

7643

U-005-1004.3

**TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING FOR THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR
THE OPERABLE UNIT 3 FINAL REMEDIAL ACTION - APRIL 23,
1996**

04/23/96

SPANGLER DOE-FN/PUBLIC
34
TRANSCRIPT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC MEETING
THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE OPERABLE UNIT 3
FINAL REMEDIAL ACTION

Held at: The Plantation - Magnolia Room
Tuesday, April 23, 1996
7:00 p.m.

Presenters: Gary Stegner, DOE
John Trygier, DOE
Steve Houser, FERMCO
John Hall, DOE
Regulators: Jim Saric, U.S. EPA
Tom Schneider, Ohio EPA

This meeting occurred at The Plantation, Dry
Fork Road, Harrison, Ohio from 7:00 to 8:10 p.m., on
Tuesday, the 23rd day of April, 1996.

Court Reporter:

Lori J. Melas

000001

PUBLIC MEETING

Tuesday, April 23, 1996

7:00 p.m.

1
2
3
4 MR. STEGNER: Good evening everyone,
5 thank you for coming. My name is Gary Stegner.
6 I work for the Department of Energy at Fernald.

7 Let me quickly introduce our presenters
8 tonight. We have John Trygier from the
9 Department of Energy. He is the newly appointed
10 operable unit 3 manager at the site. Steve
11 Houser who's his counterpart at FERMCO. And
12 also who will be presenting tonight is John
13 Hall. He is the RI/FS investigator. He is also
14 at Fernald. We also have a panel of technical
15 experts here tonight also. We have Todd Clark,
16 Wayde Hartwick and Doug Dunderman, all from
17 FERMCO.

18 We're here tonight to talk about this
19 disposition of wastes generated as a result of
20 remediation of OU3. If you will kind of harken
21 back to January of '94, when we sort of started
22 this whole process with a hearing on the interim
23 record of decision for operable unit 3. And
24 what this allowed us to do was basically proceed
25 with demolition of facilities on the site. We

000002

1 sort of deferred the decision on waste
2 disposition and how we are going to do it, or
3 what we are going to do about the rubble and
4 debris we generated as a result of the
5 demolition until right now.

6 So tonight, the express purpose of this
7 meeting is to discuss waste disposition as it
8 pertains to operable unit 3. As you can see,
9 here on the screen in front of you, this is how
10 we are going to be organized tonight. After I
11 am done rambling on here, we will have some
12 fairly brief presentations, just to sort of get
13 you up to speed on what operable unit 3 is and
14 what we have done to date to bring us to this
15 point. Following that, Jim and Tom from U.S.
16 and Ohio EPA will offer a few remarks.

17 After that, we will go into a question and
18 answer period. This will be an informal type
19 thing. We will take as many questions as we can
20 in the allotted length of time. If we need to
21 go a little bit longer, we can certainly do
22 that.

23 Following that, we will have a break, and
24 then we will move into the formal public hearing
25 aspect of the evening. And as you can see, we

1 have a court reporter here on hand taking
2 everything down. A record of this meeting will
3 be put in the Public Environmental Information
4 Center within just a matter of a few weeks, as
5 soon as it gets transcribed. But prior to going
6 into the public hearing, I will go over the
7 ground rules for that, also. And if you would,
8 if you want to speak on the record tonight, you
9 might tell Julie or Mary Jo or Sue, so they can
10 put you down. And we will kind of go on a
11 first-come-first-serve basis in terms of taking
12 testimony for the record.

13 So, where are we going to go from here?

14 I want to remind you also that this will
15 not be your only, obviously your only
16 opportunity to respond or to comment on the
17 proposed plan for operable unit 3. The ending
18 comment date is the 2nd. You can send your
19 comments in anytime between now and then. What
20 we will do with those, of course, is include
21 them into the Responsiveness Summary. They will
22 become part of the record of decision. So any
23 comments you make, any questions you may have,
24 we will respond to officially in the
25 Responsiveness Summary. I think, hopefully, we

000004

7643

1 can have you guys out of here maybe inside a
2 couple of hours. So let me go ahead and turn
3 this part over to John Trygier.

