7395 G-000-1004.25

TRANSCRIPT OF THE DECEMBER 12, 1995 COMMUNITY MEETING HELD AT THE PLANTATION

12/12/95

DOE-FN PUBLIC
54
TRANSCRIPT

DOE COMMUNITY MEETING

This meeting occurred at The Plantation, Dry Fork Road, Harrison, Ohio from 7:00 to 9:05 p.m., on Tuesday, the 12th day of December, 1995.

Court Reporter: Margaret J. Fahey (Murphy)

DOE COMMUNITY MEETING

December 12th, 1995

7:00 p.m.

MR. STEGNER: Let's go ahead and get started tonight, shall we?

Good evening, everyone. My name is Gary Stegner. I work in public affairs at the Department of Energy of Fernald. Thank you all for coming tonight. I appreciate your attendance. Happy holidays.

Tonight what we want to do is basically return to the format that we had used at previous community meetings. Now, we sort of diverged from that in August due to the radium extraction issue. But what we want to do now is basically have the meeting that we had planned to have in August, have it tonight. So what we'll do is, by way of organization tonight, we'll go back and Jack Craig will give you some introductory remarks and bring you up to date on some issues, current issues facing Fernald right now. And then Johnny will give his cleanup status presentation.

Following that, we'll have break-out sessions. And in August, if you'll recall, we

did plan on having sessions on the accelerated cleanup, the ten-year plan, and also on the remedial design and remedial process. So that's what we'll do after Johnny gets through with his presentation.

One of the break-out groups will go to the back of this room and back in, I think it's the Oak room where Jack will have his presentation for that. And those will last for about 20 minutes.

Following that, we'll have a short break, and then we'll reconvene in here for comments by the agencies, and FRESH, and Citizen's Task Force, and any citizens that want to speak. So before we get started, I wanted to remind you all that there are handouts over there on the side table. There's a Site Environmental Report, which basically talks about and tells about the monitoring. The most resent issue of the Fernald Report is back there, and all the OU Progress Reports are back there also. And there is a sign-up sheet from the Public Environmental Information Center for folks that want to get new documents from there.

What I want to also bring up tonight,

before I turn it over to Jack, is that our most, the newest public involvement issue from Fernald is going to be starting there fairly soon. It is the Community Reuse Organization. If anybody is really interested in serving on this Community Reuse Organization, please let me know. What that is going to be doing is basically looking at, to some extent, land use, but more, emphasizing more offsetting loss of employment at the Fernald site. And they are also going to be looking at reusing some of physical aspects of the site, maybe computers, maybe even fire trucks and that kind of thing. And we are going to be working with the Ross area Merchants Association, FRESH. Citizen's Task Force will be on this also, a lot of the local planning agencies. Economic development groups will be on it also.

So if you are interested in serving on that, we want to make this as open as we possibly can. Please let me know, or let's let one of the Fermco Public Affair staff know, and we'll get back in touch with you. We hope to have this group up, organized, and functioning by the end of February of '96.

So -- I am sure I am forgetting something. I always do. But I will turn it over to Jack right now, and following that then will be Johnny, and then we'll go into the break-out sessions. Okay?

MR. CRAIG: Thanks, Gary. What I quickly wanted to do is just give you a couple of highlights of some things that are going on that may be of interest to you. First of all, I would like to talk a little bit about the budget. We are just putting the finishing touches right now on the current year budget, our fiscal year '96 budget.

As some of you may have read, the DOE overall budget, at least the environmental management portion of the budget which funds all the work at Fernald, nationwide was cut about $600 million. That was the bill that Congress agreed to, and the President signed about a month ago. The department has been kind of feverishly trying to figure out how we are going to take those cuts, and dividing those up between the sites. And I think we are getting very close to getting a number so we can proceed with work this year. One of the things that's,

I guess, favorable about that is, even though the department got an over $600 million cut, it looks like the budget for '96 at Fernald is going to be relatively close to what we requested. One of the few sites across the country that was not cut. And we believe we'll have enough money that will allow us to continue on with the Accelerated Cleanup Plan. I will talk a little bit about that in our break-out session.

We also are undertaking right now what's called a rebaselining effort, and that's taking all the work that we have to do for the next 10 years, putting that down cost-of-schedule-wise, and getting that approved so we'll be able to track our progress as we proceed through the ten-year cleanup. We plan on having that baseline completed roughly mid to late January of next year.

Quickly, a couple of other things you may have read in the paper, which I will briefly touch upon, though Johnny is going to talk about a few of them, but the Operable Unit 4 schedule delay: We are potentially looking at a 17-month delay in the cleanup of Operable Unit 4 due to

some delays in the current construction and planning of the Vitrification Pilot Plant. We do have a couple of things that are ongoing right now to try to look at some ways to recover that schedule. We have two teams of people, one looking at cost and one looking at schedule. And hopefully we'll find some ways we can get that project closer back to the original schedule. And we'll continue to keep you updated on that.

On the radium issue with Operable Unit 4, I think at the last meeting, or one of the meetings we had here not long ago, we talked about radium specifically. We do have some activities underway that the University of Cincinnati is doing for us looking at the radium issue of Operable Unit 4. We have asked them to look at other sources of radium across the country. They actually delivered a draft report to DOE, I believe today, and we are reviewing that report. And it will be available for the public to look through around the first of the year. That looks at all the other sites in the country which radium could potentially come from. The other thing we are having UC do is

look at the feasibility of extracting radium from the vitrified K-65 material once we use our vitrification plan, turn it into glass, and are looking at the feasibility of removing the radium from that waste form. They are studying that right now, and will hopefully have some information to report out in February.

