

6629

G-000-1002.22

**1994 COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT - FEED BACK FROM COMMUNITY
LEADER INTERVIEWS**

**PUBLIC
200
REPORT**

DOE-FN

6629

1994 COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT

FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY LEADER INTERVIEWS

000001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1994 Community Assessment Community Leader Interviews	i
Respondents' Principle and Preferred Information Sources	01
Respondents' Contacts for Questions or Concerns	08
Respondents' Attendance at Fernald Site Community Meetings (including usefulness; preferred days and times; topics)	12
Respondents' Use of the Public Environmental Information Center	16
Respondents' Rating of Assistance or Information Provided by Fernald Site Organizations	20
Respondents' Opinions of Bias/Balance of Information from the Fernald Site	24
Rating of Fernald Management's Efforts to Inform the Public about Fernald Site Cleanup	25
Respondents' Opinion of Frequency of Fernald Site Communications	30
Respondents' Receipt of Sufficient Information to Become Involved in the Decision-Making Process	33
Respondents' Involvement in Fernald-Related Activities/Issues	35
Respondents' Own Understanding of Fernald Site Problems and Issues	39
Respondents' Own Understanding of Solutions	44
Respondents' Opinion of <i>Public</i> Understanding of Fernald Site Problems and Issues	47
Respondents' Opinion of <i>Public</i> Understanding of Solutions	51
Respondents' Awareness of Agencies/Organizations Involved in Fernald Site Cleanup	54
Ratings of Organizations' Performance in Fernald Site Cleanup	57
Respondents' Familiarity with Fernald Site Cleanup Projects and Activities	61

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Respondents' Opinions of Fernald Site Cleanup Progress 64

Respondents' Awareness of Fernald Citizens Task Force 67

Respondents' Awareness of Fernald Envoy Program 71

Respondents' Awareness of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs 74

Respondents' First Thoughts When They Hear About the Fernald Site 78

Respondents' Most Negative Statement about the Fernald Site 82

Respondents' Most Positive Statement about the Fernald Site 86

Visits to the Fernald Facility 90

Respondents' Perceptions Regarding Fernald Site Management's Top Priority 93

Community Concerns and Comments, by Order of Importance 101

Information Respondents Receive from Fernald-Related Organizations/Agencies 113

Respondents' Preference for Waste Disposal 117

Comments/Recommendations for Future Use of the Fernald Site 121

Should the Fernald Site be Cleaned to a "Pristine" Condition? 127

Has Information *From Fernald* Changed Respondents' Understanding of Fernald Site Issues? .. 131

Personal or Family Health Problems Believed to be Caused by
Fernald Site Activities 136

Others, Known by Respondents, Who Attribute Health Problems to the Fernald Site 140

Respondents' Perceptions of Fernald Site Impacts on Property 143

1994 COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT

COMMUNITY LEADER INTERVIEWS

About this document

This document provides a breakdown of responses from the 50 community leaders who were interviewed during the community assessment conducted in May 1994. Their feedback was used to revise the Fernald *Community Relations Plan*. The conclusions drawn in this document reflect only the opinions of the 50 community leaders interviewed as part of the community assessment.

1994 Community Assessment

In order to improve the Department of Energy's (DOE) understanding of community concerns, needs and interests, a comprehensive community assessment was conducted in May 1994. A community assessment is a series of interviews with members of the public who are impacted, or potentially impacted, by activities at the Fernald site. One of the primary purposes for this assessment was to monitor any changes in public interests, needs and concerns as the Fernald site begins its transition from the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) phase to the Remedial Design and Remedial Action (RD and RA) phase of cleanup. Feedback was also used to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing Fernald Public Involvement Program.

The assessment involved 415 person-to-person and telephone interviews, exceeding U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements to conduct a minimum of 15-25 (person-to-person) interviews with community residents and leaders. Of the 415 interviews, 50 were conducted with selected community leaders, including business owners, government officials, educators, local media, representatives of the Fernald Citizens Task Force, members of the Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety and Health, area professionals and others. Most of the community leader interviews were person-to-person; however, a few were by phone.

To reach a broader cross-section of the public, the assessment also included 365 telephone interviews with members of the general public living within a 5-mile radius and the area between the 5-mile and 20-mile radius of the Fernald site. Cincinnati Bell Lists, a subsidiary of Cincinnati Bell Telephone, provided randomly selected phone numbers of residential customers from these geographical areas. Zip code maps were used to minimize overlap between the areas. Business and unlisted numbers were excluded.

Because the telephone interviews were intended to supplement feedback from the community leaders, and telephone interviews are not required by EPA when conducting a community assessment, a detailed record of responses and comments was not prepared for these interviews. A summary of responses and comments from the 365 general public respondents are documented in the *Community Relations Plan*, Appendix A.

Revision of the Fernald *Community Relations Plan*

The feedback from the assessment was used to revise the *Community Relations Plan*. Although other sources of information about community concerns and issues -- such as transcripts, letters, and meeting summaries -- were consulted to select the most appropriate community relations activities, the revision of the *Community Relations Plan* relied primarily on the information gathered during the 1994 community assessment, as well as a separate communications audit with Fernald site employees.

Process Considerations and Methodology for Person-to-Person Interviews

While the community assessment was not designed to be a scientifically valid social survey, the goal was to seek a statistically significant sample of the population living within the 5- and 20-mile radius of the Fernald facility, in addition to reaching community leaders.

Community leaders were asked 59 questions during their interviews. Many of the questions were open-ended. Choices were not presented to respondents in these open-ended questions; rather, they freely presented their own views. *As a result, community leaders identified multiple responses or categories of responses for most of the open-ended questions, and responses varied considerably.* For some questions, multiple responses were counted separately if they contained independent or unrelated thoughts. Some responses were not even relevant to the revision of the *Community Relations Plan*.

Open-ended questions are difficult to use in statistical analysis because in order to provide a response, the respondent was assumed to have some level of knowledge about the Fernald site. However, the open-ended questions provided an idea of the range of responses. For statistical interpretation of the open-ended questions, major responses would need to be presented in another survey, which would allow respondents to either choose or rank items presented in a list.

Additional Information

A summary of findings from the community assessment and information on public involvement opportunities at the Fernald site are included in the 1994 *Community Relations Plan*. A copy of the plan is located in the Public Environmental Information Center, 19845 Hamilton-Cleves Highway, Harrison, Ohio, 513-738-0614 or 0615.

Community Leaders' Comments

Respondents' Principle and Preferred Information Sources

	<u>Principle Sources</u>	<u>Preferred Sources</u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	DOE and FERMCO management.	Satisfied with current information sources.
<i>Leader #40</i>	FERMCO, cleanup report, minutes, specific one-on-one conversations and the newspaper.	Current information sources are ok.
<i>Leader #18</i>	All mailings from DOE, FERMCO; the media; FRESH.	Mixture is good -- likes the balance he is currently getting.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Publications, meetings, Fernald Citizens Task Force, regulatory agencies (EPA), word of mouth (to hear other perceptions).	All sources. Need a balance.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Newsletters; word of mouth from people on site; and Tom Coreen, Columbus.	Newsletters; word of mouth from people on site; and Tom Coreen, Columbus; newspapers are not the preferred information source.
<i>Leader #36</i>	Newspaper	Newspapers and television. Has always wondered why there wasn't something publicized about what happened, why it happened and what's being done. Would like something in the newspaper, something mailed to interviewee or a special video on the Discovery Channel.
<i>Leader #49</i>	Newspapers -- <i>The Cincinnati Enquirer</i> , <i>Journal-News</i> , and the <i>New York Times</i> ; speakers bureau from WEMCO and FERMCO; personal experience; word of mouth.	Don't like reading it in the FERMCO mailings better educate people about radiation.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Fernald Citizens Task Force.	Roundtables because they give fast information.
<i>Leader #22</i>	Employees.	Employees.

Principle Sources

Preferred Sources

Leader #29	Mainly rely on documents sent from FERMCO. Although the media, word of mouth on the street are also information sources, tends to discount both.	Fernald Citizens Task Force.
Leader #17	Union, employees, news media and employees.	Would rather get information from the prime contractor. Wants information to be genuine and truthful.
Leader #28	Mailings, meetings, roundtables -- everything.	DOE -- local and Headquarters.
Leader #32	Jack Craig DOE; Ken Alkema, FERMCO; cleanup updates; FRESH meeting updates; roundtables; meetings with regulators; written materials.	Face-to-face, one-on-one meetings DOE/FERMCO representatives.
Leader #31	Newspapers, radio, Fernald publications, meetings, word of mouth, speakers bureau, environmental organizations, regulatory agencies.	The site (DOE and contractors) and regulatory agencies -- not real trustful of the media.
Leader #50	Receives most information from the Fernald Citizens Task Force; Doug Sarno, Fernald Citizens Task Force consultant; and the scientific community.	From all sources -- the widest range possible.
Leader #23	FERMCO employees.	FERMCO.
Leader #14	The <i>Federal Register</i> , DOE reports, Radioactive Exchange Nuclear Waste News, A-Energy Clearing House, meetings, conversations, industrial or professional society publications, newspapers	Science reports, the <i>Federal Register</i> , DOE publications, technical meetings.

	<u>Principle Sources</u>	<u>Preferred Sources</u>
Leader #24	Fernald Citizens Task Force materials.	From the Fernald Citizens Task Force.
Leader #34	Bulletins; FRESH meetings, RI/FS meetings; Pete Kelley, FERMCO -- Pete has been very good at relaying information. As a trustee, receives a letter on notable happenings at Fernald. Maury Hornbach, FERMCO, is our liaison and gives us information. Also gets information from Carlos Fermaintt, DOE.	FERMCO and DOE.
Leader #04	Newsletters and reports from Fernald, as opposed to newspapers.	Sources from Fernald.
Leader #45	A Fernald speaker at a meeting. Also knows FERMCO Executive Vice President John Rasile.	Rather have it put in the local newspaper (<i>Northwest Press</i>).
Leader #20	Carlos Fermaintt, DOE; Jim Jenkins, FERMCO. Calls FRESH members Lisa Crawford, Edwa Yocum, Crosby Township Trustee Jane Harper and news media -- <i>Harrison Press</i> .	Carlos Fermaintt, DOE, and Jim Jenkins, FERMCO.
Leader #21	Correspondence, conversations with Fernald site employees -- current and retired.	Correspondence with the Fernald site.
Leader #39	TV and word of mouth.	TV may only be the reporter's viewpoint; therefore, a <i>brief, direct</i> newsletter would be good.
Leader #05	Newspapers, newsletters, one-on-one communications.	One-on-one communications with Fernald site personnel.
Leader #12	Reports, meetings, newspapers.	Publications.

Principle Sources

Preferred Sources

Leader #26 First source is the printed material from DOE and FERMCO. Second source is through interfacing with various departments at the site.

Printed material from the facility, as well as face-to-face interfacing.

Leader #03 Not in order of importance: Small source -- Public Affairs office; significant source -- Emergency Preparedness office; also receives information on cleanup -- thinks it comes from Jack Craig's DOE office; DOE-EM Office; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Sources he has now are fine.

Leader #46 Meetings and word of mouth.

Meetings and word of mouth.

Leader #01 "Now it boils down to the meetings and documents I read through. In the beginning, it was leaks -- information gotten to us by the other sources. We had to expose it before they'd actually admit it."

"I'm not overly fond of what the newspaper does; they'll take the news releases from the pr people -- they're [newspaper reporters] lazy. They're biased [those who write the news releases]. TV is worse."

"My trust is getting better with DOE and contractors than it was four or five years ago. It's not all I want it to be, but it's improved. I give that credit to the people themselves -- not so much to the DOE or contractors. It's by making ourselves more knowledgeable. They've had to make themselves more accountable."

Leader #13 Hamilton *Journal-News*.

Prefer getting information directly from Fernald -- through newsletters, etc.

	<u>Principle Sources</u>	<u>Preferred Sources</u>
Leader #33	Mailings, public meetings, newspapers (doubts them).	Everything is ok.
Leader #44	"Information provided to me by FERMCO; information provided to by congressional sources and the newspaper."	No preference.
Leader #11	Fernald publications, FRESH.	Mail
Leader #30	Newspapers, radio, television, Fernald publications, meetings, word of mouth, speakers bureau, environmental organizations, regulatory agencies.	No preference, but ideally, information would come directly from the source -- DOE or FERMCO.
Leader #02	The written word -- newspaper and releases from Fernald.	"I'd prefer that the leadership there [at the Fernald site] have a periodic 'coffee/breakfast' meeting, where community leaders could come in and sit down with company [and DOE] management and brief us about what's going on out there -- maybe once every two months -- <i>face to face</i> ."
Leader #07	"Pete Kelley [FERMCO]. The principle contact I rely on most are personal contacts with people here -- Pete Kelley and Jack Hoopes [FERMCO]. That's where I get the better, most accurate, balanced information. In terms of volume, I get it from newspaper and TV."	"To really understand what's going on, I prefer to get unmediated information from the company, but because of the nature of things, better information is available through print media, rather than broadcast."
Leader #25	Mailings from FERMCO, phone calls, newspapers (A lot of times newspapers are biased or don't report the whole story).	Mailings, phone conversations.
Leader #38	Mailings, meetings, person-to-person conversations.	Current information sources are ok.

Principle Sources

Preferred Sources

Leader #37 DOE *Five-Year Plan*; Congressman John Dingell's House Energy and Commerce Committee hearing transcripts; Fernald Citizens Task Force; Ohio business which have looked at Fernald; written materials; Department of Commerce study on economic impact of Fernald and Mound; opportunity for jobs -- the report by Colorado College professor Bill Weida.

FERMCO, regarding cleanup progress; DOE Ohio Field Office; Ohio EPA office; Fernald Citizens Task Force; the community -- FRESH (the folks who make noise); Senator John Glenn's office; other congressionals, for budget information.

Leader #06 Meetings.

Meetings.

Leader #41 FRESH, *Fernald Site Cleanup Report*, word of mouth, *Harrison Press* and *The Cincinnati Enquirer*.

A computer bulletin board -- a central location for the public to have easy access. The PEIC is not convenient. Check on the Harrison Library reading room.

Leader #48 Phone calls, meetings, newspapers.

Private communication -- phone calls.

Leader #35 Newspapers -- *The Cincinnati Enquirer* and the *Cincinnati Post*; Fernald site employees; word of mouth.

Satisfied with current information sources, which include Fernald site newsletters.

Leader #19 Pete Kelley, FERMCO; Crosby Township meetings; roundtables; community meetings; mailings.

Pete Kelley, FERMCO; Crosby Township meetings; roundtables; community meetings; mailings.

Principle Sources

Leader #10 Materials sent, site-specific advisory board members; from FERMCO, DOE and state and federal EPA. Mostly receive information from DOE and FERMCO -- some EPA stuff.

Leader #08 "Newspapers; coverage by TV -- it alerts you. You don't fall into any complacency; it's been in the news for years. And your [Fernald site] publications."

Leader #41 Newspapers, FRESH newsletter, DOE literature, press releases for the *Harrison Press*.

Leader #43 FERMCO, print media, TV (gives you the negative impression).

Leader #09 FRESH, workshops, newspapers, Fernald site publications, community meetings.

Preferred Sources

"I prefer to receive it from FERMCO, DOE, EPA. I don't particularly care if I get it from newspapers. I don't have a lot of confidence they get things right. Looking for balance, I like to get information from FRESH and the unions because they have a different perspective on what needs to be done."

"I've become aware faster by the newspaper because they seem to be looking for news. Of course it appears as headlines in newspapers."

"Then there's always follow-up from one of *your* publications. The real 'bell ringer' is usually from the local news media."

DOE

First preferred source would be electronic media; the second would be print media; third source would be word of mouth (if possible); thereafter, speakers bureau and publications.

FRESH, Fernald.

Respondents' Contacts for Questions or Concerns

- Leader #15*** DOE or FERMCO management.
- Leader #40*** Dave Brettschneider (FERMCO) on specific -- start with Public Affairs.
- Leader #18*** Julie Loerch (FERMCO) or Pete Kelley (FERMCO).
- Leader #27*** Responsible person (DOE, FERMCO, EPA). Very good rapport -- getting questions answered.
- Leader #47*** Jack Hoopes (FERMCO) or Tommy Coreen.
- Leader #36*** DOE.
- Leader #49*** Not his congressman -- would call Fernald -- probably FERMCO.
- Leader #16*** Johnny Reising (DOE) or Jack Craig (DOE).
- Leader #22*** A client.
- Leader #29*** Somebody in FERMCO he does know. There are too many changes in management.
- Leader #17*** Would go right to source of primary information (if it's benefits, I'd go to the benefits department; if it is an envoy concern, would call Pete Kelley (FERMCO); if it's a medical, would call the medical department.
- Leader #28*** DOE (Public Affairs or site manager). [DOE]-HQ if necessary.
- Leader #32*** Jack Craig (DOE), Ken Alkema (FERMCO), operable unit managers, Gary Stegner (DOE), regulators, Lisa Crawford (FRESH).
- Leader #31*** Gary Stegner (DOE).
- Leader #50*** Would depend on interviewee's question -- would probably call Doug Sarno (Fernald Citizens Task Force consultant).
- Leader #23*** Sue Walpole (FERMCO).

- Leader #14** Hard to say. Would probably refer to Fernald-related materials. Depends on the nature of the interviewee's concern. Would probably bypass Public Affairs people, except to find the officer responsible.
- Leader #24** Sarah Snyder (FERMCO), John Applegate (Fernald Citizens Task Force).
- Leader #34** Pete Kelley (FERMCO).
- Leader #04** Someone who represents Fernald on the groundwater committee.
- Leader #45** Would call John Rasile (FERMCO).
- Leader #20** Carlos Fermaintt (DOE).
- Leader #21** Rachel Clark (FERMCO), Pete Kelley (FERMCO), Julie Loerch (FERMCO).
- Leader #39** Knows one person who works in FERMCO's education department. Don't think she works in or knows about the cleanup.
- Leader #05** Depends on the questions or department: Pete Yerace (DOE), Carlos Fermaintt (DOE), Dave Brettschneider (FERMCO), Dennis Carr (FERMCO).
- Leader #12** FERMCO or parents of kids who work at Fernald.
- Leader #26** No comment.
- Leader #03** Would depend on the question or concern interviewee would have. For remediation concerns, would contact Ohio EPA. For emergency preparedness concerns, would contact Fernald's Emergency Preparedness office. For most other general concerns, would contact the Public Affairs office.
- Leader #46** Would just listen to the fire and safety people.
- Leader #01** "I usually just ask questions at the public meetings. I have people call me at work, but that's difficult. (I have a nosey coworker.) Pete Kelley (FERMCO) was always pretty open. Of course they've pretty much shoved him in the background. Gary Stegner (DOE) -- I'm still trying to get a feel for him. Ken Morgan (DOE) has changed a little; he's come around. He's learned to keep his mouth shut."
- Leader #13** Ohio EPA.

- Leader #33** Would call the Fernald site.
- Leader #44** FERMCO -- Marc Haynes, John Rasile. DOE -- perhaps Phil Hamric.
- Leader #11** Knows of no one to contact for concerns. Did mention a new envoy.
- Leader #30** Bob Walker (FERMCO), Pete Kelley (FERMCO), Ken Morgan (DOE), Amy Engler (FERMCO), Perry Richardson (FERMCO), Julie Loerch (FERMCO).
- Leader #02** "I'd contact Pete Kelley or Sue Walpole -- probably Jack Hoopes before the other two. There's been an attempt for better understanding of communication with the schools, as we speak, and I'm appreciative of that."
- Leader #07** "I really wasn't aware of the Public Environmental Information Center. If I really had something -- a major concern -- I'd try to reach Pete Kelley -- somebody from Fernald or FERMCO that I know."
- Leader #25** Pete Kelley (FERMCO).
- Leader #38** Wally Quaider (DOE).
- Leader #37** Probably DOE, if it has to do with progress of cleanup. They would have oversight of FERMCO, I would assume. Regarding jobs or procurement, I would go to FERMCO Procurement office.
- Leader #06** Public Affairs.
- Leader #41** FRESH group -- not easy to get a hold of Ken Morgan (DOE) -- bad telephone access.
- Leader #48** Pete Kelley (FERMCO) or others in Public Affairs.
- Leader #36** Public Environmental Information Center.
- Leader #19** Pete Kelley (FERMCO).
- Leader #10** "I'd make my first contact to Jack Hoopes, head of Public Information for FERMCO. I might contact Lisa Crawford, FRESH. I might ask for information from Sarah Snyder [FERMCO] -- she's probably the first person I'd go to."
- Leader #08** Would go to a community meeting for additional information, but said people feel intimidated by FRESH members at meetings.

