
14 go in the waste cell, so I'm not even counting OU-4
15 at this point, so I don't think we can compare
16 those two at all. I guess when you show me
17 something like this and you show me two hot pink
18 little areas, I won't call them boxes but areas, on
19 the screen, it makes me wonder what the heck was
20 buried there that is higher than the other stuff.
21 I think folks would just kind of -- I mean are
22 there derbies buried in there? And if you don't
23 know, it's okay to say I don't know.
24 MR. WILLIAMS: We have not found any

1 sense of anything like derbies and so forth. The
2 operational history of the landfill is not well
3 understood. They didn't keep records. It was
4 essentially a place to put stuff you didn't want
5 anymore, and so they did that. However, just --
6 this is a good time to explain how things would
7 operate. How do you make sure you didn't miss one,
8 how do you know what you're putting in the cell is
9 what you say you're putting into the disposal
10 facility, and the plan is for every unit of
11 material that comes out of the waste units will be
12 screened and sampled right there before it's taken
13 to the disposal facility to insure that it meets
14 the waste acceptance criteria, and then that
15 characterization will be verified from the
16 stockpile at the disposal facility. It will be
17 looked at twice before it goes into the disposal
18 facility, and if it doesn't meet the waste
19 acceptance, then it doesn't go into the facility.
20 MS. CRAWFORD: Is there going to be
21 like a huge lag time by the time you pull it out of
22 this thing, you test it, and you sift through it to
23 make sure it's what you say it is until you get it
24 to put it in the waste cell?

1 MR. WILLIAMS: No. The screening at
2 the landfill or at the inactive flyash pile is
3 essentially going to be real time screening using
4 real time instruments. From the stockpile,
5 however, at the --
6 MS. CRAWFORD: Don't use the word
7 stockpile, that's not a good word.
8 MR. WILLIAMS: The FEMP working
9 material at the disposal facility. The samples
10 will be laboratory samples, and they will take a
11 little longer but just on the order of, days not
12 anything more than that.
13 MR. REISING: Jim, I think it is
14 important to respond to Lisa's question because
15 remember we did use trenching in the silos, we put
16 a number of trenches in there to see the type of
17 material that was actually in there. In fact, I
18 think Jerry is here who was the soil scientist in
19 charge of that operation, and also the fact that
20 the waste sample that you took, and that matrix is
21 a soil matrix, so there was solid waste material in
22 there, and we did go in and try to excavate and
23 find if there were solid objects, et cetera, and we
24 found very little of that.

1 MS. CRAWFORD: I guess I'm just
2 curious to know what it is that would cause those
3 two areas to be higher than the rest of it. I
4 guess ultimately there could be more than those two
5 little areas.
6 MR. SCHNEIDER: Certainly. I think
7 that's the benefit of excavating these areas versus
8 consolidating them in place. That's been a big
9 concern of the State, is you can punch a lot of
10 holes in an area like that and still not have a
11 good idea of what's there. What we do gain out of
12 excavation is a knowledge of everything you pick up
13 out there and we know what goes into the cell and
14 we know what's where. So I think that's what we
15 gain. These areas can just be as little as
16 somebody dug up a contaminated soil area which was
17 relatively high contamination, a thousand
18 picocuries, and dumped it into the landfill and it
19 just got mixed in with the rest. So it's not
20 necessarily that they dumped a particular type of
21 material there, just what got dumped in the
22 landfill on a daily basis, and those were two hot
23 spots. I'll be surprised if these are the only two
24 hot spots when they dig that landfill up. The

1 holes are only so big.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jim, your

3 alternative number 3, you keep mentioning that this

4 material is sited to go to Envirocare in Utah. Did

5 you look at the cost of sending it to Nevada Test

6 Site since we're talking about splitting out the

7 low level radioactive components?

8 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, we did, and the

9 reason why we used Envirocare was it was much more

10 cost effective than the Nevada Test Site primarily

11 due to the transportation and packaging

12 requirements.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My second

14 question would be, you're given a whack for U-238

15 concentrations, are there going to be other whacks

16 as well as for other uranium isotopes as well as

17 thorium and some of the other materials?

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Not for Operable Unit

19 2. Uranium is the only contaminant of concern for

20 groundwater within Operable Unit 2.

