

5892

U-003-1004.1

**TRANSCRIPT OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OPERABLE UNIT 1
PUBLIC MEETING AUGUST 23, 1994**

08/23/94

DOE-FN PUBLIC
89
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

US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
OPERABLE UNIT 1 PUBLIC MEETING

MEADOWBROOK

AUGUST 23, 1994

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000001

1 MR. LOJEK: Good evening, we're
2 going to be kicking off our meeting here now. I
3 was just waiting for a few minutes just watching
4 the parking lot and that and making sure we got
5 everybody coming in.

6 Well, good evening and welcome to
7 tonight's public meeting on the Proposed Plan for
8 the cleanup of the waste pits at the Fernald site.
9 I'm Dave Lojek. I'm the Department of Energy
10 Manager responsible for the cleanup of the waste
11 pits.

12 It's necessary here at the outset of
13 the meeting need to cover a few administrative
14 business items, just so our meeting flows a little
15 bit better as we progress through it this evening.

16 Please remember to register at the
17 door if you haven't already had the opportunity to
18 do so. I think most of you probably have as you
19 entered into the meeting room.

20 On the sign-in sheet you can indicate
21 whether you plan on making any verbal comments
22 during our formal comment session later on this
23 evening. That's important because it will assist
24 me in getting you identified when we approach that

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000002

1 session later on. I would like to be calling
2 people by name if you've identified that you have a
3 verbal comment to make.

4 If you haven't done so currently we
5 do have a break later on you can go back and sign
6 up for the comment, sign up that you want to make a
7 verbal comment at the break time, too.

8 There are some handouts located in
9 the back of the room here and we also have an
10 exhibit over here. They're both available. You
11 can pick up the handouts, you can view the exhibit
12 during the break or after the meeting.

13 Because this is a formal public
14 meeting we have a transcriber here, Connie. She's
15 taking a verbatim record of the meeting. A copy of
16 the transcript will be placed in the Public
17 Environmental Information Center which is located
18 south of here down on Route 128.

19 Anyone who is interested can review
20 that transcript at that location. I believe that
21 will probably be available Friday; is that correct,
22 Sara?

23 MS. SCHNEIDER: Friday.

24 MR. LOJEK: Right, excuse me, thumbs

1 up. Okay. Our meeting tonight is different from
2 the workshops that we've had recently, so much as
3 the format is much more formal.

4 We have a couple of brief
5 presentations you can see here on the agenda. We
6 need to get through the brief presentations. After
7 the presentation we have an informal question and
8 answer session, which is followed by a formal --
9 acceptance of formal comment session.

10 And what I would like to request is
11 that both sessions will be recorded. We will be
12 having a transcript of both of the sessions.
13 However, to get a written response to a comment or
14 question that you might make you must present it in
15 the formal session. So I just kind of want -- just
16 kind of identify that.

17 So just please hold all your
18 questions or comments until after our presentations
19 are done. That's a little different from our
20 workshops where they were quite open. And then you
21 can present your questions or comments in either of
22 the sessions that you feel is most appropriate.

23 The informal question and answer
24 session which follows the presentations is an

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000004

1 opportunity for you to ask questions about the
2 cleanup of Fernald waste pits.

3 We're here to give you the answers
4 the best we can this evening. And our attempt
5 there is to give you the information to resolve any
6 concerns you may still have over the cleanup of the
7 waste pits, and basically get you a little bit more
8 comfortable before we enter into the acceptance of
9 formal comments.

10 The formal comment session, the
11 comments made in that session, and any written --
12 the verbal and written comments that we receive
13 will be presented during that session.

14 The answers to those will be provided
15 in writing. They will be the responsiveness
16 summary which is part of the Record of Decision, so
17 those will be formally done in writing. What I
18 will do is I'll outline those sessions a little bit
19 more in detail as we approach them later this
20 evening.

21 With that what I would like to do is
22 introduce basically our first presentation and that
23 is to give you a brief introduction as to what the
24 waste pits are.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000005

1 There are five operable units out at
2 the Fernald site. Fernald's waste pits represent
3 one of those operable units. Fernald's waste pits
4 are otherwise known as Operable Unit 1 or OU1.

5 They cover approximately 38 acres in
6 the northwest corner of the site. There are 6
7 waste pits, a burn pit, a clearwell pit. The
8 cleanup of the waste pits we anticipate it may
9 involve handling up to 710,000 cubic yards of
10 material, that includes the wastes, the berms,
11 liners, surrounding soils, et cetera.

12 Well, a question you might ask is why
13 clean up the waste pits? First of all, our
14 Remedial Investigation Report which we completed
15 identified some key reasons why cleanup of the
16 waste pits are required.

17 The first of those reasons I would
18 like to identify here is we have questionable
19 structural integrity of the waste pits. The waste
20 pits were basically constructed in the early '50s,
21 early '60s, and a couple in the early '70s. So
22 over time we don't know what the condition of the
23 underside of those waste pits are so we have
24 questionable integrity of that system.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000006

1 That lends to the potential for
2 future leakage of the contents of those waste
3 pits. Leakage down into the ground, leakage down
4 into the underlying aquifer. The result of this is
5 we have long-term unacceptable risks to the human
6 health and the environment.

7 How do we propose to take care of
8 that? Well, one thing that we want to do here is
9 we have long-term -- by cleaning up the waste pits
10 we do provide long-term protection of the
11 groundwater.

12 The Remedial Investigation Report
13 noted that the waste pits hold a large amount of
14 material, contaminated material, that material is
15 located near or at the top of the underlying Great
16 Miami aquifer.

17 Also the Remedial Investigation
18 Report identified that the material in the pits was
19 somewhat saturated, which means the material itself
20 holds water in it somewhat like a sponge, the pores
21 of a sponge, that hold water in it. That
22 represents a pool of contaminated liquid that is
23 susceptible to leaching out or leaking out into
24 that underlying aquifer.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000007

1 What is the Department of Energy's
2 proposal to clean up the waste pits? The Proposed
3 Plan is the documentation wherein the Department of
4 Energy identifies to the regulators and also offers
5 up for public comment the best method for cleanup
6 of the waste pits.

7 The proposed remedy for cleanup of
8 the waste pits is to excavate the material, treat
9 it by drying, and then ship it to an off-site
10 permitted commercial disposal facility.

11 What are some of the major components
12 that we will encounter to achieve this goal? Well,
13 we'll have to -- we're looking at constructing
14 waste processing and loading facilities. Like I
15 identified we have a couple of waste pits that have
16 water cover as well as the saturated water that's
17 within the material.

18 We have removal of the water from the
19 waste pits and from the surface of the pits. We'll
20 be treating that water. We have the actual removal
21 of waste pit contents, caps, liners, and the
22 excavation of surrounding contaminated soil.

23 After which we'll be doing
24 confirmation sampling to make sure we achieved a

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000008

1 cleanup of the waste pits. We're anticipating
2 crushing or shredding. When we dig into those
3 waste pits we feel that there will be some material
4 that will be required to be crushed or shredded.

5 We've identified that we'll have
6 drying of the waste. Also have the off-site
7 shipment of the waste for disposal at a permitted
8 commercial waste disposal facility using rail
9 transportation.

10 This next slide here what I would
11 just like to show you is a permitted commercial
12 waste disposal facility located in the Western
13 United States. This facility is located in Great
14 Salt Desert approximately 80 miles west of Salt
15 Lake City.

16 In our planning for our proposed
17 action we realize that as a contingency we need to
18 see that if some of the waste doesn't meet the
19 waste acceptance criteria of the permitted
20 commercial disposal facility, and we anticipate
21 that perhaps up to 10 percent of the total waste
22 volume from our waste pits as a contingency plan
23 may meet that need, we have disposal at the Nevada
24 Test Site. We are calling up that.

1 And I have here just a photo of the
2 Nevada Test Site, Area 3. This is again located in
3 the Western United States, arid climate, which is
4 located I believe 65 miles, approximately 65 miles,
5 northwest of Las Vegas.

6 Some other major components that
7 we've looked at we have decommissioning and removal
8 of any of the facilities that we need to construct
9 to help us when we, either the drying facility, the
10 loading facility, if we have any rail spurs that we
11 have to build on-site, any rail spurs, all that
12 equipment will have to be decommissioned,
13 decontaminated, dismantled, and basically taken
14 back off.

15 We're considering the treatment of
16 any contaminated soils that we encounter will be
17 done consistent with the upcoming remedy identified
18 for Operable Unit 5. And any debris that we
19 encounter could be handled consistent with the
20 remedy selected for Operable Unit 3, so we have
21 integration with a couple of the other operable
22 units at that point.

23 Also at the end of the project we're
24 not going to be leaving open craters in the

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000010

1 ground. We have basically placement of backfill
2 into the excavations at the close. What is our
3 estimate, cost estimate, to complete this task?
4 \$513,000,000.

5 What I would like to do now, the next
6 subject on the agenda covers the methods, the
7 evaluations, and the studies that were performed to
8 develop our Proposed Plan, and I would like to
9 introduce the FERMCO Manager for the Feasibility
10 Study and Proposed Plan Terry Hagen.

11 MR. HAGEN: Well, as Dave said it is
12 introduction. The Proposed Plan, we've put forth a
13 proposed remedial alternative, and he described
14 that to you a little bit.

15 Again, as he said what I'm going to
16 do now is run through for you the findings of the
17 Operable Unit 1 Feasibility Study and Proposed
18 Plan, which really document the basis for
19 identifying the preferred alternative.

20 The Feasibility Study and Proposed
21 Plan are two of four documents really that lead up
22 to and include the Record of Decision where the
23 final remedy is established.

24 The first series of documentation is

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000011

1 the Remedial Investigation Report and Baseline Risk
2 Assessment. What we're attempting to do there is,
3 number one, go out into the field and determine
4 what contamination is present, what concentrations
5 is it present at, and just where in the environment
6 is that contamination.

7 And then the second part of that, the
8 Baseline Risk Assessment, evaluates just what risk
9 that contamination poses to human health and the
10 environment. Dave kind of alluded to the findings
11 of the OU1 RI and Baseline Risk Assessment.