Leader #41 Would call Lisa Crawford.

Leader #43 Chief operating officer: I'd like to come out and sit down with you.

Leader #09 Gary Stegner, DOE, or the DOE site manager.

Respondents' Attendance at Fernald Site Community Meetings

	<u>Interviewee Ever Attended A Community Meeting?</u>	<u>Number of Meetings Interviewee Has Attended During Last 12 Months</u>	<u>Opinion of Community Meeting Usefulness</u>	<u>Preferred DAY for Community Meetings</u>	<u>Preferred TIME for Community Meetings</u>
Leader #15	Yes	15-20	6	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #18	Yes	9	8	No opinion	No opinion
Leader #27	Yes	3	9	Saturdays, weeknights	Evenings
Leader #16	Yes	Dozens	9	Not Tuesdays	7 p.m.- 9 p.m.
Leader #29	Yes	1	8	Wednesday or Thursday	7 p.m.
Leader #17	Yes	2	3	Weeknight	7:30 p.m.
Leader #28	Yes	All	10	Not Thursday	After 6 p.m.
Leader #32	Yes	50	7	Tuesday	7:30 p.m.
Leader #31	Yes	Dozens	7	Tuesday, Saturday	Evenings
Leader #50	Yes	12	No comment.	Wednesday	Evening
Leader #23	Yes	0	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #14	Yes	40	5	No comment.	Before 6 p.m.
Leader #24	Yes	6	7	Weeknights, Saturday	7:30 p.m. or 8:30 a.m.
Leader #34	Yes	6	5	Tuesday, Thursday	Evening
Leader #04	Yes	4	7	Weeknight	Evenings

	<i><u>Interviewee Ever Attended A Community Meeting?</u></i>	<i><u>Number of Meetings Interviewee Has Attended During Last 12 Months</u></i>	<i><u>Opinion of Community Meeting Usefulness</u></i>	<i><u>Preferred DAY for Community Meetings</u></i>	<i><u>Preferred TIME for Community Meetings</u></i>
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	4-5	10	Monday - Friday	7 p.m.
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	5	8	Any Day	After 7 p.m.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	1	4	Any Day	Mid-afternoon
<i>Leader #26</i>	Yes	1	7	Weekdays	Any
<i>Leader #03</i>	Yes	10	9	Day	5 p.m. or 5:30 p.m.
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	3	5	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	15	6	Tuesday or Wednesday	7:30 p.m.
<i>Leader #13</i>	Yes	0	2	Monday - Friday	Mornings
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	More than 1	5	Wednesday	Evenings
<i>Leader #30</i>	Yes	5-6	10	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	15-20	7	Weekdays	After 5 p.m.
<i>Leader #38</i>	Yes	5	9	Any	Any
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	24	8	Tuesday and Thursday	7 p.m.- 9 p.m.
<i>Leader #48</i>	Yes	2 per month	8	Wednesday	Evening or afternoon
<i>Leader #35</i>	Yes	No comment.	8	Thursday	Evenings

	<i><u>Interviewee Ever Attended A Community Meeting?</u></i>	<i><u>Number of Meetings Interviewee Has Attended During Last 12 Months</u></i>	<i><u>Opinion of Community Meeting Usefulness</u></i>	<i><u>Preferred DAY for Community Meetings</u></i>	<i><u>Preferred TIME for Community Meetings</u></i>
<i>Leader #19</i>	Yes	3	10	Not Monday or Tuesday	7 p.m., 8 p.m.
<i>Leader #10</i>	Yes	3	7	Monday - Thursday	7:30 p.m.
<i>Leader #08</i>	Yes	1	6	Wednesday	7 p.m.
<i>Leader #43</i>	Yes	1	9	Monday - Friday	Evenings
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	All	8	Tuesday or Wednesday	7 p.m. - 9 p.m.
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	0	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Saturday	Morning
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Weekdays	Evenings
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	0	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Monday	Evenings
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Monday - Friday	Day times
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Not Friday	After 4 p.m.
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Wednesday	7 p.m.-9 p.m.

	<i><u>Interviewee Ever Attended A Community Meeting?</u></i>	<i><u>Number of Meetings Interviewee Has Attended During Last 12 Months</u></i>	<i><u>Opinion of Community Meeting Usefulness</u></i>	<i><u>Preferred DAY for Community Meetings</u></i>	<i><u>Preferred TIME for Community Meetings</u></i>
<i>Leader #02</i>	No	No comment.	5	Monday	7 a.m.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Wednesday	7:30 p.m.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Tuesday or Thursday	10 a.m.
<i>Leader #42</i>	No	0	No comment.	Tuesday, Thursday	Evening
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	0	No comment.	Tuesday, Wednesday	7 p.m.

Respondents' Use of the Public Environmental Information Center (PEIC)

	<u>Ever Used PEIC?</u>	<u>Is the PEIC Location Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Comments</u>	<u>Are the PEIC's Hours Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Opinion of PEIC's Usefulness</u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	5
<i>Leader #40</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	9
<i>Leader #18</i>	Yes	Yes	Doesn't know the hours.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	10
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	10
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	8
<i>Leader #50</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Doesn't know the hours.	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	Yes	Yes	I have also used the Harrison Library. Probably no more than 10 % of the public uses the PEIC.	Yes	5
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	9
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	Yes	"As much as they can be. I just have so little time any more."	No comment.	7

	<u>Ever Used PEIC?</u>	<u>Is the PEIC Location Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Comments</u>	<u>Are the PEIC's Hours Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Opinion of PEIC's Usefulness</u>
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	9
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	Yes and No. Everybody should keep the reading rooms at the library.	Not convenient	No. Start later, and keep more evening hours.	7
<i>Leader #48</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	8
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	Yes	No comment.	Yes	8
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.

	<u>Ever Used PEIC?</u>	<u>Is the PEIC Location Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Comments</u>	<u>Are the PEIC's Hours Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Opinion of PEIC's Usefulness</u>
<i>Leader #20</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No. Has been there, but hasn't used it.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.

	<u>Ever Used PEIC?</u>	<u>Is the PEIC Location Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Comments</u>	<u>Are the PEIC's Hours Convenient?</u>	<u>Interviewee Opinion of PEIC's Usefulness</u>
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	I know the PEIC exists, but I have not used it. Its accessibility is very limited. There should be a way to access information by computer.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #19</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #10</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	Yes	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.

Respondents' Rating of Assistance or Information Provided by Fernald Site Organizations Contacted

	<u>Agencies Contacted</u>	<u>Satisfaction With Agencies</u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	Just about all of them.	U.S. EPA 6; Ohio EPA 8; DOE 8
<i>Leader #40</i>	Contacts organizations when they directly affect respondent.	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	All	DOE-FN 10; Ohio EPA 8; U.S. EPA 5;
<i>Leader #47</i>	FERMCO	FERMCO 10
<i>Leader #36</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Wrote to Senator Dole, Secretary O'Leary, Congressman Portman, Senator Metzenbaum, Senator Glenn. Senators, Congressmen (state and federal). DOE is present at retirees' meetings -- and some FERMCO reps.	Senators/Congressmen 5; DOE 5;
<i>Leader #28</i>	FERMCO, DOE, Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA.	FERMCO 5; DOE 8; USEPA 8; Ohio EPA 8

	<u>Agencies Contacted</u>	<u>Satisfaction With Agencies</u>
Leader #32	FERMCO, DOE, U.S. EPA, Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,	FERMCO 8; DOE 8; Ohio EPA 8; U.S. EPA 8 Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry/ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 8
Leader #31	DOE, EPA, FERMCO.	DOE 6; U.S. EPA 7.5; FERMCO 4
Leader #50	FERMCO, Ohio EPA.	FERMCO, 10; Graham Mitchell, Ohio EPA 10
Leader #23	FERMCO and DOE.	FERMCO 10; DOE 10
Leader #14	FERMCO, U.S. EPA, DOE,	Overall 8-9
Leader #24	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #34	DOE, FERMCO, Westinghouse -- involving various public things needed to be done (example: public water supply).	DOE 10; FERMCO 8; Westinghouse 9
Leader #04	DOE and FERMCO.	DOE 9; FERMCO 9
Leader #45	Contacted FERMCO for speakers.	FERMCO 8
Leader #20	Department of Transportation, FERMCO, Ohio EPA, Gray-Pape.	DOE 10; FERMCO 10; Ohio EPA 10
Leader #21	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #39	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #05	Danis, FERMCO, DOE.	Danis 10; FERMCO 9; DOE 9

	<u>Agencies Contacted</u>	<u>Satisfaction With Agencies</u>
<i>Leader #12</i>	FERMCO, WEMCO, Rust.	FERMCO 10; WEMCO 10; Rust 10
<i>Leader #26</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	DOE, Fluor Daniel, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, University of Cincinnati.	DOE 7; Fluor Daniel 9; U.S. EPA 8
<i>Leader #46</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	"DOE -- I've written letters. EPA. I don't think I've ever written anything to the contractor. Verbally. . . that's a different story."	DOE 6; U.S. EPA 7; Contractors 6
<i>Leader #16</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	FERMCO, DOE, FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force.	FERMCO 8; DOE 6; Fernald Citizens Task Force 8; FRESH 8
<i>Leader #11</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	DOE, Fluor Daniel.	DOE 10; Fluor Daniel 10
<i>Leader #02</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	All mentioned before.	FERMCO 7; DOE 7; FRESH 8;
<i>Leader #38</i>	No comment.	No comment.

	<u>Agencies Contacted</u>	<u>Satisfaction With Agencies</u>
<i>Leader #37</i>	FERMCO, DOE, Ohio EPA.	FERMCO 2.5; DOE 6; Ohio EPA 5
<i>Leader #06</i>	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, EPA, DOE, FERMCO.	FERMCO 9; U.S. EPA 8; DOE 8
<i>Leader #41</i>	DOE, EPA, government officials, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.	DOE 6; U.S. EPA 3; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 9; Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry 9
<i>Leader #48</i>	Congressman John Boehner (water issue).	FERMCO 7; Westinghouse 9; DOE 3
<i>Leader #35</i>	DOE for information on problems.	DOE 9; FERMCO 9; WEMCO 9; NLO 9
<i>Leader #19</i>	FERMCO	FERMCO 10
<i>Leader #10</i>	Works at the University of Cincinnati and has been involved. Has not contacted agencies about Fernald-related issues. Has contacted the University of Cincinnati and Miami University (not about Fernald.)	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #09</i>	EPA (Ohio), DOE-HQ, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Hamilton County Commissioners, politicians.	U.S. EPA 7; DOE 7; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 7

Respondents' Opinions of Bias/Balance of information from the Fernald Site Information

<i>Leader #015</i> 7	<i>Leader #40</i> 5	<i>Leader #18</i> 5
<i>Leader #27</i> 3	<i>Leader #47</i> 5	<i>Leader #36</i> No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i> 8	<i>Leader #16</i> 9	<i>Leader #22</i> No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i> 8	<i>Leader #17</i> 8	<i>Leader #28</i> 8
<i>Leader #32</i> 8	<i>Leader #31</i> 6	<i>Leader #50</i> 6-7
<i>Leader #23</i> No comment.	<i>Leader #14</i> 7	<i>Leader #24</i> 8
<i>Leader #34</i> 9	<i>Leader #04</i> 9	<i>Leader #45</i> No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i> 8	<i>Leader #21</i> 7	<i>Leader #39</i> No comment.
<i>Leader #05</i> 8	<i>Leader #12</i> 8	<i>Leader #26</i> 8
<i>Leader #03</i> 10	<i>Leader #46</i> 4	<i>Leader #01</i> 4
<i>Leader #13</i> No comment.	<i>Leader #33</i> 8	<i>Leader #44</i> 8
<i>Leader #11</i> 9	<i>Leader #30</i> 5	<i>Leader #02</i> 8
<i>Leader #07</i> 8	<i>Leader #25</i> 7	<i>Leader #38</i> 5
<i>Leader #37</i> 5	<i>Leader #06</i> 6	<i>Leader #41</i> 5
<i>Leader #48</i> No comment.	<i>Leader #35</i> 7	<i>Leader #19</i> No comment.
<i>Leader #10</i> 6	<i>Leader #08</i> 7	<i>Leader #41</i> 7
<i>Leader #43</i> 8	<i>Leader #09</i> 5	

Rating of Fernald Managements Efforts to Inform the Public About Fernald Site Cleanup

- Leader #15*** 8 Gave a rating of "8-plus" -- said effort has been put into informing the public about cleanup.
- Leader #40*** 6 The Fernald site puts out a lot of information, but not sure how much people read if they don't care.
- Leader #18*** 7 There is a wealth of data; the Fernald site has done well in offering materials to people. Materials are well written, but still doubts getting the whole story because people in high positions have lied to the interviewee and played games in the past.
- Leader #27*** 5 The Fernald site has given out a lot of information, but it may not be in an understandable form -- seems to be one extreme or the other! Need to decide what is essential and what's not -- there is an overload of information. Set up a computer base for information, rather than using paper.
- Leader #47*** 8 Because of all the newsletters, meetings, publications, press releases.
- Leader #36*** 4 Imagines the Fernald site does a decent job of disseminating information, but the audience must be willing to be informed. If it's not in their own back yard, individuals probably won't care to learn.
- Leader #49*** 7 The Fernald site has tried to be open and honest with the public.
- Leader #16*** 7-8 Gets all of the information he needs -- it's difficult.
- Leader #22*** 8 Always getting something in the mail. The Fernald site is trying to keep the public informed and are making every effort.
- Leader #29*** 7 Still not sure the public understands the information given to them.
- Leader #17*** 3 Exposure of work being performed is low-level.
- Leader #28*** 8 Responsive to requests for meetings, workshops, etc.
- Leader #32*** 8 Responsive to requests for meetings -- taking more proactive approaches.
- Leader #31*** 7 They are trying. In fact, the Fernald site is "meeting" the public to death. In previous years, would have rated the Fernald site efforts to inform the public about cleanup with "1."

- Leader #50** 4 A "4" rating, because historically, the Fernald site's efforts have not been so good, but they're improving today. On a national level, the culture of secrecy is changing. The residents' lawsuit helped openness.
- Leader #23** 9 All the way from a "2" to a "9." What gets in the press isn't necessarily what Fernald is saying. What Fernald is doing in schools is something different. If something is mailed to every home, it's considered propaganda. People like Sue Walpole, FERMCO Public Affairs, working with schools is a "10."
- Leader #14** 9 Information is available, and questions are answered, but not sure how relevant the public's questions are to cleanup.
- Leader #24** 7-8 The Fernald site has had a number of public meetings, cooperated in forming citizens task force and indicated willingness and effort to keep public informed.
- Leader #34** 8 Receives bulletins, attends FRESH meetings, and as a township trustee, receives phone calls all of the time. Is informed beforehand when something is going to happen.
- Leader #04** 7 Would, perhaps, rate Fernald site efforts to inform the public about cleanup higher more recently. There has been an effort to make public meetings more user-friendly and accessible. The newsletter is more streamlined and concise.
- Leader #45** 8 Fernald site personnel are willing to speak -- there is a speakers bureau, and FERMCO Executive Vice President John Rasile spoke at meetings.
- Leader #20** 10 Mentioned the Fernald site mailings and public meetings as efforts to inform the public about cleanup. Calls FRESH members Lisa Crawford or Edwa Yocum, the trustees and the newspapers. Said the mailing library is unbelievable.
- Leader #21** 6 Feels like Fernald has attempted to keep the public informed -- what individuals of the public do depends upon their interest.
- Leader #39** 7 Some people at school get newsletters. Interviewee lives in the community, but does not get Fernald site newsletters.
- Leader #05** 9 There is so much information; people just don't take advantage of it. People like rumors better.
- Leader #12** 7 The information is available, for the most part. Opportunities for meetings are available.

- Leader #26* 8 The Fernald site has done a very good job of making information available. If there's a problem, it's understanding the information, not the availability of it.
- Leader #03* 10 Pretty comprehensive, proactive community education/community involvement processes. They still have to do this under CERCLA; however, the Fernald site personnel have gone out of their way.
- Leader #46* 10 "10-plus." They overwhelm people with information to the point where they don't read it anymore -- it's overkill.
- Leader #01* 6 "They've improved somewhat over the last couple of years. I think they're finally realizing that we have the ear of some people in Washington, and they just can't stall us any more. I think the first several years -- that's what they did -- is tell them what they want to hear and go on. That's what Nick Kaufman tried to do. 'No, he just told us, 'I'm not going to do it that way.' That's why he did not last. I think Westinghouse got away with a lot more than they should have, e.g. everything but cleanup. Those contractors are supposed to be working for the people as well. What is government? It's our tax money. I have no problem with them making a profit, but I don't like to see them raping our money. They should be accountable for what they spend, and I know DOE doesn't keep close enough track of them. That's the trouble with bureaucracies."
- Leader #13* 5 Seems like the Fernald site is always on the defensive. The lobbyist group always makes charges -- management provides answers.
- Leader #33* 10 Assumes everything they are saying is correct.
- Leader #44* 5 "They've probably tried [to inform the public about cleanup at the Fernald site]. I don't know if that's their job to do. There's been a limited amount of information that's come across on how cleanup is going."
- Leader #11* 8 The Fernald site corresponds with the interviewee regularly.
- Leader #30* 7 Westinghouse and FERMCO have done a decent job. Civic groups/local governments help too.
- Leader #02* 8 "I think they're really making an effort to communicate -- in written form and through newspaper. I think they could do a little bit better job through other media -- TV, the community access channel. I think they're working hard at it."

- Leader #07** 7 "It's been very good. I think what's gone out and the effort to inform has been far superior than what has been received."
- Leader #25** 9 If everybody gets everything the interviewee gets, they ought to know what's going on.
- Leader #38** 2 The Fernald site has done a very poor job of informing the public about cleanup.
- Leader #37** 2 From the vendors' perspective and people who want to participate in cleanup, there has been no participation in the kind of jobs cleanup will produce. No information on what kinds of jobs will be needed. It seems questions aren't answered and follow-up doesn't occur. This is the most damaging thing for FERMCO.
- Leader #06** 7 Seems at some meetings people do not receive enough information. Some information is very complex.
- Leader #41** 3 Poor -- most ordinary people don't tend to have a whole lot of information. There is a need for clearer information, and a need to make obtaining information easier.
- Leader #48** 7 Communications are excellent, but too much attention given to FRESH President Lisa Crawford in newspaper articles.
- Leader #35** 7 The public is sick and tired of listening to FRESH members at public meetings.
- Leader #19** 9 Receive mailings and printout sheets on environmental monitoring. Involved in Crosby Township government; calls Pete Kelley, FERMCO Public Affairs, if there is a question.
- Leader #10** 7 "I think there's been a sincere effort on the part of the people at Fernald in the last couple of years to provide information to the public and to make information available when it's requested. I've not felt any protectiveness of information. Fernald has tried to inform the public, but I don't think the public is particularly informed. That has to do with lack of information on the part of the public. Unless you live close to the site, you're probably not going to pay any attention to it."
- Leader #08** 8 "The publications are probably the biggest source for the general public. Even the news releases that are made are factual and help the public also be aware of some of the events that are happening. Some of it might be a little [too] technical."
- Leader #41** 5 The news releases.

Leader #43 3-4 This is a difficult deal. Good news doesn't get press attention. The Fernald site hasn't enlisted an advocate.

Leader #09 5 In the beginning, the Fernald site was reluctant to give information. For the last year, Westinghouse was at the Fernald site, communications improved. There was little communication during FERMCO's first year, but over the last few months, FERMCO has improved.

