

7823

G-000-1013.160

**SUMMARY OF OHIO DOE'S STRATEGIC PLAN FOR 1996-2005,
WHAT GETS MEASURED GETS DONE**

09/06/96

APPLEGATE TASK FORCE
30
MAILING

*CHAIR*

John S. Applegate

MEMBERS

James C. Bierer
 Marvin W. Clawson
 Lisa Crawford
 Pamela Dunn
 Constance Fox, M.D.
 Guy C. Guckenberger
 Darryl D. Huff
 Gloria J. McKinley
 Jerry Monahan
 Thomas B. Rentschler
 Robert G. Tabor
 Warren E. Strunk
 Dr. Thomas E. Wagner
 Dr. Gene E. Willeke

EX OFFICIO

L. French Bell
 J. Phillip Hamric
 Gene Jablonowski
 Graham Mitchell

Summary of Ohio DOE's Strategic Plan for 1996-2005 "What Gets Measured Gets Done"

A copy will be placed in the Task Force Library. This publication is also available by request from Ohio DOE.

- Gives an overview of Ohio DOE's mission, goals and management vision
- Summarizes 5 EM projects currently underway, with charts of each master schedule
- Highlights "Critical Five" performance areas, with a breakdown of "success factors" necessary to achieve each goal:
 - 1) safety management
 - 2) trust and confidence
 - 3) business indicators
 - 4) mission accomplishment and compliance
 - 5) DOE employees
- Describes the importance of assessment in ensuring that goals are met ("What Gets Measured Gets Done"), and outlines process for that assessment to make overall strategic plan work

7823

September 2, 1996
The Cincinnati Enquirer
B-3
Staff and Wire Report

Fernald health on agenda

SPRINGDALE — A citizens advisory committee plans to spend two days this week hashing out health issues linked to the former uranium processing plant in Fernald. A key topic will be an Aug. 22 dose reconstruction study sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention that found an increased risk of lung cancer for longtime neighbors of the plant. The all-day meetings begins at 8:30 a.m. Wednesday and Thursday at the Sheraton-Springdale Hotel, 11911 Sheraton Exp.

7823

September 3, 1996
The Cincinnati Enquirer
A-7, Letter to Editor

Low-level radon gas not a serious threat

TO THE EDITOR: Your front-page story, "Study: Cancer risks higher near Fernald" (Aug. 23), was actually wonderful news to nearby residents like myself. This is because the report concluded that 70 percent of our risk is due to low levels of radon gas. The risks of household radon has been a hot topic in recent years.

Most studies (such as the Fernald study) that find significant radon risks rely on *calculated* exposures and dosages. I'm aware of several studies covering millions of real people living in Florida, Washington, even Denmark and Sweden, who can find no higher lung cancer rates in high-radon homes compared to low-radon homes. (In fact, they consistently find the opposite, called a "negative response.")

So please, if you want to live longer: Don't smoke, drive defensively, eat and drink sensibly, but for gosh sakes, don't worry about radon.

BURKE F. BRUSE
Harrison

7823

September 3, 1996
 The Cincinnati Enquirer
 A-6
 Editorial.
 Lawrence K. Beaupre

Cancer risks

Study compounds residents' fears

A credible new federal study confirms what neighbors of Fernald uranium plant have said for a dozen years: Radioactive releases exposed them to above-average risks of lung cancer.

The \$4 million study by the Centers for Disease Control estimated, within a 6.2-mile radius of the Morrow, Ohio plant, an added cancer risk of up to 2.5 percent. CDC researchers conclude this is a significant increase, especially for neighbors downwind of the plant (northeast). The Cold War nuclear weapons plant processed uranium and thorium from 1951 to 1988. Biggest surprise from this latest report is that radon gas, and not uranium dust, accounted for most of the risk dosage.

"We found that radon released to the air was the most important pathway to exposure," said John Till, lead scientist for the study and president of Radiological Assessment Corp.