12 In a nutshell I think what it
13 confirmed was that in the waste pit area there are
14 significant concentrations of radiological and
15 chemical contaminants that in the absence of any
16 kind of cleanup activity could potentially pose an
17 unacceptable threat to human health and the
18 environment in the long term which there, you know,
19 sets up the requirement for some type of remedial
20 action.

21 The Feasibility Study, which I'm
22 going to be going over in more detail after this
23 slide, is where we develop and evaluate
24 alternatives to clean up the contamination. And

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000012

1 then the Proposed Plan as you know is where we
2 formally identify a preferred alternative and put
3 it out to you all to get your comments on that.

4 Finally, the Record of Decision as I
5 mentioned at the outset that's where the remedy is
6 finally established. The one thing I'll emphasize
7 there is that that document also has to consider
8 the comments that came back from the public and
9 issue a response to all of those, and that's just
10 exactly what we'll do. We'll gather some of those
11 comments tonight and get the rest in writing.

12 Okay. The Feasibility Study for
13 Operable Unit 1 was conducted according to the
14 requirements of the National Oil and Hazardous
15 Substances Contingency Plan, which is commonly
16 referred to as the NCP.

17 The NCP are the regulations where the
18 US EPA has set forth the guidelines for how you go
19 about identifying alternatives to clean up
20 contamination and how you go about selecting an
21 alternative.

22 I think a Feasibility Study can
23 really be boiled down to five basic elements and
24 these are the ones on this page. What I'm going to

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342
000013

1 do is really discuss the three bullets up here on
2 this list relative to what is in the OU1
3 Feasibility Study.

4 And then I'm going to talk about the
5 last two points relative to the Proposed Plan and
6 specifically how those two points helped identify
7 the preferred alternative that's been proposed to
8 you all tonight.

9 Remedial action objectives are pretty
10 much just what they sound like. When you start any
11 job or project you have to have a good firm handle
12 on what it is you're trying to accomplish, that's
13 what these are. What are we trying to accomplish
14 by remedial action.

15 At the highest level what we're
16 trying to do is reduce the potential human and
17 ecological exposure to contaminants to acceptable
18 levels. For OU1 I think we can be a little bit
19 more specific and say, number one, what we're
20 trying to do is remediate the waste to control
21 direct exposure type -- direct contact type
22 exposure, sorry.

23 What I mean by that is just what it
24 sounds like, literally coming into contact with the

1 waste, somehow breathing emissions in, something
2 like that. The second part of that has to do with
3 protection of groundwater.

4 I think as probably a lot of you know
5 the sole source Great Miami aquifer lies directly
6 underneath the site. And one of the principle
7 remedial action objectives for Operable Unit 1 is
8 to remediate the waste pits such that any potential
9 releases to the sole source aquifer are effectively
10 controlled.

11 In Section 2 of the OU1 Feasibility
12 Study we go into a lot more detail on the remedial
13 action objectives and ultimately where we get to
14 our proposed cleanup levels. Wherefore each
15 contaminant that was judged to be of concern we do
16 propose a cleanup level. And again that's in
17 Section 2 of the Feasibility Study and Section 5 of
18 the Proposed Plan.

19 After we've developed remedial action
20 objectives the first stage in the process is to
21 look at a wide range of potential technologies and
22 process options that could be applicable to
23 cleaning up the waste pits and screen them against
24 the three criteria you see right there.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000015

1 The one thing I would note is at this
2 point in the process we haven't put these
3 technologies together into alternatives. We're
4 looking at them individually. When I say a
5 technology a technology is like excavation versus
6 waste treatment such as drying or vitrification,
7 something of that nature.

8 Real quickly these three screening
9 criteria, they probably are pretty
10 self-explanatory, but for effectiveness an example
11 that I've used before is bioremediation is a
12 remedial technology that's being used a lot around
13 the country to clean up gasoline spills from
14 underground storage tanks. And in the right
15 conditions it works real well there.

16 Bioremediation is something though
17 that really doesn't do anything to address the
18 principal hazards associated with radioactivity
19 which of course goes along with Operable Unit 1, so
20 it was screened out because of that.

21 Implementability, you may have a
22 technology that sounds great in theory, but can you
23 really go out into the field and do it, make it
24 work, that's what that screening criteria

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000016

1 involves.

2 And then on cost, that's really cost
3 effectiveness. And the example that I used there
4 is you've got two potential technologies that offer
5 about the same advantages in terms of
6 effectiveness. If one is ten times more expensive
7 than the other, but they offer about the same
8 benefits we're going to screen it out because it's
9 not cost effective. Section 2 again is the section
10 in the FS where we documented the screening of
11 process options and technologies.

12 At this point in the process we
13 combine those that survive that initial screening
14 into preliminary alternatives. These are the
15 preliminary alternatives that are screened in the
16 OU1 FS, and you can find that screening in Chapter
17 3.

18 The criteria that we used to screen
19 them are the same three that I just had up awhile
20 ago that apply to the process options and
21 technologies. And to move forward we screened
22 these alternatives against those three criteria.

23 What I'm showing you on this slide in
24 yellow, is that the right -- yeah, in yellow are

1 those alternatives that survived that screening
2 process and went on to the next stage. The one
3 thing I would note is Alternative 1, no action, you
4 might ask how come that survived.

5 The reason is that the NCP requires
6 that that go all the way through the evaluation
7 process to provide a baseline for comparison. I
8 don't want to belabor this slide a little bit, but
9 in Alternative 2, 3, and 4C were screened out. The
10 reasons again are documented in Chapter 3, but
11 basically they all revolve around long-term
12 groundwater protection. I mentioned the sole
13 source Great Miami aquifer.

14 The conclusion of the FS was that the
15 long-term certainty that these alternatives would
16 be protective of that resource was low enough to
17 warrant screening them out, which is where we got
18 to the detailed analysis stage where essentially
19 these four alternatives and the no action
20 alternative were considered in detail.

21 Here we get into a more extensive
22 evaluation process. And the NCP dictates these
23 evaluation criteria. These are the criteria that
24 we evaluate each of the alternatives undergoing

1 detailed analysis against. And you'll see I've got
2 them divided up into three categories and I just
3 want to talk pretty briefly about those.

4 The first is threshold criteria.
5 These are particularly important because the NCP
6 says that you cannot select for implementation a
7 remedial alternative that, number one, doesn't
8 provide overall protection of human health and the
9 environment; and number two, comply with all legal
10 requirements that are judged to be directly
11 applicable or relevant and appropriate unless you
12 can obtain a waiver from those.

13 The second group are the balancing
14 criteria. The one that I especially want to bring
15 to your attention there is short-term
16 effectiveness.

17 What that particular criteria
18 evaluates is during the implementation or
19 construction phase, operation phase, of remedial
20 alternative how protective of that alternative
21 is -- how is that alternative protective of, number
22 one, workers, and number two, public and the
23 general area, and the number three part of that
24 category is how long does it take before we achieve

1 the protection.

2 As the FS and Proposed Plan state we
3 only evaluate against these first seven criteria,
4 and I will explain why here in a second. What
5 we're looking for in a preferred alternative is,
6 number one, satisfies the threshold criteria, and
7 number two, provides the best balance among the
8 balancing criteria, which is where the name comes
9 from.

10 Now, at this point we identified a
11 preferred alternative and published it in the
12 Proposed Plan which you all have for public
13 comment.

14 The modifying criteria are formally
15 considered after the close of the formal public
16 comment period and specifically state acceptance
17 and community acceptance. And where this
18 particular set of criteria that evaluation is
19 documented in that responsiveness summary and the
20 Record of Decision that I mentioned.

21 Okay. I would like to move on then
22 to the Proposed Plan. Dave set forth what our
23 preferred alternative is, it's Alternative 5B,
24 removal, treatment by thermal drying, off-site

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000020

1 disposal at a permitted commercial waste disposal
2 facility by rail transport.

3 Again, in identifying this preferred
4 alternative we evaluated all alternatives
5 individually against all of those criteria. What
6 I'm going to go over now is the basis for
7 identification of the preferred alternative. And
8 I'm really going to go over the three categories
9 that turned out to be the drive.

10 The first thing is the long-term
11 effectiveness was judged to be more certain over
12 the long term for the preferred alternative than
13 for alternatives involving on-site disposal. And
14 the big reason for that again is the presence of
15 that sole source Great Miami aquifer directly
16 underneath the site.

17 If I could compare this site to the
18 representative commercial facility that we
19 evaluated in the FS, number one, there is no usable
20 groundwater resource at the representative
21 facility, there is no surface water in the area,
22 and the nearest resident lives about 40 miles away,
23 and I think you all know how that contrasts to
24 what's here.

1 Which all led to in the end the
2 conclusion that the long-term effectiveness, the
3 long-termability to maintain that protectiveness
4 was a lot more certain for the preferred
5 alternative.

6 Number two, we think the technical
7 implementability of the preferred alternative is a
8 lot more certain. If you go back and were to look
9 at those components of the preferred alternative
10 that Dave put up on the board awhile ago if I could
11 just really boil those down, the first big element
12 is excavation, which is an element of all the
13 alternatives we looked at in detail.

14 That's something that has been done
15 at Super Fund sites with waste pits, debris in
16 them, all over the United States, not at this scale
17 for radiologically contaminated pits all be it, but
18 it's a proven remedial technology.

19 The second part of that really is the
20 drying. Again, drying is something that is a
21 robust technology. It's been done at other Super
22 Fund sites for sludgy, waste materials with debris
23 in them.

24 And then finally the transportation

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000022

1 is something that has been done at this scale for
2 radiologically contaminated material before us, so
3 we know that the implementability of that is pretty
4 certain.

5 In contrast to the two alternatives
6 that involved on-site disposal the treatment
7 technologies there were vitrification and cement
8 solidification, which are very good remedial
9 technologies for the right waste stream.

10 The problem relative to OU1 and very
11 specific to OU1 lies in the fact that these waste
12 pits are extremely heterogeneous, and that's
13 documented in the RI, and what I mean by that
14 there's a lot of debris in them. What you've got
15 in waste pit one doesn't necessarily match at all
16 what you've got in waste pit 3, or what you've got
17 in waste pit 1 10 feet away from you.