Another issue, I guess, that was in the paper last week had to do with the disposition of the uranium material we currently have on-site. As some of you may know, we have about 16 million pounds of uranium material that was left over from the production operations. We have been successful in selling some of that material. We have actually sold some of that material to Manufacturing Scientists Corporation in Oak Ridge, and also Allied Signal, which is located in Illinois. We have a Request For Proposal that's out right now to sell some additional material, I believe about 500,000 pounds. And we also are working with the Uranium Enrichment Corporation that operates the gaseous diffusion plant in Portsmouth. The department will be signing a Memorandum Agreement with them, and they will act as a

broker to dispose of the rest of our material. And we also have a study ongoing that's going to look at consolidating the rest of the uranium material at other sites across the country to be used in other DOE programs.

All of these activities, we're hoping, will be done by October of 1997. As our Ten-year Plan has told us, we need to have that material off-site by October of '97 to allow us to proceed with cleanup. We think that's doable. We think it looks good right now. When I talked to the reporter who wrote that article, there was one other thing we were looking at, which is if there was some reason why that didn't happen, what would we do. And we have initially looked at what will it take to build a facility on-site to store that stuff temporarily. And we just looked at it in a very summary form, and that's what the article referenced. The article made it sound like we were planning on building a facility, and that's certainly not the case. And we have confidence we can remove that material when it's needed to be off-site.

The last thing I'd just like to

acknowledge is a, I think a significant accomplishment that happened on-site. It actually happened about a week before Thanksgiving when the site actually reached a milestone of 3 million safe work hours on-site without a lost-time accident. It's the first time since Fermco has been on-site that's been achieved. That in itself is significant, but on top of that, if you add in the subcontractor construction work, that number is over 4 million safe work hours. So I think all the workers on-site should be recognized and congratulated for that. So, thanks.

Johnny, I guess you are next.

MR. REISING: Thanks, Jack. In Gary's opening remarks, he mentioned that the last public meeting was approximately four months ago. I believe it was August 7th. At that time I also had the opportunity to give the cleanup status. And I mentioned the transition that we were in as far as going from the RI/FS process of circulating to remedial design and remedial action. Well, we continue to go through that transition. And in my presentation this evening, which I will try to go through quickly

for you, you will hear the term "design" mentioned quite often. And I think if you look at where we are in this transition, we are definitely into the design phase. My break-out session this evening will deal with the remedial design process and opportunities for public input. And I think that during that break-out session you'll have an opportunity to see where we are at and where we are going with remedial design, and also the remedial action process.

I'd also like to mention, even though we talk about going from the feasibility evaluation of RI/FS into remedial design and remedial action, don't lose sight of the fact that we have been doing a lot of on-the-ground work as far as action is concerned. If you will look at the record, we do have 30 removal actions that we have undertaken. And of those 30 removal actions, we have basically completed 20 of those. And the 10 that are remaining are either in their final stages, or they are removal actions that are addressed on an annual state, be it safe shutdown, or weigh shipments, or something in relationship to that. So, please realize that we have been doing a lot of

on-the-ground things also in the past.

(Mr. Reising is showing picture slides.)

Jeanie. Okay. Operable Unit 1: Operable Unit 1 is composed primarily of the waste pits. You can read the bullets as well as I can. A couple of significant activities: We completed the construction of the change-out facility for the waste pits in September. This primarily consisted of a road, a parking lot and trailers. It's in an excellent centralized location. I consider it to be an integrated facility. This is going to be able to be used probably by a number of the operable units, not only Operable Unit 1, but Operable Unit 2, and probably also Operable Unit 4.

The field work was completed on the DEEP Project, that's Dewatering, Excavation, Evaluation Program. In Operable Unit 1 the preferred alternative that was chosen for the Record of Decision was excavation drawing of that material and then transporting it off-site.

The DEEP Project basically entailed a geotechnical investigation of the waste pits. We went in there and actually did some

trenching. We attempted some dewatering wells to see if we could possibly facilitate that. It was an attempt to obtain design data and construction data as we moved into remedial design and actual remedial action. All this activity was very, very successful. And, as I indicated, has recently been completed.

We submitted the Draft Preliminary Design Package. In fact, it was packaged as one and two to the EPA in October. These packages primarily were the entire design package for Operable Unit 1. It consisted of site preparation, the plant facility layout, basically equipment specification, excavation plans, transportation, rail upgrades, et cetera. And as a result, they conducted a Remedial Design Public Workshop in November. And the intent of the workshop was to address the remedial design package that had been submitted, in an opportunity to solicit input as to the design package, in an opportunity for people to take a look at it, to walk the public through the document and explain to them specifically what it meant.

Other activities in OU 1: They awarded a

contract to CSX for the design to upgrade trestles, basically on the spur line between the site, from here to Cottage Grove.

Are you going through those pictures for me, Jeanie? Okay, I was going to try to point some things out on those later on. That's okay. Not a problem. Okay.

And the design was recently awarded the contract. In checking with the OU 1, the actual work for those upgrades is scheduled to be initiated sometime in October of '96. Also, we are in the process of procuring an 80-ton locomotive from Federal Surplus for use in the Waste Pit Project. We are attempting to obtain this unit from the Defense Logistics Agency out of Columbus, Ohio. And it appears that if you go out in the open market today and purchase an 80-ton locomotive it costs you in the range of about $1.5 million. David Lojeck informs me that we'll probably be able to pick this one up at a steal of about $25,000 or so with a little bit of refurbishing.