The CDC findings make it imperative that the cleanup contractor FERMCO exercise extreme care with four K-65 silos that store 20 million pounds of radium-laced waste.

Residents must not be exposed to any further risk from leaking radon gas. Current risk to Fernald neighbors is judged minimal.

OSHA and other occupational/health agencies may need to revise their standards in light of the CDC study. But it did not attempt to estimate the number of cancer cases or cancer deaths expected from the increased risks found at Fernald. Only an epidemiological study of residents could determine that number, and even that estimate cannot prove Fernald releases caused individual cancers. Neighbors' lifestyle practices

such as smoking tobacco, a known cancer-causing substance, will make it difficult to link cancer cases solely to Fernald releases. CDC experts and the residents will need to evaluate together if an epidemiological study

here can promise definitive findings to justify spending millions more. If a Fernald study would lead to safer U.S. radiation exposure limits or safer cleanup procedures, the cost would be worth it.

In 1950, the Fernald-area population within a 6-mile radius was 10,000. It rose to 23,000 by 1990. In 1989, the government settled a class-action suit filed by Fernald residents for \$78 million and agreed to lifetime medical checkups every three years. It did not provide for residents' cancer treatment or compensation. Some want yearly checkups.

In 1993, the CDC's dose-reconstruction researchers reported that radioactive emissions from Fernald were double previous estimates. The CDC's latest report found that the 340 tons of uranium released to the air also may have put some residents at increased risk of kidney cancer. The CDC plans to train doctors monitoring the residents to detect likely lung or kidney cancers. Their medical records could help nuclear plant neighbors and workers nationwide.

Any additional money for residents from class-action lawsuits or compensation from Congress would come out of taxpayers' pockets. Hush-hush U.S. nuclear weapons agencies during the Cold War did not warn residents they could be at risk. If residents' cancers are tied conclusively to Fernald, they are as much Cold War casualties as U.S. soldiers. We would owe them.



7823

September 5, 1996
Journal News
Front Page
by: Nicholas Johnson

Officials spell out Fernald health options

By Nicholas G. Johnson
Journal-News

SPRINGDALE

In the first of a series of meetings with Fernald-area residents, federal officials Wednesday discussed possible responses to a recent study of theoretical health risks posed by radiation exposure from the former Fernald Feed Materials Production Center.

About a dozen members of a citizens group, the Fernald Health Effects Subcommittee, met with researchers from the federal Centers for Disease Control.



Greg Lynch/Journal-News

Dr. James Smith, researcher with the federal Centers for Disease Control, discusses radiation with the Fernald Health Effects Subcommittee.

The opening segment of the two-day meeting, which continues today at the Sheraton-Springdale Hotel, summarized results of the Fernald Dosimetry Reconstruction Project, a six-year study released two weeks ago outlining the hypothetical risks of radiation exposure to residents in the surrounding area.

Researchers said the majority of radiation expo-

sure to residents was from radon gas inhalation. The gas is a decay product of radium, which was stored in two silos on the site.

In the worst-case scenario described by the study, the median risk of fatal cancer would increase by three percentage points.

(Please see FERNALD, Page A5)

7823

September 5, 1996
Journal News
Front Page-A-5
by: Nicholas Johnson

Fernald _____

(Continued from Page A1)

Dr. Owen Devine, head of the risk assessment group in CDC's radiation studies branch, said the study was able to take into account many factors in assessing risk, but some factors could not be measured.

"If we're honest, and we admit there's a certain lack of knowledge in the dose estimates, then we have to carry that honesty on and admit there's a certain lack of knowledge about the risk estimates," Devine said. "In addition to the uncertainty about the dose, there's also uncertainty about how much risk one gets from a certain dose."

Because of the level of uncertainty regarding the report, some residents, including subcommittee member Robert Hanavan, say they want a more rigorous analysis, such as an epidemiological study.

"I'm telling you from living in the area that it doesn't seem like one in four or one in five people die (of cancer) — it seems like more. The numbers seem way low to what I'm used to seeing," he said.