4 MR. TRYGIER: Good evening. I am John
5 Trygier. I will give you a quick overview of
6 OU3. Here is what OU3 is made up of. OU3
7 consists of man-made structures on-site. It
8 consists of 136 acres. OU3 is comprised of 10
9 different categories of material. Most of those
10 materials are made up in two different
11 categories of concrete-like materials, which is
12 about 50 percent of the material, and steel-like
13 material, which is about 25 percent of the
14 material. There's a breakdown in the proposed
15 plan of these material categories.

16 Additionally, in the back we have photos of
17 these 10 categories of material, and a brief
18 description of that material and the quantities
19 associated with that. So if you want take a
20 look at that at the break, to see those
21 categories.

22 The components for OU3 remediation is
23 removal actions, the record of decision for the
24 interim remedial action and then the record of
25 decision for the final remedial action. For

000005

1 OU3, there is 10 removal actions that are
2 complete, that result with us being in the field
3 early. Of 14 total removal actions for OU3,
4 four of those 14 removal actions are
5 programmatic in nature, and those will continue
6 during the interim action to completion in the
7 final record of decision. Those removal actions
8 will be low level waste disposition, asbestos
9 program, safe shutdown, and the storage of bulk
10 material and debris.

11 The record decision for the interim
12 remedial action, commonly known as the IROD,
13 allowed us to get into the field and take down
14 the facilities with a record of decision early.
15 Two of those activities are ongoing now. That
16 is Plant 1 and Plant 4 D&D. They are currently
17 in progress.

18 What we are here tonight to talk about is
19 the final record decision for the disposition of
20 the materials. And we will be taking your
21 comments on that. One of the things that I
22 would like to point out is that through this
23 remediation process, we have been able to
24 accelerate getting in the field and doing the
25 actual field activities for almost three years

000006

1 from what the original schedule was in
2 developing a schedule to get to a final record
3 decision. So I think that is something that was
4 really key in the OU3 process. With that as
5 general background of OU3, I would like to turn
6 it over to Steve Houser to talk about the RI/FS
7 and the remedial alternatives.

8 MR. HOUSER: This is going to be a rather
9 quick turnover among the speakers, but I'm sure
10 it will be welcome. Let me briefly reintroduce
11 myself. Again, my name is Steve Houser. For
12 the last two years I have been the project
13 director for the Facilities D&D Program. We have
14 been busy for that time period. We have
15 achieved quite a bit. We've completed our
16 planning process for our field investigation
17 program, completed the field program, completed
18 a merger of our documents, a combination of our
19 RI and our FS. Our particular areas are of the
20 nature that it made a lot of sense to do that,
21 saved a lot of time, met our regulatory
22 objectives, and has been successful to date.
23 And we anticipate on submitting the record of
24 decision, complete with the Responsiveness
25 Summary, later this summer, probably mid summer.

000007

1 Our general approach to this field
2 investigation was, attempted to be very
3 conservative; identifying the type, the volume
4 and location of the contaminants that we were
5 concerned about. As a result of over 10,000
6 radiological surveys, we collected over 1,100
7 samples of different kinds of materials that are
8 present in our operable unit. As a result of
9 the analyses of those types of samples, we
10 identified over 60, or right at 60, constituents
11 of concern.

12 What we found was that we found
13 contamination of the approximate kind and
14 approximate location of what we expected. The
15 results -- what this evaluation showed were
16 there were basically two general types of
17 categories in which this material fell into; the
18 concrete-like type of materials on one side and
19 the steel-like type of materials on the other.

20 With respect to the concrete-like
21 materials, we further found that the
22 contamination was primarily concentrated in the
23 upper inch of concrete, or the upper inch or
24 outer layer of brick material and mortar. It
25 seemed also that the acid brick material was the

000008

7643

1 only thing that looked like it was a potentially
2 hazardous and/or slash mixed waste.

3 With respect to the steel general
4 category, most of that contamination appears to
5 be associated with residues remaining in the
6 process piping equipment that remains on-site,
7 as well as somewhat trapped in the protective
8 coatings of the different pipe and steel and
9 rail and structural members that comprise the
10 facilities. I know their conclusion was that
11 other than a small volume of lead flashing and
12 roofing in similar areas, we didn't really find
13 a gross collection of hazardous metals or
14 materials like that.