Respondents' Opinion of Frequency of Fernald Site Communications

	<u>Communications Too Frequent</u>	<u>Communications About Right</u>	<u>Communications Not Frequent Enough</u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No	Yes
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #16</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #22</i>	Yes	No	No
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #17</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #28</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #32</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #31</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #23</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #14</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #24</i>	No	Yes	No

	<u>Communications Too Frequent</u>	<u>Communications About Right</u>	<u>Communications Not Frequent Enough</u>
<i>Leader #34</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #20</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #05</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #12</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #03</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	No	No
<i>Leader #01</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	No	No
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No	Yes
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #02</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No	No

	<u>Communications Too Frequent</u>	<u>Communications About Right</u>	<u>Communications Not Frequent Enough</u>
<i>Leader #25</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #06</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #42</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #48</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #19</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #10</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No	No
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Leader #09</i>	No	Yes	No

Respondents' Receipt of Sufficient Information to Become Involved in the Decision-Making Process

	<i><u>Informed Enough to be Involved in the Fernald Decision-making Process?</u></i>	<i><u>Reason</u></i>
<i>Leader #15</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	Personal decision how involved to become.
<i>Leader #24</i>	Yes	Too much information.
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	Yes	No comment.

	<u><i>Informed Enough to be Involved in the Fernald Decision-making Process?</i></u>	<u><i>Reason</i></u>
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	"Somewhat."
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	If he wants to know more, he could get it.
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #19</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #10</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	Yes	"This is a loaded question. It might still be too technical. [Has received enough information to become involved in the decision-making process regarding] the removal of sludge from waste pits."
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	No comment.

Respondents' Involvement in Fernald-Related Activities/Issues

	<i><u>Would Like to be More Involved</u></i>	<i><u>Activities/Issues In Which Interviewees Would Like More Involvement</u></i>
<i>Leader #36</i>	Yes	Would like to be informed, not necessarily involved, and would like to be more informed with a general overview of the Fernald site and the cleanup solutions being considered.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved in everything.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved as time permits. Is interested in appropriate and experimental cleanup methods.
<i>Leader #14</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved with issues involving radionuclide migration on and off site, as well as activities involving public information and the education program -- particularly with regard to the educational curricula (math, chemistry, geology).
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	Already very involved, particularly in issues and activities involving the Public Water Supply.
<i>Leader #39</i>	Yes	Would like the site to be more involved with Crosby Elementary School -- believes this would be helpful to the parents. Suggested that Fernald site personnel participate in "Career Days" at the school.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	"I'm concerned about this whole decision process as it goes down. They need more formalized public involvement. After you get past the draft ROD, there's nothing mandated. It (Draft Interim Community Relations Plan) says agency 'may' incorporate into the final document. . . . It's <i>our</i> lives. I don't like that. Granted, they're supposed to be the experts, but they're human too. They need to more formalize public involvement as we get down the line. They need more remedial action details. They come up with remedial design and action, but they have no details of how they expect to do it."
<i>Leader #13</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved in community awareness activities and issues.

	<u>Would Like to be More Involved</u>	<u>Activities/Issues In Which Interviewees Would Like More Involvement</u>
<i>Leader #02</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved with Fernald issues, but doesn't have time. If he did have time, he would like to be involved in activities and issues related to future use of the Fernald site.
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved with issues and activities involving: rail shipments of hazardous materials through Morgan Township, hazardous material releases on or off site, and proper and efficient site cleanup to a safe level for public use of the property.
<i>Leader #37</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved with issues and activities involving jobs, procurement and economic impacts of the Fernald site. Said the only positive thing about this whole situation is the positive economic impact and the fact that the site will be cleaned up. Interviewee has yet to see a report that shows the percentage of money spent with Ohio businesses.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved with issues and activities involving public health and communications.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	Would like to be more involved with issues and activities involving Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or health research, as well as the economic future of the community.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	Wants to be more involved with workshops, comment periods, the Public Water Supply, vitrification projects and the K-65 Silos (wants to know more about radon).
<i>Leader #47</i>	Unsure	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	Unsure	Depends on the amount of involvement. Would probably like to be involved in the public understanding of radiation.
<i>Leader #46</i>	Unsure	Unsure
<i>Leader #33</i>	Unsure	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	Unsure	No comment.

	<u>Would Like to be More Involved</u>	<u>Activities/Issues In Which Interviewees Would Like More Involvement</u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	No	Plenty involved
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	No	Couldn't be more active
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	No	Can't do much more because of the time commitment required.
<i>Leader #31</i>	No	My plate's full.
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	Too busy to get more involved.
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #05</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.

	<u>Would Like to be More Involved</u>	<u>Activities/Issues In Which Interviewees Would Like More Involvement</u>
<i>Leader #03</i>	No	It would depend. . . .
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #06</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #48</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #19</i>	No	Don't have the time.
<i>Leader #10</i>	No	"I don't feel a need to be more involved than I am now. Being a member of the advisory committee is a good level of involvement. I don't feel uninvolved."
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	Wants greater assurance he won't have to get involved. Interviewee wants to know if there is a way to be helpful. Until the Fernald site is a problem for the business community -- or until the business community recognizes such a problem, there is no issue, as far as the interviewee is concerned.

Respondents' Own Understanding of Fernald Site Problems and Issues

- Leader #15* 8 Gained understanding through involvement with the Fernald Citizens Task Force.
- Leader #40* 10 Knows much about Operable Unit 5 and the South Plume, but not much at all about Operable Units 1 through 4.
- Leader #18* 7 Has a good understanding -- conducted own calculations to verify the magnitude of the job. All bureaucracy. Contractors change -- always in a "joining-up" stage. Didn't have competition; no deadlines. Competition makes a big difference.
- Leader #27* 8 Once worked at the Fernald site (Westinghouse and DOE -- strong communication). Keeps current through the Fernald Citizens Task Force, National Community Leaders Network and mailings and newspapers.
- Leader #47* 8 Knows more than the general public, but doesn't know everything being done at Fernald.
- Leader #36* 1 Has been out of the state and was not in the area when Fernald issues surfaced.
- Leader #49* 10 Has been personally involved and has extensive technical training. At that time, he said site personnel didn't tell everything.
- Leader #16* 8 Receives a lot of information through the Fernald Citizens Task Force. Since 1985, has worked on Fernald-related projects and has attended every meeting.
- Leader #22* 3 Scans mailed materials. Doesn't get too in depth or follow it that closely. Has customers who work at Fernald -- asks them questions.
- Leader #29* 7 Worked in Plant 1 for 12.5 years -- has a good understanding. Doesn't have time to get involved. Is undecided about what is being done at Fernald. Talks to a lot of people.
- Leader #17* 8 Saw problems going on; saw the background, both good and bad. Lawful and unlawful.
- Leader #17* 10 Has been involved for 10 years.
- Leader #32* 8 People working on site every day could use "10" to rate their level of understanding about Fernald site problems/issues.

- Leader #31** 8 A local resident since 1974. Receives information through FRESH and the Fernald Citizens Task Force. Reads and keeps current.
- Leader #50** 8 Historically has followed Fernald site issues; is more scientifically trained when compared to an "average" person. Is able to see the "big picture."
- Leader #23** 9 Sue Walpole, FERMCO Public Affairs, arranged for the participants of one of the interviewee's workshop participants to go on a tour of the Fernald site. It was really fascinating. It was a delightful tour.
- Leader #14** 9 Has been attending meetings for the last 1.5 years and has read a lot of material. Attends Fernald Citizens Task Force meetings.
- Leader #24** 8 Is a Fernald Citizens Task Force member.
- Leader #34** 8 Is a long-time resident who has watched the developments since 1984, when the contamination was announced. Has read every newspaper article, has attended numerous FRESH meetings; has relatives who work at Fernald, and has received volumes of information.
- Leader #04** 6 There is so much information -- Fernald is a large site to clean up. Cleanup is complicated, so it is difficult to know much about it.
- Leader #45** 6 Has a better than average understanding of Fernald site problems/issues. Fernald site personnel have spoken at exchange club and council meetings. Knows FERMCO Executive Vice President John Rasile.
- Leader #20** 7 Has been involved since 1988; has attended many meetings. Is involved with the Public Water Supply project.
- Leader #21** 3 Is on a mailing list -- not sure which -- gets a lot of correspondence. Skims through correspondence, but hasn't read in depth. Always invited to meetings, but hasn't attended.
- Leader #39** 7 Stepfather worked as a security guard at the Fernald site for 35 years, so interviewee is not paranoid about Fernald, as many are.
- Leader #05** 7 Gained understanding by being a local resident and through information with Fernald site personnel.

- Leader #12* 6 Doesn't know all of the technical activities. Has a good general knowledge of history.
- Leader #26* 7 Receives all DOE and FERMCO mailings, including bulletins and reports. Attends emergency management meetings.
- Leader #03* 8 Is not familiar with quite a few technical engineering issues.
- Leader #46* 6 Is aware of what's going on at the Fernald site.
- Leader #01* 8 Is extensively involved, has attended many meetings and has read many documents. Asks for more information when needed.
- Leader #13* 5 Has gained level of understanding from reading the newspaper -- has followed stories in the local journal, realizing only half of the perspectives were presented.
- Leader #33* 8 Keeps up with publications and meetings.
- Leader #44* 6 "The reason it's not a '1' is because I spend a fair amount of time meeting with FERMCO, the site. The reason it's not a '10' is because there are a lot of environmental regulatory issues I don't understand."
- Leader #11* 3 Belongs to FRESH, but doesn't attend regularly. Is aggravated due to belief that DOE and NLO have told many lies.
- Leader #30* 8 For the last five years, has closely followed the Fernald site.
- Leader #02* 6 As a significant office holder in the community, interviewee tries to keep informed. Understanding of Fernald site problems/issues is above average. Relies mainly on what is read about Fernald. "I should be more involved, but . . . I haven't been able to keep as involved as I'd like to be."
- Leader #07* 9 Worked as a contractor in January 1989. "I've been watching it very carefully since."
- Leader #25* 9 Receives notices and literature in the mail. The rail line goes through his town. Keeps tabs on what goes through his town.
- Leader #38* 8 Can't even get the Fernald site cleaned up.

- Leader #37** 8 Two years ago, began obtaining knowledge, from a procurement perspective, through dealings with Ohio business interested in Fernald cleanup -- with competition for bid solicitation. Was interested in opportunities for business to participate in Fernald site cleanup. Also received input from companies on what kind of technologies could be utilized in cleanup.
- Has worked with DOE to determine public participation levels. Has read through the transcripts from the December 1993 House Energy and Commerce Committee hearing on problems at Fernald, during which FERMCO's expenditures on activities such as a company picnic, were criticized). From this, interviewee learned the opinions and environmental concerns of the DOE site manager, FERMCO president, FERMCO employees and the public.
- Leader #06** 9 Attends public and FRESH meetings regularly -- feels informed. Has a science background.
- Leader #41** 5 A lot of ambiguity, vagueness in terminology, confusing things. Give information in clear, easy to understand language.
- Leader #48** 6 Meetings keeps well-informed; is not active in FRESH and would not like to be.
- Leader #35** 7 Father is a retired pipe fitter who worked 30 years at the Fernald site.
- Leader #19** 0 Doesn't know what's involved.
- Leader #10** 7 "I think I understand the issues involved. I don't have a technical understanding. I know a lot more than I did in September 1993."
- Leader #08** 7 "FRESH -- it's become a real job with those people. They almost seem like they hope this thing could go on forever."
- "What knowledge I have is from what I read from the newspaper. I see a lot of young people involved in the cleanup. I'd like to see more older people. I'd like to see some old eggheads -- people who have been involved and who are aware of what's going on over there. It just seems very complicated."
- "FRESH -- I think they feel they might have been lied to. It's complicated as to what has to be done." At the public meeting on waste pits, interviewee spoke to an expert on odds -- what the odds were for transportation accidents. I thought, 'My God, this will go on forever.' Let's get on with the business." Interviewee feels Fernald site waste should be transported by rail.

- Leader #41* 5 Gained understanding about Fernald site problems/issues through the local newspaper, but in the past, had very little knowledge.
- Leader #43* 3-4 Knowledge about the Fernald site comes from what interviewee reads in the newspaper. Feels the Fernald site is not the most important issue for the business community. Follows public meetings and issues.
- Leader #09* 8 Understands alternatives and money does drive decisions. Knows the problems. Realizes it takes a while to understand cleanup methods being considered -- other than money. Takes a while to learn locations, problems with the cleanup, the difference between construction wastes and hazardous wastes and which laws apply to each.

Respondents' Own Understanding of Solutions

<i>Leader #15</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	10	Has some understanding of the South Plume and of Operable units 1-4.
<i>Leader #18</i>	9	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	8	The Fernald Citizens Task force has to take into account proposed solutions.
<i>Leader #47</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	1	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #28</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	6	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	6	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	6-7	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	8-9	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	6-7	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	6	No comment.

<i>Leader #45</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	4	Does not know much at this time.
<i>Leader #05</i>	6	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	6	Doesn't know all of the technical activities. Has a good general knowledge of the history.
<i>Leader #26</i>	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	6	Is familiar with some of the cleanup efforts. Doesn't have technical expertise.
<i>Leader #11</i>	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	10	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	5	No comment.

- Leader #06** 9 No comment.
- Leader #41** 5 No comment.
- Leader #48** 6 Knows there is concern about moving and containing the waste.
- Leader #35** 4 No comment.
- Leader #19** 5 No comment.
- Leader #10** 5 No comment.
- Leader #08** 5 "I don't have a degree in engineering or chemistry. I'm basically relying on what I read in the newspaper."

"I don't know if anyone has, at anytime -- and I don't know if this is policy (I don't know the complexity) -- really knows how dangerous this is."

"The aquifer -- that was the first we heard this is a concern. I keyed in on that, thinking here's a tremendous water source that is being polluted. How dangerous is it -- what is the level? I don't know that anyone knows that. Pumping this to the Great Miami River -- what's the solution -- dilution to the pollution?"
- Leader #41** 3 No comment.
- Leader #43** 2-3 "6" as a chamber.
- Leader #09** 5 No comment.

Respondents' Opinion of Public Understanding of Fernald Site Problems and Issues

- Leader #15*** 3 Newspaper information -- very complicated issues and trade offs. Conflicting desires -- hard to communicate.
- Leader #40*** 2 The Fernald site is contaminated -- screwed up.
- Leader #18*** 3 The public either doesn't have sufficient information, or it has it and doesn't understand it -- doesn't understand the nature or volume of material.
- Leader #27*** 3 Ignorance, misinformation (neighbors, TV, newspapers and even public meetings). People just don't care, but they're quick to complain.
- Leader #47*** 4 People have no idea what the cleanup options are.
- Leader #36*** 3 Most people read the paper, but people's knowledge of issues is disheartening. People are involved in their own issues and interests. Interviewee can't keep up with issues other than those which personally affect interviewee. Doesn't have time to read about things which don't affect interviewee personally.
- Leader #49*** 2 The public doesn't understand "radiation" is not a bad term. We live in radiation. The media doesn't help -- it fuels the fears.
- Leader #16*** 4 The public doesn't know too much -- there is not a lot of concern. Since the beginning, people haven't cared. They are not interested enough to care.
- Leader #22*** 3 Unless you're talking about Lisa Crawford or Pamela Dunn of FRESH -- who are right on the scene and active followers -- the public doesn't understand or want to understand.
- Leader #29*** 4 The public doesn't understand. Interviewee talks to many people, who think the radiation levels are high. The news media do not help -- they create sensationalism.
- Leader #17*** 6 "4" When WEMCO first came in; "6" now.
- Leader #28*** 5-7 Depends on which group. FRESH has a higher level of understanding.
- Leader #32*** 2 Based on direct interface with the general public.
- Leader #31*** 3 They know it's there, but most people don't have a clue.

- Leader #50** 3-4 Gave a mid-school talk about Fernald. Teachers enjoyed the talk, but they had not realized the issues. People were less aware than he thought.
- Leader #23** 2 The general public doesn't have the science background. They are too emotionally involved. They believe what they read in the press. There is a strong rumor mill which has no foundation. The public doesn't understand what the original mission of the plant was.
- Leader #14** 3 There is a lack of comprehensive technical, geological and medical education and a general perception of nuclear science being equated to nuclear holocaust.
- Leader #24** 2-3 The subject matter is just so complex. Doesn't know how any member of the public could understand. Doesn't reflect a shortcoming, the subject matter is just too complex.
- Leader #34** 3 The general public doesn't seem to be aware of what's been done. There are still some people who think they make feed products at Fernald. There's a small group that is very aware, but others who don't keep up on current events. There's a lack of community awareness and lack of involvement by residents. It's not the plant's fault. The information is being sent out.
- These people don't read newspapers either. An example is at a recent meeting a man asked why we couldn't tap into the existing water system which runs from the site to the river -- it's a cleansing system, *not* a water supply!
- Leader #04** 4 Generally, people are not involved in technicalities of solutions -- they just want to know if "it" (problems) will be done and when.
- Leader #45** 3 Doesn't think people really realize what is out there. They were shocked when they saw pictures used at council meetings by Fernald speakers.
- Leader #20** 3 Amount of very technical information. Doesn't think a lot of individuals in the general public understand the information.
- Leader #21** 3 No comment.
- Leader #39** 5 Does not talk about it much. Teachers at school do not say much.
- Leader #05** 4 Because people don't take the time to understand what is going on; they listen to too many rumors, and things get out of control.

-
- | | | |
|-------------------|----|--|
| <i>Leader #12</i> | 5 | Not sure people are as involved -- or take the time -- to learn more. Depends on what they consider their level of risk. |
| <i>Leader #26</i> | 3 | There is so much information out there, and a lot of it is technical. People may not understand the technical jargon and technical nature. There may be misunderstanding of information because of the technical nature of what's being done at Fernald. |
| <i>Leader #03</i> | 6 | Overall, it's hard to say. Some have a good understanding of the site. At meetings, a few people that did understand, but there was a significant number who didn't understand the basic concepts of the processes of production or remediation. |
| <i>Leader #46</i> | 3 | Nobody seems to be able to understand what's going on. |
| <i>Leader #01</i> | 4 | "We only have so much time and energy." |
| <i>Leader #13</i> | 5 | Based on letters to editors, half feel informed; half is scared to death. |
| <i>Leader #33</i> | 5 | Because interviewee only gets information from media, so it may not be correct. |
| <i>Leader #44</i> | 2 | "I don't think most people care." |
| <i>Leader #11</i> | 2 | Anyone interviewee has ever talked to knows absolutely nothing. A nearby neighbor, who has lived there 60 years, admitted she knew nothing about the plant. |
| <i>Leader #30</i> | 7 | A "7" rating for local people. Not everyone cares. People in the Crosby area are very concerned. Most people are aware. |
| <i>Leader #02</i> | 4 | "It involves something that doesn't affect families directly. There are too many other issues. I don't think it's so much a public relations problem -- I think it's a 'people' problem. It's our problem because we don't take the time." |
| <i>Leader #07</i> | 1 | "I think it's very complex. The emotionalism surrounding the problems has been extreme. The media has done far more to confuse the issues than to clarify and shed light. The political opportunities have been exploited." |
| <i>Leader #25</i> | 5 | People don't really get involved until it's knocking at their doors. People don't get involved until it affects them directly. |
| <i>Leader #38</i> | 10 | No comment. |

- Leader #37** 3 Vendors feel they should be in there. Most people don't understand the decision-making process. People don't understand why it takes so long to get to the cleanup phase. Fernald is a critical site because it is over an aquifer. Only people in the immediate area would know this. The broader public would not know this.
- Sees cleanup as an asset -- as an opportunity from a state perspective -- to be the first place to be remediated under an Environmental Restoration Management Contractor. This is an opportunity to have a national and international model for cleanup of nuclear sites -- if successful.
- A lot of the public doesn't participate in workshops and public meetings. They have contacts with people who do attend, however.
- Leader #41** 3 Should find out, but no one has the time to hang out at the Public Environmental Information Center or reading room.
- Leader #48** 7 The Fernald site is truly a deep concern to people -- health and money are concerns.
- Leader #35** 3 The FRESH group is knowledgeable, but doesn't know about others. Only negative stuff is covered by the press.
- Leader #19** 7 At Crosby Township meetings, FRESH members tell their story, and the liaison gives a report. If there are questions, people call Pete Kelley, FERMCO Public Affairs.
- Leader #10** 3 "Broad public."
- Leader #08** 5 Doesn't know if anyone truly understands the dangers at the Fernald site and the complexity of the problems. "I'm not a member of FRESH. That group appears to be well-informed."
- Leader #41** 2 Interviewees' neighbors know very little about Fernald site problems.
- Leader #43** 2-3 Gets knowledge about Fernald site problems from the newspaper and electronic media (which is negative). People don't read mailings. The problem is better understood than the solutions. Thinks there's a negative view of Fernald.
- Leader #09** 1 It has taken so long to catch on. The public must do everything possible -- attend meetings, read documents -- to understand the issues. For the average person, it's a knowledge-building process over time. Meetings are becoming better and more understandable.