An epidemiological study can determine if an association exists between an individual's exposure to radioactive materials and a specific disease they developed.

But it cannot determine a specific person's risk for disease or if a person's disease was caused by exposure to radioactive releases from the Fernald site, researchers said.

Epidemiological studies typically cost several million dollars and continue over a number of years, Dr. James Smith said at the meeting.

7823

September 5, 1996

Everybody's News

Page 29

by: Randy Katz

MEDIA WATCH

by Randy Katz

More Low Level Radioactive Waste from *The Enquirer*?

Was it merely a "slip of the tongue," or was *The Cincinnati Enquirer* attempting to use a report on increased cancer rates near Fernald, OH, to buttress some of its own highly questionable reporting about the government-contracted clean up in progress at the former uranium enrichment plant there?

According to Tim Bonfield, *The Enquirer's* fine medical-beat reporter, it was definitely the former.

"We probably could have been clearer in indicating that the report does not address current risks [to Fernald residents] or FERMCO (the company that, since 1992, has been working under contract to the Department of Energy to clean up the site)," Bonfield told *EN*.

Bonfield wrote a series of stories about a six-year, \$4 million study issued last week by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The landmark CDC report indicated that, as Fernald residents and environmental activists had long suspected, higher than average cancer rates for Fernald area residents could indeed be attributed to long-term emissions of radioactive materials at the plant. The big surprise in the CDC report, as Bonfield's stories indicate, was that the primary cause of the increased cancer risk came—not from traces of uranium seeping into the

environment—but from radon gas leaks, particularly during the period between 1960 and 1979.

However, one sentence in Bonfield's Sunday, Aug. 25 A-1 story reads: "Now neighbors know what they suspected all along—they might get cancer living [our emphasis] near Fernald." Bonfield says he agrees it would have been more accurate to write the sentence in a way that made it clear the CDC report addresses an accumulated risk factor only for the period between 1951 and 1989.

Moreover, a "History of Fernald" chronology attached to Bonfield's Aug. 23 story on the CDC report closes with the following item:

"February 1996: a six-month *Enquirer* investigation reports that the company hired to clean up Fernald ... (FERMCO), has cheated the government out of millions of dollars and jeopardized the safety of workers and neighbors." As regular *EN* readers know, though a series of *Enquirer* stories by Mike Gallagher did indeed make such charges, many interested Fernald observers—such as Lisa Crawford of Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety and Health (FRESH), John Applegate, who chairs the Fernald Citizens Task Force, and the DOE (which issued its own report on *The Enquirer's* allegations)—have judged those reports to be baseless.

Bonfield indicates there was no intent in his stories on the CDC study to suggest that FERMCO was the cause of any increased cancer risk

to Fernald residents. However, Bonfield did tell *EN*:

"I know *The Enquirer* stands by those [Gallagher] stories."

If so, the paper may stand alone. French Bell, a researcher at the Agency for Toxic Substance Disease Research (ATSDS), a sister organization to CDC, was in Cincinnati when the agency's report was presented last week. Bell hadn't read *The Enquirer's* reports on FERMCO, but says of the California-based company managing the Fernald cleanup:

"I think they are being very cautious in everything they're doing. These [cleanups of radioactive sites] tend to be one of a kind events. I mean, it's new technology, and I think they're being very prudent and trying to make sure they have everything covered [in terms of risks to people and the environment]. They're being watchdogged by all kinds of agencies and citizen groups, and I think they're doing a good job of keeping the public informed."

The final verdict on *The Enquirer's* FERMCO allegations will probably come in the form of an exhaustive report on those matters from the congressional General Accounting Office (GAO). However, sources indicate, the GAO's report probably will not be issued any time before the November election. ■

7823

September 5, 1996
 The Cincinnati Enquirer
 Front Page-Metro Section
 by: Tim Bonfield

Fernald panel looking to future

More data, training,
 screenings sought

BY TIM BONFIELD
 The Cincinnati Enquirer

SPRINGDALE — A big, thick study reports that longtime neighbors of the Fernald uranium processing plant face increased odds of dying from lung cancer. So now what?