15 We also, through a number of studies,
16 evaluated the leachability of the different
17 contaminants that were found there. Technetium
18 99 you will see a little bit more on, and I will
19 refer you to the back for a little bit of a
20 primer on Technetium 99. It's available at that
21 back table. But it seemed to be the only
22 contaminant that we identified that was
23 leachable to the point of getting potentially
24 into the groundwater.

25 In general, the waste debris, waste

000009

1 materials fall into four different regulatory
2 categories, which are low-level radioactive
3 waste, and that includes asbestos for the
4 purpose of our particular site; the PCBs is a
5 second strain; mixed waste, I identified one for
6 you just now, some of the acid brick; and a
7 solid waste category. The second part of this
8 RI/FS slash proposed plan is the feasibility
9 study. Most of you are aware by now the primary
10 purpose of the feasibility study is to identify
11 your remedial alternatives, or what your options
12 are for disposing or eliminating waste that is
13 identified.

14 This particular FS did just that,
15 identified treatment disposition technologies by
16 the various material categories that we
17 segregated materials into. It identified
18 remedial alternatives. We performed a detailed
19 analysis of each of the alternatives, and then
20 we compared the evaluation results. Pretty
21 straightforward and simple. This one's not
22 exactly complex, as you would expect with
23 man-made structures, ground type materials.

24 Alternative one, no further action is
25 required by the national contingency plan as

000010

7643

1 part of our process. Alternative two, selected
2 material treatment, on-property disposal and
3 off-site disposition combined. Alternative
4 three, selected material treatment and off-site
5 disposition.

6 Here is a slide that gets a little bit
7 more depictive of the differences between those
8 two. They seem awful close. It basically boils
9 down to some combination of off-site disposal
10 and on-site disposal, or off-site disposal as
11 the alternative. What you see is, the
12 differences between them are depicted by the
13 different colors. Where they are similar, it's
14 yellow. Where they are different, it's white
15 and/or orange, in the case of the third
16 alternative.

17 The selected alternative, as you will see
18 in the proposed plan, and as John Hall will talk
19 about here in just a minute, is the one on the
20 left. And it represents what we consider the
21 balanced approach, and raises a balanced
22 approach in coordination with regulatory
23 requirements and a number of stakeholders, both
24 locally and across the country.

25 One of the issues and challenges that we

000011

1 had was to, as we selected that remedial
2 alternative, was to establish a waste acceptance
3 criteria for the contaminants or constituents of
4 concern. We wanted to be reasonably
5 conservative in how we went about doing that.
6 And we adopted the very similar, a process very
7 similar to all the other operable units on the
8 site and how we identified the particular
9 contaminants of concern and what might pose a
10 threat in an unmitigated situation to the
11 environment and to public health.

12 We took those 60 COCs and screened them
13 for mobility. We identified from those, through
14 screening, that there were 10 with the potential
15 to break through. From those 10, we identified
16 that there were two of sufficient mass that
17 potentially could cause impact to either the
18 environment or the public health. And from
19 those two, there was one that exhibited mobility
20 necessary to potentially migrate to the
21 groundwater in an unabated situation. That one
22 is our friend Technetium 99 that I mentioned
23 just a little bit earlier.

24 The calculated waste acceptance criteria
25 for that particular contaminant to be placed

000012

7643

1 into our cell is estimated conservatively at
2 approximately 105 grams. And we identified,
3 through our remedial investigation approach,
4 that we have approximately 127 grams on-site.
5 You wonder how you can deal with the 127, 105
6 and the ability to be that accurate, et cetera.
7 We got aggressive and tried to remain
8 conservative in our ability to deal with them,
9 and analyzed how and where we found that
10 material, and how we could deal with getting
11 that down below the 105 limit of waste
12 acceptance criteria.

13 The first step was to find that there were
14 11 grams associated approximately with the
15 hazardous/low level mixed waste that resulted
16 from the acid brick. All that material will be
17 dispositioned in our alternative off-site.
18 Secondly, we identified another 57 grams that
19 was associated with concrete in four particular
20 areas. In our remedial alternative we are
21 committing to scabbling, or crushing that
22 concrete out of that first inch layer where we
23 expect it to be, and removing that material and
24 taking that off-site. That leaves us
25 approximately with half the target for the waste

000013

1 acceptance criteria, which I feel is a very
2 comfortable and conservative estimate for our
3 ability to meet that particular concern.