21 MR. BECKNER: Earlier you used the

22 term design life of 500 years. Since you could not

23 have possibly tested any of these things for

24 anywhere near that period, I'd like to know how you

1 can design for 500 years. Also knowing a design
2 life is something that's a target and much like say
3 diesel engines, some are going to fail at a
4 thousand miles, some are going to fail at 200,000,
5 what would be the low end of failure for that
6 device if you could guarantee that the mean life
7 was 500?
8 MR. WILLIAMS: As you say, there's
9 not an operational history of hundreds of years for
10 these types of engineering facilities. The way
11 that's accommodated in the design process is
12 through application of conservatism upon
13 conservatism, belts and suspenders and everything
14 else. And so I think the 500-year design life is
15 going to be realistic with respect to an Ohio
16 application. I think that it's not meaningful to
17 speculate on what the range would be.
18 MR. BECKNER: Then I suggest you
19 don't quote 500 because you really can't guarantee
20 it or even a fraction of it.
21 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, the engineers
22 have to have a target, that's the design life
23 target.
24 MR. BECKNER: Okay, then say it's a

1 target.

2 The second question, back to Vicky

3 was talking about finance, there's about a hundred

4 million dollar difference between the plan leaving

5 it on-site and taking it off-site. This gentleman

6 I think quoted I think a million dollars a year

7 maintenance for the on-site plan. If there is no

8 inflation, in about a hundred years you would have

9 spent as much for the one plan as the other.

10 Knowing inflation, anybody who has bought a car say

11 20 years ago and bought one recently, I think it

12 would be safe to say that within 50 years or less

13 you'd probably consume that second hundred

14 million. So I'd contend -- plus if it's gone, you

15 don't have to worry about that maintenance program

16 not only being funded but being carried out.

17 My last question I guess is of the

18 two EPA representatives, I'm just curious where you

19 live, where your personal residence is, I don't

20 mean address, but like is it in Ross Township?

21 MR. SARIC: I don't live in Ross

22 Township, I live in Chicago, the Chicago area.

23 MR. SCHNEIDER: Dayton.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because I

1 found them very supportive of the plan, I was just
2 curious how close to the area they lived.
3 MS. WEATHERUP: One point I would
4 just like to make is that we have the design life
5 and some of the safety factors that Jim was talking
6 about is one of the reasons why this site as well
7 as the uranium mill tailing sites and a lot of the
8 other sites have gone to the type of cap that you
9 see back there, put in large cobble areas to keep
10 burrowing animals and trees from growing, the
11 things that, you know, that could break down a cap
12 and cause more infiltration. In the liner we have
13 not only a leachate collection system, but also a
14 leak detection system, and that's something that
15 you're able to monitor for a very long time, and if
16 there's a problem, then you'll know about it before
17 it ever begins to impact the aquifer. So that's
18 why the monitoring is key and that's why having
19 that liner, as Tom was saying, gives that added
20 level of protection and comfort and an ability to
21 do something if the containment isn't lasting.
22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That sounds
23 very impressive, but the problem is it still needs
24 to be monitored, it still has to be paid for, and

1 with this gentleman's point he just made, and I
2 want to emphasize that point, that initial cost of
3 off-site disposal of course is going to exceed
4 Alternative 6, but in the long run Alternative 6 is
5 going to far exceed Alternative 3. And somebody is
6 going to have to pay for that, and future
7 generations are going to have that burden. Of
8 course, they'll have the alternative to not pay, to
9 cancel the monitoring. Then we run the risk of in
10 the future the aquifer being further contaminated
11 because the monitoring has been cut off. We favor
12 here, we favor off-site, we favor Alternative 3.
13 MR. WILLIAMS: If I can detect a
14 question in there, it might have to do with did we
15 accurately consider operations and maintenance in
16 the cost comparison. Just because we send the
17 material off-site, you know, from here, it doesn't
18 disappear. It's still going to require operations
19 and maintenance, and people are going to be worried
20 about it and taxpayers are going to go paying for
21 worrying about it whether it's in Utah or here.
22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But in that
23 area climate you don't have near the concerns you
24 have over an aquifer.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: It's a different
2 climate, agreed.
3 MS. DUNN: I want to just respond to
4 a couple of these comments because I live in Crosby
5 Township, less than a mile from the site, and I am
6 willing to accept the preferred alternative because
7 there are a lot of other people in this country who
8 are dealing with this same issue, and they don't
9 want this stuff in their backyard either, and if we
10 can get the worst of this stuff out of here, I
11 think the least we can do is be responsible for
12 what we can safely keep here.
13 MR. WILLIAMS: Well, if there are no
14 further questions, I believe we're due for a break
15 of about ten minutes, and then we'll come back and
16 take your comments.
17 MR. WARNER: If you want to register
18 and make a verbal comment, please do so now or hand
19 in any written comments.
20 (Brief recess.)
21 MR. WARNER: I think we'll start the
22 formal session of this meeting now. I'm going to
23 call out the names of those who registered and
24 indicated they wanted to make a verbal comment, and

after we've called everybody's name and they've made their comments, we will open the floor for any additional comments, and after that we'll read a couple of comments that we've received that were written on the cards. Again I would like to emphasize that responses will not be presented this evening to your comments. You will find them in the responsiveness summary document that will be submitted with the draft Record of Decision in January of this year.