A 17-member citizens advisory committee huddled in a hotel conference room Wednesday and today to begin hashing out health concerns linked to Fernald. The early consensus: The studies shouldn't stop now.

Committee members want more information about cancer risks, more frequent health screenings for neighbors, and more training about Fernald for local doctors. Several members said screenings could help ease minds of worried neighbors while early detection of tumors could help save lives.

"Are we here to help people afflicted with various diseases or are we here to build case studies for the future?" said committee member Louis Doll, a union representative at Fernald.

The meeting was the first chance the committee had to discuss results of the Fernald Dosimetry Reconstruction Project, released Aug. 22 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Worst-case scenario

In a worst-case scenario, the study estimated that radioactive pollution from Fernald increased the odds of dying from lung cancer from 20 percent to 22.5 percent.

The biggest surprise of the study was that most of the cancer risk came from radon gas emitted from waste storage silos over the years, and not from tons of uranium dust that escaped plant borders. Current radioactive leaks from Fernald pose no significant human risk, study authors said.

The citizens' committee was formed earlier this year to recommend health priorities to the CDC. One big issue: to decide whether to launch a multimillion-dollar epidemiological study to estimate how many people may have died of cancer caused by Fernald.

CDC experts are still studying whether it is possible to do a meaningful epidemiological study. The dose reconstruction study was an important first step. Another piece of the health puzzle may come out early next year, when the CDC completes a "Community Based Risk Assessment."

Deaths, dosage compared

That assessment will use the dose estimates released last month to make a rough, first guess at how many Fernald neighbors may have gotten cancer. The assessment will compare dose estimates with more than 7,300 death certificates of people who died of lung cancer in Hamilton and Butler counties. But the results will not be definitive, said CDC researcher Dr. Owen Devine.

For example, the study cannot tell whether people smoked (a major cause of lung cancer). The assessment will miss as many as 8 percent of lung cancer deaths that were never recorded as such on death certificates. It also will miss residents who died after moving away.

August 28, 1996
 The Harrison Press
 Front Page
 By: Ollie Roehm

7823

Radon releases, not uranium, posed greatest threat

CDC study shows cancer risk greater near Fernald

By Ollie Roehm
 Editor

The recent release of a report assessing the radiation dosage to folks living or working near the Fernald Uranium Processing Plant made a long-held suspicion a chilling reality for many folks.

Because of radioactive emissions from the plant, people have a higher-than-average risk of dying from cancer.

The results of the six-year study were presented Thursday, Aug. 22, by representatives from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Radiological Assessments Corporation (RAC). The study, called "Fernald Dosimetry Reconstruction Project" was prepared by RAC for the CDC.

The report estimates the amount of

radioactive materials released from Fernald and the health risks to the public. The time period of 1951 to 1988, the years the plant processed uranium for nuclear weapons, was used in the study.

It concludes that the chances of dying from lung cancer are increased by about three to nine percent due to releases of radioactive contamination from the facility. The risk is dependent on the time spent near the plant and the distance from the plant, states the report.

The estimated chance of Fernald area residents developing a fatal cancer ranges from about 23 percent to 29 percent, a figure higher than the national average of 20 percent, said the study.

According to RAD president Dr. John Till, radon, and not uranium, provided

the highest dosage of radiation. Although people were exposed to radiation through the release of contaminants into groundwater, surface water and food, the inhalation of radon was probably the main source of exposure, he said.

"The air was the most important pathway for release," Till said.

Radon emissions were highest during peak operating years in the 1950s and 1960s, although releases from the plant's K-65 silo were still significant in the 1970s, Till said. Accidental mass releases in 1966 and 1986 were also taken into consideration, according to Till.