4 Let me introduce John Hall, who will take
5 the next section. John is the Department of
6 Energy, Fernald's project manager for the RI/FS
7 program.

8 John, if you will.

9 MR. HALL: As Steve said, I am John
10 Hall. I am DOE project manager for the OU3
11 RI/FS. I am thrilled to be presenting the first
12 alternative to you tonight because it signifies
13 a major milestone in the OU3 process. As you
14 know, we have spent the last several years
15 characterizing, and sampling, and evaluating,
16 and documenting our results. But now we are
17 finally prepared to present our preferred
18 alternative.

19 And we have chosen to use a format tonight
20 that, from consumer reports. You are probably
21 used to seeing these for comparing a Ford Taurus
22 to a Chevy Lumina, or something like that. We
23 kind of adapted that to what we are trying to do
24 here. Across the top, we have the alternatives
25 that Steve has gone over with you, and down the

1 side we have seven of the nine USEPA criteria
2 from the national contingency plan. These are
3 the evaluation criteria.

4 We've left off state acceptance and
5 community acceptance here, because that's going
6 to be addressed during the public forum rather
7 than now. The second thing I want to show is
8 this horizontal line here. It separates the
9 threshold criteria from the primary balancing
10 criteria. The threshold criteria are things
11 that you must meet. It doesn't matter how well
12 you do on the ones below that, you have to meet
13 those. And because of that, I am not going to
14 go over the no action alternative tonight,
15 because it doesn't meet the two threshold
16 criteria, as you can see by the white dot.

17 I want to compare alternative two to
18 alternative three tonight, and go over the area
19 where two is superior to alternative three.
20 And, as Steve pointed out, the major difference
21 between alternative three and two is that in
22 alternative three all the material will be
23 dispositioned off-site and alternative two there
24 will be some on-site disposal. So the first
25 area where we will see there is a difference is

1 short-term effectiveness. You see that
2 alternative two is superior. And that's mainly
3 due to the number of man hours that would be
4 required to load the waste away and certify it
5 and load out the containers for off-site
6 shipments under alternative three. And
7 obviously the amount of risk, it increases the
8 mechanical injury to our workers as it increases
9 the number of hours that they are required to do
10 those type of activities.

11 The next area where alternative two is
12 superior to alternative three is under
13 implementability, right here (indicating). I
14 think that several of you have visited the
15 Nevada Test Site and seen the disposal
16 facilities, and you are aware of the difficult
17 process it takes to transfer waste from here to
18 there. And there is numerous states, I could go
19 through numerous state codes and you are also
20 aware that the record of decision for OU2 allows
21 for an on-site disposal facility here on the
22 site. So this implementability of transferring
23 waste from OU3 to the facility is easier than
24 transferring it across the nation.

25 And lastly, you see the cost here, it's

000016

1 about a \$100 million cheaper to do alternative
2 two than alternative three, and that in itself
3 is not reason enough to choose alternative two
4 over alternative three, but it does provide for
5 two important advantages. It's better
6 stewardship of taxpayer dollars, and it also
7 allows us to use our financial resources to do
8 more site activity and cleanup on the site. For
9 these reasons alternative two was our preferred
10 alternative, which we will be soliciting your
11 comments on tonight.

12 This next slide does a nice job of showing
13 you exactly what this alternative will be doing.

14 I want to point out in this slide that the
15 nuclear materials and its legacy wastes from
16 category J, this kind of corresponds with page 3
17 of your proposed plan -- there is a little chart
18 in there that kind of shows this -- the nuclear
19 materials and the legacy wastes are destined for
20 off-site shipment. They are not a part of these
21 bullets.

22 Also, I want to call out that these are
23 based on our best estimates and assumptions at
24 the time. These numbers could change as we do
25 the project. And as you can see, this first

000017

1 number is a good example of that, 309,000 cubic
2 feet of material for recycling, reuse and
3 disposal for commercial sanitary landfill, that
4 number could change as we get smarter at the
5 site about our recycling, reuse and
6 decontamination activities.