18 The ability to design vitrification
19 or cement solidification for a waste stream that is
20 this heterogeneous is difficult and increases the
21 uncertainty of being able to do it significantly
22 particularly compared to the implementability of
23 the preferred alternative.

24 And finally cost effectiveness, which

1 is much lower on the totem pole. The main things
2 are can we do this safely, can we do it right, the
3 implementability question, and is it going to be
4 protective over the long term. Those are the
5 drivers, but cost effectiveness did enter into
6 this.

7 What I've got on the slide is is that
8 the cost estimates show a slight cost advantage for
9 the preferred alternative and that's true. What I
10 really want to point out here though is, and to
11 recognize right up front that if you compare the
12 cost of the preferred alternative to the
13 alternative involving cement solidification or
14 on-site disposal they're basically a wash, but when
15 you factor in the two slides that I just had ahead
16 of this with the increase certainty of long-term
17 protectiveness and the increased certainty over
18 implementation we believe the cost effectiveness of
19 the preferred alternative is a lot more certain.

20 And really I just went over this last
21 slide which is what's the basis of the preferred
22 alternative identification. We think that the
23 certainty that it's going to maintain that
24 protectiveness over the long term is much more

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000024

1 certain mostly because of the presence of the
2 aquifer under the site and the number of residents
3 in the area, which is the total opposite of the
4 situation out in the arid West.

5 Number two, we think that the
6 implementability or just planning the ability to do
7 this is much more certain for the alternative and
8 the remedial components of that alternative that
9 we've selected. And those two things really add up
10 to the conclusion that we think the cost
11 effectiveness is more certain especially when it's
12 slightly, according to the cost estimates, the
13 cheaper alternative.

14 Dave, I think you wanted to get back
15 up and say a few things about the community
16 involvement process.

17 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Terry.

18 The next subject that I would like
19 to cover is some public participation highlights
20 that we've completed in Operable Unit 1.

21 Before I kick into that Terry if you
22 remember on his slide he presented some of the
23 criteria that we evaluate alternatives against.
24 The first ones were two threshold criteria, then

1 there were a series of balancing criteria, then
2 there were a couple of modifying criteria at the
3 bottom of the slide.

4 Those modifying criteria were state
5 acceptance of our proposed remedy, our proposed
6 cleanup. They were also community acceptance of
7 our proposed remedy. And that's why we're here
8 tonight to cover that territory right there.

9 Public participation highlights that
10 we've completed here in Operable Unit 1 back on
11 December 7th last year, December 7th, 1993, we had
12 a public roundtable that was to present the results
13 of a Remedial Investigation Report. That was held
14 shortly after the submittal of that document to the
15 US EPA and the Ohio EPA.

16 We had on March 29th a public
17 roundtable on the Feasibility Study. That was held
18 shortly after the submittal of that document to the
19 US and Ohio EPA.

20 On April 7th the Citizens Task Force
21 and FRESH hosted a workshop with Envirocare.
22 Envirocare is a permitted commercial disposal
23 facility.

24 On August 9th, just 2 weeks ago, we

1 had a transportation workshop.

2 On August 10th the Operable Unit 1,
3 the public comment period for the Operable Unit 1
4 Proposed Plan began.

5 August 16th we had an availability
6 session with CXX -- CSX, which is a difficult
7 acronym to say. They're a railroad transporting
8 company.

9 On August 17th the Ohio EPA held
10 their public community outreach meeting with the
11 stakeholders.

12 On the 23rd, which is tonight, we're
13 having our public meeting on the Proposed Plan.

14 And a little brief look ahead our
15 formal public comment period for the Proposed Plan
16 concludes on September 8th.

17 What is our goal in this process? As
18 illustrated here we're working through the process,
19 we're holding the workshops, we're communicating
20 with the stakeholders, we're submitting documents
21 into the US and Ohio EPA.

22 Our goal is to achieve the submittal
23 of a ROD on November 4th of this year. The Fernald
24 Department of Energy is committed to continuing

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000077

1 opportunities for public involvement in the cleanup
2 of the Fernald site. We take your input
3 seriously.

4 If you look back on our schedule here
5 we had our Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan
6 roundtable on March 29th. During that roundtable
7 numerous concerns were brought up relative to
8 transportation issues.

9 We came back to you after we looked
10 at those issues. We thought about them. We came
11 back to the public on August 9th where we had a
12 transportation workshop.

13 During that workshop there was
14 numerous concerns raised about needing to speak
15 with CSX. That was then answered on the 16th of
16 August where we had an availability session.

17 Our immediate goal is to gain
18 acceptance of the Proposed Plan to remediate the
19 waste pits. I will commit though we will then work
20 together through the remedial design and through
21 the actual field work.

22 At this point I would like to open
23 the floor to Mr. Jim Saric, the US, United States
24 Environmental Protection Agency for any remarks.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000028

1 MR. SARIC: Thanks, Dave. Before I
2 get started I would like to introduce Gene
3 Jablonowski. He's with US EPA also is here
4 tonight. He's been working with me for the last,
5 you know, couple of years with the inner radiation
6 section in our office and now he's come to work
7 directly with me on the project, so you'll see his
8 face at a lot more of these meetings and if you've
9 got questions feel free to answer -- you know, to
10 ask them to him.

11 About three or four months ago we
12 were here, I was here with Ohio -- I mean with Ohio
13 EPA and with US DOE, and we were talking about
14 Operable Unit 4 and the K-65 silos, and we were
15 talking about a remedy or Proposed Plan for a
16 remedy for the silos, and here we are again several
17 months later talking about a remedy for the waste
18 pits.

19 You know, for years when I first got
20 involved in this site in '91 the question was let's
21 quit studying these projects, let's start getting
22 something done, let's make some decisions. And I
23 think that what you're seeing here with the
24 Proposed Plan for Operable Unit 1, this is an

1 operable unit that we've been involved in reviewing
 2 our I documents, the Feasibility Study documents,
 3 the Proposed Plan documents with DOE, with Ohio
 4 EPA.

5 We provided numerous comments to the
 6 documents, had numerous meetings and discussions
 7 you don't see here, but what you do see here in
 8 this Proposed Plan is a document which we had
 9 approved which we think is a good remedy. It's one
 10 that addresses the waste pits.

11 And I think if you look at the
 12 activities or the various wastes on-site, the K-65
 13 silos being one which everyone had a very large
 14 concern about, the number 2 unit would be the waste
 15 pits, having this large ground material here, lying
 16 above the aquifer, potentially contaminating the
 17 aquifer, you've got contaminants, you know,
 18 materials inside the waste pits, and so I think you
 19 have a Proposed Plan here that addresses that and
 20 remediates this very well.

21 So if you have any questions
 22 regarding this I would be glad to answer them as we
 23 go forward. And I encourage everyone to, you know,
 24 have input on these things because, yes, these

1 comments are answered and these response to
2 comments documents in the ROD that comes forward
3 you'll see the ROD for OU4 will come out soon,
4 you'll see that and there will be the response to
5 comments in there. So all your comments will be
6 addressed by Ohio EPA and we'll be reviewing those
7 also, so, Dave.

8 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Jim. I would
9 like to open the floor now to Mr. Tom Schneider,
10 the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency.

11 MR. SCHNEIDER: Good evening. Like
12 Dave said I'm Tom Schneider from Ohio EPA. And
13 it's good to see there's a lot of new faces out
14 here tonight. I'll be honest there's a lot of you
15 that I haven't seen at Proposed Plan meetings
16 before and we're glad to get as many people out to
17 comment on these, and express your concern, and
18 your stake in the cleanup we're doing here, so
19 we're glad to have you here.

20 Just like Jim has new people working
21 on the site, Ohio EPA has new people working on the
22 site and I want to introduce Tom Onco who's just
23 started with us, and Tim Hall who's been around for
24 a couple of meetings, and Graham Mitchell who's

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000021

1 been around forever like you all know so.

2 I just wanted to come up and say that
3 Ohio EPA believes that the Proposed Plan, the
4 preferred alternative the DOE is putting forward is
5 the most protective alternative for the site, for
6 the aquifer, and we support its implementation, but
7 prior to that being initiated we're here to get
8 your comments on this. We want to know what your
9 concerns are.

10 And we're going to be here through
11 the RDRA work plans, through the implementation to
12 hear your concerns as well. You know, our ears
13 don't close after tonight on this operable unit,
14 we're going to be around to hear from you as we go
15 through this process. So we just wanted to let you
16 know that and we do want to get your concerns
17 tonight on the record and how you think this action
18 could be improved.

19 The other thing that I wanted to let
20 you know is just because we're here working on this
21 document doesn't mean the DOE is stopping what's
22 going on out there.

23 Within the next week or two they're
24 going to be there taking some more samples in the

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000032

1 waste pit area to start looking at design criteria
2 and what they're going to need to actually
3 implement the field -- the field program of
4 excavation, so the process isn't stopping as we go
5 along. They're going to be continuing to collect
6 more data so that they can implement this remedial
7 action quicker and more effectively.

8 Please feel free to ask us questions
9 at the break. If you want to ask us questions
10 prior to commenting we'll be around, you can ask
11 any of us, and you can always feel free to give us
12 a call at the office on any questions you have
13 regarding the cleanup activity. So thanks for
14 being here tonight and we look forward to your
15 comments.

16 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Tom. As Tom
17 mentioned we do have a program to basically
18 evaluate what it is we're going to run in to when
19 we start excavation that's an acronym DEEP, D E E
20 P. It stands for the dewatering excavation
21 evaluation program and we have started that and I
22 think we'll be getting some very valuable
23 information.

24 Like I mentioned in the offset we

1 have water on top of the pits, we have water inside
2 the pits, and this is going to give us some
3 information on what we might anticipate when we
4 actually start getting into the material there and
5 encounter that water.

6 The next item that we move into now
7 after Tom's comments is our informal question and
8 answer session. I would like to just cover a few
9 little notes here on this session. This is a
10 session -- the purpose of the session is to provide
11 an opportunity for members of the public to ask
12 questions about the OU1 Proposed Plan.

13 It will be a little bit of an open
14 session. We'll be giving you answers to your
15 questions. Terry Hagen and myself will answer what
16 you can come up with here. Our intent here is to
17 resolve any confusion or concerns you may have, to
18 assist in a little bit -- making your formal
19 comments a little bit more valuable, making them a
20 little bit more targeted.