Till said about 340 tons of uranium and 170,000 curies of radon were released into the air during the plant's

operating years.

In order to estimate the radiation dosage, scientists developed nine scenarios of hypothetical people living, working or going to school within a 6.2-mile radius of the plant. Exposure estimates in each scenario were based on factors including location, age, method of exposure and time spent near the plant, Till said.

Till stressed that although he has confidence in the study, its conclusions bear a degree of uncertainty. Radiation doses received by people in the past could not directly measured and instead were estimated, he said.

Till said CDC scientists will study the report to determine if an epidemiologic study is needed investigate the

association between the estimated Fernald-related exposures and cancer occurrences. Scientists will also try to estimate the range of likely cancer deaths caused by radioactivity from Fernald, he said.

The report will be presented on Sept. 19 and 20 for assessment by the National Academy of Sciences, before further study is made by the CDC, Till said.

"Reconstructing history is a time-consuming process," Till said.

Several Fernald area residents expressed confidence in the study, but say more must be done.

"Although we suspected this, I think we're all still a little shocked by what we're hearing. This confirms much of

what we've been saying for years," said Lisa Crawford, president of Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety and Health, a citizens group. "Now we need the epidemiologic study."

FRESH member and 11-year Fernald activist Edwa Yocum agreed with Crawford that the epidemiologic study is a must.

"This justifies everything we in FRESH knew already," Yocum said.

Yocum said she performed her own study, using a list of names she gathered of people who developed cancers and illnesses she thinks may be related to Fernald radiation. She plotted on a map the residences of the people on her list.

Continued on Page 16A

August 28, 1996
The Harrison Press
A-16
By: Ollie Roehm

7823

Fernald

Continued from Page 1A

"We show large clusters of sick people in several areas, especially in the northeast corner," she said.

Yocum lives on Ohio 128 near the facility and said she thinks she children may have been by radiation exposure.

"My son has a very low sperm count and thyroid problems. His wife has had several miscarriages. My daughter developed pituitary tumors and is also having a problem with her thyroid," Yocum said.

Harrison Township resident Corilla Kelly doesn't live within the study's milage radius but is convinced that ra-

diation exposure at Fernald directly contributed to the death of her husband, Herb. Herb Kelly was employed at Fernald for several years and was the first worker to publicly raise questions about conditions at the plant. He died of lung cancer about two years ago.

"I'm glad they've confirmed that the place caused cancer - that all of this hasn't been in vain," said Corilla Kelly.

Kelly said she is trying to convince her children to become involved in the fight to find out the truth about Fernald's effects on the public.

"It's just something we all should be concerned about," she said.

August 28, 1996
The Harrison Press
A-4
Community News

7823

Fernald Task Force sets meeting for Sept. 28

The Fernald Citizens Task Force will hold a meeting on Saturday, Sept. 28 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton Cleves Highway, Harrison.

The task force will discuss site monitoring and a proposal to amend Silo 3 treatment.

The meeting is open to the public, and time will be reserved for the public to address the task force.

The task force has been created to help guide cleanup at Fernald. The U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, and DOE collaborated to form the Task Force, and it includes representatives of the constituencies affected by cleanup decisions.

The agencies have agreed to consider the task force's recommendations in their decisionmaking processes,

though the recommendations are not legally binding.

The key 1996 issues for the Task Force include: waste transportation, design of the on-site disposal facility, and the timing and completion of construction activities.

7823

September 2, 1996
The Cincinnati Post
A-6
Associated Press

Ohio EPA may delay rules for site cleanup

'Brownfields' worry environmentalists

Associated Press

COLUMBUS — The director of the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency may postpone the approval of rules that would make it easier to clean up and redevelop polluted industrial sites around the state.

Jenifer Kwasniewski, a spokeswoman for the EPA, said Director Donald Schregardus is considering such a delay after local governments, businesses and environmental groups raised concerns

about the proposed rules for the sites, known as brownfields.