Respondents' Opinion of Public Understanding of Solutions

<i>Leader #15</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	5	Put out a lot of information -- descriptions and procedures. Processes have been put in lay terms.
<i>Leader #27</i>	2	The public may know some problems, but may not have any idea of solutions. Was asked by a teacher why the Fernald site is dumping everything at Rumpke -- the interviewee had to clarify that only some fly ash was being placed at Rumpke.
<i>Leader #47</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	1	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	6	"4" (1986-1992); "6" (1992-present).
<i>Leader #17</i>	5-7	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	2-3	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	1	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	6	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	2-3	No comment.

<i>Leader #34</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	4	Knows a few members of the public are very involved.
<i>Leader #05</i>	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	6	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	1	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	7	For the concerned public.
<i>Leader #02</i>	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	1	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	7	No comment.

- Leader #37* 2 The solutions being considered or proposed are not well understood. Doesn't believe EPA knows the best way for cleanup. Ohio EPA is involved in the sign-off on cleanup, but there's no way a one-person shop can make us believe they have a great understanding to appropriately assess all of the technical sections.
- Leader #06* 8 No comment.
- Leader #41* 3 No comment.
- Leader #48* 4 No comment.
- Leader #35* 3 No comment.
- Leader #19* 5 No comment.
- Leader #10* 3 "Except for people who are technically oriented or familiar with Fernald (FRESH), I don't think the average citizen of the Greater Cincinnati area understands the degree of 'pollution' of the site, nor do I believe they understand the technical abilities to clean it up. I just don't think the general public has a perception of the scope of the problem, nor of the technical complexities of the problem."
- Leader #08* 4 No comment.
- Leader #41* 3 No comment.
- Leader #43* 1-2 Convince community members they are able and willing to cure the problem, assuming the federal government will provide funding through completion. FERMCO is the third operator -- a clear "game plan" is needed.
- Leader #09* 1 No comment.

Respondents' Awareness of Agencies/Organizations Involved in Fernald Site Cleanup

- Leader #15** DOE, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, FERMCO, Fluor Daniel, Jacobs Engineering, FATLC, trades union, FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force.
- Leader #40** FERMCO, DOE, U.S. EPA.
- Leader #18** No comment.
- Leader #27** U.S. EPA, FERMCO, Ohio EPA, Rust, DOE (Headquarters, Fernald), Fluor Daniel.
- Leader #47** FERMCO, DOE, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, Fluor Daniel.
- Leader #36** DOE.
- Leader #49** DOE, FERMCO, WEMCO.
- Leader #16** FERMCO and subcontractors (Jacobs Engineering Group).
- Leader #22** FERMCO, Westinghouse.
- Leader #29** NLO. Has leased space to subcontractors working at Fernald specialty systems. Has sold homes to lots of employees and subcontractors.
- Leader #17** Prime contractors, some subcontractors.
- Leader #28** FERMCO, Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA, FATLC, Greater Cincinnati Building and Trades Union, FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force, other subcontractors.
- Leader #32** FERMCO, DOE, Parsons, Advanced Sciences Incorporated, IT, FRESH, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, Fernald Citizens Task Force, Battelle, University of Cincinnati, Catholic Universities, Rust, Martech U.S.A., Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Leader #31** U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, DOE, FERMCO, Ebasco, Martech U.S.A., Advanced Sciences Incorporated/IT.
- Leader #50** FERMCO, Westinghouse, Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA, DOE, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Leader #23** Medical agencies (health monitoring).

-
- Leader #14** U.S. EPA, DOE, Westinghouse, Fluor Daniel, FERMCO, Environmental Resource Association.
- Leader #24** DOE, FERMCO, FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA.
- Leader #34** DOE, FERMCO, Westinghouse, Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA, Rust Engineering.
- Leader #04** FERMCO, DOE, Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA.
- Leader #45** FERMCO
- Leader #20** DOE, FERMCO, Ohio EPA, Gray-Pape (archaeology).
- Leader #21** FERMCO -- only know management companies.
- Leader #39** DOE, FERMCO, Westinghouse, U.S. EPA, National Lead.
- Leader #05** FERMCO, Danis, PENN Drilling, Martech U.S.A.
- Leader #12** FERMCO, WEMCO, Rust.
- Leader #26** No comment.
- Leader #03** DOE, Fluor Daniel, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, University of Cincinnati.
- Leader #46** FERMCO
- Leader #01** "FERMCO. I forget a lot of the little subcontractors; they've changed a lot of them. Some have even introduced themselves to me, but I can't remember. I just draw a blank. A lot of that is probably my fault for shoving names aside and trying to concentrate on the thing I was working on. The building trades are important out there. They're just one of the groups I remember that's out there."
- Leader #13** Westinghouse (was); FERMCO -- not sure if current contractor; DOE.
- Leader #33** No comment.
- Leader #44** FERMCO, DOE, FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force.
- Leader #11** No comment.
-

- Leader #30** DOE, Fluor Daniel.
- Leader #02** Doesn't know.
- Leader #07** "DOE; FERMCO, a subsidiary of a major . . . ; I knew folks from Westinghouse; Parsons Engineering. NLO and the NLI connections are totally severed, but I know of their having been involved in operating the plant. [U.S.] EPA, Ohio EPA (monitoring agencies looking over the shoulder). I don't know [U.S.] EPA and Ohio EPA are involved in actually setting the plans."
- Leader #25** FERMCO has the contract -- that's Fluor Daniel. DOE, FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force (which he's not too pleased with), trustees, Butler and Hamilton County Emergency Management.
- Leader #38** DOE
- Leader #37** Fluor Daniel, DOE, Ohio EPA, Department of Health (person from radiation office).
- Leader #06** Ohio EPA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, DOE, FERMCO, FRESH, emergency preparedness agencies, Red Cross agencies.
- Leader #41** DOE, U.S. EPA, FERMCO.
- Leader #48** FERMCO; don't know who the subcontractors are; DOE.
- Leader #35** Parsons, Jacobs Engineering, Rust, WEMCO, FERMCO.
- Leader #19** Wise, FERMCO, DOE.
- Leader #10** "FERMCO, DOE, Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA, University of Cincinnati, Miami University."
- Leader #08** "FERMCO is the only one. There was a pipefitting operation too."
- Leader #41** DOE, U.S. EPA, FERMCO.
- Leader #43** NLO, Westinghouse, FERMCO (only contact is with Westinghouse), DOE, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, Navy.
- Leader #09** Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA, IT, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, John Till's group, FRESH, DOE, Westinghouse, FERMCO.

Ratings of Organizations' Performance in Fernald Site Cleanup

	<u>FERMCO</u>	<u>DOE</u>	<u>U.S. EPA</u>	<u>Ohio EPA</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	No comment.	3	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	8	8	5	8	There was better information when Westinghouse was operating; Westinghouse was more community- oriented.
<i>Leader #47</i>	9	3	1	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	8	7	1	1	Interviewee said he hates the entire U.S. EPA.
<i>Leader #49</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	7-8	7-8	8-9	8-9	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	7	2	4	4	FERMCO is doing a good job.
<i>Leader #29</i>	9	8	6	6	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	4	9	5	4	No comment.
<i>Leader #28</i>	5	8	8	9	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	6	8	9	9	Rated Congress at "5."
<i>Leader #31</i>	3	6	6	8	DOE has gotten better with Phil Hamric. With regard to FERMCO, can't help but think of the first year of FERMCO's contract.

Community Leaders' Comments

	<u>FERMCO</u>	<u>DOE</u>	<u>U.S. EPA</u>	<u>Ohio EPA</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<i>Leader #50</i>	7-8	7	7-8	7-8	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	7	7	5	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	8	7	7	7-8	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	7	7	7	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	6	8	3	1	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	7	7	No comment.	7	Doesn't know much about U.S. EPA's role.
<i>Leader #45</i>	6	3	3	2	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	10	10	10	10	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	5	3	3	3	Hasn't heard anything about DOE's, U.S. EPA's and Ohio EPA's role in cleanup.
<i>Leader #39</i>	8	8	8	8	Does not know enough. Each organization seems concerned.
<i>Leader #05</i>	6	6	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	6	5	7	7	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	7	8	8	9	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	3	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	Doesn't want to rank DOE, U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA.
<i>Leader #01</i>	5	6	7	7	FERMCO is improving. When FERMCO started, would have given the company "3." It's at "5" now.

	<u>FERMCO</u>	<u>DOE</u>	<u>U.S. EPA</u>	<u>Ohio EPA</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<i>Leader #13</i>	5	1	1	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	6	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	5	1	3	3	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	10	10	10	10	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	7	7	7	7	"They seem to be doing a good job. I'm not informed enough to evaluate this."
<i>Leader #07</i>	7	3	4	4	FERMCO: It's a little soon to tell -- it's likely that "7" rating will go up as we get a longer track record. U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA: Don't know enough to distinguish.
<i>Leader #25</i>	7	8	8	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	10	8	No comment.	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	3	5	3	3	Haven't gotten too far with FERMCO yet.
<i>Leader #06</i>	7	8	8	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	FERMCO's hands are tied; refers to DOE.
<i>Leader #48</i>	6	4	7	5	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	7	7	No comment.	No comment.	U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA: no opinion.
<i>Leader #19</i>	7	5	10	10	Rated Westinghouse with "9."

Community Leaders' Comments

	<u>FERMCO</u>	<u>DOE</u>	<u>U.S. EPA</u>	<u>Ohio EPA</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<i>Leader #10</i>	7	7	6	8	Knows less about U.S. EPA.
<i>Leader #08</i>	8	8	6	6	FERMCO: They're trying. DOE's rating is based on the mailers. Not too familiar with U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA; their ratings are based on information received.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	2	0-1	0-1	0-1	What the hell has happened?
<i>Leader #09</i>	5	7	7	7	No comment.

Respondents' Familiarity with Fernald Site Cleanup Projects and Activities***Projects and Activities with Which Interviewee is Familiar***

- Leader #15** Decontamination and decommissioning on Operable Unit 3; groundwater pumping; Minimum Additive Waste Stabilization (MAWS).
- Leader #40** Water pumping -- the South Plume.
- Leader #27** Knows a little about a lot.
- Leader #47** Pumping and treating of the river, activities with the silos -- also the new mapping procedure.
- Leader #49** Capping, wells, identifying what is there.
- Leader #16** Plant 7 cleanup.
- Leader #22** Pumping soil through water, dumping radioactivity in the river. Will that deposit be in one spot in the river?
- Leader #17** Tearing down two plants -- Plant 7 and storage bins at K-65.
- Leader #28** All of them.
- Leader #32** Operable Units 1 through 5, removal actions.
- Leader #31** All of them.
- Leader #50** Operable units 1 through 5 -- proposed silo vitrification; characterization of the waste pits; taking down buildings, asbestos containment; characterization of radiation in old plants; pumping and monitoring of the South Plume, soil sampling.
- Leader #23** Dismantling of buildings. Sludge ponds.
- Leader #14** Operable Unit 2 and Operable Unit 4 project descriptions and comprehensive risk evaluation for Operable Units 1 and 2.
- Leader #24** Has become especially familiar with efforts to clean-up operable units 1 through 5, as well as the activities of the Fernald Citizens Task Force.

- Leader #34** Waste management program -- a lot of it. The water loop that goes down to the river and back, methods for taking down contaminated buildings, overpacking of drums, precautions with shipping materials.
- Leader #04** Groundwater contamination plume cleanup, silo dismantling, shipment of materials to the Nevada Test Site.
- Leader #45** Shipping waste to Nevada.
- Leader #20** Water project, MAWS pilot project, core sampling in the K-65 Silo area.
- Leader #05** South Plume Recovery System; dismantling of buildings.
- Leader #12** Silos (from leaking into groundwater), drainage ditch to river, dismantling buildings, soils work, Public Water Supply system.
- Leader #03** Operable units, removal/dismantling of buildings on site, sampling.
- Leader #01** They're dismantling the buildings. They had shipped quite a few drum equivalents of thorium off site. They're starting to ship mixed waste to Envirocare of Utah, Inc.
- Leader #33** What's covered in the Fernald site's newsletter.
- Leader #44** Cleaning up the site, taking down the tallest building.
- Leader #30** K-65 Silos, MAWS, rail shipments
- Leader #25** Vitrification process, water treatment (pump to the river), dismantling buildings, disposal options.
- Leader #37** Surveys and site assessments which must be done first to see what has to be dealt with. FERMCO put information out about planned dismantlement of buildings. Also aware that part of the cleanup is to dilute contaminated water.
- Leader #06** Waste removal and treatment (soil and vitrification activities), emergency response exercises.
- Leader #41** It's confusing -- there are lots of projects. Plans to get more informed -- needs easy access to information.
- Leader #19** Double-lined drums (How much better are two than one?); K-65 Silos -- glass pellets -- a new technology.

- Leader #10* Operable Units 1 through 5.
- Leader #08* Drying out the waste and shipping it by rail.
- Leader #06* Groundwater, building dismantling.
- Leader #18* No comment.
- Leader #36* No comment.
- Leader #29* No comment.
- Leader #21* No comment.
- Leader #39* No comment.
- Leader #26* No comment.
- Leader #46* No comment.
- Leader #13* No comment.
- Leader #11* No comment.
- Leader #02* No comment.
- Leader #07* Not familiar with specifics. "I understand there's removal of some material. It's been a while since I've seen specifics. There was a proposal to flush the aquifer."
- Leader #38* No comment.
- Leader #48* No comment.
- Leader #35* No comment.
- Leader #41* No comment.
- Leader #43* No comment.

Respondents' Opinions of Fernald Site Cleanup Progress

- Leader #15** Slow, but regulations require it.
- Leader #40** Slow! They have known about problems since 1984, and there is still no progress.
- Leader #18** No comment.
- Leader #27** Slow.
- Leader #47** Feels comfortable with it.
- Leader #36** It's going pretty well, only because there is not a whole lot about it in the newspaper. This means it's going well because newspapers only cover bad news. Good cleanup progress isn't bad news.
- Leader #49** Cleanup progress is still very slow.
- Leader #16** All would like everything to go a bit faster. Regulations take *so* long.
- Leader #22** Slow . . . sure is slow.
- Leader #29** Moving very well.
- Leader #17** Feel it could be done closer to schedule (projects behind schedule, no schedule, etc.), with less interferences (company has allowed subcontractors who weren't properly trained to do things -- duties -- which were not in their original assignment).
- Leader #28** Seeing progress; seeing action.
- Leader #32** Hopeful the Fernald site will be cleaned up.
- Leader #31** So far, it's all right. Knows DOE-Headquarters and Congress want the cleanup done faster. It took 50 years to create the mess. Take time, and do it right.
- Leader #50** Thinks cleanup progress is coming along, despite criticism; slow pace -- realize you have to plan. All is going pretty well.
- Leader #23** Cleanup progress is slow because of government regulations.
- Leader #14** Cleanup progress could be better and faster if there were comprehensive regulatory goals.

- Leader #24** It's very slow.
- Leader #34** Cleanup progress is not fast enough.
- Leader #04** Very long-term, but progress is being made.
- Leader #45** Cleanup progress is probably moving along an average pace.
- Leader #20** Thinks cleanup is going about as good as it can be. The Fernald site has something nobody wants, and it can't be transported.
- Leader #21** Slow
- Leader #39** Does not know enough right now.
- Leader #05** Cleanup progress is too slow -- too much paperwork.
- Leader #12** Think it is mired in studies! Study it, study it! Understand new technologies are involved, but it is hard to get involved in studies.
- Leader #26** No comment.
- Leader #03** Cleanup progress is going well for the most part.
- Leader #46** Cleanup progress has dropped off.
- Leader #01** "It's very hard to say; I think it has taken a *heck* of a long time. In the beginning, they just didn't know what to do with it. They kept saying, 'We've got the experts.'"
- Leader #13** No comment.
- Leader #33** No complaints.
- Leader #44** Unsure
- Leader #11** Never going to live to see it cleaned up.
- Leader #30** It's continuing.
- Leader #02** "I feel ok [about the cleanup progress]."

- Leader #07** "To the extent I know about it, I think it's been adequate. I think progress is being made."
- Leader #25** Too slow. It's gotten to the point where there's too much planning and decision making.
- Leader #38** Poor, slow.
- Leader #37** Confused.
- Leader #06** It's somewhat delayed, stalled.
- Leader #41** Take 30 years? Make sure it's done right the first time.
- Leader #48** Think cleanup is progressing fairly well. Interviewee had more concerns when DOE was upset with FERMCO. Would have liked the cleanup done yesterday..
- Leader #35** Spending a ton of money.
- Leader #19** Doesn't know about the progress. Aren't so many drums supposed to be shipped each week? How deep will the soil be dug to get all of the contamination? Why build more stuff? It doesn't make sense to contaminate more material.
- Leader #10** "I think there's probably too much paper work required to do the job efficiently. I think it can get a little frustrating, from a community perspective, when you have to balance between all of the regulations of EPA, Ohio EPA and DOE."
- Leader #08** "It seems like it's going on forever. As more people become involved -- I don't want to take any kind of hit at anybody -- there are some organizations that could possibly feed on this."

"If someone doesn't sell this program with some degree of proficiency and sell the public, there are going to be so many divided groups and entities saying this can't be done. You've got to get focused; we've got to solve this problem. You've got to definitely sell the people. Let's get on with it. You've got to get some kind of presentation the public is going to buy, or this thing is going to go on for 20-30 years."
- Leader #41** It's exasperating to think it will take 30 years to clean up the Fernald site.
- Leader #43** Incredibly slow.
- Leader #09** It's moving now. Activities are beginning to start.

Respondents' Awareness of the Fernald Citizens Task Force

	<i><u>Aware of Fernald Citizens Task Force?</u></i>	<i><u>Ever Attended a Fernald Citizens Task Force Meeting?</u></i>	<i><u>Want More Information About the Task Force?</u></i>	<i><u>Comments</u></i>
<i>Leader #015</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No answer was provided.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Yes	Yes	No	Is a Fernald Citizens Task Force member.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	Yes	No	Is a Fernald Citizens Task Force member.
<i>Leader #29</i>	Yes	No	Yes	If there were time in evenings. Saturday mornings are a bad time.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	Yes	No	Is a Fernald Citizens Task Force member.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	No	No	Not enough time.
<i>Leader #14</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment. was provided.

	<u>Aware of Fernald Citizens Task Force?</u>	<u>Ever Attended a Fernald Citizens Task Force Meeting?</u>	<u>Want More Information About the Task Force?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<i>Leader #24</i>	Yes	Yes	No	Is a Fernald Citizens Task Force member.
<i>Leader #34</i>	Yes	No	No	Only if it's held in this area. It's not a good idea to hold meetings too far from the site (Winton Road). Another Fernald Citizens Task Force member also keeps interviewee informed.
<i>Leader #04</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	No	Yes	If I had the time.
<i>Leader #21</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	No	No	The Fernald Citizens Task force is ridiculous – just a political cover-up. They don't make decisions, nor does interviewee want them to.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.

	<i><u>Aware of Fernald Citizens Task Force?</u></i>	<i><u>Ever Attended a Fernald Citizens Task Force Meeting?</u></i>	<i><u>Want More Information About the Task Force?</u></i>	<i><u>Comments</u></i>
<i>Leader #44</i>	Yes	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Only if it generated pertinent information.
<i>Leader #02</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Maybe. Right now their decision process is looking at alternative uses of the site. They should set goals but be realistic -- don't spend time on what's going to happen in 20 years. Too early to tell what will have happened in 20 years. Make cleanup safe enough for the area to be residential in the future, then adjust from there, as the community develops.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	No	Yes	Saturday is a bad time -- 8 a.m. is stupid. Hold meetings on a weekday evening.
<i>Leader #48</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	No	No	If it's a day during which I could attend.

	<u>Aware of Fernald Citizens Task Force?</u>	<u>Ever Attended a Fernald Citizens Task Force Meeting?</u>	<u>Want More Information About the Task Force?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<i>Leader #10</i>	Yes	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	Yes	No	Yes	"If I knew an agenda where they were going to not necessarily go and butt heads -- if I knew they had specific ideas I felt were acceptable and not get involved in a tremendous debate that this is going to be turned back into virgin land. <i>That</i> would be a waste of my time."
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	No	Yes	No comment.