21 We just ask if you could please use
22 the microphone, we would appreciate that, we can
23 get that. And also speak loudly so our transcriber
24 can hear concisely what your comment, what your

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000034

1 question is.

2 I would like to point out that the
3 formal session that we'll have after we have our
4 break that will be where you'll be providing us
5 with your comments or statements. You can also
6 provide written comments which we can read here
7 tonight at tonight's meeting or you can mail them
8 in during our public comment period here. And I'll
9 cover that a little bit -- just highlight that a
10 little bit more as we get into that session.

11 I would like to identify here that
12 our Proposed Plan, we've laid out our plan in the
13 conceptual scheme of what we think the best method
14 is to clean up the waste pits. And there are a lot
15 of details that we conceptualize to help solidify
16 that plan.

17 And at this point I would just like
18 to go ahead and move into this informal question
19 and answer session. If anybody has a question you
20 can raise your hand or a comment, feel free to move
21 up to a microphone. Anything? Edwa, thank you.

22 MS. YOCUM: Okay. As a resident,
23 oh, Edwa Yocum, State Route 128, Harrison, Ohio, as
24 a resident the method I'm concerned about you

1 managing the OU1 soils, that includes the
2 contaminated, the surface, the covered soils, and
3 you said this will be documented in OU5's ROD.

4 When -- how long will it -- will
5 these active soils be sitting on these -- be stored
6 on the site before the OU5 ROD is decided on?

7 MR. HAGEN: Yeah. The first thing I
8 guess I would like to do is just emphasize again
9 what is in the Proposed Plan and then go into an
10 answer.

11 What the Proposed Plan says is that
12 for the surface soils and material underneath the
13 waste pits, not the waste itself that is
14 contaminated above action levels, but not nearly as
15 badly contaminated as the waste pit material, that
16 if Operable Unit 5 develops a remedy that safely,
17 cost effectively addresses those then we will
18 forward those waste over to them.

19 But the one thing I want to emphasize
20 is that if there is any doubt as to whether that
21 OU5 remedy is appropriate for these soils they're
22 going to go off-site with the waste material
23 themselves. That is in the Proposed Plan. So in
24 other words, they're not going to OU5 no matter

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000026

1 what. They're going to OU5 only if and if you US,
2 and Ohio, and yourselves I think concur, that the
3 remedy that they've selected for the process area
4 soils would also be appropriate for these soils, so
5 I want to emphasize that.

6 Now to get to your question. If you
7 look at the schedule for OU5 compared to the
8 schedule for OU1, right now we believe that their
9 remedial action will be underway such that as we
10 remove those soils they will be ready to handle
11 those.

12 The plan right now is not to put
13 significant amounts of soil into some kind of
14 interim storage. It's to send to them if they're
15 ready. If for some reason we ran into schedule
16 difficulties, the one thing I would say is the
17 Proposed Plan and the ROD, if the ROD says what the
18 Proposed Plan says, allows for that material to go
19 off-site, so we wouldn't have to put it into
20 interim storage to comply with the ROD. We've got
21 that flexibility available.

22 MR. LOJEK: Any additional informal
23 questions? Go ahead.

24 MS. DUNN: Pam Dunn, can't you hear

1 me? Can you hear me? Now you can. When you talk
2 about the removal of the water, the purpose of
3 that, if I'm -- you know, correct me if I'm not
4 wrong here, but I thought part of those waste pits
5 were covered with water to help keep down airborne
6 emission releases of the contaminants, so is there
7 going to be some type of capping or something as
8 this water is extracted before that material is
9 removed as it becomes exposed?

10 MR. HAGEN: Yeah, if I could answer
11 that. What we're doing in removing that water,
12 remember that there's maybe a foot or two, or
13 whatever it is of standing water, that's just kind
14 of dirty water, and then what is underneath of that
15 is a very, very wet sludge material.

16 What we're really talking about
17 doing, number one, is getting rid of that, what's
18 more or less standing, dirty water on top, treating
19 it appropriately through the site facilities, and
20 then removing the material underneath of that.
21 It's still going to be a very wet material.

22 In other words, it's not -- when we
23 take that water out we're not -- what's going to
24 result isn't going to be a real dry material that's

1 amenable to getting up in the air and getting all
2 over the place, it's still going to be a very wet
3 material, and that's how we intend to design that
4 so we don't run into the problem you just talked
5 about.

6 MR. LOJEK: That's a very good
7 question, Pam, and that will be something we will
8 be covering in the design aspect of the project as
9 we get into that to prevent any kind of dusting or
10 airborne releases.

11 Any additional comments?

12 MS. CRAWFORD: Take it a step
13 further for me, and I can talk loud enough because
14 I've got a big mouth, take it a step further for me
15 because when we suck that water off the top of
16 these pits, and you just said you're going to run
17 it through the plant's system or whatever, are you
18 going to be testing it, are you going to be looking
19 at what's in it, and making sure it meets the
20 standards we've all talked about and worked on
21 before you ship it to the river where I'm assuming
22 it's going to go?

23 MR. HAGEN: Yes. The one thing that
24 I guess I would emphasize is every drop of water

1 that's going to come out of the tail end of that
2 plant is subject to the NPDES permit. And as I
3 think you well know we have some very strict
4 requirements for sampling that water and we
5 wouldn't do anything outside the requirements of
6 that permit.

7 MS. CRAWFORD: You promise you won't
8 violate your NPDES?

9 MR. HAGEN: I think we can't violate
10 the NPDES permit.

11 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay. Does it cover
12 more than uranium?

13 MR. LOJEK: Oh, yeah.

14 MS. CRAWFORD: Okay.

15 MR. LOJEK: Oh, yeah. The NPDES
16 permit covers --

17 MS. CRAWFORD: Oh, that's right.

18 MR. LOJEK: -- a wide range of
19 chemicals.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: Never mind.

21 MR. LOJEK: Norma.

22 MS. NUNGESTER: Ah, it's low
23 enough. I have a question for Jim Saric real
24 quick, in a way it does have something to do with

1 this, and I think it's Ohio EPA, let me check my
2 calendar right here, yeah, I think it's Ohio EPA,
3 I'm sorry, Jim, it's not you, it's, Tom.

4 They're having proposed standards on
5 water on September 9th at 8:00. I saw Barbara in
6 the Cincinnati Enquirer. They're having a meeting
7 September 9th at 8:00 at Linder Hall at UC, you
8 don't know anything about it?

9 MR. SCHNEIDER: It's probably
10 proposed water standards.

11 MS. NUNGESTER: Yeah, proposed
12 probably. You don't have anything to do with
13 that?

14 MR. ONCO: That's out of our
15 office.

16 MS. NUNGESTER: You're here, I
17 thought I could ask. Okay. Some of the questions
18 I have have been answered before, but I kind of
19 wanted to cover them again. So if anybody else has
20 a question don't feel bad interrupting me, and then
21 I will sit down and come back again later.

22 In one of the documents we got
23 several years ago, I believe it was the EE/CA
24 document, it mentioned there was millions of pounds

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000041

5892

1 of thorium in the waste pits -- or thousands of
2 pounds of thorium, let me get this correct -- and I
3 should have given you my name. It's Norma
4 Nungester. I live on Mt. Hope Road, Harrison,
5 Ohio.

6 ----- It was millions of pounds of uranium -----
7 were contained in the waste pits and thousands of
8 pounds of thorium. Also it mentioned arsenic and
9 asbestos. Okay. And in our current documents I
10 don't -- I just see the generic terms that it's in
11 there, not the quantity or thing.

12 But my concern is with the asbestos,
13 can that be dried out too as the other materials?

14 MR. HAGEN: And the answer is that
15 if we didn't do it -- right, yeah, it could be
16 dried out, that's where the engineering controls
17 during the drying process come in, you know.

18 For instance, what we're looking at
19 right now is doing all the drying inside of an
20 enclosed building, for instance, having emissions
21 control type of equipment on that.

22 The quantity of the asbestos in the
23 pits if you look at it as a whole is very low.
24 There are some asbestos --

1 MS. NUNGESTER: Compared to millions
2 and thousands of pounds it is?

3 MR. HAGEN: That's right. Are there
4 asbestos in the pits, yes. Are there regulated
5 amounts of asbestos in the pits, no. So the one
6 thing I want to emphasize is that's a small
7 volume. And number two, we think that we can very
8 adequately take care of what I think the real
9 question is can we control those emissions during
10 the excavation and drying process, and the answer
11 to that I believe is definitely yes.

12 MS. NUNGESTER: Well, you probably
13 answered also another -- which brings up another
14 question. Are you going to be covering, some kind
15 of cover, I know these pits are huge, they take up
16 a lot of acreage, but is there some way you're
17 going to cover this, explain to me, refresh my
18 memory how you're going to take it out of there?

19 MR. HAGEN: Okay.

20 MS. NUNGESTER: You have workers no
21 doubt.

22 MR. HAGEN: Yeah, I tell you what,
23 I'm going to defer to Stace Dahl who is the Crew 1
24 Engineering Manager who is working on the design

1 right now for those issues.

2 MR. DAHL: Okay. The excavation
3 it's I guess a misconception. Right now the
4 excavation is not going to be one big waste pit,
5 one big empty bathtub. The excavation will be
6 phased in an approach where we're going down to
7 cleanup levels and then backfilling as we reach our
8 cleanup levels.

9 So to minimize exposure and the
10 amount of waste that's exposed will have a phased
11 approach, so you won't have a huge face open at any
12 one time. And we're currently looking at methods
13 in our field program to evaluate ways to control
14 emissions and dust, and that's going on right now
15 so.

16 MS. NUNGESTER: Okay. You don't
17 have a plan written up yet, you're just still
18 evaluating.

19 MR. DAHL: That's correct. We're in
20 the conceptual phase right now. We haven't even
21 really kicked off design.

22 MS. NUNGESTER: Okay. But you will
23 let us know when you come out with -- with your
24 decision for that or will we have any input on it

1 once you do decide?

2 MR. DAHL: Yes. I mean as Dave
3 mentioned we're going to continue to keep you
4 informed throughout the design process.