Okay. The next one. Okay, just quickly to run through these pictures, as we said, this is a change-out facility for OU 1. As you can

see its location, it is basically centrally located. It's to the west of the production area, a little bit south and east of the pit itself. A parking lot, change-out trailer facility is going to be used by OU 1, OU 2, OU 4, and even possibly OU 3 in some of the D&D that takes place.

Jeanie. Some of the excavation of the DEEP Project took place. Here we are in Pit 3. You can see some of the heterogeneity in the material that's there. It looks like we have some pallets and other material. You can also see the water content that we had in Pit 3. Interesting enough, if you look at the reports, the amount of water in the various pits vary pit by pit.

Jeanie. Again, this is a shot of some of the materials and samples being taken out of the project. There's some interesting material that Mr. Lojeck and the crew had to deal with. This is just an example of a conceptual site plan that came out of the Preliminary Design Package, Package One, I believe, that Operable Unit 1 submitted, just to give you an idea of the type of documents that you'll see in some of the

remedial design, again indicating that this was followed up by a workshop to discuss the design package and to attempt to walk people through it.

Jeanie. Again, this is the Okeana trestle. Again, the award for design. The upgrades of this, that actual construction activity and upgrade is to take place sometime in October of '96. Thank you.

OU 2, the other waste area: Basically this is the south field, the inactive flyash, formerly active flyash, lime sludge ponds, and the solid waste landfill. Awarded the On-Site Disposal Facility Design Contract to GeoSyntech out of Atlanta. This was in August. This is the design contractor for that facility. A public workshop was held on the on-site disposal facility in October. This is, again, part of the remedial design process. This was an attempt to solicit ideas, concerns, interests, as far as the actual on-site disposal facility, to try to capture those.

It's my understanding that we have formulated a response to the various concerns that we received, and that document hopefully

will be going out to the public sometime in the relative near future. It's an attempt to basically point out how the various concerns and issues are going to be handled throughout the remedial design process. It's an attempt to point out where the various areas of concern will be addressed, what documents, and what submittal that the various concerns will be addressed within.

The Pre-Design Investigation & Site Selection Report for the on-site disposal facility was approved by both of the agencies in September and November respectively. The intent of this investigation was to determine the best geology and hydrology for the siting of the on-site disposal facility. The Remedial Design Work Plan was approved in November. We submitted the final report for Removal Action #30, which was the seep control at the south field in the ex-flyash pile back in December. The intent of this removal action was to collect seeps that were in the inactive flyash in the south field area, to collect these seeps in sumps. Those sumps are then pumped to the Advanced Waste Water Treatment Facility,

treated, and then released. The seeps ranged in concentrations of uranium anywhere between 20 parts per billion all the way up to some readings as high as 900 parts per billion.

The key issue here, as far as OU 2 is concerned, the preliminary design for the on-site disposal facility is to be submitted to the EPA on December 22nd of this year. This will be the preliminary design or the 30 percent Design. Again, this is the initial portion of the remedial design process. This is an opportunity for people to take a look at that. If they have concerns, or comments, or questions, to solicit them to the department, and to have them potentially incorporated into the advance designs, et cetera. So we'll talk a little bit about this also in my session as far as the remedial design process is concerned.

Jeanie. This is a collage that's been put together indicating the development of the on-site disposal facility, going from '95 through 2005, primarily showing you the site as it presently is, and then an indication as to the development and the continuous progression of the on-site disposal facility there on the

northeastern portion of the site, indicating that the clear areas where remediation and removal is taking place, and then the actual growth of the cell.

Jeanie. I have got some individual shots of this. I have all five of them, but I am just basically going through about three or so here. This is, I think it's the year '97 or so. You can see the development of the cell in the northeast portion of the property, and the continuation as it comes further south, the area that has been cleared up in the northeastern towards the northwestern portion of the production area.

Jeanie. This, I believe, is about the year 2001. A rendition of the continuation of the filling of the cell, putting material in the disposal facility. And you will note that in the upper portion of the cell is where it has been permanently closed with the vegetative cover on the top of it.

Jeanie. And a rendition of a potential representation of what the cell may look like, this in the case of year 2000 or -5 or so, primarily a remediation of the site showing the

buffer areas and protection of the cell itself, with the Advanced Waste Water Treatment Facility there on the southwestern portion of the site as far as continuing the aquifer remediation.

This is the Removal Action #30, which is seepage control in the active flyash in the south field area. Primarily trenching was done to capture these seeps. These seeps were then taken to sumps. The sump is the area which is to the top of the picture toward the riprap which was placed in these trenches to reduce the amount of erosion. The seeps are collected in the sumps, and it is indicated that the sumps are then pumped to the Advanced Waste Water Treatment Facility where they are actually treated and then discharged.

Jeanie. Operable Unit 3: The production area of man-made structures, except for the silos. A lot of action continues to take place in OU 3. Of note is the completion of the UNH Neutralization Project in late August. This project consisted of the neutralization and filtering of over 200,000 gallons of UNH that was being held in 19 tanks. This activity, the actual neutralization and filtration, took

approximately five months, if we take into consideration, we also count the institute process that was began. The entire operation was completed approximately one month prior to the date that we were given for completion in Ohio EPA's Director's Findings and Orders. Of note here is that as a result of processing this 200,000 gallons of UNH, this resulted in approximately 2,100 55-gallon drums of filtered material, which in itself is interesting because the original estimate was an anticipated potential 5,000 55-gallon drums of this material. So by the efficient processing of this material, we are able to reduce the amount of waste that was generated.