Respondents' Awareness of the Fernald Envoy Program

	<i>Is Respondent Aware the Fernald Site Envoy Program?</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Usefulness of the Fernald Site Envoy Program</i>
<i>Leader #15</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	No comment.	7
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	Interviewee gave a "5" rating because the program is new.	5
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	No comment.	9.5
<i>Leader #34</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	No comment.	10
<i>Leader #02</i>	Yes	No comment.	10
<i>Leader #07</i>	Yes	No comment.	10
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	No comment.	9
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #19</i>	Yes	No comment.	10
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	No comment.	8
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.

	<i><u>Is Respondent Aware the Fernald Site Envoy Program?</u></i>	<i><u>Comments</u></i>	<i><u>Usefulness of the Fernald Site Envoy Program</u></i>
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #05</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.

	<i><u>Is Respondent Aware the Fernald Site Envoy Program?</u></i>	<i><u>Comments</u></i>	<i><u>Usefulness of the Fernald Site Envoy Program</u></i>
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	Get more information to the public at the community meetings.	No comment.
<i>Leader #48</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #10</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.

Respondents' Awareness of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs

	<i>Is Interviewee Aware of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs?</i>	<i>Interviewee Opinion of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs' Usefulness</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No comment.	Received science grant through Sue Walpole, FERMCO Public Affairs. Did "Dolphin Smiling" program through Sue at the Cincinnati Zoo.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.

000079

	<i>Is Interviewee Aware of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs?</i>	<i>Interviewee Opinion of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs' Usefulness</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.	Wasn't aware of the math and science literacy programs. "It doesn't surprise me. I did not know there was a formal program, but I did know Fernald was making some technical staff available to schools."
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #48</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #10</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #15</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Yes	8	Interviewee is involved in a lot of educational programs.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Yes <i>Is Interviewee</i>	No comment. <i>Interviewee Opinion</i>	Heard of it, but can't rate it.

	<u>Aware of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs?</u>	<u>of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs' Usefulness</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Leader #49	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #22	Yes	10	Anything to help out kids.
Leader #17	Yes	10	Much needed.
Leader #28	Yes	10	No comment.
Leader #32	Yes	No comment.	Aware of parts of program -- maybe not all of program. No way to judge -- don't know the goals.
Leader #31	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #23	Yes	10	No comment.
Leader #14	Yes	5	Below "5" at present -- potentially "8."
Leader #34	Yes	10	No comment.
Leader #04	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #05	Yes	No comment.	No comment.
Leader #12	Yes	8	No comment.
Leader #03	Yes	No comment.	Doesn't know.
Leader #01	Yes	3	"I don't know exactly what they're trying to do. Are they just contorting money, or are they actually trying to teach them something, or what?"

	<i>Is Interviewee Aware of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs?</i>	<i>Interviewee Opinion of Fernald Math/Science Literacy Programs' Usefulness</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<i>Leader #30</i>	Yes	10	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	Yes	9	"It's a real positive effort."
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	10	No comment.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	8	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	No comment.	Just became aware in March.
<i>Leader #19</i>	Yes	10	No comment.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	7	No comment.

Respondents' First Thoughts When They Hear About the Fernald Site

1. Government Mismanagement (13 related comments)

- Leader #49** Deception.
- Leader #16** Dirtiest place during operation -- no rules and regulations.
- Leader #31** Negligence and total disrespect for the environment.
- Leader #50** Secrecy and danger.
- Leader #14** DOE/Department of Defense secrecy.
- Leader #24** Mysterious secret government operation in the community.
- Leader #46** "Bulls...." -- it has been beaten to death; there is a ridiculous overload of information.
- Leader #01** "How my government has wronged its people. I was naive in a lot of sense. A lot of us were naive, including the workers who were working with the stuff. A lot of what they did was Machiavellian in nature. The ends justify the means. I still think they do that."
- Leader #33** The big expenditure of money -- there is big business being made out of cleaning the site. Where is the incentive to get the job done?
- Leader #07** "Public hysteria -- total irrationality; media irresponsibility; stupid management brought about by the secrecy required by the cold war."
- Leader #19** The whistle blowing each morning and afternoon. Also, interviewee was lied to.
- Leader #43** Nuclear waste disposal, toxic waste disposal, filth in a bucolic setting. Government misrepresentation, obfuscation, duplicity.
- Leader #09** Contamination of groundwater. How stubborn and bull-headed management is. Not taking public concerns seriously.

2. Radiation (6 related comments)

- Leader #15** Radiation.

- Leader #47** Radioactivity.
- Leader #28** Contamination and radiation.
- Leader #44** "Radiation."
- Leader #11** Radiation/contamination of his well water and impacts on soils.
- Leader #41** Radiation.

3. Environmental Contamination (6 related comments)

- Leader #40** Contaminated area.
- Leader #28** Contamination and radiation.
- Leader #11** Radiation/contamination of his well water and impacts on soils.
- Leader #37** First: the Fernald site is out in the middle of no where. Second: it's a sore -- it's contaminated.
- Leader #09** Contamination of groundwater. How stubborn and bull-headed management is. Not taking public concerns seriously.
- Leader #27** "Environment" -- bad. Interviewee was an environmentalist before it was the trend.

4. Fernald Production (6 related comments)

- Leader #23** Low radioactive uranium refinement -- heavy metal.
- Leader #45** Atomic energy.
- Leader #20** Chemical and metallurgical processing for the manufacturing of uranium.
- Leader #05** Have grown up with the place -- the "atomic plant."
- Leader #25** Plutonium production or whatever previous production for atomic bombs.

5. Health Safety and Risk Issues (5 related comments)

- Leader #32** Risk from uranium.
- Leader #39** Interviewee's stepfather worked at the Fernald site for 35 years. Said Fernald site personnel are monitoring her parents house. It's been going on for 20 years.
- Leader #06** Life-threatening.
- Leader #41** Illness, sickness, radiation.
- Leader #10** "We have a nuclear waste site that needs to be made *safe* -- notice I didn't say 'cleaned up.'"

6. Cleanup (3 related comments)

- Leader #21** Cleanup and security (thinks it is humorous that we have such strict security process for being on site).
- Leader #03** Cleanup.
- Leader #30** A former production plant is now being cleaned up.

7. Hazardous Wastes (2 related comments)

- Leader #13** Radioactive waste.
- Leader #43** Nuclear waste disposal, toxic waste disposal, filth in a bucolic setting. Government misrepresentation, obfuscation, duplicity.

8. Miscellaneous (11 related comments)

- Leader #36** Three-mile Island.
- Leader #22** Purina Plant.
- Leader #29** Interviewee worked at the Fernald site (1953-1966) and wasn't laid off.
- Leader #17** Relationship between salaried and hourly workforce -- "who is doing what."

- Leader #34** Attorney Stan Chesley getting \$16 million and the people living around Fernald getting \$500.
- Leader #04** Very complicated.
- Leader #12** Controversy.
- Leader #02** "Problems."
- Leader #38** Water.
- Leader #48** Jokes.
- Leader #35** Upset over how the press has handled information.

9. No Comment (2 related comments)

- Leader #18** No comment.
- Leader #26** No comment.

Respondents' Most Negative Statement About the Fernald Site

1.) Government Mismanagement and Bureaucracy

- Leader #015** History of carelessness.
- Leader #27** Too much red tape with regard to regulations. Money, time, people.
- Leader #47** The government is involved.
- Leader #49** Deception, but that's getting better.
- Leader #17** Totally dissatisfied with management discrepancies with employees. Downcast a lot of people, including employees and residents.
- Leader #28** Get rid of old work horses; fresh blood is needed.
- Leader #31** DOE's lack of control of their contractors.
- Leader #50** Secrecy -- the unknown.
- Leader #23** Building a plant like that on an aquifer was stupid.
- Leader #34** I resent the contaminants being put on our community by our government, when they were aware it was going on. They aren't the only ones doing it.
- Leader #21** How contamination was allowed to happen (how DOE could allow this when we know so much).
- Leader #03** Tends to be bureaucratic (in regards to management structure).
- Leader #01** "They kept trying to deceive us, even after part of the truth came out -- even after it was in the paper. Body parts, the comment that was made to Lisa Crawford, FRESH president]: 'Put up or shut up.' There's nothing like worrying about your children and your health to get you involved and educated. What one of us doesn't understand, the others help us to understand. We used to tell [Jerry] Westerbeck [DOE], "Go back and tell them we're not giving up. We're not going away."
- Leader #13** Don't think the series of contractors at Fernald have been up-front and honest about conditions to employees and community until forced.

- Leader #44** Inefficient waste of money.
- Leader #11** NLO and Fernald representatives did not tell the truth.
- Leader #30** Too much bureaucracy involved -- studies too lengthy. Move schedule up.
- Leader #07** "Management (local and government) did not recognize the change in times that would require them to be more interactive with the community. The need for secrecy shifted. That really set things up for furor when there were problems. In a negative thing, in a 'non-blaming' way, is the negative impact on the water. It's a consequence of the operations."

"I'm convinced the best technology available was used. I push the management and government for not being perceptive to the change in the environment that should have made them more interactive with the community."
- Leader #25** When particular incidents occur, they try to shuffle it off as nothing.
- Leader #41** Lack of responsibility to the public's health. Had one purpose; never considered the public.
- Leader #19** Was lied to in the beginning (1950's). Was told they'd be making fuel rods and that was it. It was scary and secretive.
- Leader #10** "Its history. It has to do with the secrecy and efforts around trying to sort out what personal and public damage may have occurred as a result of feed materials processing."

"The second negative aspect is the danger to the public of the site if it's not cleaned up to the extent possible."
- Leader #08** "The problems that evidently go back to its conception. Things -- the basic site that our forefathers didn't realize the priorities. It wasn't the most ideal site; we had this plant built on an aquifer. When this was built, this area wasn't that populated. It was predominantly a rural, farming community. It's unfortunate they didn't have foresight to see, 'We're building on an aquifer.' This bothers me more than anything else."
- Leader #41** Cover-up over the years.
- Leader #09** When it comes to picking a contractor, they leave it up to someone else to review qualifications and don't double check -- example: Is FERMCO hiring a contractor who can't do the job? Taxpayer money should be spent with more care.

2.) Cost, Progress and Future of Cleanup Activities

- Leader #16** Wants faster cleanup and money.
- Leader #32** Question whether resources will be provided to clean up the site.
- Leader #24** May be impossible to clean up or to put it to a beneficial use.
- Leader #04** It takes so long to accomplish cleanup. Public education is a tedious process.
- Leader #33** Spending too much taxpayer money on cleanup.

3.) Environmental Contamination

- Leader #22** The mess they have with contamination. Also, was denied a previous claim, even though interviewee fed cows on Fernald property.
- Leader #39** Mystic of *not knowing!* -- How much contamination, where is it contained.
- Leader #05** Environmental effect -- especially groundwater.

4.) Health and Safety

- Leader #12** Potential dangers.
- Leader #46** Health effects on the community.
- Leader #06** The Fernald site is a health hazard.

5.) Waste Issues

- Leader #45** There is too much nuclear waste, and it's not good to have it at the Fernald site.
- Leader #20** Solid and liquid wastes stored at the Fernald site impact the environment.
- Leader #35** The waste that is stored and the likelihood of it being stored there. And are they bringing other waste to the site?

6.) Miscellaneous

- Leader #43** The Fernald site hasn't been able to do it. (Interviewee was not more specific.)
- Leader #40** Same as before.
- Leader #36** Just the problem that it happened.
- Leader #29** Media coverage is negative -- both TV and the papers. Politicians using it to help their careers or hinder others' careers.
- Leader #14** Condescending attitude.
- Leader #02** "I really don't have anything negative to say. There's a problem we somehow got a hold of, and we've all got to work together to solve it. Everyone's done the best they can to solve it. The only negative would be going back to the way it was."
- Leader #37** The negative public relations regarding how the cleanup process has been done so far, the perception of money being wasted and nothing being done. Hope this turns around.
- Leader #48** Concern with property values, and thinks the Fernald site is too open with communications (if 6 pounds of something are spilled, it's not a big deal).
- Leader #18** No comment.
- Leader #26** No comment.
- Leader #38** Doesn't know.

Most Positive Statement About the Fernald Site

1.) Public Involvement

- Leader #15** Public outreach efforts -- involvement.
- Leader #36** They seem to be making a public effort to deal with the problem.
- Leader #28** Fernald site personnel are starting to understand. FRESH is acknowledged and consulted.
- Leader #32** Communication improvements over last years, and cleanup is finally happening.
- Leader #04** There has been a real effort to do a good job from people involved. Fernald and FERMCO are trying to listen.
- Leader #12** Business relationships have been good. Partnership in Education program -- information received upon request.
- Leader #33** Liked the open house. The Fernald site is bending over backwards to be a good neighbor.
- Leader #02** "I think they're working very hard to inform the public."
- Leader #07** "In the recent history, the most positive thing is the tremendous turnaround in public opinion brought about by recent managements. In long-term, Fernald was an absolutely vital link in our national defense. It provided some very good jobs for a long time."
- Leader #25** Feels the Fernald site has become more community-oriented.
- Leader #10** "I think the most positive thing is that in the course of my involvement -- brief compared to others -- I've found management, employees, DOE, EPA (state and federal) to be open and sincere in their desire to keep the public informed. The more open people are, the more comfortable people are going to feel and the more confidence people are going to have in Fernald."
- Leader #41** Communication is improving between Fernald and the public.

2.) Management Commitment, Improvements and Change

- Leader #27** Commitment to quality of environment. Strides!

- Leader #31** They are trying to rectify past mistakes.
- Leader #50** Change.
- Leader #14** They try to do a patch-up and mend fences.
- Leader #45** Working hard to solve problems.
- Leader #03** That the Fernald site has made a lot of progress in 5 years.
- Leader #46** Big turnaround over the last few years.
- Leader #06** Steps are being taken toward resolving the problems.
- Leader #48** It's a bad situation that is being corrected.
- Leader #09** They have come a long way on the better side.

3.) Cleanup Progress

- Leader #47** It's being cleaned up.
- Leader #16** Cleanup progress.
- Leader #29** Honest effort to clean it up -- made good progress. Shut the plant down.
- Leader #32** Communication improvements over last years, and cleanup is finally happening.
- Leader #24** Operations ceased, and the Fernald site is being cleaned up.
- Leader #05** The Fernald site will be cleaned up in the long run.
- Leader #30** They're making efforts to do cleanup.
- Leader #19** They're working on cleaning it up. They're coming around. Joe Schomaker, FERMCO, is good to work with in environmental monitoring. Fernald's involvement in establishing severe weather sirens.
- Leader #43** Sincerity of Westinghouse and FERMCO, interviewee assumes. The Fernald site is being cleaned up.

4.) Fernald Workforce

- Leader #34** Most of the employees interviewee has met are conscientious, caring, hard-working people.
- Leader #21** Staff with which interviewee has contact.
- Leader #44** Personnel
- Leader #35** The employees.
- Leader #10** "I think the most positive thing is that in the course of my involvement -- brief compared to others -- I've found management, employees, DOE, EPA (state and federal) to be open and sincere in their desire to keep the public informed. The more open people are, the more comfortable people are going to feel and the more confidence people are going to have in Fernald."

5.) Employment Opportunities

- Leader #22** Employment.
- Leader #17** Income (not benefits) was at a good level.
- Leader #39** Creates a lot of jobs for the community.
- Leader #07** "In the recent history, the most positive thing is the tremendous turnaround in public opinion brought about by recent managements. In long-term, Fernald was an absolutely vital link in our national defense. It provided some very good jobs for a long time."

6.) Plant Closure

- Leader #20** Production activities have ceased.
- Leader #11** They closed the Fernald site down.
- Leader #24** Operations ceased, and the Fernald site is being cleaned up.
- Leader #29** Honest effort to clean it up -- made good progress. Shut the plant down.

7.) National Security

- Leader #23** It was a plant we needed at the time.
- Leader #41** Nothing -- maybe cold war protection.
- Leader #07** "In the recent history, the most positive thing is the tremendous turnaround in public opinion brought about by recent managements. In long-term, Fernald was an absolutely vital link in our national defense. It provided some very good jobs for a long time."

8.) Miscellaneous

- Leader #01** "It has educated a lot of people. I give most of that credit to the FRESH group as a whole. It hasn't educated as many people as I'd like. But for a small group with limited funds, we've done a heck of a job. We're just a bunch of average Americans."
- Leader #13** Fernald management is being the scapegoat for the government's problem.
- Leader #37** The Fernald site has been selected as the first full-blown remediation project.
- Leader #08** "We're not dropping like flies around here. I often would pass the operation and see heads of dairy cattle grazing on the property, knowing that air contaminants could drift off of the property. I'd like to think those cattle would be a first-line gauge of the type of environment there."
- Leader #18** No comment.
- Leader #26** No comment.
- Leader #38** Doesn't know.
- Leader #40** None.
- Leader #49** Nothing.

Visits to the Fernald Facility

	<i><u>Has Respondent Ever Visited the Fernald Site?</u></i>	<i><u>Would Respondent be Apprehensive About Visiting the Fernald Site?</u></i>	<i><u>Respondent Comments</u></i>
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	Yes	Wouldn't want to visit the Fernald site.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	Yes	She wouldn't feel safe because of potential exposure.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #15</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	Yes	No	No comment.

	<i><u>Has Respondent Ever Visited the Fernald Site?</u></i>	<i><u>Would Respondent be Apprehensive About Visiting the Fernald Site?</u></i>	<i><u>Respondent Comments</u></i>
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	Yes	No	May have visited years ago on employee/family day.
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	Yes	No	No comment.

	<i><u>Has Respondent Ever Visited the Fernald Site?</u></i>	<i><u>Would Respondent be Apprehensive About Visiting the Fernald Site?</u></i>	<i><u>Respondent Comments</u></i>
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	Yes	I've always been apprehensive; I've toured the plant four times.
<i>Leader #13</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #48</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #19</i>	Yes	No	Visited the Fernald site during a tour of the Crosby Township trustees.
<i>Leader #10</i>	Yes	No	Not apprehensive if proper safety precautions are taken.
<i>Leader #43</i>	Yes	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	No	No comment.

Respondents' Perceptions Regarding Fernald Site Management's Top Priority

	<i>Respondent's Perception of Fernald Site Management's Number 1 Priority</i>	<i>Respondent's Opinion of What Should be the Number 1 Priority at Fernald</i>
<i>Leader #15</i>	Cleanup.	Reduction of eminent hazards.
<i>Leader #40</i>	Not kicked off by DOE (for Fernald management to keep their jobs and not be fired by DOE).	Do something! Too slow. Too many studies. Pumping is a joke!
<i>Leader #18</i>	Fernald management -- DOE, EPA and FERMCO -- doesn't really know what Fernald management priority is. Thought he knew what WEMCO's priority was -- always to have employment for employees.	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Proving to the public that they are actually getting some cleanup done.	Environmental quality, cleanup, worker safety, public safety.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Clean the site up.	Cleaning up the site -- making it safe.
<i>Leader #36</i>	Solutions are understood less than problems. Once problems are addressed, newspapers begin covering the issue. Number 1 priority: Find a safe solution. Find a solution that is politically feasible and financially sound. People's priorities vary when you are covering an environmental issue.	To make the area and the surrounding area environmentally sound.
<i>Leader #49</i>	Identify and be truthful about materials on site -- handling, containment, disposal of the most hazardous materials.	Identify and be truthful about materials on site -- handling, containment, disposal of the most hazardous materials.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Cleanup -- as clean as possible.	All "hot" stuff removed, including chemicals.

***Respondent's Perception
of Fernald Site Management's
Number 1 Priority***

***Respondent's Opinion of
What Should be the
Number 1 Priority at Fernald***

<i>Leader #22</i>	Protecting the aquifer.	Protect the aquifer -- get it cleaned up.
<i>Leader #29</i>	Actual cleanup -- get information out to the public in a manner they can understand -- don't know the terminology.	Clean up to a point so the site can be used in the future.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Contractor's priority is to be truthful to residents. Bring down wall of ignorance. There was a "wall of ignorance" on the part of residents. Company wouldn't tell residents anything -- company didn't think residents need to know.	Management versus job assignments/duties. Management to communicate jobs/assignments to the workforce should improve.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Oversight and communications.	Total cleanup.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Safety and health of workers and residents.	Health and safety of the community and workers.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Cleanup -- and have to improve financial accountability. Budget is the driver for everything.	Do cleanup right, under budget, and maintain open communications.
<i>Leader #50</i>	Cleaning up the K-65 Silos (containment preferred to cleanup).	Cleaning up the K-65 Silos.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Cleanup.	Completion of cleanup.
<i>Leader #14</i>	Integrity in identification communication of the problem -- integrity is the key.	Reality. Separate wishful, "magical" thinking from what can actually be done.
<i>Leader #24</i>	Expediting cleanup -- environmentally sensitive cleanup.	Expedited cleanup that is environmentally sensitive.