5 MS. NUNGESTER: We may be perfectly
6 happy. We may not have nothing to say.

7 MR. DAHL: Right.

8 MS. NUNGESTER: Okay. While I have
9 you here also another question that came up, we
10 understand that a couple of these pits, they have
11 no liners and they're basically -- it's possible
12 they're sitting right on that gravel or clay till
13 or very little till in between them and the
14 aquifer.

15 MR. DAHL: Correct.

16 MS. NUNGESTER: How are you going to
17 backfill that with just dirt, aren't you going to
18 have to try to manufacture some kind of till or
19 something there?

20 MR. DAHL: Well, I'm not sure I
21 understand your question, but let me go ahead and
22 try and talk to it.

23 MS. NUNGESTER: I'm not sure I
24 understand it either.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000045

1 MR. DAHL: Okay. Yeah, you're right
2 some of the -- some of the liner, and when we talk
3 liner we're talking clay liner.

4 MS. NUNGESTER: You're not talking
5 that plastic liner?

6 MR. DAHL: You're not talking a
7 plastic liner in the areas you're talking about
8 that borders onto the Great Miami aquifer
9 formation.

10 Now, what we're doing is we're going
11 in and taking out waste and sampling. It's not
12 going to be a problem once we get down there
13 because it's going to be dewatered and you're not
14 putting more contamination in, you're actually
15 taking it out.

16 MS. NUNGESTER: Okay. I guess
17 really what I wanted to ask then is what are you
18 going to do if there is nothing there, there's
19 evidence that's it's gone right on into the
20 aquifer, you're going to pull the water out and
21 then try cleaning the water?

22 MR. DAHL: Okay. Well, let me go
23 ahead and clarify something. Once we're down to
24 the Great Miami aquifer it's going to be a dewater

1 condition. And what you're talking about is a sand
2 and gravel formation. Okay.

3 So what we will do is we will remove
4 that down to the established cleanup criteria and
5 we will stop when we have reached that cleanup
6 criteria and backfill with clean material, so it's
7 not like we're leaving dirty material behind.
8 We're going to cleanup to establish cleanup goals
9 and then backfill behind that.

10 The point was made about
11 differentiating between the Great Miami aquifer and
12 the groundwater which is, and I'm just going to
13 throw out a number here, 20 feet below the topic
14 formation. Now, once we start excavating the waste
15 and get down to -- we're approaching the bottom
16 that is -- we'll just call that perched water.
17 That is not the Great Miami aquifer.

18 MS. NUNGESTER: Right.

19 MR. DAHL: Now, once that water is
20 gone and we're in a dewatered condition you're not
21 going to have any more water there. It's going to
22 be removed and the Great Miami aquifer is going to
23 be another 20 feet or more below depending upon
24 what time of the year you're excavating, but it

1 could be 20 to 40 feet below the top of the
2 formation, so it's --

3 MS. NUNGESTER: And it could be even
4 closer to in some cases.

5 MR. DAHL: It could be depending
6 upon the rainfall, and the recharge, and exactly
7 where the water table is, yes, it could be.

8 MS. NUNGESTER: Okay. I want to go
9 back to Edwa's question that she asked before about
10 the dirt that's surrounding the berm and
11 everything, you addressed that fairly well.

12 But we also know that there are hot
13 spots sitting off of these pits, not, you know,
14 miles, but within feet, so that soil is
15 contaminated, too, will that also -- it can't be
16 cleaned by soil washing, is that going to be
17 packaged up, and dried, and shipped along with
18 these other materials, or are you planning on
19 putting that in Operable Unit 5?

20 MR. HAGEN: Okay. The first thing I
21 would say as you mentioned there could be hot spots
22 in the OU1 area, but off the pit covers.

23 MS. NUNGESTER: Off the immediate
24 berm.

1 MR. HAGEN: Right. In the Proposed
2 Plan we've evaluated that specifically and we have
3 proposed cleanup levels for the surface soil that's
4 outside of the pit cover area, and we've also got
5 proposed action levels for the soils underneath the
6 waste pits. And those soils, number one, is we're
7 going to go out with the field characterization
8 program and if it's above those action levels we'll
9 excavate it.

10 What happens next is what I was
11 referring to when I was answering her question is
12 that if those soils are appropriate, they can be
13 addressed safely and cost effectively by the remedy
14 that OU5 has selected for the process area soils,
15 and the schedule is consistent, then we'll go to
16 them. If there is a bust on any of those things I
17 just said what the Proposed Plan says is that they
18 will be sent out in the same way that the pit waste
19 will be.

20 MS. NUNGESTER: Also I wanted to ask
21 at the end where is the track going to be located
22 when they put this track in there, the railroad
23 track, to ship the material off-site because as we
24 understand there is not enough room to put a mile

1 track in there?

2 MR. LOJEK: What we're looking at
3 we're looking at basically I've asked my FERMCO
4 team to look at exactly answering that question.
5 We don't have -- that's a very detailed design
6 question. We are considering it.

7 Currently we have plans to build one
8 spur which comes along the east of the waste pits,
9 okay, comes down from the existing line, comes
10 along to the east of the waste pits. So we're
11 looking at that. We're addressing that need of
12 additional rail on facility or to support our
13 activity.

14 MS. NUNGESTER: I know the community
15 has asked for this because we want it to, you know,
16 be shipped out of there, but it's going to be very
17 expensive also.

18 MR. LOJEK: Yes.

19 MS. NUNGESTER: For just a mile
20 track to be used for five years.

21 MR. LOJEK: That's a very good
22 comment, and that's one of the aspects, that's one
23 of the criteria I've asked my FERMCO team to
24 evaluate how much it's going to cost, not only to

1 construct it, we have to look at the entire picture
2 of the project and also how much will it cost to
3 decommission, decontaminate to remove that rail
4 when we're done.

5 MS. NUNGESTER: Okay. I've taken up
6 enough of your time. I'll go somewhere else.

7 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Norma. Any
8 other questions? Go right ahead.

9 MS. YOCUM: On the rail in the
10 Proposed Plan it says that the FEMP site can
11 support rail transport by using existing property
12 rail spurs, so you still need to add another mile
13 of rail spur inside the site?

14 MR. LOJEK: Some of the conceptual
15 thinking that went into the Proposed Plan, the
16 concepts that support that statement that you just
17 made also recognize the use of the Shandon rail
18 site to support that activity that you're reading
19 right now.

20 MS. YOCUM: Okay. That was one of
21 my other questions. Does this also include what's
22 out beyond the fence line, like Ross-Morgan
23 Crossing?

24 MR. LOJEK: I'm not sure of the

1 Ross-Morgan crossing.

2 MS. CRAWFORD: The one that crosses
3 Morgan-Ross Road.

4 MS. YOCUM: Yeah, Morgan-Ross Road.

5 MR. LOJEK: The spur up there?

6 MR. HAGEN: No, it doesn't go beyond
7 that.

8 MS. YOCUM: But that's considered
9 your property, DOE's property, though isn't it?

10 MR. HAGEN: If I could go back and
11 maybe take a shot at that a little bit with the
12 statement, and I recognize where that could cause
13 some concern or maybe wondering just what we
14 meant.

15 What we meant to say is there are
16 existing rail spurs on the site that can in their
17 state right now be used to help support this, the
18 rail shipment. Some of those maybe of too light
19 gauge to support the fully loaded cars, but would
20 be adequate to stage empty cars.

21 If you remember -- I think there is
22 also another statement in there, I believe there
23 is, that said additional upgrades may be needed
24 however. So what we were trying to say in that,

1 and again I recognize that it could be very
2 unclear, is that the rail spurs that are on there
3 right now could be used including some of the
4 lighter gauge ones to support the staging of empty
5 cars.

6 I think there is also a statement in
7 there that additional upgrades could be necessary,
8 too, though. And that was intended to imply not
9 only on-site, but also for that -- the portion of
10 the line between the site and Cottage Grove.

11 MS. YOCUM: Okay. And those ones,
12 especially the Morgan-Ross rail, you do not plan to
13 let cars sit on that full or empty?

14 MR. LOJEK: The Morgan-Ross rail?

15 MS. YOCUM: Yeah, that's just right
16 out of the fence line.

17 MS. CRAWFORD: The one that sits
18 right by the pallet company on Morgan-Ross Road,
19 that's the property she's talking about.

20 MS. YOCUM: No, it's down -- it's
21 closer to the plant. Okay. Where's the one that
22 goes out from the plant?

23 MR. LOJEK: This is Paddy's Run
24 right here.

1 MS. YOCUM: Right there, right
2 there.

3 MR. LOJEK: Okay. Right in this
4 area right there, there is a parallel rail track
5 from that area back into the site, that's what
6 you're asking about?

7 We've heard the concerns of the
8 public that's made about using the rail site, the
9 rails outside of what I can't say the FEMP site,
10 because the FEMP site goes off to that point.

11 But we've heard the concerns about
12 the FEMP site being more considered of right at the
13 edge of Operable Unit 1, the inside fence, and
14 that's part of the evaluation I've asked the Crew 1
15 Team to look at, and that goes back to your earlier
16 comment, your earlier question, is we need to find
17 a place to locate essentially a mile worth of track
18 and that's what we're evaluating right now. We're
19 evaluating an alternative to work around the
20 Shandon switchyard, that Shandon site. We're
21 looking at an alternative to that.

22 MS. YOCUM: Okay. Also in this
23 Proposed Plan you use the word "on-site" and "on
24 property," what's the difference and does property

1 cover a lot more than on-site?

2 MR. HAGEN: There wasn't intended to
3 be a difference. I mean if you wanted to get
4 really technical we should have been using in that
5 instance the word on property.

6 Site has a real meaning when you look
7 at a CERCLA site. It can go beyond the property
8 boundary. So let me clarify that what we were
9 attempting to mean is on property and if there is
10 confusion I apologize.

11 MS. YOCUM: So on property is out
12 beyond the fence line?

13 MR. HAGEN: It's within the property
14 that is owned by DOE at the site that's what's
15 referred to.

16 MS. YOCUM: But how far does DOE --
17 what property does DOE own outside the fence line;
18 is there a buffer zone that they own outside the
19 fence line?