We submitted the draft for Remedial Investigation, Feasibility and the Proposed Plan to the EPA in September. It was reviewed by EPA. It was disapproved with comments. We recently revised the document, and are in the process of resubmitting it to the EPA within a couple of days, realizing that in Operable Unit 3 we do have an Interim Record Decision that has been approved. And this is the Final Record of Decision which deals primarily with the

disposition of the waste out of OU 3. Again, we'll be resubmitting this in the near future to the EPA, and we'll hopefully obtain approval on that document and move forward towards the Draft Record of Decision which will be the Final Record of Decision for the site.

We completed the Thorium Nitrate project in November that was initiated, I think, about on September 11th or so. This activity basically entailed neutralization solidification of about 6,000 gallons of Thorium Nitrate. And we also had to process approximately 1,000 gallons of rinse water with that. This resulted in about 370 or so drums of solidified material, which will have to be disposed of.

Safe shutdown continues in progress in Plant 9, the Pilot Plant, and Plant 5. Plant 9, I think we began our safe shutdown activities in August of '95, and we hope to complete that in January of '96. The Pilot Plant -- when I speak of the Pilot Plant, I am referring to the old Pilot Plant and not the Vitrification Pilot Plant, which I think we've asked Vicky, and tells me that I need to make sure there's a differentia of the two. We initiated

concentrated efforts of safe shutdown in the Pilot Plant in September of '95. We hope to complete that in May of '96. Plant 5, we've just kicked off the safe shutdown activities in Plant 5. We hope to complete those in August of '97.

D&D, we continue to move forward with our progress in D&D. The Plant 4 Complex was initiated in January of '95, and we are still anticipating completing that project in September of '96. Plant 1 we had to turn off for a while, but we recently turned that D&D activity back on in October of '95. It's scheduled for completion in August of '97.

Jeanie. Just a couple of shots. This is one of the UNH tanks, one of the 19 UNH tanks, which was in a little better shape than some of them. Those of you that worked in the project who are familiar with the plant will recognize this as being one in a little better shape.

Jeanie. Thorium Nitrate: This is the Thorium Nitrate tank. Again, we had approximately 6,000 gallons of this material which was neutralized and solidified. This is the actual operation, the apparatus we used in

that neutralization and solidification process. It was very effective. They came in and did this quite rapidly. And we are very happy with the results of this, and also the UNH activity.

Jeanie. I threatened Jeanie with having to point out all the various plants on this photo, but Rick Strobl was kind enough to be able to put the various designation of the various plants on here. This is just a site, an overhead of the production area, showing you safe shutdown, which is taking place in Plant 5, Pilot Plant, and Plant 9, and then the actual D&D activities of the location of Plant 1 and Plant 4. Thank you, Jeanie.

Operable Unit 4: Operable Unit 4 is the silos, Silos 1 and 2, containing K-65 material; Silo 3, containing cold metal oxides; and Silo 4 being empty. As the first bullet indicates, and as Jack mentioned in his opening remarks, the Pilot Plant, in the full scale facilities, we have realized some schedule delays.

Primarily, this is due, as Jack indicated, due to construction delays, a result of delays in melter procurement, reevaluation of the actual efficiency of the melter itself. It

resulted in approximately a five-month delay in the start-up of Phase 1, which is the surrogate material or the no-radioactive material, and with an overall stretch of approximately 17 months with delay of Phase 2, or the hot runs of the K-65 material.

The completion of the Vitrification Pilot Plant: What we are going to be doing, as Jack indicated, we are looking at both schedule and cost. We are trying to evaluate ways to bring that up and to bring that in. But I think we need to realize that this is a complicated process. We are wanting to move very methodically but cautiously forward in relationship to this. It's something that, from a start-up and an operation standpoint, we are extremely concerned about. We, both DOE and Fermco have put additional resources on this activity, and we hope to continue to move it forward.

EPA approved the Site Prep Package. And when I refer to the approval of the Site Prep Package, this is for the full-scale facility, the full-scale melter. The Site Prep Package was primarily for the underground utility site

preparation, super structure, and the Radon Treatment System. The Phase 1 Remedial Action Work Plan was approved by the EPA in November. Again, this is for the full-scale facility. The construction of the Vitrification Pilot Plant is scheduled to be completed in January. It's about 98 to 99 percent completed.

Presently we are undergoing CAT testing and systems operability testing at this point in time. The readiness assessment is anticipated to be conducted sometime in February, hopefully about February 7th. And the bake-out of the melter is presently scheduled probably for about the end of February. And Rick Strobl likes to tell me that it's February 29th, and there is actually a February 29th this year.

The initiation of the Vitrification Pilot Plant, as far as nonradioactive material testing, which is Phase 1, is scheduled to begin on March 21 and run primarily through January of '97. Phase 2 is anticipated to be initiated in April of '97 and to run through December. Again, I don't know if Jack mentioned it or not, but in looking at the schedule for the OU 4 full-scale facility and melter, that presently,

as far as the accelerated scenario and the ten-year schedule, it is not on the critical path.

We do continue to move forward with all the activities pertaining to that. As this slide indicates, we did have approval of the Remedial Action Work Plan Phase 1. We are looking at site preparations, super structure development, and a radon treatment system, all being evaluated and hopefully being constructed as far as that activity is concerned. So it's not as if everything has stopped. Again, we are continuing to move forward to address these potential delays, and other activities are going on.