"The request is something we have to take seriously," Ms. Kwasniewski said. "We're discussing a possible extension."

The regulations have been debated for about two years. EPA officials had intended to present the rules package to the state's Joint Committee on Agency Rules Review next month, the last step before final approval.

Local governments and business



Donald Schregardus

leaders had hoped that approval of the final rules for the Voluntary Action Program — also called the "brownfields law" — would provide a boost to the program, which has been operating under temporary rules for two years.

The rules are being created to flesh out the program, which the Legislature authorized in 1994 to allow developers to privately clean up a contaminated property using private, licensed contractors. The cleanup would proceed without direct EPA oversight, following a set of rules the agency is to establish.

Once the site is cleaned up, the EPA will issue a "covenant not to sue" — a promise not to take action against the

property owner if other contaminants are later found on the property. The program was set up to provide a faster alternative to traditional EPA cleanup programs.

Since the program started in September 1994, only four sites have been issued covenants not to sue. That's mostly because the interim rules prohibit properties with contaminated groundwater to take part in the program.

Environmental groups say the proposed permanent rules are too lax because they don't do enough to protect groundwater and don't allow for public participation in the cleanup.

Representatives of three environmental groups who sat on an advisory committee to help develop the rules sent a letter last week to Schregardus, attacking the program as a threat to the groundwater that many Ohioans drink.

"We want the EPA to go back and rewrite the rules to address our concerns," said Jane Forrest, environmental project director of Ohio Citizen Action, a consumer and environmental citizens group.

The groups said the EPA made changes in the proposed rules during the weeks after a series of public meetings in June, and the public has not had a chance to learn about the changes.

7823

September 2-8, 1996
Cincinnati Business Courier
Page 15
Week In Review

Fernald report cites cancer risk

A six-year study confirmed an increased cancer risk for those living near the Fernald uranium processing plant. The \$6 million study, sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control, found Fernald area residents had a 23 percent chance of dying from cancer, 3 percent higher than the national average.

Southwest District Office

401 East Fifth Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2911
(513) 285-6357
FAX (513) 285-6249

George V. Voinovich
Governor

August 26, 1996

RE: FERNALD FUNDING AND
SCHEDULE

Mr. Phil Hamric
Department of Energy
Ohio Field Office
P.O. Box 3020
Miamisburg, Ohio 45343-3020

Dear Mr. Hamric:

Two correspondence recently arrived at Ohio EPA that relate to the Fernald budget over the next several years. The first included the *Ohio Initial Ten (Nine)- Year Plan* (A 10 year plan) recently submitted to DOE HQ, and addressing the A1 Alm ten year vision, dated August 9, 1996. The second is an August 15, 1996 FERMCO to DOE letter regarding revised planning funding levels. Ohio is concerned with the inconsistencies in these two documents and the apparent DOE retreat from its commitments to the Fernald 10 Year Plan present in both documents.

At DOE's direction, FERMCO recently expended significant resources to rebaseline the remediation program at Fernald to meet a credible 10 Year Plan in order to complete site remediation activities by 2005. These activities were intended to support the Fernald Ten Year Plan which only last year was introduced, widely endorsed, and funded. Even the U.S. Congress supported acceleration of the Fernald project through the 1996 National Defense Authorization. In word and deed the Department of Energy made a commitment to the citizens around Fernald, the State of Ohio, and numerous other stakeholders to pursue a genuinely accelerated cleanup of Fernald. But before the baselining effort was even completed a reduction of approximately \$10 million per year was passed back to Fernald. Clearly such a cut will influence the completion of cleanup, but DOE FN and OH, with support from stakeholders, accepted the cut and prepared to uncover even more novel and innovative ways of completing the cleanup. To a point such cuts can be worked around.

The initial replan, based on the new \$264 million funding level and also the basis for the Fernald portions of the *Ohio Initial Ten (Nine)- Year Plan*, suggest that the 'cost' of the reduced funding is one to two years on the schedule and something near \$200 million in additional costs. Hence the Fernald Ten Year Plan has been extended to a twelve year plan before year one is completed. More recent information, however, sheds entirely new light on the future of the Fernald cleanup.