7 The next number is the amount of material
8 right now that we anticipate will be shipped
9 off-site to a permanent commercial disposal
10 facility or the Nevada Test Site. And then
11 below that you see a subset of that, is 2,400
12 cubic feet of material, that Steve talked about
13 earlier, where we are going to need to scabble
14 concrete to stay below the waste acceptance
15 criteria for Technetium 99 in our cell. Then
16 the last volume that we show is the amount of
17 material that we estimate right now that will
18 meet the waste acceptance criteria and be able
19 to be disposed in the on-site disposal facility.
20 And then lastly we have seen the cost.

21 That's all the material I have to go over
22 with you tonight. Thanks for your attention. I
23 will look forward to receiving your comments.
24 With that I will give it back to Gary Stegner.

25 MR. STEGNER: Thanks, John. I'm going

000018

7643

1 to read this to you. I do want to emphasize the
2 fact that -- reemphasize the fact that the
3 comment date ends May the 2nd. If you don't
4 want to make your comments on the record
5 tonight, you can use the form that's on your
6 chair there, and send your comments to me. Or
7 you can just send me a letter, fax me a letter,
8 however you want to do it, by May the 2nd,
9 please.

10 I wanted also, in terms of public
11 involvement opportunities on this, I looked at
12 the record today, and I believe this is the
13 seventh public involvement opportunity we've had
14 to date exclusively to OU3. There, of course,
15 will be other opportunities for public
16 involvement, I believe the next one is scheduled
17 for sometime in the early fall. OU2 will be
18 having their 60 percent meeting, as promised,
19 sometime probably in late May. So, with that, I
20 think we can move it on and see if there are any
21 comments from our regulators. Jim.

22 MR. SARIC: I would just like to kind of
23 briefly put things into perspective with this
24 particular proposed plan. This truly kind of
25 links our interim record decision with this

000019

1 final potential proposed plan that will come
2 here in ultimately the OU3 record of decision.
3 So it puts everything in perspective. We're
4 kind of closing the loop on this last particular
5 operable unit.

6 And then ultimately it will, by signing
7 this ROD, eventually we will move into the
8 redesign phase and continue on from there. And a
9 key point that was brought forward was a lot of
10 the activities, like starting with the IROD
11 first and now moving forward, this really helped
12 us move forward three years ahead, as far as
13 taking buildings down and getting ahead in this
14 process. But it doesn't mean we were trying to
15 short circuit this process in any means. We are
16 still trying to make sure we get all the public
17 comments on what to do with this material. And
18 I think this remedy is not just a cost driven
19 remedy, by any means. I think that this remedy
20 is consistent with what the approach we used,
21 this balanced approach, for taking the more
22 contaminated material and disposing them
23 off-site and then consistently, with this
24 operable unit, we will see that the brick from
25 the acid brick material, and some of the other

000020

1 material, will be shipped off-site, whereas some
2 larger volumes of lower contaminated material
3 will be placed in disposal cells. And the
4 disposal cell option is consistent with that
5 from operable unit 2 and operable unit 5. So I
6 guess the point I really want to stress is that
7 we definitely welcome all your opinions that are
8 there and we support this remedy. We have
9 looked at it and we feel it is consistent with
10 the operation from the site. If you have any
11 questions, I will be glad to answer them later.
12 Thanks.

13 MR. STEGNER: Tom Schneider from the
14 Ohio EPA.

15 MR. SCHNEIDER: Good evening. As Gary
16 said, I am Tom Schneider with the Ohio EPA. And
17 I just wanted to reiterate what Jim said about
18 the fact that we support the proposed plan
19 that's out there. We think it's an integral
20 part to the balanced approach that's been put
21 forward by DOE, USEPA and Ohio EPA. It's
22 consistent with that approach in that the most
23 highly contaminated material and process related
24 waste, the acid brick and stuff, are going
25 off-site and we are going to manage the rest of

1 the material, the lower level contamination, the
2 large volume material on-site. As Jim said, if
3 you have any questions, we will be around during
4 the break, and you can ask them. And we look
5 forward to your comments. Thanks.