Jeanie. This is a good shot of pipe racks and other equipment there at the Vitrification Pilot Plant. You can see Silo 4 in the background with the super structure. The lockup and the super structure are used for some of the exercises, as to actually getting into the silo itself. As you may or may not know, the design line of the silos is basically nil, and this is going to be utilized to actually gain entry into the silos to prevent any

collapse of the domes. There you see Silo 3, the other silo eventually down from it, and then Silo 2 and 1, which have the earthen berms around it.

This is a good shot to give you an indication this is not a simple process. There is a lot of equipment, a lot of various systems from an operability standpoint that have to be evaluated and tested. And we make sure that when we are ready to operate, that we are ready to initiate and operate it safely.

Jeanie. Again, an overhead view, a good shot showing you the Vitrification Pilot Plant where the melter would be housed, the Radon Treatment System over to the side, and I think that's where the, a, the -- one of the tanks that hadn't been placed at that point in time. But, again, just to show you that it's a complex system out there.

Jeanie. OU 5: Primarily the soils. The Aquifer: It's indicated, Submitted Draft Final Record of Decision to EPA on November 9th. And I was very pleased to find out today from Jim Saric, Ohio EPA, excuse me, US EPA, that they approved the document probably about a week or

so ago. I haven't seen the letter as of yet, but it's hopefully working its way towards us. I did receive a letter from Tom Schneider from Ohio EPA yesterday conditionally approving the document also. So this is basically our fourth Record of Decision. And also we have one Interim Record of Decision. So we are moving forward with obtaining approval for the Records of Decision.

The public water supply schedule: Just to give you a brief update on that. The hookup at Fernald is scheduled to take place at the end of this month to the first part of January. The reservoir, there's approximately a 1 million gallon reservoir. I think it's located on Crosby Road south of New Haven. It is scheduled to be completed in June of '96. I think construction of that structure has been initiated. But as a result of winter and weather, that construction has been halted until the spring, and will be completed in June.

Service connections: Basically a letter is to go out relatively soon to all of the individuals that will have service connections. In talking with Carlos Fermaintt, he indicated

that hopefully this letter will go out sometime this week discussing the service connections. And, again, these connections are scheduled for June. Also, it's my understanding that the representatives of the Hamilton County Department of Public Works are here tonight, as far as possibly talking with those folks, if you would like. And, also, I know Carlos will make himself available as far as any discussion as to the water supply project.

Completed construction of the Advanced Waste Water Treatment Dewatering Facility is anticipated for February. The function of this structure is to dewater the sludges. Presently, this activity takes place in Plant 8. An example is the UNH, the filtration that took place in Plant 8. These types of filtration processes, the dewatering processes that will be taking place at this new facility, allow us to shut down Plant 8.

The complete design of the expansion of the AWWT is scheduled for March of '96. Eventually this will add approximately 1,800 gallons per minute capacity. It is anticipated its additional capacity will go on-line,

hopefully sometime in March of '98. Presently we have potentially up to 11,000 gallons per minute capacity. This will give us a total of about 2,900 gallons per minute in the future.

The south field extraction system design has been complete. Six of the eight wells have been installed. We anticipate pipeline construction to be initiated in spring of '96, and the process to be operational in December of '96. This is an activity that's taking place in the south field to where we have some elevated concentrations of uranium. And the aquifer shows elevated concentrations. And this is an attempt to have some initial stages of aquifer remediation. We hope to move forward with that.

Jeanie. This is probably a familiar sight to many of you that make ingress and egress to the site. I don't see too many cars stopped behind this location, so it may not be too representative. But, again, this is the insulation of the public water supply throughout the area near the site.

Jeanie. This is the Dewatering Facility. This is located next to the Advanced Waste Water

Treatment Facility. This is about at approximately 50 percent completion stage.

Jeanie. This is the insulation of the extraction well field in the south field. This is one of the eight extraction wells being placed. Again, an opportunity to initiate the actual aquifer remediation in the area where we have those elevated levels.

Jeanie. Waste programs: As the slide indicated, we completed out fiscal year '95 shipping goal early this year. The shipments this year to NTS has been somewhat curtailed, primarily as a result initially of the continuing resolution in the fact that we were getting funding somewhat piecemeal. We decided to use that funding and expenditures elsewhere. That did not mean that we did not -- that we stopped any activity.

As far as waste management was concerned, we continued to package and prepare materials to be shipped. And it's my understanding that we have approximately 15 to 20 truck loads ready to go out the gate as soon as we turn that activity back on. We are in the process of trying to turn that on. It is my understanding that NTS

does shut down for the holidays, so we may have some difficulty in initiating that. I think our philosophy here is to ship as much as we can as quickly as can. This activity is going to be somewhat budget-related. As Jack indicated, we are in the process of conducting a baselining. And the baselining will basically indicate, give us an indication of what our goals are going to be for this year.

The proposed Site Treatment Plan for the mixed waste was approved by Ohio EPA. It was originally submitted in March, and it was approved in October. Some of the activities that have taken place and will take place under the Site Treatment Plan for the mixed waste: UNH, for example, Thorium Nitrate, the Liquid Bulking Project that we've recently undertaken, and the Mixed Waste Stabilization Project that's ongoing.

Jack mentioned the continued nuclear material dispositioning resolution. We were able to ship 700,000 pounds of Uranium, as Jack indicated, to Allied Signal in Metropolis, Illinois. So we continue to attempt to realize that this is a critical path activity, and to

try to move the material off-site, hopefully not having to build a structure in order to house it.