With the efforts to accelerate cleanup mentioned above in place, the inconsistencies in the

Mr. Phil Hamric

August 26, 1996

Page 2

August 9 and 15 correspondence raise significant questions about DOE's commitment to accelerating cleanup and about Fernald and OH efforts to secure adequate funding from DOE HQ. The August 15 letter which describes the replanned path forward for Fernald, given the reduced funding expected, sounds a clear death knell for anything that could legitimately be called a ten year plan. The new funding level, it seems, puts such tremendous pressure on the schedule that site remediation extends to 2010 or beyond. These delays will result in violation of numerous regulatory milestones, many subject to stipulated penalties. No relation to ten years exists any longer. Almost simultaneous to receipt of this information Ohio EPA received the *Ohio Initial Ten (Nine)- Year Plan* which suggests that all is well at Fernald. This document clearly states that, "All operable units stay in compliance...", "Initial analysis of the Baseline at this funding level will cause a two year schedule extension.", and that by 2006 OU4 waste is disposed and no additional OU4 activities remain. The only post 2006 activities identified in the plan are the groundwater remediation and disposal cell monitoring.

It appears that the information being submitted to DOE HQ does not reflect what can be accomplished in the field. The *Ohio Initial Ten (Nine)- Year Plan* clearly is not aligned with the on the ground fiscal realities that will either enable or prevent prompt and efficient cleanup of Fernald. It is critical that OH fully evaluate funding requirements for the site and use that data to request appropriate funding. In order to provide any meaningful comments Ohio EPA requests that detailed clarification be offered explaining the differences between the Alm submittal and the actual work anticipated at Fernald under the funding scenario currently offered by the Assistant Secretary.

It is pertinent to reiterate the primary goal of the initial Ten Year Plan at Fernald - completion of cleanup at the site by 2005 except for the groundwater. The benefit of acceleration was the expedited completion of cleanup activities so that the site could be removed from the EM funding trough enabling other sites not currently so advanced in their programs to obtain increased funds. In addition, the acceleration created a life cycle cost savings for DOE and the taxpayer of nearly \$3 billion. To reach this point Fernald had to complete investigations, sign RODs, establish stakeholder credibility and support, and identify substantial productivity improvements that would net tens of millions of dollars. With many of the productivity improvements being implemented, additional reductions in funding from the baseline, especially in the early years, have crippling effects on work schedule. That message must be clearly presented to DOE HQ.

It is genuinely disheartening to see the Department so quickly retreat from such a promising opportunity. Not often will accelerating the actual cleanup of a site offer as large a life cycle savings as Fernald presented at so little a near term cost. Unfortunately, this retreat is also jeopardizing DOE's credibility with stakeholders. Credibility that was hard earned over years is being rapidly discarded in a matter of weeks. This undesirable outcome cannot possibly enhance

Mr. Phil Hamric

August 26, 1996

Page 3

the chances for future success at Fernald. The community needs to be assured, in a real and meaningful fashion, that DOE is not shirking its responsibility to effectively manage the cleanup of Fernald.

Ohio believes DOE must reaffirm their commitment to the Fernald 10 Year Plan and show how funding will be provided to achieve that commitment. Additionally, Ohio requests that DOE provide resolution to the very significant discrepancies between the *Ohio Initial Ten (Nine)- Year Plan* and FERMCO's August 15, 1996 letter to DOE.

If I can answer any questions regarding this letter please call me. A prompt response to the concerns enumerated in this letter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,



Graham E. Mitchell

Chief

Office of Federal Facilities Oversight

cc: Al Alm, DOE EM-1
James Owendoff, DOE EM-40
Jack Craig, DOE FN
Jim Saric, EPA Region V
Lisa Crawford, FRESH
John Applegate, FCTF
John Bradburn, FERMCO