6 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, gentlemen. I
7 think with that we are ready for our informal
8 question and answer period. And it's been our
9 custom, when we handle these things in the past,
10 it's been something of a free-for-all. You guys
11 can shoot us your questions -- It might be best,
12 if you would use the microphone, just to help
13 our court reporter. But if you don't want to do
14 that, please speak loudly and it will probably
15 be a free-for-all from this end also, deciding
16 who is going to answer the questions. But I
17 guarantee you, we will get your responses to
18 you. And if we can't do it with this bunch up
19 here, there are folks out in the audience who
20 I'm sure will chime right in. And if they can't
21 do it, we will research it and get an answer to
22 you. So whoever wants to be first, feel free.
23 Vicky.

24 MS. DASTILLUNG: The first question I
25 have was, you had like 200 to 1,000 years that

1 this was being designed for. That is a pretty
2 big discrepancy, or range. Can you explain why
3 it's this big of a range?

4 MR. CLARK: I think there are a couple
5 different aspects according to that 200. It's
6 really 200 or 1,000 years. There are different
7 criteria being looked at for a 200-year
8 look-ahead, which is really the way CERCLA tends
9 to look at things. And the thousand years is
10 sort of a site specific look-ahead.
11 Specifically to the disposal cell from site is,
12 it's a thousand year look-ahead. There is some
13 components of that that are 200 year. I think
14 for a more detailed answer on that, we will
15 probably have to get involved with the cell
16 design folks, the people in OU2, that if you've
17 got a more detailed question than that.

18 MS. DASTILLUNG: So if I understand
19 that, some of the regulations that you have
20 followed call for 200 and some a thousand. It's
21 not real a range, it's just --

22 MR. CLARK: It really shouldn't be
23 reported as a range. It's two different
24 criteria, I believe, that are being looked at.

25 (Inaudible.)

1 MS. DASTILLUNG: You said that the
2 perimeter completion is in the back?

3 MR. CLARK: That's the yellow fax sheet.

4 MS. DASTILLUNG: You guys are getting
5 good, because that's one of the questions I
6 already had written down, more information on
7 that. This is, I guess, more for Gary. I think
8 we need a round table on the free release of
9 materials, or for recycling, and an explanation
10 of what criteria will be used and what you
11 consider to be, quote, "economically feasible,"
12 and certification programs that will be
13 involved, because I think we have a lot of
14 questions about that kind of stuff.

15 MR. STEGNER: That's a good idea. Maybe
16 we will do that.

17 MR. CLARK: I would add to that that the
18 Citizens Task Force has a subcommittee now on
19 waste management. It's looking at recycling,
20 reuse and those areas. I think we haven't had
21 our second meeting yet, but that will be a good
22 connection to make.

23 MS. DASTILLUNG: That was all of my
24 questions.

25 MS. CRAWFORD: I want to reiterate

1 Vicky's question. This has been a long, hard
2 discussion for us about the reuse and how we
3 will recycle, and what kind of a threshold are
4 we going to look at. I think the round table
5 would be fine. Maybe working it with the waste
6 subcommittee for the task force will probably be
7 fine. And I think that's where you are going to
8 get a bulk of the comments, because that's not
9 spelled out real clearly and our primary
10 concern, as always is, where this stuff is going
11 to end up. And some countries have far less
12 than this country does, hopefully.

13 We understand that some of the stuff is
14 going to be used to make metal boxes. We don't
15 really have a problem with that. But anything
16 over and above recycling from metal boxes, we
17 need some real clear ideas and standards of what
18 we are looking at.

19 MR. CLARK: I think that's something we
20 have talked quite a bit with our counterparts,
21 Tom Schneider and Jim Saric, on these issues,
22 too. And one of the things I think you will
23 find in this set of documents, is that we left
24 it a very open framework for those kind of
25 decisions to be pinned down later and adjusted

1 as technology has improved or economics change,
2 or as the variables change. There is a
3 commitment from the site to participate in
4 recycling as stakeholders define the need and as
5 the economics support and all the variables that
6 go into those decisions are clearly able to be
7 changed over a 10-year span of the project, and
8 left that open. The openness, coupled with
9 commitment, is what we are hoping is acceptable
10 in this document.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, the other end of
12 that issue is sometimes when you talk about
13 recycling things, the cost to recycle is
14 sometimes higher than it is to just bury it or
15 do away with it. And, you know, we feel like if
16 we can recycle something and it's not
17 astronomically this huge range of difference,
18 that we really should work on recycling as much
19 as we possibly can. And I think we need to kind
20 of look at our options there, because sometimes
21 the prices you are quoted aren't always the
22 price you can ultimately get in the end.