I also indicated that, under the Site Treatment Plan, we initiated the Waste Stabilization Project. This was initiated early on November 21st. We have approximately, I think, 1,550 drums of characteristic waste, of mixed waste, primarily lead-bearing and chromium containing. I anticipate completing this activity probably in March of '96.

The Thorium Overpack Project: We have approximately 5,600 drums of Thorium stored in Building 64 and 65. We are in the process of trying to initiate the overpacking activities there. We have obtained, I believe it was in August and September, two remote units AND which we are going to be using to conduct overpacking activities. Due to the radiological fields that we have out there, we are going to do that activity with these remote units. It's my understanding that training is in progress as far as utilization of this activity, and of these units, and it's going well. It's anticipated that full-scale operations will be

initiated in March or April of this year. Excuse me, March and April of '96. And the duration of the activity could possibly be up to one year, depending upon the efficiency that we have as far as the overpacking activity is concerned.

Jeanie. A couple of slides indicating this is the Mixed Waste Stabilization Project that's ongoing, that was initiated. It is a rather impressive activity out there. Jack and myself and others walked it a few days prior to them going on-line. Jack and I both were telling ourselves we didn't know if they were going to make their deadline or not. They did. I was very impressed of the activity, very impressed with the fact that they were able to go through the readiness assessment, and to start the activities ahead of schedule. Again, this is an operation to where the material comes in, it's shredded and sorted.

Next slide, Jeanie. The -- it's not pointed out too well, but this is the actual -- there is a drum located in front of the gentleman which you can't see very well. And that is a mixture that's used. The material is

put in there, and then with a Type 1 Portland cement.

Next slide, please. And you can see the actual mixing of the material in the drum. After it's thoroughly mixed, then it is placed or dumped into a modified white, metal container to which then it actually sets up. It's a very impressive operation that's going on out there.

This is the remote control unit for the Thorium Overpack, one of the two that we have. As you can see, it has an arm that's able to actually pick up the drum. And then, if you will notice, at the very base of the unit there is a base plate that can actually pick up the drum, and bring it back, and then put it on that base plate. In case the bottom of the drum has been deteriorated, or is of questionable integrity, it will give it some support so it's not hanging out there on its own. As you'll notice at the top, it is equipped with lights and also video cameras. It's a rather impressive piece of machinery. The drum holder itself has the capacity to rotate approximately 180 degrees. If in fact a drum is either on its side or of some questionable integrity, you

actually have the ability to move the drum from side to side.

Jeanie. This is the Operations Control Unit, or Base Unit. You can see numerous screens, the two screens in front of the operator there being the video cameras that are actually mounted on top of the unit itself. There's a screen which has the east camera and a west camera on the other side, which is actually within the building itself. The actual operation of the overpack takes place completely outside, away from Building 64 or 65 in a trailer that's located totally separate and away from it. And this is as -- Mr. Trygier refers to it as the Super-Duper-Thorium Scooper. You can see there's a mod -- The actual unit allows to be modified to where the drum holder can be utilized to actually attach to a scoop which can allow to bring, if you sweep the material -- If you have a spill and the material falls out of a drum as a result of being degraded, you can actually move it into the scooper. The scoop at the bottom actually goes onto that base plate that I showed you in a prior photo.

So, as you can see, a number of the drums

out there are in relative varying degrees of deterioration. And we anticipate this is going to happen. And I think that this is a lockup scenario as far as the training and operation in attempt to become proficient at this operation. And checking with Mr. Trygier, he indicates to me that the current operators out there have the ability to change out and go from, to basically put on the scooper and actually the sweeper unit of this, to change that out in approximately three minutes. So, I think that in itself is quite an accomplishment, that they can do that.

Jeanie. This is just a standard slide that we use as far as waste shipments are concerned, giving you the totals that were shipped to NTS and elsewhere through the end of fiscal year '95.

Again, I just want to end with a reiteration of the fact that we are heavily into the design phase of the project. I think that this is an opportunity for us. As we have said in the past, a lot of the things, and a lot of the decisions, some of the areas of concern, would be addressed through the design process. We are presently in the design process. So I

encourage you to take advantage of looking at the documents, asking questions, working with Jack, myself, other members of DOE and Fermco through Gary, et cetera, to look at these design packages. So, thank you very much.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Johnny. Now we arrive at the time where we will go to our break-out sessions. Jack's session will be in the Oak room, which is, again, out the doors and in the adjacent room. Jack will be pretty much giving you information on the Ten-Year Plan and present quite a bit of information on it, and of course take your questions and try to answer as many questions as he can on it in hopes to bring you up to speed on what we are planning on doing here the next 10 years at the site.

Johnny's session will be in the back of this room. And basically what he'll do is very quickly sort of reiterate what he went over at our workshop on RDRA Public Involvement in February. And, hopefully, then he will get your input on how things are going so far and suggestions for changes or improvements in the RDRA Public Involvement process.

So let's go ahead and hit the break-outs.

You know, try to break out as even as you can, half and half. After 20 minutes we'll switch. And then the half that's listening to Jack will come in and participate with Johnny. Okay?

(Off the record.)

(Break-out sessions.)

MR. STEGNER: Let's get on with it tonight. And we are at the point right now where we receive comments from USEPA, Ohio EPA and FRESH. And John Applegate from the Task Force is not here tonight, so we will not get a report from the Fernald Citizens Task Force. But let me go ahead and get started. Jim.