<i>Respondent's Perception of Fernald Site Management's Number 1 Priority</i>	<i>Respondent's Opinion of What Should be the Number 1 Priority at Fernald</i>
<i>Leader #34</i> In some way to clean up the pollution that has been dumped on our community.	Returning the land to a safe, useable, productive station.
<i>Leader #04</i> Think it is to clean up the site in a reasonably acceptable way -- won't be pristine -- and the funds aren't there to have it pristine.	Clean up the Fernald site in an acceptable manner to the public for future use.
<i>Leader #45</i> Get stuff out of there.	Want them to concrete over the place -- "entombment" of Fernald. Wasting too much money. All we're doing is shipping waste somewhere else where we'll have a problem.
<i>Leader #20</i> Clean up the environment. Protect the health of the people and the workers.	To protect the environment. Protect public health and the workers.
<i>Leader #21</i> Cleanup.	Cleanup -- what to do with contaminated chemicals and where they go.
<i>Leader #39</i> The best way to clean up the site and make the community feel safe.	Working toward cleaning up the site and making the community feel safe. As long as the job is done well or right, does not care how long it takes -- does not want a quick fix.
<i>Leader #05</i> Management should strive to make things happen faster, physically, like cleanup. Too many meetings -- not enough work. Just get things done.	"Whole" cleanup as quickly and safely as possible. No priority on which should be first.

***Respondent's Perception
of Fernald Site Management's
Number 1 Priority***

***Respondent's Opinion of
What Should be the
Number 1 Priority at Fernald***

<i>Leader #12</i>	Public safety.	Public safety -- if it is cleaned up to increase public safety, that is good. Concerned with cleanup doing more harm.
<i>Leader #26</i>	The whole cleanup process and restoration.	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	Restoration of site. Assume they're telling the truth since they've said this time after time.	Restoration of the site.
<i>Leader #46</i>	To make money.	Cleanup and taking care of the environment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	<p>Their main priority <i>should</i> be to clean up the mess that's been caused over the past 40-50 years. The site should be cleaned so it is as close to original as possible before they ever got there. "That doesn't mean I don't realize they don't have the technology to do it; that should be their main goal."</p> <p>"FERMCO's going to do whatever DOE tells them to do or whatever they can get by with."</p> <p>"EPA -- I've got a little problem with them. They seem to be working behind our backs -- already on the first step of getting that law where they can store waste over Fernald with that aquifer. I believe they should come to the residents first and say, 'This is what we plan to do or will try to do.'"</p>	Clean up the aquifer.

	<i><u>Respondent's Perception of Fernald Site Management's Number 1 Priority</u></i>	<i><u>Respondent's Opinion of What Should be the Number 1 Priority at Fernald</u></i>
<i>Leader #13</i>	Cleanup.	Cleanup.
<i>Leader #33</i>	Cleanup.	Cleanup.
<i>Leader #44</i>	"To find the most efficient method for cleaning up the site at the lowest cost to the taxpayer."	"Efficient, timely cleanup of the site."
<i>Leader #11</i>	Cleaning up and getting the public water, especially those who have been affected.	Get in the Public Water Supply. Clean up the silos and waste pits.
<i>Leader #30</i>	Cleanup, i.e., contain certain wastes and remove most dangerous stuff and then find an appropriate re-use for the site.	Clean it up right, and make available for future use.
<i>Leader #02</i>	"Their number 1 priority should be complete submergence into all aspects of community life. It's not so much what FERMCO tells the people the options are." "Trust is the issue here. Sometimes it doesn't just come through the written word. Establishing trust should be the number 1 priority. I don't think people read what all of us put out. They watch TV."	"I think it gets back to public perceptions -- public relations -- but <i>more</i> public perceptions."
<i>Leader #07</i>	"The number 1 priority is cleaning up the site -- that's what I understand it to be."	"I think the number 1 priority should be containment of the damage to the water system. If it is possible to clean up the site, fine, but I think containment should be the number 1 priority."

***Respondent's Perception
of Fernald Site Management's
Number 1 Priority***

***Respondent's Opinion of
What Should be the
Number 1 Priority at Fernald***

<i>Leader #25</i>	Public information.	Cleaned up to the safest level possible and, if attainable, the property should be used for the surrounding communities.
<i>Leader #38</i>	They are trying -- give them an "8" rating. Cleanup.	Cleanup.
<i>Leader #37</i>	From DOE's perspective, the number 1 priority is to bring the Fernald site back to its natural, safe environment -- to basically restore the site successfully.	To restore the site and to have a positive economic impact on the community.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Waste removal.	Waste removal and future use.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Public health.	Public health; exposure elimination.
<i>Leader #48</i>	To protect and enhance their credibility.	To remove and/or contain the dangerous materials and to complete and develop a closure plan.
<i>Leader #35</i>	Need to get the positive things the plant is doing to the media.	Cleanup.
<i>Leader #19</i>	Keeping the same president two weeks in a row! It seems like every other month there's a new guy in charge. With the changes come new focus, strategies and plans. Talk to us in <i>our</i> language. We're country people.	Cleanup.

***Respondent's Perception
of Fernald Site Management's
Number 1 Priority***

Leader #10 "I think the number 1 priority is to complete the tasks they've contracted to do (clean up the site) in as effective and efficient manner possible and with complete openness to the public."

Leader #08 "Nothing should be behind closed doors, but I think there is a priority here that the best minds should get together with the best technology and try to keep people informed.

"This going back and forth -- someone should set some time tables here and inform the public that if there is cooperation, we can see some light at the end of the tunnel. I'm a little 'cog' here, but I don't want the site turned into public housing, etc. Leave it as basically raw ground. If problems occur in the future, they can go back in there and not have to displace people, etc."

Leader #41 The economic welfare of the community, both financial and health.

***Respondent's Opinion of
What Should be the
Number 1 Priority at Fernald***

"To make the site safe for residents in this community and the greater Cincinnati community. That would be by cleaning it up to the extent possible; storing waste off site, when possible; and protecting people from any wastes that have to remain on site."

"To give the public some positive information as to when we can see some *definite* completion here -- where some of the area can be viewed, and you can see some *positive* signs of *progress* (visual) -- you can see that something is happening. At present, I see plastic domes. It appears to be growing, rather than consolidating.

Safe, successful cleanup; complete removal.

***Respondent's Perception
of Fernald Site Management's
Number 1 Priority***

***Respondent's Opinion of
What Should be the
Number 1 Priority at Fernald***

Leader #43 Convince the community they are able and willing to cure the problem. That assumes that the federal government will fund through completion. You're the third operator. Why should I believe you? Clear "game plan."

Convince the community that they are able and willing to cure the problem. That assumes that the federal government will fund through completion. You're the third operator. Why should I believe you? Clear "game plan."

Leader #09 Get the cleanup done. To work within the budget and not waste

Cleanup! Cleanup of the K-65 Silos; cleanup of groundwater; cleanup of soils.

Community Concerns and Comments, by Order of Importance

Ranked in order of importance by each respondent, the ★ represents each respondent's "number one" concern.

1) Groundwater and Surface Water Contamination

- ★ Migration of hazardous materials off-site. (*Leader #15*)
- Accelerated contamination to the aquifer. (*Leader #18*)
- ★ Groundwater. (*Leader #31*)
- Releases associated with the waste pits. (*Leader #31*)
- ★ Hydrogeology migration of waste or source materials. (*Leader #14*)
- ★ Only what can be done to keep the contamination from spreading. (*Leader #34*)
- ★ Cleanup of the groundwater contamination. (*Leader #04*)
- ★ Biggest issue is contaminated aquifer/groundwater in aquifer – that directly affects us. (*Leader #05*)
- South Plume. (*Leader #01*)
- South Plume -- them putting uranium in the river. (*Leader #01*)
- "I'm deeply concerned they can never clean up the aquifer." (*Leader #01*)
- Fear of contamination from contaminated water in the Great Miami Aquifer. (*Leader #11*)
- Ground seepage from waste pits. (*Leader #11*)
- ★ Water -- has well on property. Had to close well, which was interviewee's drinking water supply. (*Leader #38*)
- Going to take a long time getting water in -- until March 1995! Indian bones -- they're dead! Take care of the living. Interviewee does not get city water. (*Leader #38*)

- Fernald has obligation to provide public water to the township. (*Leader #06*)
- Water contamination. (*Leader #06*)
- ★ Public Water Supply -- will interviewee get public water? (*Leader #19*)
- ★ "Threat to the aquifer. We already have contamination (South Plume). The aquifer is important to the water supply for this area." (*Leader #10*)
- ★ Harm to the aquifer. (*Leader #43*)

2) Future Use of the Fernald Site (17 comments, 17 interviewees)

- Long-term usefulness of the site and property. (*Leader #015*)
- ★ Real concern if waste is stored on site. It doesn't matter if it's done right, the area will never be developed and the problem won't be solved (*Leader #47*)
- ★ Down the road -- what is going to become of the Fernald site? How clean will it be? Will the site be used for recreational activities. (*Leader #29*)
- Will cleanup be adequate? (*Leader #32*)
- ★ Future use of the Fernald site. (*Leader #50*)
- Resolving usage for the property. (*Leader #24*)
- Future use of the site. (*Leader #04*)
- Long-term of site. (*Leader #46*)
- ★ What's going to happen to the site? (*Leader #33*)
- ★ Cleaned up properly -- safest level possible for community use (cleanup). [*Leader #25*]
- Future use of the Fernald site. (*Leader #06*)
- Future land use. (*Leader #41*)
- Future plan for site concerns me; don't want it to be a dumping ground. (*Leader #48*)

- What will happen to the site once it's cleaned up? (*Leader #19*)
- ★ "I don't want it developed into an industrial park. It would best be left as a 'natural sanctuary.' Leave it as raw ground. If development is inevitable, at least leave it in a natural state for "x" amount of years, in case anything happens - maybe 10 or so [years]."
(*Leader #08*)
- ★ Future land use. (*Leader #41*)
- ★ Will it become a waste disposal site? (*Leader #09*)

3) Public and Worker Safety and Health (22 comments, 18 interviewees)

- Safety during cleanup. (*Leader #015*)
- ★ Personnel safety (employees/area residents). [*Leader #18*]
- Impacts if an earthquake or tornado were to strike the site. (*Leader #18*)
- Safety. (*Leader #17*)
- Effects of demoted ("revamped") benefits for workers, which affect their family life and morale -- several personnel relating back to NLO. (*Leader #17*)
- ★ Health risks to the public. (*Leader #32*)
- Will workers be protected? (*Leader #32*)
- Health issues -- more about worker health than resident health. (*Leader #50*)
- Time line related to dose reconstruction study -- concern. Correlation between events and processes, known residues versus constructed projected correlation of effects. (Facts versus myths versus perception). [*Leader #14*]
- Interviewee remembered during the Gulf War, they barricaded the site and had security guards stationed. Media coverage was extensive. It was scary. Interviewee thought they must really be worried about something at the Fernald site. (*Leader #39*)
- ★ Public safety -- children's safety at school. (*Leader #12*)

- Fear of accident/disaster. (*Leader #12*)
- ★ In remediation process, identify any potential hazards to the off-site population, as a result of remediation facilities (for example, the water treatment facility). [*Leader #03*]
- ★ Health effects. (*Leader #46*)
- Safety. (*Leader #13*)
- Safety of the community, current and future. (*Leader #44*)
- Safety. (*Leader #06*)
- ★ Public health -- individuals are in fear of losing their (or not being covered by) health insurance if they speak up or say they live within the vicinity of the Fernald site. (*Leader #41*)
- ★ Scared of an accident -- knows there are things there that could hurt people. (*Leader #48*)
- Health of the workers cleaning up Fernald. (*Leader #19*)
- Health concerns. (*Leader #41*)
- Results of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry report -- wants to see the final report in April. (*Leader #41*)

4) Waste Handling and Storage (11 comments, 10 interviewees)

- ★ What is on site (hazardous materials) and what is being done to decrease the dangers of the hazardous materials and plans to get rid of them. (*Leader #49*)
- On-site waste disposal. (*Leader #31*)
- Thorium. (*Leader #31*)
- ★ Overregulation of disposal -- taking the lead paint off the water tower and treating it and disposing of it like contaminated clothing is *too* much! (*Leader #23*)
- ★ Do they truly have all the tanks (containers) underground under control? (*Leader #21*)
- Contaminated materials stored on site. (*Leader #05*)

- ★ Waste pits. (*Leader #01*)
- ★ Materials that pose health hazards must be dealt with appropriately. (*Leader #30*)
- Waste removal. (*Leader #06*)
- Where is the waste going to be stored? (*Leader #41*)
- Moving contamination from the Fernald site to another place; it's not right to do that. (*Leader #19*)
- ★ Contractor oversight [strong DOE presence]. (*Leader #17*)
- Contractor (construction site). [*Leader #17*]
- ★ Truthfulness of the prime contractor. (*Leader #17*)
- A bunch of great people -- a great team of people. The people don't understand the talent of all of the people working on this. (*Leader #20*)

5) Fernald Site Management (9 comments, 7 interviewees)

- Nothing, other than I believe the people working for FERMCO at the site are genuine in their desire to do the best job possible. I'm extremely impressed with the efforts of Tom Grumbly, DOE. I'm particularly impressed with the efforts of Dan Reicher, DOE-HQ. (*Leader #44*)
- ★ There's been a change in management (FERMCO president). Fluor Daniel's had a recent change in their leadership in the plant. What does all of that mean for us? I think there needs to be a little better explanation of the current philosophy of management. More contact with community leaders is needed. (*Leader #02*)
- The contractors who will get the cleanup jobs. (*Leader #41*)
- Don't like the rapid turnover of personnel. I like working with the same people (*Leader #48*).
- My position as a trustee is it was a deplorable situation and the public has a desire for it to be corrected, and I want it corrected. That's why I don't like DOE -- they say they will correct it, but they have not. (*Leader #48*)

6) Operable Unit 4 Silos 1 and 2 (K-65 Silos) (7 comments, 7 interviewees)

- ★ K-65 Silos, get them down. (Leader #27)
- ★ K-65 Silos. (Leader #16)
- Releases associated with the K-65 Silos. (Leader #31)
- K-65 Silos. (Leader #01)
- ★ K-65 Silos being hit by a tornado or an airplane. (Leader #11)
- Aging silos and when they're going to pop. (Leader #25)
- The leaking K-65 Silos. (Leader #19)

7) Budget and Costs (8 comments, 7 interviewees)

- Budget [lack of funds]. (Leader #17)
- How much will it [cleanup] cost? (Leader #32)
- Congressional commitment. (Leader #32)
- Whether money will run out before project completion. (Leader #24)
- Ultimate cost of cleanup. (Leader #44)
- ★ I think it's very costly. (Leader #07)
- ★ Manner in which cleanup takes place -- need to make a decision that is best for the environment and makes sense budget-wise. (Leader #37)
- Cost. (Leader #43)

8) Environmental, Economic and Psychological Impacts of Fernald Site Operations on the Community (13 comments, 11 interviews)

- Cannot sell property because of water contamination. (*Leader #40*)
- Environmental impact. (*Leader #18*)
- Short- and long-term effects of the site on the surrounding community and government. (*Leader #24*)
- Hear many stories from people with personal stories that are being told about Fernald. Home care services are reluctant to provide services in their homes because the senior citizens are telling them their homes are contaminated. (*Leader #21*)
- There is a perception that people down-stream from Fernald are in more danger than the local neighbors. (*Leader #21*)
- Understand there are two sides to Fernald. A lot of parents work there, so it is an economic and safety issue. The school is interested in what is best for the students. (*Leader #12*)
- All the settlements from government to people – after they pay you, they then seem to have the right to take your body parts. (*Leader #46*)
- ★ Environmental impact. (*Leader #13*)
- Long-term impact on community (environmentally, economically and mentally) (*Leader #13*);
- Government shouldn't have been allowed to do what they did. Need to pay restitution for putting people at harm's risk. (*Leader #41*)
- "You don't see a mass of 'for sale' signs here. If anything, I see more people moving here. Let's work together to see what can be done." (*Leader #08*)
- Economic future. (*Leader #41*)
- Quality of life. (*Leader #43*)

9) Fernald Site Cleanup Progress (12 comments, 12 interviewees)

- Long time to clean. (*Leader #40*)

- As long as they clean it up. If progress were to stop, interviewee would be concerned. (Leader #22)
- See continuation of what has been started. Stay on track with the consent agreement. (Leader #28)
- Is the Fernald site ever going to be cleaned up? (Leader #32)
- Whether the site can be remediated within a reasonable time so that it can be of use to the community. (Leader #24)
- Feels sometimes employees at the site do things that are self-serving and drag out the job so they have a job. (Benefits are more important than cleanup) [Leader #04]
- Would like cleanup or project to move faster. (Leader #45)
- ★ Wants to know the Fernald site is being cleaned up, and the groundwater is safe. Want to know work is actually taking place. (Leader #39)
- Where is the Fernald site on cleanup? (Leader #19)
- How long will it take to clean up the Fernald site -- is there a timetable? (Leader #43)
- "I'm overall very positive in terms of what the plant did historically for our country. On the shorter term, I'm positive about what's being done to clean up. I think there's progress." (Leader #07)
- Keep up the work. (Leader #09)

10) Transportation (7 comments, 7 interviewees)

- Has waste shipment questions. Permit to store waste on site -- better organization of the waste stream. (Leader #16)
- Transportation issues. (Leader #31)
- When removal occurs, will danger be increased near this area? (Leader #12)
- State should be closely kept informed about shipping campaigns. (Leader #03)

- It is DOE's responsibility to ensure that modes of transport (truck, rail) are done in the safest way (ensuring CSX tracks which will be used for shipping are inspected and in the best condition). (Leader #25)
- ★ Waste removal. (Leader #06)
- Transportation of waste off site – potential for an accident. (Leader #10)

11) Air Emissions (4 comments, 4 interviewees)

- Air issues. (Leader #04)
- Like to see hands-on monitoring of the demolition of the K-65 Silos and Plant 7. (Leader #06)
- Air pollution. There's no manufacturing going on down there, and the potential for radon gas getting into the environment is probably reduced. (Leader #10)
- Air quality impact. (Leader #43)

12) Public Involvement, Public Information and Communication

- Hopes lessons learned at the Fernald site are factored into new facilities. Is the government doing something today the people will have to pay for in 40 years? (Leader #18)
- These surveys are very important; they should be completed every 1-2 years to measure changes in perception. (Leader #27)
- Would like more information about the Fernald site. (Leader #36)
- Not real thrilled by the public address system blaring through town -- it gives people a feeling of danger, which doesn't help the Fernald site's image. Those sirens are there for more reasons, other than to warn the community of bad weather. In addition, the community doesn't need to hear information about the site. The sirens are tested too often. (Leader #29)
- Communications continue to improve. Continued public involvement in decision process -- the community should feel a part of the process. (Leader #17)

- There are a lot of good people here, but it seemed the attitude of DOE and Fluor Daniel is that we're "country bumpkins." DOE has realized this is not true. Fluor Daniel is realizing the people here as important as those in California. *(Leader #17)*
- Keeping information open forever – not returning to a culture of secrecy, even 500 years from now. *(Leader #50)*
- Concerned about the futility of public comment communication. Seems to be going in circles. *(Leader #14)*
- The information supplied initially to task force was too much information. It must be recognized that any information supplied must be readable in a short period. Task force members were literally receiving books. *(Leader #24)*
- Felt that past community meetings dealt with employee-employer issues, rather than environmental issues. *(Leader #04)*
- Overall, communications have really improved. *(Leader #04)*
- Are they telling the truth? What the public reads and what the public is told – is it the truth? *(Leader #21)*
- In 1982, the school had standard operating procedures for Fernald emergencies. Like if an emergency were to occur, people would need to take showers, teachers would put kids on the bus and make them take out their contacts, etc. The kids did not know about the procedures -- only the teachers. The interviewee does not know if those procedures are still in place. *(Leader #39)*
- Believes DOE and FERMCO are doing a good job in trying to get information to the public. Senses openness and willingness to discuss issues. Has observed that some people's negative attitudes date back many years, and it's difficult to change those negative attitudes. *(Leader #26)*
- Believes exercise to involve the public is an attempt to pacify the public. *(Leader #46)*
- "At formal public hearings, limiting people's comments to 3 or 4 minutes . . . If someone is saying something that's important, they should be given time. If someone is making legitimate concerns, they should be allowed to speak. Five minutes is a good guideline, especially when someone is babbling and really has nothing to say." *(Leader #01)*
- Not critical of past mistakes because they weren't intentional. Thinks Fernald site management is going overboard trying to put out an image of "a good guy." *(Leader #33)*