20 MR. LOJEK: The inside fence line,
21 the production area fence line, and all that, yes,
22 there is a buffer zone around that.

23 MS. YOCUM: Okay.

24 MR. LOJEK: Essentially we come

1 across here to the north, this is really called the
2 east access road, that would be on property.

3 MS. YOCUM: Okay.

4 MR. LOJEK: We have basically if you
5 look at the edge of the photograph here basically
6 that corner we run over this would be, essentially
7 the bottom of the photograph, would be Willey Road
8 down there, come up along Paddy's Run Road which is
9 along that side and ends up here in the north
10 corner there, so yes, there is a buffer zone around
11 that interior fence.

12 MS. YOCUM: Okay. So the
13 Ross-Morgan spot is close to the buffer zone?

14 MR. LOJEK: Right.

15 MS. YOCUM: Okay. Now, I have
16 another question. This concerns the waiver. And
17 maybe EPA can answer this also.

18 Even though everyone seems to be
19 recommending the OU5B, are you still going to be
20 looking into the waiver of exempting waste to be
21 stored on the Fernald site even though it's on a
22 sole aquifer, are you still going to be looking
23 into that waiver?

24 MR. SARIC: As far as are we looking

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000056

1 -- the Department of Energy in some of the -- with
2 Operable Unit 2, with the remedy they proposed here
3 they talked about taking some of the waste, some of
4 the contaminated soils, not the waste pit material,
5 but the soils and potentially taking some of that
6 material and transferring to Operable Unit Number 5
7 if the remedy is feasible, desirable, whatever
8 terms they use.

9 Some of the other operable units do
10 have leading alternatives which talk about and
11 discuss siting a landfill -- a landfill on the
12 facility. And the Department of Energy has come in
13 and we have talked about -- talked to us about the
14 possibility of waiving an ARAR to potentially meet
15 that criteria, meet that ability to put a landfill
16 on-site.

17 And I know Ohio EPA and ourselves
18 we're going to hold a meeting September 13th to
19 talk about ARAR waivers to specifically address
20 this idea of a solid waste siting criteria, and how
21 this whole process works of exemptions and waivers,
22 and to clarify that, to hopefully answer some of
23 your questions informally and try to explain more
24 about this.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000057

1 I think that may be the best format
 2 to go through rather than get into a huge
 3 discussion of the ARAR waiver. But no, it is being
 4 looked into and some of those discussions will come
 5 forward and I think that you'll be hearing a lot
 6 more about them in the very near future.

7 MS. YOCUM: So it's not a decision
 8 that's going to be made right now?

9 MR. SARIC: No. There is not going
 10 to be a decision right now with OU1 that will talk
 11 about or address yes or no, will a landfill go
 12 on-site.

13 MS. YOCUM: Okay. But this waiver
 14 will also cover other operable units then, waste
 15 from other operable units?

16 MR. SARIC: The waiver issue will be
 17 addressed when an operable unit comes forth with a
 18 remedy in a proposed plan to site a landfill on the
 19 facility if that happens.

20 MS. YOCUM: Okay.

21 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Jim.

22 MS. SCHWAB: Hi, I'm Carol Schwab.
 23 I live on Dunwoody Road in Riley Township. And my
 24 husband and I own a farm on both sides of the

1 railroad track and I'm concerned about the rail
2 transportation.

3 I looked at this document and in
4 several places it talks about the risk, but it says
5 excluding transportation, is there another place
6 where that's addressed?

7 MR. HAGEN: If I can clarify that a
8 little bit. Transportation risk is discussed in
9 there and what you were looking at is we were --
10 there is a paragraph where we start comparing
11 occupational risks.

12 MS. SCHWAB: Right, loading the
13 trains.

14 MR. HAGEN: In other words, like
15 loading the trains, building a disposal cell. The
16 paragraph where you saw that statement was a
17 paragraph where we compared the occupational risks
18 among those alternatives.

19 Further through the document and in
20 the FS as well we discuss specifically the risk
21 directly associated with transporting these waste.

22 MS. SCHWAB: The risk to the people
23 who live along the railroad track?

24 MR. HAGEN: That's right, workers

1 and people that live along the track for a scenario
2 where we ship it all out there, nothing happens,
3 everything goes to a plant, and a scenario where
4 something goes wrong, we look at that as well. And
5 that is discussed in there.

6 MS. SCHWAB: It's in this one?

7 MR. HAGEN: Yes, ma'am. If
8 afterwards maybe I can just point --

9 MS. SCHWAB: You can show me.

10 MR. HAGEN: Yes, ma'am.

11 MS. SCHWAB: That would be good.

12 MR. HAGEN: And it's in the FS, too,
13 and we've got that over there, maybe I can help you
14 find that, too.

15 MS. SCHWAB: Okay. Thank you very
16 much.

17 MR. HASBERY: Yes, I'm Dick
18 Hasbery. What action levels are being proposed for
19 the radiological and the hazardous substances, how
20 do you plan to certify, verify, that you've met
21 them?

22 MR. HAGEN: Okay. First of all let
23 me tell you where they're found and then let me
24 speak to those. Right off the top of my head I

1 don't know each of those, but maybe I can talk to a
2 couple of the ones that maybe you've heard the most
3 about, such as uranium.

4 Number 1, there are proposed action
5 levels in Section 2 of the FS and Section 5 of the
6 Proposed Plan, and they're for 2 types of
7 material. Again, the waste pit material has been
8 judged to be so grossly contaminated that it's all
9 coming out. There are not action levels
10 established directly for those waste pit
11 materials.

12 We have action levels proposed for
13 surface soils in the area. And then -- when I say
14 surface soils I'm talking about outside the cover
15 area as you were mentioning. And then for
16 surface -- subsurface soils, sorry, underneath the
17 waste pits.

18 Now the numbers, I don't know them
19 all off the top of my head, but let me give you for
20 instance, the uranium proposed, and I believe it's
21 Uranium 238, proposed action level in our document
22 is 56 picocuries per gram, okay, as an example.

23 Now, let me get to the question of
24 how are we going to certify that we're meeting

1 those. We are going to as excavation proceeds both
2 for just the surface soil, which hopefully we won't
3 have to go down too deep, and then the material
4 underneath the pits, both, as we excavate where we
5 know there is contamination we will excavate a
6 certain amount, say, a foot, for instance, or two
7 feet, whatever remedial design says is
8 appropriate.

9 Then we'll initiate a sampling
10 strategy that includes each and every contaminant
11 for which an action level is established. And if
12 we're below that, we're done, we start the backfill
13 process. If we're not, we keep going.

14 And where will that plan be. That
15 will be most likely part of the remedial action
16 work plan, which is reviewed and approved by US and
17 Ohio EPA. And you know, we would, again along the
18 lines of what Dave was referring to earlier, keep
19 the public involved as to what is in those
20 documents as well.

21 And I apologize for not knowing every
22 number off the top of my head, but again Section 2
23 of the FS and Section 5 of the Proposed Plan.

24 MR. LOJEK: Okay. I think what

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000062

1 we'll do here to keep on track with our agenda, I
2 think we had a very good discussion here, at this
3 point what I would like to move is we take about a
4 15-minute break after which we'll reconvene.

5 And at that point we'll have
6 acceptance of formal comments. And prior to
7 entering into that session I'll just go over a few
8 of the ground rules of entering into that session.

9 Oh, yeah, thank you. Mike here
10 reminded me that if you have -- if you feel you
11 would like to make a verbal, formal comment during
12 that session you can go ahead and sign up in the
13 back of the room during the break. Sara Schneider
14 and Cathy Graham, a couple of our public relations
15 specialists, are in the back. They'll be able to
16 take your name at that point.

17 Also if you don't want to make a
18 verbal comment during that session, but you would
19 like to still submit a written comment, you can go
20 ahead and write them down. I think there are some
21 comment cards on the chairs, if not there's some
22 more in the back of the room. You can write your
23 comment down, at the end of our verbal comments I
24 will go through and read the written comments.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000063

1 The way I plan on going through this
2 is basically the verbal comments, we'll receive
3 those first. I'll have a roll call one by one for
4 those who have indicated on the registration
5 sign-in sheets that they have an intention to
6 submit a verbal comment. I have a list of names
7 here, we'll move through that.

8 After that, after the roll call, I
9 will open the floor to any others here attending
10 this evening. If anybody else would like to make a
11 verbal comment based on maybe something they've
12 heard somebody else mention, they're welcome to do
13 so at that point.

14 I would just like everybody to step
15 up to a microphone. We have one here, moved it
16 back a little bit farther in the room, just step up
17 to the microphone, speak clearly, state your name,
18 if you need to please spell your name. These
19 comments are being transcribed, so we need to get
20 them down accurately so that we can respond to them
21 in writing accurately also.

22 One thing else I just wanted to
23 mention here on the bottom of the slide here I
24 indicated written comments, I did receive one

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000065

1 written comment here during the break.

2 If there are others that you write up
3 during our period here, please feel free just to
4 hand them to me or raise your hand and show me that
5 you have a written comment, and I'll be glad to get
6 that from you. And I will read them after we go
7 through the verbal comment session.

8 I guess with that let's go ahead and
9 start the formal comment period, and the first on
10 my list is Darryl Huff.

11 MR. HUFF: Thank you. My name is
12 Darryl Huff. I'm a Morgan Township resident, and
13 the train tracks on which waste will be exported
14 from Fernald run through my backyard. I am also a
15 Fernald Citizens Task Force member and the chair of
16 the Waste Disposal Subcommittee, although tonight I
17 am speaking as an individual and not for either the
18 subcommittee or the task force.

19 I would first like to say that I
20 generally support the Unit 1 Proposed Theory --
21 Plan in theory. Although there are serious
22 short-term risks associated with transporting the
23 waste pit materials off-site, the risks are
24 outweighed by the very real long-term threat that

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000066

1 these unidentified wastes located in unplanned, ad
2 hoc disposal pits at Fernald pose to the Great
3 Miami aquifer.

4 Far too long, people have been
5 short-sighted when it comes to the subject of
6 safety at Fernald. We can be short-sighted no
7 longer. Thus, I favor DOE's plan to thermally dry
8 the waste and to ship the waste to a commercial
9 disposal facility, namely Envirocare.