MR. SARIC: I've only got a couple of quick things, I think, to cover tonight. First of all, as you may be aware, there's been some issue with OU 4 and concerns about the Pilot Plant. And I want you to know that we are going to be watching very closely the progress of the Pilot Plant, how it progresses, how many activities they can do in parallel to try to reduce any delay that may occur. Again, though it's important to realize it is part of the Pilot Plant, or part of this thing is to do several experiments. And I think it's important

to make sure that everything gets done correctly so that when the full-scale vitrification plant comes on-line, that it's going to operate properly and we are going to get this whole process to move as quickly as possible. So although we are going to try to make this thing move as rapidly as we can, it's our concern, too, to make sure this is done correctly.

The second thing I think is real important is the Thorium Overpacking, after having some discussions today with that and seeing earlier some of the slides where you saw kind of the robot that can grab the drums. It's a lot of material that definitely needs to be moved off-site. And for us personally, it's a real important thing this gets done and gets moved off-site. So we are watching that very closely also. I encourage everyone to keep track on where both these projects are going.

Overall, as you have probably seen what Johnny showed tonight, is that the project really is moving into a design phase. And if you find yourself looking at some of these design documents, more than likely you open these things up and you see all kinds of

diagrams and a lot of engineering terminology. And you look at this and you may say to yourself, How can I really comment on this? Or, How do I know if it's right or wrong? And in many cases that a good question, you know, if you haven't had a lot of experience looking at this. So rather than getting kind of hung up on looking at the design documents, I think maybe the solution is to think about the remedies that are being selected in each of the operable units. And maybe you've attended a session, a work session, or a round table. And when you went through that, or if you talk to people at DOE, or Fermco, or ourselves about this, and if you've got concerns about the remedy itself, how it may be implemented -- Let's say if you are taking down the building, is there going to be too much dust? Or if you are concerned about will the ground water be treated through the treatment system. Or how will you make sure that soil being picked up from one area won't be placed in another area. If these are concerns you've got, or a remedy, you know, let DOE know, let us know, and maybe what we can do is we can kind of keep track of your concerns with each

remedy.

And as the process moves on and you get into actually the remedial action phase, or even before that, we can keep tally of how these concerns are being addressed. That way, rather than trying to interpret a diagram that's an engineering diagram, you can kind of look at what are your major concerns with the remedy, and we'll make sure those get addressed in the process.

So, you know, I hope no one feels lost by some of these diagrams, but there is an end to this in sight somewhere. And I'm sure you will have lots of questions, so we'll move on. As always, if you have any questions or anything, I am here tonight to answer any questions you gather. I'm available. I can give you my office phone. You can contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Jim. Next we have Tom Schneider from Ohio EPA.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thanks for coming out this evening. I know it's cold and we probably all have things we would rather be doing this evening besides talking about Fernald. But I

just want to talk just briefly about the OU 4 issues. I think something that's been overlooked is the fact that what we are doing on OU 4 is really cutting edge technology. And DOE has been trying to make vitrified waste product around the country for a while. And they are making lot of progress on OU 4 compared to some of the other projects that are going on around the complex. This is new technology. That's why you do a pilot project, to try and figure out the bugs before you build a great big plant and something, and know how to operate it most efficiently, and make the best product.

So I think some of these kinds of delays are to be expected when you are on the cutting edge of waste treatment technology. I think the other thing to keep in mind with regard to OU 4 is the success that DOE and Fermco and the workers were able to show with regard to Thorium Nitrate, UNH, and the nitric acid. In that it may have taken a while to get those projects underway, but once they did, they were able to make up the schedule in actual processing time.

So I think we can look forward to some of those kind of efficiencies to come out of this.

And actually probably even during the actual processing of the material they will be able to gain some time on schedule. So I think the example is there that the site can make up time once they get the project underway. So I think we'll be looking for those kinds of efficiencies to be gained once the process starts. And I think Fermco has shown a commitment to putting this project back on schedule, as well as DOE.

The other thing I want to talk about is the year ahead. Last year at this time we said, you know, "This upcoming year is going to be the year of the rods." And this is obviously going to be the year of the design or the engineers. You might want to look at it. So there's going to be a lot of design documents floating around out there, lots of blueprints for everybody to look at. The other thing is, there's going to be a lot of activity on-site. Hopefully, Jim and I have talked a little bit about the fact that we are going to try to have more of a presence around the site, as far as, I know the state is going to be expanding its Environmental Monitoring Program. We'll be issuing a sampling plan here within the next couple of months to

talk about what kind of sampling we are going to be doing associated with the Environmental Monitoring Program. And I think there will be other activities that will be on-site over the course of the next year, and probably expanding even further out, as time goes, how much time we are on-site. So those kinds of issues are stuff to be looking for over the course of the next year. And I think DOE is looking to change their Environmental Monitoring Program around a little bit. And hopefully we can get ours and theirs to mesh together, and make something that can make everybody happy, and provide useful information to the stakeholders.

With regard to the design commenting and those issues, we are available to talk about how DOE is doing these things. About our comments in the design documents, we are reviewing them at the same time that you are. As soon as you can get those comments in, the same thing DOE tells us, the sooner that they know our concerns with their design, the earlier they can put them into the fix. You know, they can fix the comments. And it saves everybody money. And you don't go and design a project that nobody is

going to be able to implement.

So, if you can get those comments in, and a preliminary design, and those first documents, look at the big picture, the concepts and your concerns with how the remedy is going to be implemented, that can save everybody a lot of time and effort. And we are going to be, it's going to be easier for us to listen to and implement your comments at that point for sure. Other than that, I just want to wish you all Happy Holidays. And if you have any questions, feel free to give us a call. We are always there to take care of it. Thanks.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Tom. Next we have Lisa Crawford from FRESH.