If there's no questions, I would like you to come up to the microphone, clearly state your name, and then present your comment. Our first commenter will be Tom Willsey.

MR. WILLSEY: My name is Tom Willsey, and I'm a township trustee from Ross Township.

A lot of you people have not seen us -- Don King is also here, he's a township trustee. We have not been to a lot of these meetings because at this point we have never really been in an adversarial position with you folks, but I think now we are. I've been a trustee, I'm in my ninth year, so this didn't just happen to me last

night. We've known about the problems and all the things that went on in that plant for some time, and for ten years now we pretty much believed that they were going to clean up, they were going to move it off site, and we believed that because that's pretty much what you told us. Now I'm seeing where it's permanent, lifelong. I don't think you plan on moving it. Our people in Ross Township, they have a permanent stake in this, and permanent to them is lifelong because they will be there all their lives. So we feel that the meaning of permanent means something different to us than it does to you. We have been dumped on, we've had, of course, the uranium blow on us. We put up with it for a long time, and like I said, we have been very cooperative to this point.

We've watched different things happen in our area that we're not real happy with, our property values obviously went down, that's a matter of record, I'm not making that up, but we tell people, hey, it's a good area, they're cleaning it up, look at all the things they're doing. Well, you're not doing that. We've had it for four years.

1 I look at all your charts and your
2 graphs and I see the Alternative 3, I see
3 Alternative 6, 1, 2, I don't know how many there
4 were, but the thing that glares out and hits me on
5 the nose on Alternative 3 and Alternative 6 is 212
6 million versus 110 million. Cost, money. Quite
7 frankly, if you've ever been to Washington, DC,
8 cost has never been a factor to the federal
9 government. They're a monument to what you can do
10 with unlimited funds. On every street corner
11 there's a monument to something or somebody. So
12 cost should not be a factor. This cost to me is
13 not a factor. The well-being off our residents and
14 our township is a factor to me.
15 We will go on record as being opposed
16 to this, and quite frankly, we're going to try to
17 get a ground swell of people to be opposed to it
18 also. I didn't want to be adversarial about this
19 and I'm still not. I just want it moved. I don't
20 care what it costs. I'm paying for it anyway. I
21 would rather pay for it out of my pocket than pay
22 for it with the lives of my family. Thank you.
23 MR. WARNER: Thank you, Tom, we
24 appreciate your comment.

1 MR. WILLSEY: Sorry, one more thing,
2 Don and I have to leave because we have a levy on
3 and we're going to get up to the Board of
4 Elections, we're supposed to be up there. Thank
5 you very much.
6 MR. WARNER: We appreciate your
7 participation. Richard Strimple.
8 MR. STRIMPLE: I'm going to just
9 make a little statement on water aquifers. If it
10 is polluted, it's already polluted.
11 MR. WARNER: You are Richard
12 Strimple?
13 MR. STRIMPLE: Yes, I'm sorry. It's
14 polluted forever and there's no going to be a
15 permanent digging it up and hauling it out. You
16 will dilute it, you will cut your options, but for
17 somebody to think that they're going to clean it
18 up, it's spitting into the wind, period.
19 MR. WARNER: Thank you, Richard.
20 Russ Beckner.
21 MR. BECKNER: My name is Russ
22 Beckner, I'm a resident of Ross Township and live
23 1,500 feet from the site.
24 I would just like to go on record

that I support Alternative 3 versus 6 for the following reasons: One, I feel it's definitely the safest choice for the area. Second, long term it is definitely the least expensive, and long term would only be a few decades, not a century. Today no one can guarantee that a quality maintenance program will be put in place and maintained because the people doing it are very possibly not even alive today, and I think some of the things we've seen occur at this site in the last four decades confirm that.

Also I would ask our EPA representatives to give a second thought, would they be so positive around the plan they support if they lived 1,500 feet from the site as opposed to the locations they mentioned. And the last thing, as I said earlier, there's no one that can design anything today that hasn't been designed before and guarantee it will have a 500-year life. Thank you.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Russ. Are there any other comments from the floor? That was the last of our registered commenters. Yes, sir, you want to come up and state your name, please.