- "I think they're trying. I think the new management is very much interested in the community. I think they need to find new and creative ways to involve the community. I think they're doing everything they can in terms of task force, press releases. Somehow, they're going to have to be more *personally* involved. Maybe more informal -- maybe it's too structured. They've got to keep it simple. The leadership needs to get more personally involved. Come to athletic boosters, the Lions Club, senior citizens centers -- people interact at these places." (*Leader #02*)
- "As a PR [public relations] professional, I'm impressed with what's been done to deal with public opinion." (*Leader #07*)
- Proper emergency responses and communications are in place. (*Leader #25*)
- The Fernald Citizens Task Force was set up for two reasons: initially, to address the "How clean is clean?" and future use issues. That's the task force's number one and only purpose. Now the task force is going off in tangents, for example, the 10-point emergency situation notification list notification of shipments -- that's not their concern. The task force is now becoming a watchdog group looking for credibility and creating worse red tape. (*Leader #25*)
- When an incident (shipments, releases) does happen at the Fernald site, they shuffle it off like it's not important. Incidents should not be minimized. They should be handled in different ways. (*Leader #25*)
- Is concerned that decisions are not made and actions are not taken inside a vacuum -- wants assurance that ideas/recommendations of stakeholders will have been incorporated when decisions are made and actions are taken. It's important to involve people, but it's also important to educate and inform people, so they can have a good, well-rounded look at the situation. The public must be enlightened or proposed plans won't add up to much. (*Leader #37*)
- Emphasized the importance for the state to be involved as a stakeholder -- it's very important for DOE to be successful. This is a true win-win opportunity for all, in terms of positive economic impact. (*Leader #37*)
- Need continuity in information. People will come and go, so a central record (information base) is needed to ensure continuity. This record should be easily accessible via computer. (*Leader #37*)
- New managers at Fernald should attend Crosby Township meetings for introductions. Former programs, such as the beautification award, Christmas lights award, and memorial association donation, should be continued. (*Leader #06*)

- There needs to be more communication with employees at the Fernald site. If employees don't understand issues, rumors spread to the townships, as they did with the near-miss electrical fatality and recent safety stand down. (*Leader #06*)
- Would like to see more positive articles, but realizes these are "news" to the press. (*Leader #35*)
- WEMCO was more involved with the community. (*Leader #35*)
- "We've got to work together to solve this problem. You hear so many people talking negatively, yet I don't see a mass exodus of people getting involved." (*Leader #08*)
- "It's an unfortunate situation. It's something the community has to come to grips with. To be naive to think it was listed as a feed plant, some people thought they were making livestock. It's unfortunate." (*Leader #08*)
- Keep up community relations activities. Wants to see a DOE representative at township trustee meetings, in addition to a FERMCO representative. Wants updates brought to each township meeting. FERMCO President Don Ofte should be introduced to trustees. DOE management needs to be introduced to trustees. DOE needs to be aware of what FERMCO says at township meetings -- would like DOE to initial handouts. Meetings need to be announced and promoted. (*Leader #09*)

Information Respondents' Receive From Fernald-Related Organizations/Agencies

	<u><i>Information Received ?</i></u>	<u><i>Types of Information</i></u>
<i>Leader #15</i>	Yes	Receives all types of information, ranging from technical to non-technical.
<i>Leader #40</i>	Yes	Receives information from FERMCO.
<i>Leader #18</i>	Yes	Gets information from DOE and FERMCO: newsletters, press releases, announcements of public meetings, information from the Fernald Citizens Task Force.
<i>Leader #27</i>	Yes	Receives mailings, committee news (EPA), etc. -- <i>everything</i> .
<i>Leader #47</i>	Yes	Receives newsletters about the cleanup.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	Receives all mailings.
<i>Leader #22</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	Yes	Receives reports from people doing the work, invitations to roundtables and public meetings, information from the task force, occasionally gets a call from FERMCO and DOE about property values.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	Gets verbal and written information, such as flyers, from employees, as well as subcontractors. Associated with envoys, union, retirees, FEAA.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	Receives everything.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	Receives information through verbal responses at meetings, monthly mailings, EPA, DOE, FERMCO, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	Receives the <i>EM Progress Report</i> , <i>Fernald Site Cleanup Report</i> , information from EPA, etc.
<i>Leader #50</i>	Yes	Receives information from FERMCO, EPA, DOE, the Military Production Network, educational mailings and the newspaper. Biggest source is the Fernald Citizens Task Force. Receives handouts, summaries, etc.

<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	Receives health monitoring results.
<i>Leader #14</i>	Yes	Receives technical information and is updated at public meetings, hearings, through outreach, phone conversations, reports and updates. Has seven library shelves of reports and analyses from Fernald.
<i>Leader #24</i>	Yes	Receives an "enormous amount" of information as a member of the Fernald Citizens Task Force.
<i>Leader #04</i>	Yes	Receives information from DOE on public participation efforts, nationally.
<i>Leader #20</i>	Yes	Receives anything sent by FERMCO or DOE and receives the FRESH newsletter.
<i>Leader #21</i>	Yes	Receives correspondence -- newsletters, direct letters from DOE, invitations to meetings.
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	Only newsletters -- other information received is by request.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	Receives the cleanup report, Fernald Citizens Task Force report, yearly site reports.
<i>Leader #26</i>	Yes	Receives news releases, progress reports and occurrence reports.
<i>Leader #03</i>	Yes	Receives cleanup updates on the different operable units. Also receives notices of meetings, courses and briefings.
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	Stopped reading information unless it's something important to interviewee personally -- if the information is not personalized, interviewee does not read it.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	"I receive mailings -- the updates, notice of RI/FS meetings and EPA things. I receive pretty much of it, and if I don't, I holler until someone sends it to me. I'm on the mailing list."
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	Receives more than he understands.
<i>Leader #44</i>	Yes	"I get things from FERMCO and from DOE and the [Fernald] Citizens Task Force."

Leader #30	Yes	Receives information through DOE/FERMCO faxes, phone conversations, news releases and Fernald liaison updates to local governing bodies.
Leader #25	Yes	Receives information through press releases, some confidential releases, meeting announcements and schedules, the truck shipment of hazardous materials schedule and meeting minutes.
Leader #38	Yes	Is on Fernald's mailing list.
Leader #06	Yes	No comment.
Leader #48	Yes	Receives information regarding any accidents, closings, movement of materials, policy changes, etc. I am kept very well-informed.
Leader #35	Yes	Receives Fernald's newsletter -- reads the front cover -- it's too complicated.
Leader #19	Yes	No comment.
Leader #10	Yes	Receives a number of reports, operable unit summaries, copies of proposed solutions, information regarding cleanup alternatives, invitations to meetings. "I've received a fairly extensive amount -- about one and one-half feet on my bookshelf."
Leader #08	Yes	"I get this stuff in the mail. I generally gloss over it. If something hits me, I focus in on it. I can't actually say what particular publications or mailings I get."
Leader #41	Yes	Receives information from DOE -- asked Ken Morgan to put her address on the mailing list at the March 1994 FRESH meeting.
Leader #43	Yes	No comment.
Leader #09	Yes	Receives fact sheets, <i>EM Report</i> , progress reports, telephone calls, reading room (PEIC).
Leader #36	No	No comment.
Leader #49	No	Has involvement via Mercy Hospital in Fairfield.
Leader #34	No	No comment.

Community Leaders' Comments

<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	Not aware of receiving any information.
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	Does not receive any information; however, interviewee wants clear, easy access to information regarding contracts awarded to do the cleanup.

Respondents' Preference for Waste Disposal

- Leader #15*** Put high-level radioactive waste in an arid environment. Put low-level radioactive waste at or near FEMP.
- Leader #40*** Build a concrete silo or ship off.
- Leader #18*** At a location where it would be safely stored in a way where it wouldn't have to be recycled every 10 years -- it lasts for centuries. However, doesn't expect that all of the waste at Fernald will leave the site. (It would depend on the type of waste.)
- Leader #27*** Centralized -- east or west. Keep transportation of wastes to a minimum. Dispose of waste away from populations and aquifers.
- Leader #47*** Put it in Rumpke.
- Leader #36*** There needs to be a storage site with the State of Ohio, if it's low-level radiation. Also, at various sites across the country -- at the "Barnsville" site in South Carolina.
- Leader #49*** In a safe place. On-site if necessary -- under water. Favors the arid west. The ocean.
- Leader #16*** The desert is isolated, dry climate. The Nevada Test Site is already polluted.
- Leader #22*** Non-hazardous waste should be sent to Rumpke. Proper, safe and economic decisions depend on the type of waste.
- Leader #29*** In the Los Alamos area, in the west, in an arid region, in Nevada.
- Leader #17*** Down in the caves where they're sending it (in sealed containers).
- Leader #28*** Some to Nevada, some to Envirocare. Probably will have to keep some of it.
- Leader #32*** In a scientifically defensible site/arrangement where there is no risk to anyone.
- Leader #31*** Like to see Silos 1 and 2 material and thorium shipped off site. Waste pit stuff probably will have to stay.
- Leader #50*** In the sparsely populated west.
- Leader #23*** If handled properly, the location isn't important.

- Leader #14** A geological repository.
- Leader #24** Off site, if at all possible.
- Leader #34** Not in interviewee's backyard. It should be shipped to a remote site, but then there's the question of how long will it stay a remote site? Interviewee doesn't know what to do with it.
- Leader #04** Hard question! There is the idea of carting it away to another or purifying it until is stable -- doesn't know. Shouldn't necessarily be dumping it on other states. Difficult to answer.
- Leader #45** Not here. Nevada.
- Leader #20** Wherever possible -- Nevada, etc., if you all of the transportation problems can be handled. Nobody wants Fernald site waste, and it won't go away.
- Leader #21** Good question. The problem will be moved from here to another location. Need to guarantee that it will not endanger any other person. Where is the golden spot?
- Leader #39** Middle of the desert! Not in a populated area! Do not think *space*. Nervous about it traveling any place. Trucks and trains go through populated towns.
- Leader #05** Would hate to see wastes stored at the Fernald site. Interviewee's choice would be Nevada.
- Leader #12** Doesn't know -- not in interviewee's backyard.
- Leader #26** The best place would be the place with the least likelihood of impacting other people and the environment.
- Leader #03** A lot of it could be kept on site, depending on what kind of waste it is. (Anything that can't be recycled should be kept on site.) If there is high-level waste, ship to NTS. Mixed waste should be shipped to Oak Ridge.
- Leader #46** Send it back to where it came from.
- Leader #01** "They don't have an answer for that, other than NTS, and that's a poor solution. That and dump it in the river. They have to transport it across the U.S."
- Leader #13** Technology needs to be developed for safe disposal of hazardous waste.
- Leader #33** Encase in glass and bury on site.

- Leader #44** In the safest place -- the place that will cause the least potential hazards to the public.
- Leader #11** Utah, Nevada, Arizona -- as far away as possible.
- Leader #30** Other federally approved facilities around the country.
- Leader #02** It should go somewhere it won't cause someone else a problem.
- Leader #07** If we can prevent further leaching, I have no problem with disposing of it at the Fernald site. "I really don't know the alternatives -- moving it somewhere else just makes it someone else's problem."
- Leader #25** Fernald site waste should be disposed in the current designated facilities for such wastes.
- Leader #38** Hard question -- hard to answer. It is not fair to dump elsewhere.
- Leader #37** There is no place to dispose of Fernald site wastes -- it's going to have to be contained -- it should not be disposed. "Disposed" implies that it hasn't been decontaminated, so it needs to be contained. Can't think of anyone who would take it. It would have to be contained and maintained.
- Leader #06** Should be carried by the space shuttle and targeted toward the sun.
- Leader #41** Not here. Doesn't know. In the least-populated area possible -- Nevada. How about the ocean?
- Leader #48** A place which is not highly populated -- maybe New Mexico or Arizona -- not someplace like New York.
- Leader #35** Should be in the salt flats.
- Leader #19** Why ship it somewhere else? No one wants it. Would like to get rid of the Fernald project wastes, but why send the problem to someone else?
- Leader #10** The Nevada Test Site would be interviewee's first candidate.
- Leader #08** In government-approved dumping sites.
- Leader #41** Doesn't know -- not an expert on radiation. Safe place where no one will suffer from it.
- Leader #43** Washington, D.C., in the district itself, between Congress and DOE; not in my backyard.

Leader #09 In the proper atmospheric conditions. Some things should be shipped to Nevada, if they can't safely be stored at Fernald. The word "stored" should be used rather than "disposed." Waste should be monitored under all storage conditions until technologies allow us to handle it in a better way.

Comments/Recommendations for Future Use of the Fernald Site***1) Nature/Wildlife Preserve (10 related comments)***

- Nature preserve, wild life society park. (*Leader #29*)
- If they can clean up the waste pits and K-65 Silos, turn the Fernald site property into a residential area. Turn it into wildlife preserve for first 100 years, then reconsider ultimate use. (*Leader #17*)
- Create a nature preserve, with educational tours of a small building to feature a "living" history of the site for future generations. (*Leader #17*)
- Leave Fernald site property alone. Plant trees and create a wildlife preserve, with unrestricted use. (*Leader #32*)
- Make a nature preserve. (*Leader #46*)
- First choice: animal preserve. Second choice: a park (would have to be concerned about liability, however). (*Leader #33*)
- Depends on the extent of cleanup (It shouldn't be cleaned to pristine condition.). Different levels would allow for different uses. If the contamination were contained, but the site itself had dangers, it should be locked and monitored. Otherwise, use it as a wildlife preserve. (*Leader #07*)
- Make it a wildlife preserve. (*Leader #10*)
- Wildlife sanctuary: wetlands, prairies and forests. That would fall into the natural balance of things before the property was developed. It would also benefit the community, which could say, "This was once an atomic energy plant, but now it's" (*Leader #08*)
- Use the property as a land preservation area where animals could live. Don't put people there. (*Leader #09*)

2) Technology Center/Museum (8 related comments)

- First clean up the Fernald site, then create a technology resource center to help in the cleanup of other sites. However, other sites would dispose of their own waste at their sites. (*Leader #18*)
- Create an educational facility for peace-time uses of nuclear energy. (*Leader #49*)

- Create a training center or establish a clinic. Keep some history. (*Leader #16*)
- Establish a small building with tours featuring a "living" history of the site for future generations. (*Leader #17*)
- Establish a museum or educational facility to teach future generations about the history of atomic energy -- "Lest we forget." (*Leader #50*)
- Document what occurred at the Fernald site and why. Use the documentation as a symbolic warning for future operations. (*Leader #04*)
- Use part of the Fernald site as a government research center and part as a public park for the people. (*Leader #20*)
- It seems impossible to actually clean the property to previous natural levels. If by some wonder the property was cleaned to its previous natural condition, it should be given to the community. If the property is not cleaned to its previous natural condition, it should be monitored, and a historical museum on the history of the Fernald site should be established, depending on the level of cleanup and whether waste is stored on the property. (*Leader #01*)

3) Industrial/Commercial Use (7 related comments)

- Ultimately convert to mixed industrial and green space. (*Leader #15*)
- With the exception of areas that will probably remain hazardous indefinitely, the site could be used for industrial purposes, if safe. (*Leader #24*)
- Light-industrial manufacturing site. (*Leader #34*)
- Donate the property to local schools, churches or organizations -- if the land can be proven to be clean. (*Leader #21*)
- Industrial or factory, perhaps, to create jobs. Not residential! (*Leader #39*)
- Economic development facility of some kind -- perhaps a manufacturing facility to boost the economy. (*Leader #30*)
- Industrial site. (*Leader #35*)

4) Residential Use (6 related comments)

- If they can clean up the waste pits and K-65 Silos, turn the property into a residential area. (*Leader #17*)
- If it were cleaned to pristine condition, use the property for housing development. (*Leader #07*)
- Consider "Love Canal." Think of the next generation. If the property is unsuitable for development, it shouldn't be developed into an industrial or housing park. (*Leader #08*)
- Don't put people there. (*Leader #09*)
- Not residential! (*Leader #39*)
- Future use of the Fernald site will depend on realistic measures. One interviewee does not foresee the property being cleaned to pristine condition because he feels that is not feasible, and he does not believe the property will be clean enough for residential purposes. (*Leader #26*)

5) Park (6 related comments)

- If proven clean, turn the property into a natural state park -- give it back to taxpayers. (*Leader #18*)
- Make it a park. (*Leader #49*)
- Second choice: park (would have to be concerned about liability, however). (*Leader #33*)
- Protect the aesthetic nature of the land -- a park or a golf course -- something where a lot of the community could enjoy it at no cost or a nominal cost. (*Leader #02*)
- Make it a park. (*Leader #11*)
- Do not build a park; no one would go there. (*Leader #19*)

6) Farm Land/Agricultural Use (4 related comments)

- Convert the site to green area and use for agricultural purposes. (*Leader #16*)
- Farm use. (*Leader #22*)

- Farm land. (*Leader #12*)
- It couldn't be used for farming. Perhaps permit cattle to graze there. (*Leader #19*)

7) Recreational Use (4 related comments)

- Use the property for a golf course. (*Leader #40*)
- With the exception of areas that will probably remain hazardous indefinitely, the site could be used for recreational industrial purposes, if safe. (*Leader #24*)
- Use the property for a recreational area if concrete walls were around it over it -- there is a tremendous amount of land, and it should be used for something. (*Leader #45*)
- Park and recreational area for the community -- a fishing lake. (*Leader #25*)

8) Low-level Radioactive Waste Repository (3 related comments)

- Put fence around it and make it a low-level waste repository. (*Leader #03*)
- If there will be on-site waste disposal, the waste must be retrievable, and the government will have to maintain ownership. (*Leader #31*)
- Even if the contamination were contained, if the site itself had dangers it should be locked and monitored. (*Leader #07*)

9) Sell Fernald Site Property (3 related comments)

- Perhaps sell the property to a business which could provide jobs for people in the area. (*Leader #21*)
- If possible, Ross Township should be given the first option to purchase the Fernald site property. (*Leader #41*)
- Sell Fernald site property to the highest and best bidder. (*Leader #43*)

10) Open Space (3 related comments)

- Keep the property as open space. (Leader #04)
- Leave it empty. (Leader #38)
- Nothing -- it can't be cleaned up. (Leader #41)

11) Yard Waste Recycling site (1 related comments)

- If the property could be used commercially, perhaps it could be converted into a yard waste recycling site. (Leader #10)

12) No Opinion/Undecided/Non-specific (11 related comments)

- One interviewee does not care. (Leader #36)
- One interviewee does not know. (Leader #23)
- Depending on the level of cleanup, conduct environmental monitoring for 50 years, then make a determination. (Leader #14)
- Depends on the extent of cleanup. (It shouldn't be cleaned to pristine condition.) Different levels would allow for different uses. If the contamination were contained, but the site itself had dangers, it should be locked and monitored. (Leader #07)
- Need to collect more information on what the community would like to see happen. People who live in the community should decide the future use of the Fernald site. (Leader #13)
- Future use of the Fernald site will depend on costs. (Leader #44)
- Future use of the Fernald site will depend on realistic measures. One interviewee does not foresee the property being cleaned to pristine condition -- feels that is not feasible -- therefore, the property will be clean enough for residential purposes. (Leader #26)
- Future use of the Fernald site will depend on what is practical for the area at the time. One interviewee said the decision should be based upon the existing infrastructure and conditions and circumstances surrounding the area. It's too early to say what will be appropriate. (Leader #37)

- Return the property to the community, although people probably won't ever feel comfortable going there. (*Leader #05*)
- Future use of the Fernald site should be a township decision. The land should be reverted back to the people of Crosby Township for their final decision. (*Leader #06*)
- Let the people of Ross Township develop a future use plan for the Fernald site. (*Leader #48*)

Should the Fernald Site be Cleaned to a "Pristine" Condition?