MS. CRAWFORD: We have got a couple of things. And I -- You can turn it down. Some of this might be directed towards Ohio EPA, but we also want DOE to think about this, too. There's been a lot of discussion about monitoring some of the off-site wells as the public water system goes in. And I also understand there's been some discussion that no private wells would be monitored after this water system goes in. And we want to highly encourage you all to do

quarterly monitoring of the private wells, of at least Well No. 39, which seems to be one of the wells that shows the higher reading. And I know there's been a lot of back and forth conversations between the state EPA, and DOE, and some of the folks that are working on the public water system. So that's something we want to encourage you all to think about and look at. It would keep that level of trust, I think, you know, and show us whether this well is going up or down. It's a trust thing with us. And I realize you're trying to save money, but, you know, one well doesn't seem like a whole heck of a lot to us.

Another little issue -- and I don't make it to the Water Meetings. Unfortunately I have a job. I understand that at this last public water, at this last Water Meeting, that there was some discussion on DOE paying some people's water bills, which kind of floored me because there's been absolutely no discussion about that at any meetings I have been to in the last few months. And personally I feel like you are opening up Pandora's box if you go pay this person and this person. And I will be very

careful and try not to use different people's names. I feel like you are opening up Pandora's box if you pay two different people's water bills, and other folks are going to go, "Well, hell, you pay their water bill, why can't you pay my water bill?" And I just think that this is something that needs to be openly and thoroughly discussed before a final decision is made on that.

And I certainly didn't know anything about it, and was quite shocked when I was told about it. My understanding is we are providing an alternate water source to one of the companies, you know, the wells up on Willy Road. People were very heavily reimbursed through the class action lawsuit. They are getting public water free in the contaminated area. And I think that's above and beyond the call of duty here. As a taxpayer, I have a major problem with us paying folks' water bills.

Also, out of that Water Meeting came another surprising statement, was that one of the wells on the farm was going to be allowed to be left open so that the cattle could be watered with it. And it's our understanding that this

well has a higher reading in it, and that was a large concern of ours, too. Again, I think you are opening up Pandora's box. If you give one person -- I'm not sure how -- If you let one person do something and you're telling everybody else they can't do it, it puts you in kind of a serious situation there.

These are subjects that probably need to be added on my evaluation sheet for this evening. I add that maybe this is something that needs to be talked about at these kinds of meetings, you know, a session on the public water system, how it's going to affect people, what's going to happen, who is going to do what. You know, the public participation process of this needs to be expanded, I think.

With regard to the Vitrification Plant, we are really disappointed. We also realize this is something new. It's technology that, you know, we are kind of feeling our way through. I just -- we really hope that you learn from this mistake. I think we make screwups and we learn from them as we go along. And I would highly encourage you to, and I think Ohio and US EPA both said it well, that we try

to pick up as much time as we possibly can.

Gary, you talked a little bit about this Community Reuse Organization, CRO. I'm a little disappointed that no one is here this evening that has shown a tremendous interest in the CRO. I would encourage the Department of Energy to set it up just like you set up the SSAB's, with full public participation with a charter, and bylaws, and that all the meetings will be open to the public, and we make sure that everybody who needs to be included in that is included.

With regard to the Special Nuclear Materials issue, Jack, the only thing I'll say to you is, temporary on-site buildings scare the hell out of us. Temporary tends to be permanent in DOE's language most of the time. If we cannot have a temporary building, we would prefer that to happen. We also realize this is another sticky little situation that we are going to have to feel our way through. And I also know that the paper's headlines were not correct.

The last thing I have is, there's a couple of reports out there that we are kind of putting under our heading of "Where Are They?"

The Federal Facility Compliance Act, we were under the understanding it was coming very soon, and we haven't seen hide nor hair of anything with regard to that.

(Inaudible response from crowd.)

MS. CRAWFORD: We are still on the list. We haven't seen any finalized report. My understanding with the conversation -- with, I can't think of his name off the top of my head, out of headquarters was that it was coming. That was a month or so ago, and we haven't seen hide nor hair of that document. So I think we need to find out where that's at and what's going to happen with it.

The other one is the Economic Report that the folks from UC are working on next week. Okay, that maybe we need to do a little update in the Monthly Update. You all do a "Here it is," instead of "Where are they".

The last thing is the Radium Study. I want to encourage you to make sure, as these studies come through, which they are going to come through quickly -- you know, we have one due this month and then one in January -- that we keep people updated on what's happening with

the radium issue.

A couple of little tidbits I'll give you on the FRESH Organization. Our next meeting is in January, the 4th, Thursday. And we will be going to every-other-month meetings. And our newsletter went out in the mail yesterday morning, correct, Vicky? The newsletter went out yesterday morning?

VICKY: Yes.

MS. CRAWFORD: So its on the street. And the last thing I'll say to you is, I hope you all have a happy, healthy and safe holiday season. And I am going home.

MR. STEGNER: Thank you very much, Lisa. Does anybody else want to say anything before we close the session this evening?

(No response.)

MR. STEGNER: Well, again, I want to thank you all for coming. I wish you all happy holidays. I know it's a very busy time of year, and if you are not doing something, I know you are trying to rest up to do something. So thank you all for coming, and we'll see you next time.

(Meeting concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Margaret J. Fahey (Murphy), a court reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a transcript of the DOE Community Meeting held on Tuesday, December 12th, 1995.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of December, 1995.

Margaret J. Fahey (Murphy)

Margaret J. Fahey (Murphy)
Notary Public-State of Ohio

My Commission Expires:
August 14, 1997