23 MR. CLARK: There is an activity going
24 on within the site right now, there is actually
25 another fact sheet in the back about recycling

000026

7643

1 and reuse that alludes to some methodology being
2 developed within DOE-FN and FERMC0 to try and
3 factor in the true cost of waste disposition.
4 Because, you're right, sometimes recycling
5 initially looks like it's more expensive. There
6 may be other factors, longer term factors, when
7 we start to take them into consideration it may
8 sway the actual cost, the fact is being more
9 competitive with the disposal option. Economy
10 is a scale, if DOE and the government as an
11 entire entity can buy larger contracts for
12 recycling, the price will come down. There are
13 a lot of variables that could eventually get us
14 there.

15 MS. CRAWFORD: We just want to make sure
16 that we are looking at all of our options and we
17 are not just saying, well, this company, you
18 know, wants this amount of money and that's the
19 only one we are going to look at. I would like
20 for us to open that up and look in a lot of
21 different directions. We can recycle stuff and
22 feel pretty confident it's not just going to hit
23 the public pretty quick, then we are very much
24 in favor of recycling.

25 MR. HOUSER: Lisa, one of the things we

000027

1 are most pleased with regarding our progress at
2 this point is the number of opportunities, we'll
3 have to revisit that as this time period goes
4 by. We wanted to build in flexibility, as Tom
5 pointed out, and we worked hard with a number of
6 factions in the site, both DOE and FERMCO, and
7 we worked hard with the U.S. and Ohio EPA to
8 adopt an approach that will allow us to revisit
9 opportunities for recycling and reuse on each
10 implementation plan that we develop for each
11 specific complex, and then it might come down.
12 AND so I think that will give us a lot of
13 opportunity to discuss this and explore it, and
14 take maximum advantage of opportunities there.

15 As the task force explores it, and the
16 waste subcommittee, and the committee reuse
17 organization explores how we can deal with these
18 things, they will provide another conduit of
19 debate and evaluation, and we will be able to
20 visit it. I think the round table is an
21 excellent idea, and as we go through the next
22 few months, we can lay the groundwork out for
23 that.

24 MR. STEGNER: The floor is open.

25 MS. CRAWFORD: Well, if nobody else is

7643

1 going to talk, I will ask another question.

2 MR. HOUSER: You waited a little too
3 long, Lisa. You caught me by surprise, I
4 thought you would be faster than this.

5 MS. CRAWFORD: Again, I think -- I don't
6 know if this is a question more than a comment,
7 but you are going to hear from a lot of us
8 basically saying no off-site waste be brought in
9 for disposal, for on-site storage. We haven't
10 seen that, but that's to let you know that we
11 won't let that occur. You are going to see that
12 quite a lot.

13 Oh, wait there is another one. At our
14 availability sessions, there was discussion of
15 use of a commercial solid waste landfill. And,
16 you know, the word Rumpke or other was mentioned
17 as -- basically no way. You are going to hear
18 that quite a bit, too. I mean, I don't know if
19 you can respond to that. Are we looking into
20 that?

21 MR. HOUSER: One of categories of
22 materials that will be generated during the
23 course of our remedial action is solid waste,
24 that is not low level contaminated, is not
25 hazardous, that is not PCB or asbestos based.

000029

1 That solid waste certainly has the capacity to
2 be disposed of in accordance with regulations at
3 permanent commercial disposal facilities. As
4 far as I know, Rumpke is that. We can be
5 responsive and listen to the comments that come
6 in and deal with them as best we can. That is a
7 viable option, is there --

8 MR. CLARK: I think maybe by example it
9 may make more sense if we look at some of the
10 things like operable unit 3 includes a lot of,
11 let's say office trailers right now is one of
12 the things that comes to my mind. I live in an
13 office trailer, and the trailer is clean and at
14 the end of a project the trailers will be old
15 enough that they really won't be able to be
16 reused somewhere else, and they are not expected
17 to be contaminated. Why would we want to add
18 that necessarily to the bulk of the disposal
19 cell, if it could be within regulations to
20 dispose of it at a local facility, or any number
21 of other options that might be cost effective
22 and better stewardship of the environment and
23 things like that. It was to maintain that
24 capability for the project.