- Leader #18*** Yes If this is achievable: interviewee would be willing to spend taxpayer money to restore a site. If a fiscal responsibility program is going to be started. Let's not start with cleanup of our waste sites. Don't know what government standards are on basic government regulations -- they're ambiguous.
- Leader #17*** Yes Because all agencies have agreed on schedule already.
- Leader #32*** Yes Realistically, interviewee realizes it probably won't happen.
- Leader #21*** Yes The Fernald site needs to be cleaned to perfection, so there is no danger to people now or in the future to the children.
- Leader #39*** Yes Fears mild contamination will be left. The Fernald site should be cleaned up totally -- leave nothing there.
- Leader #01*** Yes "Our government has money to help everybody else in the world, and they need to be more responsible for their own messes and clean it up first. I'm very angry for them buying uranium and spent fuel countries. They need to clean up their own mess first. It's *our* money they're spending, and they should spend it on us first, especially when they caused it to begin with."
- Leader #13*** Yes Doesn't necessarily trust government standards. Government standards are established by bureaucrats, as opposed to leaders in particular fields like hazardous waste and environment.
- Leader #11*** Yes Because there is only have one earth, it must be cleaned up. there is only so much groundwater around.
- Leader #02*** Yes "I just don't have enough information. I need more information before I can answer that question intelligently. Philosophically -- yes."
- Leader #38*** Yes The Fernald site should be completely cleaned up, but that will be difficult.
- Leader #06*** Yes Because that is the way the property was before anything was started there.
- Leader #41*** Yes "Basic government regulations" are not good enough. You can't depend on the government decisions anymore. The Fernald site should be cleaned up! This question seems unfair.

<i>Leader #35</i>	Yes	Because the facility can be a very positive industrial site if made safe.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	Because what the government might think is safe, the community might not agree. Even if it means spending taxpayers' money.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	Because will ask for pristine and probably get basic government cleanup regulations. If it becomes a waste site, it will have little future use.
<i>Leader #15</i>	No	A rather loaded question. Can't be done -- doesn't need to be done.
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	Do what is practical today.
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	Should be cleaned up to level necessary for future use.
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	Cost/benefit ratio explanation. If the contaminants are removed and the site is safe, that is sufficient.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	Is for cleaning this up to safe levels and no more. Doesn't have a problem being around some of these hazardous waste sites.
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	Because it is impossible to be "pristine." Can't afford. Return to a safe environment.
<i>Leader #16</i>	No	Have to be practical -- some areas more than others. Still hear cow complaints, but doing a job to make place look nice.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	Badly worded question. Whatever it takes to put it back for grazing. Put it back to farm use -- for grazing -- its original use. Farms are diminishing.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	Should be cleaned up to within fairly normal background conditions.
<i>Leader #28</i>	No	Never go to pristine. The Fernald site should be taken back to a manageable level people can live with and feel safe.
<i>Leader #31</i>	No	Because it's inevitable the budget will shrink as other DOE sites turn to cleanup. If you demand pristine, may get nothing. It would be hard to justify spending that kind of money.
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	Doesn't know. Would like it to be as clean as possible, but need to see the money. If it can't be cleaned to pristine condition then planning for public protection on an ongoing basis is an absolute necessity.

-
- Leader #23* No It's impossible to do. There's a philosophy that things can be perfect (or better than before) after they've been damaged, and that's impossible.
- Leader #14* No Human habitation changes the nature of pristine conditions. Thinks pristine is a poor choice of cleanliness level. Takes issue with "pristine" as a concept -- turn back the clock. Define "pristine." It's an unrealistic goal.
- Leader #24* No Would prefer Fernald be returned to its original state, but it's probably unrealistic and impractical within a reasonable period of time and given available resources.
- Leader #34* No Doesn't think it's possible to clean it to a pristine condition. Stopping the contamination is important. It's unrealistic to think it can be returned to a pristine condition. There's not enough money or technology to do it. Doesn't think a subdivision will be built on it.
- Leader #04* No Think there are a number of other sites that need attention also. Would like to see other sites raised to the level of cleanup to ensure public safety, as opposed to cleaning up Fernald to pristine condition -- which is probably not achievable any how.
- Leader #45* No Wasting too much money. The site wasn't that perfect to start with. EPA wants to make everything better than the way it was when it started. Nature isn't perfect.
- Leader #20* No What you should do is have your citizens task force come up with an acceptable level of cleanup and use.
- Leader #05* No From experience at Nevada, it would be a waste. It would cost too much money to return it to a pristine condition. Clean it up as best you can, and put a fence around it. If it's economically feasible to clean it up, fine; otherwise, it's ridiculous.
- Leader #12* No Doesn't know that it is physically possible or necessary to get it to that position. Need to get it to a condition where accidents and disasters are not a threat.
- Leader #26* No Bad question. It depends on the costs compared to "cleaned to a pristine condition." Wants assurance that there are no possibilities of affecting areas around the site -- assurance that any contamination would effectively be contained.
-

Leader #03	No	Not cost effective; may not even be possible.
Leader #46	No	Doesn't think they would ever achieve that, but is a nice goal.
Leader #33	No	Cost too much!
Leader #44	No	"The 'How clean is clean?' question has to be answered, taking into consideration other factors, such as other needs in the country."
Leader #30	No	Doesn't need to be turned into a park. Need a more practical use.
Leader #07	No	"If we can control or minimize future damage to the environment, then I think it's not a problem, particularly when we're looking at billions and billions of dollars. To return 'pristine' condition, when we're looking at the costs involved, I think it's an <i>absurd</i> idea!"
Leader #25	No	It should be cleaned up to a safely, usable site.
Leader #37	No	The goal should be to have the best level of cleanup they can have, but they need to be realistic. Don't throw money down a black hole.
Leader #48	No	Doesn't think it needs to be pristine condition -- just acceptable in terms of if people could live on site. Pristine is hard to define.
Leader #19	No	Bad question. Basic doesn't seem to be good enough. But the site shouldn't be any safer than what a brick house is (natural radiation levels).
Leader #10	No	"I don't believe the site needs to be cleaned to a 'pristine' condition. Given current technology, that's too expensive."
Leader #08	No	"These standards I'm not completely familiar with. I don't think you're ever going to be able to get this back to a 'pristine' condition -- it's original, pure state. This is an impossibility. If you're going to argue this, you're never going to accomplish anything. I don't care if you're farming, [even farmland can't be returned to pristine condition because of] pesticides, etc. [I think] this is impossible, as a layman. You've got to leave this as an environment that can be monitored. Don't ever expect that it can be clean. I don't think it can be done at the cost of taxpayer money."
Leader #43	No	Doesn't like the question. There needs to be a standard that makes sense. Pristine is not realistic.

Has Information From Fernald Changed Respondents' Understanding of Fernald Site Issues?

- Leader #15*** Yes Has more knowledge.
- Leader #18*** Yes Had an understanding that there was a nice, stable FERMCO management team at the Fernald site, but in the next stage -- former FERMCO President Nick Kaufman was gone, and there was a new management team again -- they passed the "baton" to a new runner. (Showing off credentials does not impress interviewee.) Some of the younger people with less education and less experience are more capable/committed to doing a good job.
- Leader #27*** Yes The media and FRESH members have raised a lot of safety concerns. Interviewee went through Fernald site training, which changed interviewee's perspective -- the Fernald site is much safer than interviewee thought -- which made a family member feel more comfortable. Also, establishing the Safety First Team was a positive step.
- Leader #47*** Yes Information in a Fernald site newsletter changed interviewee's understanding about contaminated groundwater.
- Leader #49*** Yes When interviewee inspected Fernald site medical facilities 10 years ago, interviewee was told lies.
- Leader #16*** Yes Bias and balance of information has changed over the years. Since the 1980's communications have become more open and trustworthy. For example, interviewee had an opportunity to provide input on the Operable Unit 4 K-65 Silos and is now satisfied.
- Leader #29*** Yes The K-65 Silo cleanup project was well handled. Interviewee was involved in sampling activities there.
- Leader #17*** Yes It's difficult to answer whether information has changed interviewee's understanding of an issue at the Fernald site. Interviewee's understanding changed for the good and bad.
- Leader #28*** Yes Information clarified interviewee's understanding about operable units and how each has a separate focus. Information also changed interviewee's understanding about the baseline and strategic plan.
- Leader #32*** Yes Interviewee has received more information in a format that is understandable,
-

- and the site is learning more community concerns.
- Leader #31** Yes Used to think the Fernald site would be cleaned to pristine condition; now knows that's an unrealistic expectation, due to the cost and time such a cleanup level would require.
- Leader #50** Yes Understanding has become more sophisticated, not in a big picture sense, but in depth of understanding.
- Leader #14** Yes Yes and no. There is a voluminous amount of information, but the correlation between concern and data doesn't always mesh. There needs to be a cross-indexing and reference system. Community obsession with cancer and disease -- there is not always a correlation.
- Leader #24** Yes It has become clear that issues are exceedingly complex. The cleanup process is expensive and problems require long periods to resolve.
- Leader #34** Yes In 1984, when information about the extent of contamination first started coming out, interviewee didn't believe it. Interviewee didn't believe the government would let that happen, but now knows it has. Interviewee just doesn't know how damaging the contamination is.
- Leader #04** Yes Can't pinpoint any issue, but information received has made things clearer.
- Leader #45** Yes Is better informed; knows where problems lie.
- Leader #20** Yes Once you understand the problems and the complexity of the solutions, then you understand what has to be done.
- Leader #21** Yes Thinks Fernald site information is factual, but it's a little hard to read and understand. Sometimes it's too complex.
- Was unfamiliar with the Fernald site before receiving correspondence. Now understands a little about the past and history and what management companies want to do to clean it up.
- Leader #12** Yes Through the yearly reports has learned about monitoring stations and how information and data are recorded.
- Leader #26** Yes Better understands what the issues are -- especially through the transition of going from production to remediation.

-
- Leader #03* Yes Had a misunderstanding of problems, but once interviewee received information from the Fernald site, changed mind.
- Leader #01* Yes "Because I didn't realize there was a difference in types of thorium and uranium. One time, when we were touring the plant, someone mentioned thorium was stored in it, and it turned out there were five areas on site we didn't know about."

"I had no idea of the multitude of the waste that was stored in the pits, until one of those EE/CA documents mentioned them. That's another federal document though; they had to put it in there, I guess."
- Leader #44* Yes Has a better understanding of what cleanup is taking place and a better understanding of the problems at Fernald.
- Leader #30* Yes Better understands the vitrification program -- it seems to be a good idea.
- Leader #25* Yes By receiving the full report on any particular issue or problem, it fills in the cracks and helps you understand why they're doing what they're doing.
- Leader #37* Yes DOE's openness blew interviewee away. Information interviewee has gained in the past six months really talked about the openness.

Through Congressman John Dingell's House Energy and Commerce Committee hearing (December 1993), interviewee perceived FERMCO lacked good leadership and direction. FERMCO's priorities did not seem appropriate.

Ohio EPA seems to be real lackadaisical regarding damage and ill effects of contaminants. They downplay risks -- have heard that Cincinnati has the highest cancer level in the U.S.
- Leader #06* Yes Better understands the vitrification process.
- Leader #41* Yes Found out some things at FRESH meetings.
- Leader #48* Yes There was deep concern and mistrust, but they have been corrected. Has no confidence in DOE, but has confidence with the rest of the people.
- Leader #35* Yes Information interviewee now receives better explains the cleanup. Liked the
-

<i>Leader #19</i>	Yes	open house -- it was very informative. Water is the main issue. Wasn't aware the water was so contaminated before reading and hearing about it. Community meetings have helped interviewee understand more about it.
<i>Leader #10</i>	Yes	"I think I'm clearly more knowledgeable about the issues. I also have a better sense of perhaps what's possible and not possible. Consequently, I probably don't have the kind of unrealistic expectations I had before I received that information."
<i>Leader #08</i>	Yes	"I suddenly realized this is an extremely costly operation. I get the feeling from what I've read that this is more than a pilot program, and it's probably the premier operation and will set standards for other operations. Hopefully, the taxpayers will gain a lot in the future. Mistakes at other sites won't be so costly and hopefully will be smoother operations."
<i>Leader #43</i>	Yes	New information, new explanations. Issues are not covered well in press or TV.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	Information changed interviewee's understanding about the South Plume pumping system. Better understands information about the K-65 Silos and dismantling activities. Better understands construction waste versus mixed waste classifications.
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #05</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #46</i>	No	Not recently.
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No	No comment.

<i>Leader #11</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	"I think I had a pretty good understanding, so I don't think there's been any change."
<i>Leader #38</i>	No	Interviewee was told lies, and interviewee's well is contaminated.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No comment.

Personal or Family Health Problems Believed to be Caused by Fernald Site Activities

	<u>Do Respondents or Family Attribute Health Problems to the Fernald Site?</u>	<u>Respondents' Descriptions of Health Problems Attributed to the Fernald Site</u>
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	Cancer in family.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	Emotional and mental health problems and mental anguish cause worry and make interviewee angry. Angry about property loss. Has no physical health problems at this point.
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	Cancer.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	Has been on an anti-depressant since 1990 or 1991. Wasn't sleeping -- was up and down. Is a smoker. "I damage myself some." Is on medication for allergies. Said it would be hard to determine the factors which have impacted the interviewee's health.
<i>Leader #11</i>	Yes	Family member, who used to live nearby, had a lot of skin problems and tumors, which interviewee attributes to the Fernald site. Another family member suffered from hair loss, which interviewee also attributes to the Fernald site. In addition, had three dogs, which died from tumors. Interviewee and another family member both take blood pressure medicine and claim this is directly related to the Fernald site. Missed three months of work due to gastrointestinal illness and skin rash. According to the interviewee, the doctor said the symptoms were due to the environment in which the interviewee resides.
<i>Leader #38</i>	Yes	Skin cancer, miscarriage, cancer in area.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	Emotional distress, skin lesions.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	Family member died of kidney cancer before age 40 -- family member had always lived within 3 miles of the Fernald site. Three years ago, interviewee's baby was premature, and another family member died.

<i>Leader #15</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	No	Interviewee is not aware of health problems -- unless a family member's asthma attributed to the Fernald site.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	Doesn't know.
<i>Leader #17</i>	No	There could be connections to some injuries -- possible lung and foot problems -- but interviewee is not sure and is not blaming the Fernald site.
<i>Leader #28</i>	No	There is a huge fear of future effects.
<i>Leader #32</i>	No	Doesn't have any evidence of health impacts, but interviewee is not sure. Interviewee will question future problems.
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #24</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No comment.

<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	Not sure. Interviewee's parents have been examined, and interviewee would also like to be examined. Interviewee is concerned because of a death of a family member.
<i>Leader #05</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #48</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	Yes and no. A family member's yearly check-ups at the Fernald site indicated cancer.
<i>Leader #19</i>	No	No comment.

<i>Leader #10</i>	No	Doesn't know. Family member lives within 4 miles of the Fernald site and has lived there 10 or 15 years. Doesn't know if family members have suffered any health problems.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	Family member was extremely concerned after interviewee visited the Fernald site, but interviewee found the visit fascinating.
<i>Leader #09</i>	No	Chose not to answer.

Others, Known by Respondents, Who Attribute Health Problems to the Fernald Site

	<i>Does Respondent Know Others Who Attribute Health Problems to the Fernald Site</i>	<i>Respondent Descriptions of Others' Health Problems Attributed to the Fernald Site</i>
<i>Leader #40</i>	Yes	Not physical, but mental.
<i>Leader #47</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #49</i>	Yes	But it's mostly in their heads.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #22</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #14</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	No comment.

<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #11</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #02</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #38</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #06</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	Respondent knows someone who attributes health problems to the Fernald site.
<i>Leader #48</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #41</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #09</i>	Yes	No comment.
<i>Leader #15</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.

<i>Leader #24</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #39</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #03</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #33</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #19</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #10</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #08</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	No comment.

Respondents' Perceptions of Fernald Site Impacts on Property

<i>Leader #49</i>	Yes	Lowered property value -- acquaintance of interviewee sold a car, and the buyer was afraid it was contaminated. Sold another car and encountered the same problem.
<i>Leader #16</i>	Yes	Radiation spills, radon gas and inversion spikes.
<i>Leader #22</i>	Yes	Family member's farm is near the Fernald site. People are reluctant to build a subdivision so close to Fernald.
<i>Leader #28</i>	Yes	Property devaluation.
<i>Leader #32</i>	Yes	Property values are impacted by Fernald -- poor perceptions. Soils have slightly elevated uranium levels.
<i>Leader #31</i>	Yes	The perception problem affects the 1.5-mile radius. Most people have wells. In 1989, installed a cistern. Didn't want to use the well any more.
<i>Leader #24</i>	Yes	Concerned about Cincinnati Water Works' water supply.
<i>Leader #39</i>	Yes	Interviewee lives close to a school; however, interviewee is moving. Probably still staying in Ross area, but interviewee thinks about the Fernald site sometimes and worries. Will not have a problem selling interviewee's home. However, a family member is worried. The perception at the home of a family member of the situation is bad because there are men running around in white suits.
<i>Leader #05</i>	Yes	Value-wise, interviewee's property would be worth a lot more 3-4 miles away from the Fernald site.
<i>Leader #12</i>	Yes	People's uncertainty over water and other contamination has resulted in economic impacts to property.
<i>Leader #46</i>	Yes	There has been a decrease in property value, and it's just hard to sell, period.
<i>Leader #01</i>	Yes	Interviewee lost all interest in own property -- used to garden, but now interviewee just lets the vegetables rot in the ground.
<i>Leader #33</i>	Yes	Devaluation.

- Leader #11** Yes Have been unable to sell our property at the fair market price because of proximity to the site.
- Leader #02** Yes "I think it has hindered a natural progression of growth in the community. The growth of Cincinnati is coming out to the north. I think Fernald has had a negative impact to property values over the past 15 years. That may not be negative. Some people may not want growth."
- Leader #38** Yes Couldn't sell house; no one would buy it.
- Leader #06** Yes Property value has decreased, due to proximity to the site.
- Leader #41** Yes Property values -- interviewees feel their property won't sell. Vegetation, crop and live stock is a concern.
- Leader #19** Yes It seems that property value has decreased quite a bit. Don't want to sell their farm, but hearsay is the value has decreased. A neighbor tried to refinance recently, and the bank said no because of decreased property value within a 1-mile radius of Fernald.
- Leader #10** Yes Interviewee thinks a family member's property has been impacted by the Fernald site.
- Leader #08** Yes "That's a difficult question. I don't know that our property has been affected, but I don't know what our property would be worth if Fernald wasn't sitting on the other side of the hill. There's no doubt Fernald has influenced the monetary value of land in this area."
- Leader #41** Yes Owns 20 acres on Morgan-Ross Road. People say, "You're so close to Fernald. No one will want it." Hasn't decided to sell the house, but has tried. Has lived in the house four years and owned the land six years.
- Leader #09** Yes Has been denied the right to drill a well, which has caused the interviewee to have to pay for water because of groundwater contamination. Sediment from the Great Miami River is dropped on interviewee's property 1-2 miles downstream of Fernald's effluent line.

Because the interviewee lives 1.5 miles from the Fernald site, people expect the interviewee's house to be cheaper than other homes, as close as four miles away. Interviewee's quality of living has changed. Interviewee can't have a vegetable garden. Trucks from the Fernald site carry hazardous waste past interviewee's house twice a day.

<i>Leader #15</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #40</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #18</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #27</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #47</i>	No	Can't answer.
<i>Leader #36</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #29</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #17</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #50</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #23</i>	No	Too broad of a question – too vague. Fernald is a possible reason for lower property values.
<i>Leader #14</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #34</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #04</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #45</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #20</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #21</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #26</i>	No	No comment.

<i>Leader #03</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #13</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #44</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #30</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #07</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #25</i>	No	Lives next to the Indiana state line; the wind blows the other way.
<i>Leader #37</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #48</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #35</i>	No	No comment.
<i>Leader #43</i>	No	The Fernald site clearly had a terrible negative impact on the local community. The fact it's not known is the only reason it's not a more negative impact to Cincinnati.