10 Envirocare was designed and permitted
11 to receive these types of waste, and since that
12 part of Utah gets so little rain, the threat of
13 contaminants leaching into the groundwater there is
14 far less than it is here.

15 Also, Envirocare is not located over
16 a sole source aquifer. Envirocare is a privately
17 owned facility located in sparsely populated area
18 that is in the business of waste disposal. It
19 contributes to the tax base of the surrounding area
20 that specifically zoned that land for that use.

21 As for the method of shipment, I
22 again favor DOE's plan, which is to transport the
23 waste from Fernald by rail to Utah. While there
24 are and will be many problems associated with train

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000067

1 transport, the alternative to that, transport by
2 truck, clearly is not feasible for an operation of
3 this magnitude and duration. The waste must leave
4 somehow, and train is safer and more efficient than
5 truck.

6 While I do support the Operation Unit
7 Proposed Plan in theory, I am concerned about
8 several issues related to its implementation. I
9 have listened to comments made during the public
10 meetings and I've heard valid points raised about
11 potential flaws in the plan. I will repeat some of
12 those comments to ensure they are submitted to DOE
13 for consideration and response. I also have some
14 concerns of my own that I will voice.

15 I would like to start by addressing
16 several issues related to track conditions. The
17 first of these is one that has troubled me for some
18 time. I am concerned that no one has any idea
19 whether the rail lines that stretch between Fernald
20 and Cottage Grove, Indiana are contaminated at the
21 moment. This is significant for several reasons.

22 The first of these is that people
23 often come in contact with the track. Kids play on
24 the track. Hunters walk along the track.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000068

1 Concerned citizens remove debris from the track.
2 Workers will be upgrading the track. We need to
3 know if these people are at risk of being
4 contaminated.

5 Another reason is to check for
6 radiation is that DOE would have a number to use as
7 a norm for the track, so that the track can be
8 checked in the future in case of a leaking car or,
9 heaven forbid, an accident. Finally, it would give
10 area residents valuable peace of mind.

11 Another issue concerning track
12 conditions is ascertaining what the impact would be
13 of the proposed upgrade. If this upgrade were
14 sufficient to boost the track classification from
15 Class 2 to Class 3, then the speed limit for the
16 trains would increase from 25 miles per hour to 35
17 miles per hour. That concerns many residents.

18 There have been too many track
19 blockages in that area where residents have had to
20 do the cleanup for them to accept the blockage will
21 be cleaned up before one of the Fernald trains come
22 to it.

23 Maintaining the 25 miles per hour
24 speed limit would mean the train would be able to

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000069

1 come to a complete stop using less track, thus
2 giving the engineers more time to react to any
3 accidents or blockages on this branch line.

4 At very least I would like to see
5 some figures on stopping distances for a loaded 47
6 car unit train going 35 miles per hour versus the
7 same train going 25 miles per hour.

8 This issue leads me straight into
9 another one, which is the effectiveness of the
10 weekly track inspections CSX conducts. With the
11 stories I have heard from area residents concerning
12 blockages they have removed from the track
13 themselves, I have to think that these must be
14 somewhat ineffective.

15 Perhaps DOE needs to supplement these
16 with their own personnel or perhaps more frequent
17 inspections should be negotiated into DOE's
18 contract with CSX.

19 Next, I have some questions about
20 what surrounds the track, namely fences, crossings,
21 and vegetation. Will there be upgrades to the
22 fences bordering the tracks to keep animals and
23 people off the tracks, and if so, who will pay for
24 that?

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000070

1 What if the States of Ohio and
2 Indiana are unable to afford the massive crossing
3 upgrades that the increased rail traffic will make
4 necessary to keep area residents safe? Will DOE
5 help foot the bill for those upgrades?

6 How often will DOE require CSX to run
7 sprayer trucks and limb cutters along the line to
8 ensure visibility for both the engineers and area
9 drivers?

10 Another issue of concern is the
11 possible use of the Shandon switchyard to store
12 empty cars that have not been decontaminated and
13 also loaded cars waiting to depart for Utah. DOE
14 needs to consider extending the fence line and
15 building track on-site to store the trains.

16 If there were an accident, cleanup
17 would be facilitated by having everything within
18 the fence line. Security to prevent vandals and
19 curiosity seekers from getting to the cars would be
20 easier to arrange as well.

21 Liability in the event of an accident
22 is another problem area. Who would pay for the
23 cleanup of an accident, CSX or DOE? How clean will
24 that cleanup be? Where will residents be able to

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000071

1 see that in writing?

2 I realize that the contract between
3 DOE and CSX cannot be negotiated until the Record
4 of Decision is signed, but residents need to know.

5 That brings me to what is perhaps the
6 most important issue of all, that of continuing
7 public involvement after the Record of Decision is
8 signed. Many important decisions will be made
9 after the Record of Decision is signed, and
10 residents should have input on those decisions.

11 The CSX contract is an excellent
12 example. DOE has already assured the public that
13 there will be public review of the transportation
14 plans before it is final and also that residents
15 can oversee the track upgrading.

16 There needs to be more official
17 public involvement, however, all the way through
18 2002 when the last empty train returns from Utah.
19 I would like to see DOE publicly announce how the
20 residents will be systematically be included in the
21 decision-making process after the Record of
22 Decision is signed. A specific promise here and a
23 specific promise there is not enough.

24 For example, what would happen if

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000072

1 those unknown waste pit materials failed
2 Envirocare's acceptance requirements and the Nevada
3 Test Site had previously closed its doors to
4 incoming waste? Finalizing an alternative plan
5 would require public acceptance, but there is no
6 mechanism for that that the public can see in
7 writing.

8 These are some of the issues that I
9 have heard other stakeholders mention and also ones
10 I have considered. As a resident of the area with
11 the track on my property, I cannot overemphasize
12 the significance of this operation to my family, my
13 community, and myself.

14 Two things will be left when I'm
15 gone, my family and the land, I want to ensure that
16 both are left in the best condition possible.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Darryl. I
19 would like to call Mildred Ramsey.

20 MS. RAMSEY: I'm from Riley Township
21 and I was also interested in the tracks. And I
22 think he pretty well discussed it. I know the
23 train runs through our farm.

24 We did live in the five-mile radius

1 and we moved out and thought we got away, now it's
2 following us. We can't get away from it.

3 So I know we've stopped a train three
4 different times when the tracks were out when the
5 water washed through and different things, so we're
6 concerned that that's all upgraded and taken care
7 of. Thank you.

8 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Mildred. I
9 would like to call Eugene Ramsey.

10 MR. RAMSEY: Well, my wife pretty
11 well covered what I was going to say except that I
12 will add this that Nick Schwab and I walked part of
13 the track the other night before the CSX meeting,
14 and that track is in bad shape. Your spikes are
15 loose, you can go along and pull them up and so
16 on. And also I know one culvert that's completely
17 plugged.

18 And like my wife said we keep a close
19 watch on that because we own ground on both sides.
20 We're right there at the New Kirk crossing where
21 New Kirk used to be. There used to be a station
22 there. And I've had to call them because of trees
23 blocking the thing, blocking the tracks, culverts
24 washed out and CSX has always cooperated and so on

1 and stopped the trains up at Raymond, Indiana.

2 So because there's a lot of waterways
3 up there where these culverts go up under the track
4 and them waterways ends up clear down at Paddy's
5 Run Road-- or Paddy's Run Crick and then on down to
6 wherever, so if any car would ever spill up there
7 no telling where that would end up and I just don't
8 want to see my property or anybody else's property
9 ruined by any waste, because we have seen cars jump
10 the tracks and everything else up there.

11 So we've lived there going on 29
12 years so we've seen a lot up and down that tracks.
13 And I've seen them burn stuff in the tracks in a
14 rainstorm, what it was I don't know. I told CSX
15 about that the other night, of course they don't
16 remember what it was or anything else.

17 But I understand you're talking maybe
18 \$3,000,000 to upgrade the tracks and I hope before
19 one car goes up through there or one train, which I
20 understand is suppose to be 47 cars, what they was
21 talking the other night, I think 47 cars, that them
22 tracks is gone over with a fine tooth comb and
23 really checked because they need it. Thank you.

24 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Eugene. I

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000075

1 would like to call Carol Schwab.

2 MS. SCHWAB: Yes. I would like to
3 talk about page ES11, lines 12 through 14, which is
4 the contingency plan for waste that fails to meet
5 the criteria and they're going to send it to the
6 Nevada Test Site.

7 Well, as I understand this this would
8 be before it leaves the Fernald property they
9 decide where to send it. But I am concerned about
10 if it already has left the property and goes to
11 Utah and they decide they don't want to accept it
12 at Utah because for some reason it doesn't meet the
13 criteria. I think that it should be sent directly
14 to Nevada without coming back to Ohio.

15 And some of the other stuff that you
16 sent out, I know there was a case where something
17 came back or a contaminated car came back, and I
18 think it should just go directly to the other site
19 for the more hazardous material without coming back
20 and re-exposing us again. Thank you.

21 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Carol. I
22 would like to call Nick Schwab.

23 MR. SCHWAB: I'm Nick Schwab, Riley
24 Township Trustee. And I also and my wife lived

1 within these five miles and hopefully moved out of
2 it and find ourselves in the position where they're
3 going to bring it right through the middle of our
4 farm. However, as a township trustee there are
5 certain things that I think that we need to make
6 our concerns -- voice our concerns.

7 Certainly in Ohio -- or yeah, in
8 Ohio, Riley Township is the only township where
9 you're going to send it up one side, the west side
10 of the township, to Cottage Grove and bring it back
11 down through the east side of the township, so our
12 township is going to see this train twice.

13 In the plan ES2, lines 27 to 29, you
14 talk about if actual threat and release of
15 hazardous substance and it goes on may present, I
16 don't want to read it all, but may present a
17 potential threat to the public health and welfare
18 of the environment.

19 Points out that the need that the
20 plan include training of the volunteer fire
21 departments along the spur line to handle the
22 specific waste, the securing of a site in case of
23 an accident.