25 MS. YOCUM: Even though, that answer,

000030

7643

1 even though you are saying it's on the same side
2 of the site, are you still going to run it
3 through decontamination?

4 MR. CLARK: It would have to be looked
5 at to verify that it is clean, but it is in an
6 area considered clean. People who work there
7 are not in and out of the process area. There
8 is no reason to expect it to be contaminated
9 itself. But, yes, you are right. It would be
10 looked at as to verify it is as expected at the
11 time of the disposition. We have to do that.

12 MR. STEGNER: Do we have any other
13 questions right now? If not, why don't we take
14 about a 10-minute break, and then we will
15 reconvene for the formal public hearing part.
16 During the 10-minute break, if you have any
17 questions come to mind, our panel here will be
18 available, will be in the back of the room,
19 mingling around, free feel to ask them any
20 questions. So we will try to reconvene about
21 five minutes until 8:00.

22 (Short recess.)

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

25 Okay. Let's go ahead and move into the

000031

1 formal part of the evening. The way we will
2 proceed is the people who have signed up and I
3 am told no one has signed up to speak yet. What
4 they will have done is we would have called them
5 in order. But since no one has done that, we
6 will have an open microphone for anyone who
7 wants to comment on the record. You can send
8 your comments in until May 2nd. If you want to
9 use the form provided, feel free to do that. If
10 you want to use the letter format, feel free to
11 do that. If you don't want to speak on the
12 record, if you have a copy of your statement you
13 want to provide for us, if you have attachments
14 you want to provide, please feel free to do that
15 also.

16 We will ask when you do come up to the
17 microphone, please state your name clearly for
18 the benefit of our court reporter. And let's
19 see if I am forgetting anything before I turn it
20 over to you. So, again, this is just to
21 emphasize this is the formal comment period. We
22 will not be responding to anything you say from
23 this point on. It will be included, of course,
24 in the Responsive Summary, which will become
25 part of the record of decision. Okay. The

000032

7643

1 microphone is now open if anyone wants to speak
2 on the record at this time, now is the time to
3 do it.

4 Yes, sir.

5 MR. MURRIN: I would like to thank the
6 Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of
7 Energy, and for all the good things you have
8 done and all the people we miss.

9 MR. STEGNER: Next, please. I take it
10 we want to do all this in writing. Are we going
11 to make it an early evening? Going once, twice,
12 okay. Thank you all very much for attending
13 tonight.

14 This is Maria Curro Kreppel. Since the
15 formal part of our meeting is now adjourned,
16 Maria would like to say a few words since she
17 has an opportunity of heading the crowd here to
18 talk to you.

19 MS. KREPPEL: I would just like to say
20 hello because I recognize a few faces. One of
21 the gentlemen on the panel referred to this
22 organization earlier this evening. We will be
23 meeting to discuss the committee reuse
24 organization, which will be reformed in the next
25 two months in this room on May 28th. That's a

000033

1 Tuesday evening, 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. I hope any
2 of you who may be interested in this new
3 community activity, that we really focus on the
4 future of the Fernald and the continuous
5 community and your interest in those
6 communities, will let me know before the 28th by
7 virtue of filling out the application form on
8 the back sheet, or by coming on the 28th of May
9 to that meeting, or both. My phone numbers are
10 also on the sheet, and I will be pleased to have
11 a conversation with any of you and certainly be
12 led by you to other members of your community
13 whom we also maybe can contact. Thank you for
14 the chance to say hello, and I will be around
15 for a few minutes if you would like to have
16 further conversation.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

000034

7643

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, Lori Melas,, a court reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the public hearing taken on April 23, 1996.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 29th day of April, 1996.

Lori Melas,

Lori Melas

Notary Public - State of Ohio

My Commission Expires:

August 27, 1997

000035