1 MR. STORER: I'm Gary Storer, I'm
2 Crosby Township Trustee and also a resident within
3 one mile of the plant.
4 I wanted to make a point versus
5 alternative, versus Alternative 6. I favor
6 Alternative 3 based on the fact the initial cost,
7 212 million, will be exceeded by the initial cost
8 of Alternative 6, which is 110 million, in the fact
9 that the required monitoring over a number of years
10 in the future will far exceed Alternative 3. So
11 basically I don't see putting that burden on, I
12 don't see putting that burden on future
13 generations, however many years it would be down
14 the road, maybe a hundred years or more. I don't
15 feel it's fair to put that burden of monitoring,
16 which is going to far exceed Alternative 3. So I
17 oppose Alternative 6 and I prefer Alternative 3.
18 Thanks.
19 MR. WARNER: Thank you. Any other
20 comments?
21 We've got two to read into the record
22 here. I'm not sure I pronounce this last name,
23 Judy Suzurikawa. The Cincinnati Water Works
24 received notification of the public hearing and

1 comment period on November 7th. We have not had
2 sufficient time to review the options and their
3 impact on water quality and the sole source aquifer
4 which supplies many residents of Butler County and
5 northern Hamilton County. Also, wells in the area
6 of the FERMCO project provide water to major
7 industries in the Greater Cincinnati area (Fortune
8 500 companies), which provide employment, which
9 contributes to the economic health of the region.
10 And Judy is a chemist with the Cincinnati Water
11 Works. Thank you.
12 This final comment is from Darrell
13 Huff. I am submitting these formal comments on
14 Operable Unit 2 Proposed Plan. I'm a Morgan
15 Township resident, a member of the Fernald Citizens
16 Task Force, the chair of the Citizens Task Force
17 Waste Disposition Subcommittee. I submit these
18 comments, however, as a concerned area resident and
19 not as a representative of any of the
20 aforementioned groups.
21 One, I do not think forcing area
22 residents to accept a permanent disposal cell is
23 fair. No one asked us whether we wanted DOE to
24 come here in the first place, nobody even told us

1 what was going on at this site for decades.
2 Two, when all is said and done, DOE
3 will have buried the waste, packed up and moved
4 out. Area residents will be left with no benefit
5 from the site having been there. Only the waste
6 will remain, and it will stay forever.
7 Three, area residents are not being
8 unreasonable in asking DOE to ship the OU-2 waste
9 off-site. There were two reasons for this. A,
10 cost. The cost of the off-site option is
11 approximately $213 million. The cost of disposal
12 cell option is $110 million. If something should
13 go wrong with the disposal cell, it might bring the
14 cost of the disposal cell option much closer to
15 that of the off-site option. B, long term safety.
16 Places like Utah, Nevada are much better suited for
17 disposal of the waste because they aren't located
18 over water sources and also receive less rainfall.
19 Four, I have doubts that large
20 numbers of the public understand what a permanent
21 disposal cell really means to the area.
22 Five, extensive opportunities for
23 meaningful public involvement should be planned for
24 after the signing of the ROD. The community

1 relations plan draft that was circulated in
2 September does not give any concrete examples of
3 what public involvement will be after the ROD is
4 signed. That is unacceptable. DOE officials must
5 firmly commit themselves in writing before the ROD
6 is signed seeking public involvement, a specific
7 time frame, the RA time frame and beyond after the
8 ROD is made official.
9 Six, if DOE does not construct a
10 disposal cell on-site, absolutely no off-site waste
11 will be disposed of in the cell -- excuse me, if
12 DOE does construct a disposal cell on-site. I add
13 this comment reluctantly as I still do not believe
14 the cell should exist. The land there should be
15 left in the best condition possible. Area
16 residents have already sacrificed enough for God
17 and country.
18 Seven, the waste acceptance criteria
19 of 360 picocuries per gram must be a maximum
20 allowable figure for any waste that goes into the
21 cell. It cannot be an average or a soft ceiling
22 limit.
23 Eight, DOE headquarters must issue a
24 final ruling on the current ban on disposal of DOE

1 waste at a permit commercial disposal facility.
2 DOE headquarters has had plenty of time to study
3 the problem. Thank you.
4 And that's the final written comment,
5 so if there are no other comments, we will bring
6 this meeting to a close and I would like to ask you
7 to remember to fill out the evaluation form if you
8 will please, and place them on the desk by the
9 door. Again, thank you all for coming. It was
10 nice to see some new faces here.
11 - - -
12 MEETING CONCLUDED
13 - - -
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 I, LOIS A. ROELL, RPR, the undersigned, a
3 notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify
4 that at the time and place stated herein, I
5 recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had
6 transcribed with computer-aided transcription the
7 within (59) fifty-nine pages, and that the
8 foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete
9 and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.
10
11
12
13 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL, RPR
14 AUGUST 12, 1997. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24