24 Or what really concerns me since

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000077

1 there has been so much concern about the train
2 sitting down in Shandon would be a contingency plan
3 that would address a problem if there is a stopped
4 train on that track for some reason for an extended
5 period of time.

6 It's important that the DOE in
7 considering a contract that the nationwide safety
8 record or the carrier not be considered, but rather
9 the safety record of the railroad along this
10 particular spur line, the number of miles along the
11 spur line, the number of miles along the spur line,
12 and more importantly the fact that only three
13 trains a week travel this line need to be
14 considered in the accident rate and what remedial
15 action needs to be taken.

16 The neighbor directly north of me was
17 killed on this spur liner at Peoria several years
18 ago. The neighbor directly west of me was hit by a
19 train and had the front of his car torn off. If
20 you read CSX material that they passed out last
21 week nobody alive should know -- have two neighbors
22 injured on a little short piece of track like
23 this.

24 Other factors that need to be

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000078

1 considered is part of a contract with the
2 railroad. Number one, cutting and clearing of the
3 brush that limits sight distances at many of the
4 unsignalized crossings. Mr. Woody last week I
5 think he said it's been several years since they
6 cut the brush and sprayed along there. And Mr.
7 Woody was with CSX railroad.

8 The number two, the regular
9 inspection and maintenance of all cross bucks and
10 pavement markings on the spur line.

11 Three, the posting at appropriate
12 locations along the spur line of no hunting signs
13 and a method of enforcement that includes
14 prosecution of violators because of the danger that
15 they could leave something on the tracks that could
16 cause a possible derailment that would place the
17 residents at risk.

18 Number four, the building and repair
19 of farm fences along the spur line as required by
20 Ohio law. This has been neglected in the past by
21 the railroad. And since DOE is going to assure
22 profitability of this line the railroad needs to
23 live up to their responsibility to the landowners
24 along this spur line and to maintain their fences.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000079

1 Number five, the drainage problems
2 that threaten the structural integrity of the
3 tracks need to be addressed in this plan.

4 Six, a complete and thorough
5 inspection of the North Weaver Road trestle.

6 Alternative 5B doesn't indicate
7 whether or not that the waste shipped by rail will
8 be containerized, and wouldn't the waste be more
9 secured if it were containerized and placed in the
10 rail cars. Thank you.

11 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Nick. Next
12 up I would like to call Irene Lewis.

13 MS. LEWIS: Thank you so much. What
14 I'm going to say really is going to be very brief.
15 I have a problem with questions at one meeting and
16 the answer written down and brought back with no
17 specifics, just generalities.

18 For instance, will DOE look at the
19 potential risk if the train sits in a rail yard for
20 days. Says DOE did consider the potential risk of
21 having cars, and they were assessed and concluded
22 that there was no risk. What went into this
23 discussion to bring you to this conclusion?

24 I think these are some of the things

1 that we really want to look at is how did you come
 2 to this decision, and that's throughout here. So
 3 my comment is that I would like to see more
 4 specifics go into this plan. You know, a law is
 5 one thing, how it's implemented is another.

6 I would like to see the
 7 implementation steps spelled out. How you're going
 8 to do this. For instance, you say that the
 9 residents are going to be receiving notification,
 10 do you mean notification or do you mean a schedule
 11 of when the trains depart? There's is difference.
 12 Is it going to be, you know, notification like we
 13 got under the other operation when it started.

14 I would like to see a map of Butler
 15 County where the train track runs, like Nick said
 16 it comes through his farm twice, so you know, we
 17 have concerns every place that this train travels
 18 through. I know that there is more concerns in
 19 rural areas naturally. So I would like to see a
 20 map of the county with the train track, the route
 21 that this takes, that the train takes.

22 I would like to see an emergency
 23 plan, not just a basic plan like CSX gives to us
 24 and some other people, but like Nick said some

1 procedures, specific procedures, one, two, three,
2 four, five, this is what you do when this happens,
3 the next step is this, the next step is this, and
4 some things really spelled out.

5 Who do you consider an incident
6 commander? Is that the people on the train crew.
7 You know, I think these are the things -- it's too
8 late to do something when there is an incident and
9 you go out there and try to decide now what was it
10 I was suppose to do, know that person's
11 responsibility. You know, it's too late when you
12 have an incident and have to try to work out who's
13 going to do what, so I would like to see this and
14 see some input.

15 I don't know if you're going to stop
16 after this September the 8th meeting or not. You
17 said that was the last meeting, is that September
18 the 8th or whatever it was?

19 MR. LOJEK: September the 8th is the
20 close of the comments.

21 MS. LEWIS: Oh, the comments, okay.
22 Where are you going then from here, after all the
23 comments and so on are you going to start working
24 on specific plans?

1 MR. LOJEK: Yes. We can answer that
2 formally.

3 MS. LEWIS: Right, okay. That's
4 really all that I have to say, but I would like to
5 see some of these specifics and not leave all these
6 general remarks hanging. And almost every question
7 and answer on here is general. The law says we'll
8 do that, you know.

9 But you know, we've heard for years
10 everything with this plan is acceptable, how many
11 years have we heard this people? You know. And
12 all of a sudden when this comes into place it's
13 like quoting Rush Limbaugh, shazaam, look, it's
14 unacceptable all of a sudden, and this is where
15 we're at. We want it to be acceptable and not have
16 to go through all this again. Thank you, Dave.

17 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Irene Lewis.
18 I would like to call Gene Willeke. No Gene
19 Willeke.

20 MS. CRAWFORD: I think he left.

21 MR. LOJEK: You think he left, okay,
22 thank you. I saw Willy Benson standing up in the
23 back there, he's in the dark and I was trying to
24 strain to see who that was.

1 At this point that's the roll call
2 list that I had for people who designated
3 officially they wanted to make a verbal comment.

4 At this point I open the floor to
5 others who would like to make a verbal comment at
6 the meeting. If you would just raise your hand I
7 will go ahead and catch you and get you on the
8 microphone and state your name and speak clearly,
9 and we'll go ahead through the room.

10 Okay. I take it there are no further
11 verbal comments to be presented. Okay. We do
12 have, okay, thank you.

13 MR. SCHULTE: Hi, my name is Steve
14 Schulte and I also own land, a half a mile of land,
15 that borders CSX railroad tracks and I was just
16 wondering if there is going to be an eminent
17 condition study done along the railroad tracks to
18 compare figures with later on as far as the
19 radiation that's along the railroad tracks now?

20 MR. LOJEK: Okay. Thank you. We
21 will respond to your concern. Do we have another
22 one here?

23 MS. NUNGESTER: I'm going to make a
24 written comment, but I have a couple of quick ones

1 I wanted to make.

2 And I think that CSX should do more
3 than a visual inspection of those railroad tracks
4 once a week. Somebody needs to get down there and
5 actually see, you know, what's happening. A visual
6 inspection as you're driving by you don't see all
7 that much. Maybe they have better eyes than I do,
8 but I don't think they can see any real damage that
9 might be there.

10 Also I have a real concern about
11 these tracks. They are currently being used by
12 three companies that sit -- or two companies I
13 guess it is, that sit southeast or southwest of the
14 Fernald site, and they're using these tracks and I
15 understand that they don't need the upgrade to use
16 them, but I think that somehow they should also
17 share in the cost of these tracks because they're
18 going to get the benefit when they are made
19 better.

20 I didn't give my name again. Norma
21 Nungester, N U N G E S T E R, [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]

23 MR. LOJEK: Thank you, Norma. Any
24 additional verbal comments from the open floor? I

1 saw Lisa, I've given her, Lisa Crawford, the eye
2 here expecting her to get up, but that's fine.

3 I did receive -- Norma you mentioned
4 that you have a written comment, you'll not hear
5 for the meeting for a later date, correct?

6 MS. NUNGESTER: (Nodding head.)

7 MR. LOJEK: Okay. I did receive one
8 written comment and I'll go ahead and read that
9 comment now. This is a comment from Rita Janson.
10 She's 2343 Ranch, that's in Lawrence, Kansas.

11 Her comment reads as follows: Will
12 communities along the rail route be notified when
13 shipments of pit waste take place, through what
14 mechanism will this notification be made, through
15 community newspapers, through government agencies,
16 or both? Will emergency personnel along the rail
17 shipping route be notified prior to the waste
18 shipment through their area? All right. That
19 concludes the written comment that I received here
20 at the meeting.

21 What I would like to do here we'll
22 move to basically close up our meeting. I have a
23 couple of short items to close out with.

24 First, I would like to identify that

1 if you have any lingering, or if you have any new
2 comments, or if you choose to present your comments
3 in writing after this meeting you can do so by
4 submitting those comments to Mr. Gary Stegner.
5 He's Director of our public affairs group at the
6 Department of Energy, the Fernald Branch, that's
7 Post Office Box 538705. In your Proposed Plan
8 document the post office box is listed as 398705.
9 We've just recently changed our post office box and
10 if you use either post office box the mail will get
11 to us.

12 The OU1 our public comment period, we
13 started that on August 10th. The written comments
14 if you submit them need to be postmarked by the
15 closing of our public comment period which is
16 September 8th, 1994. So please make sure that
17 you -- we look forward to getting any additional,
18 make sure you get them in the mail by then.

19 And I need to stress at the bottom of
20 my slide here I say this is the time to make your
21 views known. And I appreciate all the comments
22 that I do receive and all the input and concerns
23 that you have for us implementing our proposed
24 cleanup of those waste pits.

Spangler Reporting Services

PHONE (513) 381-3330 FAX (513) 381-3342

000087

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

At this point let me just mention for the public affairs people there was an evaluation form placed on your chair, if you would please go ahead and fill that evaluation form out.

And I would like to thank sincerely everyone for attending the meeting this evening and providing verbal and any written comments and their input into the meeting tonight. Thank you very much -- hold on a second. Okay. You're all right. Okay, very good. Thank you very much for attending.

- - -

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 9:15 P.M.

- - -

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, CONNIE DUPPS, RPR, the undersigned, a notary public-court reporter, do hereby certify that at the time and place stated herein, I recorded in stenotypy and thereafter had transcribed with computer-aided transcription the within (88), eighty-eight pages, and that the foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

Connie Dupps, RPR

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: CONNIE DUPPS, RPR
AUGUST 13, 1997. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO