

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

FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT
OPERABLE UNIT 5
PUBLIC MEETING ON THE
FEASIBILITY STUDY & PROPOSED PLAN

May 23, 1995

The Plantation

- - -

1 MR. STEGNER: Good evening and
2 welcome. Thank you all for coming. My name is
3 Gary Stegner, I work for Public Affairs for the
4 Department of Energy for Fernald. Soon I'll be
5 turning it over to Rob Jenke, our manager of
6 Operable Unit 5 at the Department of Energy at
7 Fernald.

8 If you haven't done so, I would urge
9 you, everybody that has shown up tonight, to
10 register at the door, at least before you leave
11 this evening, and if you want to speak during the
12 public comment period, the formal part of the
13 evening, if you would just indicate that on the
14 sign-in, that way we'll be sure to get you. It's
15 not required that you do so, but we'll have an open
16 mike, and that will give us a better idea of how to
17 allocate our time tonight. I would appreciate if
18 you do that, plus by signing in, you will be sure
19 to get on the mailing list and get all the
20 proceedings that happen tonight.

21 Also I want to tell you all there's a
22 lot of handouts here this evening there in the back
23 of the room that gives you a better explanation of
24 Operable Unit 5 and our proposed plan for Operable

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000002

1 Unit 5, and I would urge you to pick that stuff up
2 and take it home with you this evening also.

3 Let's talk a little bit about what
4 we're going to do tonight. We have two hours
5 scheduled. That should allow us plenty of time for
6 questions and comments. If it doesn't, we'll stay
7 here for as long as it takes. We know this is an
8 important issue in the community and we want to
9 make sure everybody gets their say. I want to make
10 sure everybody realizes that you do not have to
11 speak tonight to issue a formal comment on the
12 Operable Unit 5 proposed plan. You can do it in
13 writing, send it to me. The address and a response
14 card are included with the proposed plan document,
15 assembly document.

16 Again, this is a public hearing
17 tonight. We have a court reporter here with us to
18 transcribe the meeting. A copy of the transcript
19 will be placed in the Public Environmental
20 Information Center located on 128, very close to
21 the site. Probably be there within a couple of
22 weeks. Anyone who is interested in what's going on
23 here can review that transcript.

24 Rob will speak for about 20 to 30

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000003

1 minutes tonight, give you kind of a review of
2 Operable Unit 5. For some of you, this may be your
3 first exposure to a Fernald meeting. Normally
4 we're very casual, you can shout questions out
5 pretty much at any time. Tonight I would ask that
6 everyone, just for the sake of getting through this
7 initial presentation, to hold their questions until
8 the question and answer period. Prior to going
9 into the official public comment section this
10 evening, we will take questions and answers.

11 Obviously this is a complicated
12 issue, we would urge you guys to ask a lot of
13 questions. We have people up here very, very
14 capable of responding to I think most of the
15 questions you folks would have tonight.

16 Fernald is a complicated place, a lot
17 of issues going on around there, but tonight I'm
18 going to try to keep the evening focused on
19 Operable Unit 5. Again, for the sake of conserving
20 time and since this is a formal public hearing
21 tonight, I want to keep it as focused as we
22 possibly can. So if you would, keep your questions
23 and comments, at least in the meeting part, focused
24 on Operable Unit 5. If you have questions outside

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 the realm of this document, we'll be around during
2 the break, we'll be around after the meeting to
3 answer your questions. And again, we're only a
4 phone call away.

5 When is the formal comment period
6 over? 31st of May. So if you do not choose to
7 speak tonight, you do not choose to hand any
8 comments in tonight, you have until the 31st of May
9 to send your comments in to me to get them into the
10 formal record.

11 What I want to do now is turn the
12 next part of the evening over to Rob Jenke.
13 Following Rob we'll have some comments from our
14 regulators, Ohio and US EPA's. Then we'll have the
15 informal question and answer period. It shows it
16 on here being 35 minutes. We can go longer than
17 that if necessary, but again, we're here as long as
18 you want us to be, and following that we'll take a
19 10-minute break. Then we'll go formal into the
20 formal public hearing part of our evening. So,
21 Rob.

22 MR. JENKE: Okay. Thanks a lot,
23 Gary. I guess with that, I'll begin the
24 presentation. I appreciate you all coming

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 tonight. As Gary said, this is the formal public
2 meeting on the Operable Unit 5 Proposed Plan and
3 Feasibility Study, and this presentation should
4 take about 30 minutes.

5 Before I get into the presentation,
6 I'd like to first start off with I guess a bit of
7 thanks to the team sitting here at the table. I'm
8 a relatively newcomer, as probably many of you
9 know, to Operable Unit 5. Most of my time at the
10 site with DOE has been spent in Operable Unit 3. I
11 just came on board to Operable Unit 5 about nine
12 months ago, I guess August of '94, and it's been,
13 to be quite honest, a great learning experience. I
14 think I've learned a lot, and I think each of the
15 members of the team, both from FERMCO and the
16 people that were in DOE Operable Unit 5 at the
17 time, have been very helpful and I think supportive
18 of that transition, so I would like to thank them.
19 And I think a special thanks goes to Dennis and
20 Mark who put in long hours on this project, and I
21 think it's, this represents really a focal point to
22 all that hard work. I would just like to thank
23 them.

24 With that in mind, I would like to

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 jump into -- Can everybody hear me okay without
2 this microphone because if you don't mind I'm going
3 to pull this away. I guess to start off with why
4 we're here tonight. We're here to share with you
5 how we came about the decision, the remedy, the
6 proposed remedy, that is, for Operable Unit 5.
7 What we want to I guess convey is the options that
8 we looked at, the range of options, the factors
9 that went into coming up with those range of
10 options, and the tradeoffs that we encountered
11 along the way. Ultimately what you'll find at the
12 end, those of you who have already read the
13 proposed plan, certainly it represents in many ways
14 a compromise. The purpose of tonight's meeting is
15 to go over that in basically summary form.

16 What we'd like to have in terms of
17 feedback is feedback in terms of how we look at the
18 process. Are there things that we left out,
19 considerations, technical considerations that we
20 didn't include in our analysis, assumptions that
21 maybe are invalid. Basically do you see any flaws
22 in our logic. With that in mind, a brief overview
23 of tonight's presentation.

24 I'm going to start off with a little

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 bit of a description of Operable Unit 5, sort of a
2 background description, more focused on the way it
3 fits in with the other operable units in terms of
4 volumes of waste, contaminated soils in terms of
5 OU-5, that's what we're talking about, and in terms
6 of levels of contamination that exist in Operable
7 Unit 5. Then I'll move on to -- That will be the
8 overview, the contamination or the RI of Operable
9 Unit 5. Then we will move to how we determine
10 cleanup levels in the operable unit, and then
11 finally the path forward for using those cleanup
12 levels.

13 Operable Unit 5 represents the soil
14 and groundwater media at the site. It essentially
15 is the receiving end of all the past operations and
16 discharges. It's not a source operable unit,
17 meaning that we don't have a waste unit there we
18 have to remove and then treat and put back. We
19 basically have contaminated soil. So it's a little
20 different than Operable Unit 1, which is the pits,
21 or Operable Unit 4, which represents the silos.

22 Specifically Operable Unit 5
23 represents the soil, the groundwater, perched
24 water, surface water, sediment, flora and fauna. I

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000008

1 think most of you are familiar with this. It's
2 been around the process for a while, but just to go
3 over it briefly.

4 In terms of FEMP waste volumes, what
5 does Operable Unit 5 mean to the site as a whole?
6 It represents about 60 percent of the FEMP waste in
7 terms of contaminated waste. Operable Unit 3,
8 which is roughly 6.6 percent of the waste by
9 volume, this slide is a little deceiving in that
10 Operable Unit 3, the pink area, is 6.6 percent, but
11 then we have uranium and thorium residues, which
12 are roughly 1.5 percent. Together we have about 8
13 percent at Operable Unit 3. In contrast, Operable
14 Unit 1 is approximately 20 percent by volume of
15 representing the waste at the site. This is
16 important because in terms of total radioactivity,
17 Operable Unit 5 represents the smallest
18 contribution, especially when we balance that off
19 the total volumes. Roughly about 2 percent.
20 Operable Unit 2 isn't shown, basically because it
21 represents roughly .2 percent, so it would be
22 basically incremental to the Operable Unit 5 waste
23 volume, actually radioactivity increment.

24 As you can see, the Operable Unit 3

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 materials in terms of uranium product, the legacy
2 waste and the thorium waste represents around 50
3 percent of the total radioactivity but only about
4 8 percent of the volume.

5 In terms of Records of Decisions and
6 remedies that we've basically established so far,
7 there's been four Records of Decisions that are
8 either in process, I'm not completely sure of
9 Operable Unit 2's status, but I believe we have
10 four signed Records of Decision.

11 We have a Record of Decision for
12 Operable Unit 1, which is the waste pits, to
13 excavate and ship to Envirocare in Utah.

14 For Operable Unit 2, that's the
15 soils, soils in the South Field area and connected
16 with the flyash piles and the sewage sanitary
17 landfill, that material will be excavated and
18 disposed of on property.

19 Operable Unit 3, although disposition
20 decision hasn't been determined, the decision to
21 bring all the buildings down has, and we have an
22 Interim Record of Decision on that.

23 Operable Unit 4, which is the K-65
24 silos, the high radium bearing waste, that will be

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000010

1 vitrified and shipped to the Nevada Test Site.

2 Again, the purpose of tonight's
3 discussion is Operable Unit 5. In terms of that
4 total radioactivity, where is that on the site or
5 around the site? This aerial isopleth basically
6 outlines the level of uranium contamination around
7 the site at a concentration of between 5 and 20
8 ppm, parts per million of uranium. As you can see,
9 at those levels it extends off property to some
10 degree, which resulted from the years of process
11 operations and discharges from the roughly I guess
12 two to three -- well, I guess nine process plants.

13 In terms of on property
14 contamination, uranium contamination, the levels
15 range between the southern portion of the property
16 5 to 10 parts per million on average, there's hot
17 areas -- I forgot my pointer, I apologize, but down
18 in the South Field areas there's concentrations
19 that are fairly high, but on average the
20 concentration is 5 to 10. The waste pit area,
21 those areas that are anywhere from a hundred to a
22 thousand, but on average around 10 to 20. The
23 production area is roughly a hundred to 10,000 in
24 places.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000011

1 Formerly we used to have some
2 contamination out near the incinerator that was
3 fairly high, in the order of 25,000 parts per
4 million. That soil has since been removed. So in
5 terms of peripheral area of the site, we're
6 basically down around the 5 to 10 or the 10 to 20
7 reading.

8 In terms of groundwater
9 contamination, depending on where you're at,
10 there's various plumes, we have the 3 to 20 plume
11 right here, represents the largest size, that's 3
12 parts per billion, less than 20 parts per billion.
13 In terms of 20 parts per billion plume, which is in
14 green, the largest section of that is in the South
15 Field area extending off-site. Within the
16 production area of Plant 6 we have a plume that is
17 greater than 20. I think in terms of maximum
18 concentrations in the South Field we're up around
19 300 I believe.

20 MR. CARR: Off-site 300, on-site
21 about a thousand.

22 MR. JENKE: On-site about a
23 thousand.

24 Given these levels of contamination

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000012

1 in the soil and groundwater, the goal, the
2 objective of Operable Unit 5 was to determine or
3 develop cleanup levels for these media, essentially
4 surface soils and groundwater. The issue from the,
5 I guess from the start was given that we have large
6 quantities of soil that have concentrations of
7 uranium in it anywhere from 5 to 10,000 parts per
8 million on average across the site, we're probably
9 looking at a hundred parts per million, how do we
10 address that. We know background for uranium is
11 around 4 parts per million in soil, there aren't
12 any action levels in the regulations, EPA or state
13 regulations that we can adopt and say this is what
14 we're going to clean up the soils to at Fernald.
15 We're basically given the process we have to follow
16 under CERCLA and NCP and we have to develop cleanup
17 levels. A guiding requirement under developing
18 those cleanup levels is to make sure we remediate
19 to health-protective levels for both the soil and
20 the groundwater.

21 In terms of the groundwater, we knew
22 from the beginning that our really only option is
23 to, one, restore it to its maximum beneficial use
24 and, two, protect it in the future from the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000013

1 continued or possible continued migration of
2 contaminants from the surface soil, those that are
3 there now or those that we may leave in the future
4 after we determine the cleanup level to make sure
5 we don't recontaminate the groundwater. Those are
6 basically our guiding principles.

7 With that in mind, we have basically
8 two constraints or two needs to allow us to develop
9 a framework for developing these cleanup levels.
10 One is the need to address cross-media impacts,
11 which I just touched on, which is the process by
12 which contaminants, whether they be uranium,
13 radium, thorium, or other contaminants, migrate
14 through the surface soil and contaminate the
15 groundwater. It's a possible or potential exposure
16 pathway in the future and in the present, and
17 whatever cleanup level you achieve for or develop
18 for soils, that number has to be protected for the
19 groundwater in the future.

20 The other need or requirement that
21 allow us to set up this framework is a need to
22 develop receptor-specific exposure levels. Given
23 that we don't have a number that we can look up in
24 the regulations, whether it be EPA regulations or

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000014

1 state regulations or DOE orders, or NRC regulations
2 to say that we need to clean up uranium to this
3 concentration. Instead EPA has developed a process
4 for developing cleanup levels, so the site specific
5 process. The reason for that is, depending on the
6 level of use at the facility, ultimate use in the
7 future, the cleanup levels will vary. So the
8 process really calls for you to develop this
9 receptor-specific exposure scenario framework.

10 To do that we developed or postulated
11 four different receptors: A residential farming
12 receptor; an industrial/commercial worker receptor,
13 similar to the workers that exist who are working
14 on the site right now; a developed parkland
15 receptor, developed parkland would be a situation
16 where you had, you cleared the site off and you had
17 picnic tables, you had a park, restroom facilities,
18 you had possibly ball parks and swing sets and
19 things like that; or an undeveloped parkland, which
20 is basically green space with possibly hiking
21 trails or a bike trail, maybe an extension of the
22 Great Miami bike trail.

23 Given those receptors, we had to
24 develop ultimately land uses to go along with

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000015

1 them. Before we developed land uses, or I guess in
2 concert with developing land uses, we had a, we
3 have a rule book that we have to follow for
4 developing the cleanup levels, sort of a check
5 point on the cleanup levels. A framework for
6 determining whether levels are too high or too low,
7 really actually for the most part too high.
8 There's three parts to that rule book. The NCP is
9 certainly the overall guiding process which
10 establishes a risk range 10 to the minus 6 to 10 to
11 the minus 4, which is an incremental lifetime
12 cancer risk that someone could get from being
13 exposed to the contaminants at the site. That's
14 the risk range that we have to work within in
15 developing the cleanup levels.

16 Another criterion or rule book,
17 component of the rule book which represents a lot
18 of different standards and regulations and
19 guidelines is what's called ARARs, which are
20 applicable, relevant, and appropriate
21 requirements. The ARARs really, in some cases they
22 represent MCL's or specific cleanup levels, MCL's
23 or maximum contaminant levels for a specific
24 contaminant. In some cases they are specific for a

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000016

1 contaminant. For uranium they're not, at least at
2 the soils. And for other actions they represent
3 standards or processes that you have to follow to
4 implement the action. So there's a large number of
5 ARARs that have to be factored into the decision.

6 The last component of our rule book,
7 which is really in part included under the risk
8 range or the process for using the risk range as
9 well as ARARs, is to evaluate or consider
10 ecological effects. Ultimately the cleanup levels
11 that we choose for the soil and groundwater have to
12 be protective of ecological receptors that live in
13 and around the site and may ultimately be exposed
14 to contaminants.

15 Given that rule book, the question I
16 guess that certainly comes up in one's mind is how
17 do you go from that rule book and these exposure
18 scenarios and receptors to needing to know what the
19 future land use is. Quite simply, cleanup levels
20 vary with respect to future land use. As the level
21 of activity on the site, the future use of the site
22 goes up, cleanup levels go down. The reason for
23 that is as the level of activity, i.e., something
24 like farming occurs, you have a lot more exposure

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 to the contaminant. The farmer is out plowing the
2 fields, he's planting crops, there's just a lot
3 more time outdoors in which to gain exposure. As
4 that exposure goes up, his corresponding risk to
5 contaminants goes up; therefore, cleanup levels,
6 acceptable cleanup levels go down.

7 On the opposite end is, would
8 probably be a trespasser receptor, where a
9 trespasser being an individual that maybe crosses
10 or transverses the site a few times a year and has
11 very minimal exposure. If you take those two
12 receptors, it essentially establishes the range or
13 the magnitude, the difference between cleanup
14 levels within our land uses.

15 More specifically in terms of land
16 uses, we looked at four land use objectives, the
17 first one being unrestricted use, which would
18 correspond to the residential farmer. That's
19 basically we clean the soil up to levels that would
20 permit an individual to come on and farm the land.
21 The fences are torn down, the buildings and
22 everything are taken away, and basically the site
23 is just released, no strings attached.

24 The next, how should I say, level of

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000018

1 decreased activity would be land use objective
 2 number two, where we released the outer peripheral
 3 area of the site and maintain the center portion of
 4 the site for a no access region. In that area we
 5 evaluated a couple options. We evaluated on-site
 6 disposal in a couple options or a couple ways or
 7 manners in that area.

8 The third land use objective we
 9 looked at was essentially a restricted use of the
 10 outer portion of the site and then again no access
 11 in the center. So the difference between two and
 12 three is this would be a farmer and this would be
 13 some type of restricted use, such as a developed or
 14 undeveloped park or commercial/industrial scenario
 15 or a trespasser, something along those lines.

16 Four would essentially be a fence
 17 around the entire property, which would, of course,
 18 correspond to the highest cleanup levels, the least
 19 amount of remediation, at least of the soils.

20 In terms of, jumping back to
 21 groundwater, in terms of the groundwater, I think
 22 we knew right away that, I think even the community
 23 and certainly EPA and Ohio, US EPA and Ohio EPA I
 24 think recognized right away there's not a lot of

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 option in the groundwater. As you can see from the
2 earlier viewgraph on uranium contamination in the
3 aquifer, it's a very large plume. The Great Miami
4 Aquifer is rather large, as most of you, if not all
5 of you, realize or know. The options for restoring
6 or remediating the aquifer are somewhat limited.
7 You basically have to pump and treat it.

8 So up front we recognize that first
9 we had to restore the aquifer to maximum beneficial
10 use. Then we had to decide what level are we going
11 to remediate the aquifer, are we going to remediate
12 it to a risk space level of 1 times 10 to the minus
13 4 or one times 10 to the minus 5 or one times 10 to
14 the minus 6. As you I guess decrease or increase
15 your level of remediation to achieve levels such as
16 10 to the minus 6, the amount of pumping and
17 treatment that you have to do go up considerably.

18 In addition to looking at risk, we
19 looked at the use of maximum contaminant levels.
20 For uranium we only have proposed numbers. These
21 proposed numbers have been on the books for some
22 time. That's all we had and that's what we used.
23 Proposed MCL, maximum contaminant level for
24 uranium. We decided based on the work that EPA had

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000020

1 done on coming up with that proposed number, as
 2 well as where that proposed MCL fell within our
 3 risk assessment process, we did look at risk space
 4 cleanup levels for the groundwater, we decided to
 5 go with the MCL. That established -- by coming up
 6 with 20, that established the contour of our
 7 plumes, which is why that graph earlier showed 20.
 8 It also established to a great extent how much we
 9 have to pump and where the wells would be located.

10 In any event, the really only option
 11 for the groundwater is to pump and treat.

12 In terms of soil, at least
 13 conceptually one would think there's a lot more
 14 options. You could somehow put some type of cap on
 15 it, in-place containment, that was examined. You
 16 could maybe theoretically, one would think you
 17 could maybe treat the soils in place, you could
 18 treat VOC's, volatile organic compounds, in place
 19 by stripping them, air stripping them or using some
 20 type of biological agents to break them down.
 21 Maybe something could be done with uranium.
 22 Unfortunately, there are no more options there.
 23 You can't eliminate radioactivity, you can't break
 24 it down. You can only move it around. So that

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 really didn't prove very feasible.

2 We looked into washing, and those of
3 you who have been involved in the process, there's
4 a lot of detail on it, just how hard we looked at
5 soil washing, basically in the form or the process
6 of removing the soil, running it through a process,
7 multi-step process to wash uranium from it with
8 using strong or weak acids and water to basically
9 rinse it from the various fractions in which it
10 resides within the soil, the clays, the silts, the
11 sand. The problem with soil washing is we found
12 it's very expensive. I believe the numbers are
13 roughly a factor of three greater. It doesn't
14 achieve the lowest cleanup level within the area of
15 the production area, so it's not -- one could say
16 it's not protected in terms of achieving all our
17 cleanup levels for uranium, and, three, we had
18 concerns with its implementability, given that we
19 have to start up this large process and we would
20 have to run approximately two million cubic yards
21 of soil through it. That raised a lot of concerns
22 with us in terms of the number of chemicals that we
23 would have to bring onto the site in order to run
24 the process, the length of time that it would take

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000022

1 to do it. All of these point to soil washing as
2 not being very viable.

3 The only option left, if you look at
4 the top three in the feasibility study, the only
5 option left was to excavate and dispose. Once we
6 got to that point, we realized that with excavation
7 disposition or disposal, the issue is really
8 on-site or off-site. With that, we started looking
9 at considerations for on-site and off-site
10 ultimately, which became our remedy or our proposed
11 remedy for soil, is it on-site or off-site. Well,
12 we looked at, consulted with, and listened to the
13 Task Force recommendations for on-site disposal,
14 we've attended and conducted numerous public round
15 tables, open forums with many of the members of the
16 public on the issue of on and off-site disposal.
17 We've had a lot of, as you can imagine, many of you
18 realize, a lot of negative I guess feelings about
19 on-site disposals. It wasn't something we
20 certainly preferred, but, nevertheless, we have
21 considered numerous people's input on the issue.

22 We also looked at the availability,
23 the uncertainty of off-site disposal. Given that
24 the action associated with Operable Unit 5 is going

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 to span probably 20 years, and the large part is
2 due to length of time it is going to take to get
3 the buildings down and out of the way in order to
4 get to the production area soils. That's a long
5 time frame in order to be sure or be, how shall I
6 say, enthusiastic that we have disposal capacity
7 there. There's concerns that have been expressed
8 to us from the states of Nevada and Utah to us
9 sending all of our stuff out there, as well as
10 people along the routes. The cost of off-site
11 disposal initially, given our cost numbers that we
12 have today, are approximately twice the on-site
13 disposal option, not quite twice. The cost over
14 the long term were very unpredictable, uncertain.

15 Given those considerations, we
16 basically came up with a proposed remedy which
17 you'll see in the proposed plan. There's a number
18 of components of the proposed remedy. This slide
19 tries to I guess provide a summary of the more
20 important ones. I believe the proposed remedy
21 that's in your handout is, the language is slightly
22 different than this one. This one was modified as
23 of later this afternoon so it didn't get in the
24 slides. We tried to convey a few more of the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000024

1 factors.

2 Ultimately, as I indicated earlier,
3 our primary goal is the restoration of the Great
4 Miami Aquifer, first and foremost. In terms of
5 soils, we're going to excavate all contaminated
6 soils down to our cleanup level. It's discussed
7 under alternative 3A in the proposed plan. Those
8 soils will be deposited in an on-property
9 engineered disposal facility, those that meet the
10 waste acceptance criteria for an on-property
11 disposal facility. Soils that don't will have to
12 be either treated or shipped off-site.

13 We'll continue to look at
14 technologies and innovations over the long haul to
15 make sure this was the right decision. That's a
16 tough, that will be a tough process. It will
17 always have to be balanced of with protectiveness
18 and its implementability and its practicality.

19 And I guess to sum up the proposed
20 remedy, we're going to try to maximize the release
21 of the largest portion of the site for reuse.
22 What's outlined in the proposed plan under
23 alternative 3A is an undeveloped park scenario, but
24 within that alternative there's a range of cleanup

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 levels associated with other receptors.

2 Now, within the rule book once again,
3 the NCP allows us to go from 10 to the minus 6 to
4 10 to the minus 4, so essentially we, in terms of
5 the ultimate land use, we can move between those
6 receptors and still stay within the acceptable risk
7 range and modify the ultimate use it's agreed to or
8 desired I guess by the public down the road.

9 The proposed plan in our draft Record
10 of Decision when it's written up and sent into EPA
11 will not pick a particular land use. That wasn't
12 envisioned that that could be done at this time.

13 Back to on-site disposal, and this is
14 a slide that we put into our presentation just of
15 late because of the numerous, I guess all the
16 feedback we've gotten from the community on just
17 how unfavorable on-site disposal is. I guess I
18 wanted to touch on this a little bit because this
19 is real important. In terms of uranium, and I
20 mentioned this earlier, we take all the soils
21 across the site and we excavate them down to our
22 cleanup level, which under the proposed plan is 80
23 parts per million for uranium, and we take all
24 those soils together, we're going to have an

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000026

1 average concentration on a maximum end probably of
2 100 parts per million uranium. It's essentially 20
3 parts per million above our cleanup level. That is
4 approximately one-tenth of the waste acceptance
5 criteria for disposal in our on-property disposal
6 cell, so essentially we have a tenfold safety
7 factor there.

8 In terms of what's the purpose of the
9 on-site engineered disposal facility, we've had a
10 lot of comments on that in terms of how big the
11 buffer area is going to be, where the fence is
12 going to be located, how high the fence is going to
13 be, all very good questions. They're questions
14 that we're not answering in the proposed plan, we
15 haven't answered, nor will they be answered in the
16 ROD. It's a process we want to get as much
17 feedback as we can as we go through design.
18 They're issues that need to be worked out at that
19 time.

20 The important point that I want to
21 make is the purpose of the engineered disposal
22 facility isn't to keep one from being exposed to
23 the contamination in there from air pathway or
24 direct radiation pathway, although it will do that

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000027

1 certainly, it will make it off limits, it will be
2 monitored, there will be so many feet of cover on
3 top with a liner, there will be a fence around it.
4 The primary purpose for it is to protect the
5 aquifer, to protect the migration of the
6 contamination once you pile it all up in the soil
7 from migrating through the top of the soil and into
8 the aquifer and exceeding the MCL's.

9 With that in mind, what are the
10 concerns associated with off-site disposal. I
11 touched on some of these earlier when we were
12 talking about options of on and off-site disposal.
13 There were transportation risks and logistical
14 concerns associated with shipping this large a
15 quantity of soil across the country approximately
16 2,000 miles. There were uncertainties with the
17 availability of off-site capacity for this large a
18 quantity, given all the other things that are being
19 shipped from this site from the other operable
20 units. Once again, they represent by far the
21 magnitude of radioactivity at the site. There was
22 issues with the state acceptance on the receiving
23 end. And there are issues of cost. When we factor
24 all those factors in, that's how we got to the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

600028

1 proposed remedy of on-site disposal.

2 In terms of our path forward tonight,
3 as Gary indicated earlier, the public comment
4 period will end, it's scheduled to end May 31st
5 unless a member of the public, the community would
6 like to see it extended for some reason. If you
7 do, tonight would be a good time to talk about
8 that. We have received approval on the proposed
9 plan for Operable Unit 5, which is being handed out
10 and I guess was distributed at the beginning of the
11 comment period on May 1st from US and Ohio.

12 So where we're at in the process
13 right now is we're drafting up a Record of
14 Decision, and we're planning, as long as the public
15 comment period isn't extended, our plan is to
16 submit that to EPA, US and Ohio, on July 2nd. What
17 that will have in it is a more detailed description
18 of the proposed remedy. It will have a more
19 detailed description of the RI component, the
20 remedial investigation component. It will
21 basically be a formal document on the proposed plan
22 that will ultimately establish the decision for
23 Operable Unit 5.

24 Attached to that document will be a

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000029

1 responsiveness summary, which will be formulated
2 from all the public comments that we have
3 received. There will be responses to those
4 comments, and they will be attached in draft form
5 and submitted to EPA for review and approval.

6 With that, I am done. I would like
7 to at this time turn it back over to you, Gary.

8 MR. STEGNER: Thanks, Rob.

9 You see on the agenda the next item
10 is comments by our regulators, so Jim Saric from
11 Region 5, US EPA, if you would please lead it off.

12 MR. SARIC: How is everybody doing
13 this evening, all right?

14 This remedy that has been proposed by
15 DOE is one that's been a long time coming. We've
16 worked a lot directly with Ohio EPA, with DOE, with
17 the Fernald Citizens Task Force, and we worked
18 through a lot of these issues, as Rob talked about,
19 the soil washing and the different alternatives
20 that were there. We spent a lot of time looking at
21 earlier drafts, earlier revisions, the various
22 remedies trying to figure out what is the best
23 thing to do with this material, this large volume
24 of material at this highly contaminated site that

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000030

1 we have here at Fernald.

2 When all was said and done, when we
3 reviewed this document very critically and had lots
4 of comments and had lots of meetings over our
5 comments and what to do, we're very supportive of
6 this remedy as it stands.

7 This remedy is part of a large scale
8 strategy. It's a protective remedy that includes
9 both basically off-site disposal of the most
10 contaminated materials on-site and then on-site
11 disposal of the much larger volume of materials
12 that are lower level contamination that's there.

13 And the thing about this remedy, it's
14 not limiting the land use I think here, but it
15 actually provides some type of future vision to
16 what the land use can be. As Rob said, it speaks
17 for the undeveloped park, but there's other land
18 uses that can come from this site if it so be it in
19 the future, and that's not why we're here to make
20 that decision on the ultimate land use, and I think
21 it's the people in the community who will make
22 those decisions ultimately what happens there.

23 And so I guess with that, you know, I
24 think that we really encourage your comments here

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 tonight because they're a very important part of
2 this remedy selection process. It is not complete,
3 and we welcome all the comments that you have
4 here.

5 If you have any questions tonight,
6 I'll be glad to answer them, and I'll stick around
7 to answer those. But certainly this is part of a
8 large scale remedy of the site, and I sit back and
9 think about -- I was involved in the site, I became
10 involved in May of '91 was really when I got
11 heavily involved, and this site has come a long way
12 from the time which I think none of us really knew
13 exactly what direction we were ultimately headed
14 and we were studying the problem, studying the site
15 and how many samples to take here or there, what
16 are we going to do with this place. Ultimately I
17 think we've moved forward towards cleanup and we
18 have really tried to keep things rolling trying to
19 clean this place up. I think we're moving towards
20 that, we have direction, and certainly I'm very
21 interested in everyone's input.

22 With that, I'm done. Gary.

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

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000032

1 MR. SCHNEIDER: Good evening, glad
2 you all could make it out tonight. It's quite
3 evident that you're all committed to the public
4 participation process because you drove around the
5 barricades that say don't go this way. We all
6 drove through it too because we don't know any
7 other way to get here. We appreciate you being
8 out, it's a good time to be involved in the public
9 participation process at Fernald, and it is a time
10 of moving forward and making decisions. It's the
11 year of decisions; from about December of '94 and
12 through December of this year we'll have made
13 Records of Decisions for OU-4, OU-1, and OU-2 and
14 OU-5, so we'll have the site pretty much wrapped up
15 as far as decisions and how we move forward from
16 here from now to the end of the year. So now is
17 the time to be involved. If you're going to be
18 involved, this is when the most impact can be
19 made. So your comments now are most timely and
20 have a significant impact on how we move forward
21 with the site.

22 With regard to OU-5, Ohio EPA
23 supports the proposed or the preferred remedy. We
24 think it's both protective and implementable, with

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000033

1 a lot of emphasis on implementable. Rob talked a
2 little bit about potential problems with off-site
3 disposal. We think it is important to take our
4 aggressive move forward and try to get this site
5 off the books so that we can choose the tough
6 decisions so we can move forward, and that's the
7 on-site alternative for the large volume lower
8 contamination materials. So the State of Ohio
9 supports the preferred alternative, we think it is
10 going to be protective. It takes into account
11 what's been referred to on a number of occasions as
12 the balanced approach, and that's what's really the
13 important thing here. We're looking at this as the
14 site-wide perspective, not just one operable unit
15 at a time. You really have to keep in mind the
16 whole size of the whole project, and as well on a
17 national perspective you have to keep in mind that
18 there are other people out there who have back
19 yards just like we do.

20 So, anyway, I just wanted to let you
21 know that the State of Ohio supports it, and we
22 really want your public comments and this is the
23 document to do it on. Granted, this is the
24 Reader's Digest version of the much larger FS that

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000034

1 has all the details in it, but we want to make sure
2 you all have the opportunity, we put this nice
3 little page on here so you can write your comment
4 out, and we will pay for the postage to get it back
5 to us. Probably the easiest way that's ever been
6 developed for you to make your comments. You don't
7 even have to turn them in tonight or figure out how
8 to address it.

9 Anyway, I look forward to your
10 comments. Don't forget, the 31st is the last date
11 to do that, and if you have any questions, you can
12 chase me down after the meeting, my phone number is
13 in the book. Thanks.

14 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Tom.

15 I think now we'll move directly into
16 the informal question and answer period. I think
17 probably most of you are very familiar with what
18 we're doing here at Operable Unit 5. If you still
19 have questions, details you want clarified, main
20 issues you want painted up more clearly, now is the
21 time to do that, and we will proceed as -- you can
22 use the microphone, you can holler them out, please
23 if you do, ask make sure that you're loud enough so
24 that the court reporter can get the questions. Now

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000035

1 if you want to use the microphone, if you just want
2 to holler them out, I would suggest somebody could
3 start off with the first question.

4 MR. JENKE: Can I interject just one
5 thing before we get started, just so -- I don't
6 think I officially introduced all the panel. On my
7 left is Kathy Nickel, she's with the Department of
8 Energy at Fernald. We have Mark Jewett, who is
9 with FERMCO. Dennis Carr is with FERMCO, and Bill
10 Hertel is also with FERMCO. Between our panel here
11 and Gary, I think we can answer your questions.

12 MR. STEGNER: Between the panel
13 there, they can answer your questions I'm sure.
14 Pam.

15 MS. DUNN: I just have a couple
16 quick ones. We can fax comments in on Wednesday,
17 can't we?

18 MR. STEGNER: Yes, you can.

19 MS. DUNN: How much time do we have
20 after this before public meetings will start on the
21 RDRA; I mean is there going to be a little bit of
22 time where there won't be any meetings or are those
23 meetings going to get started right away?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Gary, aren't

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000036

1 you planning to have a meeting on the 13th?

2 MR. STEGNER: My sense is that I
3 suspect we will start relatively soon, Pam. I
4 think this is something the public has a great deal
5 of interest in, the on-site disposal in
6 particular. This is something we want to keep them
7 apprised of exactly where we're headed. So I think
8 you can probably count on public involvement fairly
9 early and fairly often for the foreseeable future
10 on this.

11 MR. JENKE: Johnny had a comment.

12 MR. REISING: We had a meeting a
13 couple of months ago on the RD process. At that
14 point in time we tried to explain that 60 days
15 after finalization of the Record of Decision of
16 OU-5, that is the signature by the agencies, that
17 we're required to submit our work plan to the
18 agencies. That RD work plan will have a schedule
19 of subsequent deliverables as far as design
20 packages, and then, as you know, we have a
21 relatively well-defined process to inform you when
22 these design packages are going to be submitted and
23 an opportunity to comment on that. So again 60
24 days afterwards we will -- the RD will be

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000037

1 submitted, the agencies will comment on it, we will
2 submit our work plan with the design packages, and
3 you will have an opportunity to comment on that.

4 MS. DUNN: We don't get a break.

5 MR. REISING: Right.

6 MR. STEGNER: Yes, sir.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the
8 projected lifetime of the Miami aquifer? I didn't
9 see that anywhere reading in the book. You're
10 basing your proposal on 1,000 years, and I'd like
11 to know what's the proposal on or what's the
12 lifetime of that aquifer system to be around?

13 MR. JENKE: To be around?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How long has
15 it been there?

16 MR. JENKE: It's been there since --

17 MR. HERTEL: It's been there for
18 about 150,000 years.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're only
20 basing your plan for a thousand years and you're
21 putting it on top of the aquifer.

22 MR. JEWETT: I think the key is the
23 thousand years is really a target time frame that
24 we have to design against. It's kind of mankind's

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000038

1 way of basically putting a number into an
2 indefinite performing engineering structure, and if
3 you can design for a thousand, that's kind of an
4 engineer's way of saying this thing can perform
5 indefinitely, it's a way of putting a time frame on
6 indefiniteness, and that's how the regulation is
7 developed. So it's not like we're planning at year
8 1,000 for everything to fail. That is probably the
9 key point.

10 MR. STEGNER: Any other questions
11 before we move into the break and then reconvene
12 for the public comment period?

13 MS. SCHULTE: The way I understand
14 there is a law that prohibits a storage unit over
15 the aquifer, and because of the fact that Fernald
16 existed before this law went on the books, there's
17 going to be a waiver for that, and my question is
18 if this is a new site coming into view and was not
19 a pre-existing unit, why does the EPA look at it in
20 the same light to grant a waiver for this storage
21 unit?

22 MS. NICKEL: As you know, I think
23 what you're referring to is the sole source
24 prohibition as part of Ohio's solid waste

Spangler Reporting Services

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

600039

1 regulations. Originally the regulations were
2 targeted at limiting new sources of contamination
3 of the aquifer by encouraging sanitary landfills,
4 new commercial disposal facilities to locate
5 geologically appropriate places, not over an
6 aquifer. As you know, our situation is really
7 quite a bit different. We are already a source of
8 contamination to the Great Miami aquifer, but our
9 objective is to minimize or eliminate actually that
10 source. For that reason, we view that in a
11 different light. However, we did view that sole
12 source prohibition as an applicable regulation to
13 us. We took it really very seriously, but as Rob
14 mentioned, we have an aggressive groundwater
15 restoration component to our alternative that is
16 going to carry a price tag of \$160 million with
17 it. Clearly we're not interested in a proposed
18 remedy that is going to put that aquifer at risk
19 and at going through that effort of getting it
20 cleaned up, but again, as Rob discussed, after we
21 went through an evaluation of the alternatives, the
22 on-site disposal facility really panned out to be
23 the only option that we could insure its
24 implementability as a practical alternative.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000040

1 So with those reasons behind us, we
2 went to EPA and requested a waiver. To get that
3 waiver we had to demonstrate that our disposal
4 facility would be as protective as if we had fully
5 complied with that regulation, i.e., hadn't located
6 there. So what we had to do was to provide some
7 assurance that for that thousand year, i.e.,
8 indefinite period of time that the aquifer would
9 not be impacted, and the way we did that was by
10 eliminating the concentration of what could go into
11 the cell. As Rob talked, about we have waste
12 acceptance criteria of 1,030. What will go in
13 there is actually almost 10 times less than that.

14 If you have an opportunity to look in
15 the back, we have columns more or less that show
16 the liner and the cap design. It's a cap designed
17 to funnel water away from the facility and to
18 prevent infiltration into the facility, to prevent
19 contaminants from leaving the facility. With that
20 and also locating the facility on the site in the
21 best geological area, where the on-site clay is the
22 thickest, we were able to provide EPA with enough
23 assurance that we would protect the aquifer.
24 That's probably more of an explanation than you

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000041

1 wanted.

2 MR. JENKE: Can I add one thing to
3 that in terms of, I think maybe Jim or maybe Tom
4 would like to comment on it in terms of another
5 site that was clean and exists on top of an
6 aquifer, whether or not they would site it over an
7 aquifer, a disposal facility over an aquifer, I
8 believe they could answer the question or would
9 answer the question that, no, it probably wouldn't
10 be granted. I don't know if that was part of your
11 question.

12 MS. SCHULTE: That's exactly what my
13 question is. If this was a different site, a new
14 site being looked at, this would not be considered
15 a good location for this because it's located over
16 an aquifer.

17 MR. JENKE: That's correct.

18 MS. NICKEL: The difference is we're
19 taking already a bad situation, something that is
20 already at risk to the aquifer and trying to
21 improve it as opposed to trying to locate a new
22 commercial disposal facility.

23 MR. JENKE: Something that should be
24 added to it is we could have provided the Ohio and

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000042

1 I guess US, both Ohio and US could go along with
2 it, we could have proposed something such as a cap
3 that would not have required a waiver. What
4 requires a waiver is the fact we're digging it up,
5 putting it back down.

6 MS. SCHULTE: But that would not
7 have provided enough protection?

8 MR. JENKE: That would have been
9 less protective, certainly less protective than an
10 engineered disposal facility.

11 MS. NICKEL: And the big difference
12 is if you're a new commercial disposal facility,
13 you have options, you can go someplace else, you
14 don't have to locate over an aquifer. Because
15 we're already existing over the aquifer, we really
16 don't have a choice, we have to do something with
17 the facility we have at hand.

18 MR. STEGNER: Any more questions
19 before we break and reconvene for the formal part?

20 Let's take a 10-minute break now and
21 then we'll reconvene, we'll change the
22 configuration here.

23 (Brief recess.)

24 MR. STEGNER: So far I only have two

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000043

1 folks who have asked to enter comments into the
2 record tonight. Again, this is the formal part of
3 the evening where your comments will be entered
4 into the record. They will be responded to in the
5 responsiveness summary section of our document. We
6 would ask that for this part you use the microphone
7 if you want to speak, and state your name, and if
8 you have a written comment that you want to submit
9 also, please let me know and you can hand it to me
10 after your comments. Also please remember that
11 this period lasts until the 31st of May, so if you
12 have comments you want to send me, fax to me
13 between now and then, please feel free to do so.
14 You do not have to speak tonight to have your
15 comments entered into the record.

16 So with that, Mr. Boudreau of the
17 Cincinnati Health Department has asked that I read
18 his comments, which I will do now. Mr. Boudreau
19 endorses land use objective one, full unrestrictive
20 use. This is the only means of insuring
21 environmental stability and protecting the Great
22 Miami Aquifer. The soil is contaminated with
23 uranium at 100 times background levels to a depth
24 of 20 feet. The highest level, 8,000 parts per

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000044

1 million, is 1600 times background level.
2 Contamination near processing facilities of acidic
3 uranium solutions is 400 parts per million, which
4 is 80 times background level. Another 11 square
5 miles which is approximately two times background
6 levels has all contributed to contamination of the
7 Great Miami Aquifer. The radioactive half life of
8 the uranium isotopes is 234 to 238 is 2.45 times 10
9 to the fifth to 4.46 times 10 to the ninth years
10 respectively (this is almost a million to many,
11 many millions of years). The contamination of
12 groundwater in the Great Miami Aquifer ranges from
13 50 parts per billion at the former production area
14 to 2100 parts per billion at South Field, a solid
15 waste disposal area. The highest projected
16 contamination levels in the aquifer will occur
17 within 1,000 years.

18 Consideration of Alternative 3A,
19 engineered disposal facility (on-site) will place
20 the Great Miami Aquifer at an unacceptable risk to
21 introduction of additional radioactive material
22 contamination over time.

23 I also have a comment, and the
24 gentleman had to leave, from Marvin W. Clawson.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

600045

1 His comment: I agree with remedial action for
2 Operable Unit 5 is Alternative 3A. My concern is
3 the 300 foot area around disposal cell should be
4 planted in trees and fenced on outside of 300 foot
5 area so it would make it difficult for a trespasser
6 to enter the area. DOE should monitor area and be
7 responsible for upkeep of disposal cell forever.

8 I also have three other comments here
9 which I will now read into the record. I formally
10 submit the following comment -- no name associated
11 with this. At a recent Fernald Citizens Task Force
12 meeting, Mr. Willeke brought up the issue that
13 Operable Unit 5 was using a proposed drinking water
14 standard for uranium. Mr. Willeke further noted
15 that the standard is expected to be finalized in
16 the next year and is anticipated to increase from
17 the current 20 parts per billion. I concur with
18 Mr. Willeke's position that the Operable Unit 5
19 decision should permit the adoption of the final
20 uranium drinking water standard when available.

21 This approach is consistent with the
22 recommendations of the task force and with the
23 spirit and intent of federal environmental
24 regulations. Such an approach provides adequate

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 protection to the aquifer and the public and would
2 save the government in excess of \$150 million.
3 Such a savings must be taken seriously in these
4 times of financial crisis at the federal level.

5 Also attached, I formally submit the
6 following comment: During the Operable Unit 2
7 public meeting, a representative of Ohio EPA noted
8 that the disposal facility would not receive
9 hazardous waste. Of issue was soil containing lead
10 from a firing range.

11 At the October 15th Ohio EPA meeting,
12 representatives of the agency again recommended
13 that the public submit comments requesting a
14 prohibition of hazardous waste in the disposal
15 facility. For Operable Unit 5, again this appears
16 focused on lead contaminated soil from a trap range
17 and possibly some other soils containing metals.

18 I question the sensibility of the
19 Ohio EPA position. It is inconceivable that a
20 disposal facility designed to contain uranium for
21 1000 years cannot be designed to address spent lead
22 bullets and other metals. The Ohio EPA position
23 presents an inconsistent message to the public. It
24 cuts at the foundation of the disposal facility

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 concept; that of long-term performance.

2 At a recent Fernald Citizens Task
3 Force meeting, waste acceptance criteria for the
4 disposal facility were discussed. At this session
5 it was noted that criteria were being developed for
6 uranium and a series of other contaminants. It
7 would seem appropriate that these criteria address
8 lead and other metals.

9 In summary, I request that DOE
10 develop waste acceptance criteria for all
11 contaminants found in soil at the site. I further
12 request that soil received at the facility be
13 measured against these criteria, regardless of a
14 regulatory label (i.e., hazardous waste). This
15 will provide a consistent message to the public on
16 the disposal facility.

17 And, finally, I submit the following
18 comment: The Operable Unit 5 proposed plan notes
19 that treatment will be applied to wastewater and
20 groundwater streams such that the "blended"
21 concentration is less than the federal drinking
22 water standards. DOE needs to revise this
23 position.

24 Why does DOE feel it necessary to

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 spend hard earned taxpayer money to treat water for
2 drinking and then dump it to the river. This is
3 inconceivable in this time of shrinking budgets.
4 We all need to tighten our belts. Here we need to
5 simply abandon such an idea and treat only as
6 necessary to protect the river (fish, et cetera)
7 and recreational users of the river. Anybody using
8 the river for drinking (Note: I don't know of any)
9 would be required to treat the water anyway.

10 Those were submitted into the record
11 this evening.

12 Now I have a request by Tom Renck to
13 speak with Ross Area Merchants. Tom. You can use
14 this microphone here or that one there, either
15 one.

16 MR. RENCK: I'm Tom Renck, I'm
17 representing the Ross Area Merchants. I have seven
18 points to make, and I am going to start off I think
19 with my conclusion, which I think this needs to be
20 taken as we're taking this whole thing, which is as
21 citizens we trusted this group to clean it up and
22 did not become actively involved until March 17th.
23 We now at that point found out that there was a
24 cover-up, and we've wrote a letter and the

Spangler Reporting Services

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

1 merchants, which represents about 60 businesses in
2 the local area, are opposed to this cell. We don't
3 feel it's a good long-term solution.

4 You folks have been studying this for
5 two years. We're given 30 days to comment on this,
6 we don't feel that's long enough. This is one of
7 our busiest times in the year in this farming
8 community. Everybody is out in the fields tonight,
9 that's why there aren't people here that should
10 have been here. So we would like to have another
11 30 days to comment on this process.

12 We feel that the Citizens Task Force
13 is not representative of the local citizens. We
14 don't know where these folks came from. We
15 understood that a lot of the people tried to get on
16 here locally. We didn't have a lot of involvement
17 because we thought it was going to be cleaned up,
18 so we feel that the Citizens Task Force does not
19 represent us fairly.

20 Seems to be an awful lot of jargon
21 used in this, Operable Unit Number 5, on-site
22 engineered disposal facility. We call this a dump,
23 and I think when all this information is being
24 given out to people, they're getting very, very

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000050

1 confused. I've involved about two months, and this
2 is the amount of material that I've received to
3 study, read, revise, look at. I mean this is not
4 my job, and I'm overwhelmed. I have another
5 cardboard box at home that I throw all this Fernald
6 information in, and it's about two or three foot
7 high of stuff that I can glean at and get rid up,
8 but we're just overwhelmed, we're wore out, and I
9 think that's part of the process, we get worn down
10 trying to understand what's going on in our
11 community.

12 Last week I attended a meeting that I
13 thought was important, same notification. Operable
14 Unit No. 5 deals with 9,800,000 cubic yards of
15 material. This thing dealt with 3,400 barrels of
16 material. It's just a drop in the bucket, but the
17 same process goes on, and the average citizen that
18 gets involved just gets overwhelmed, and we've run
19 out of time, we've run out of energy.

20 I have another document that has 30
21 comments about the document Operable Unit 5, so I'm
22 submitting the letter from the Ross Area Merchants
23 in opposition to this and my 30 comments in
24 writing, and I will hand this to Gary when I get

Spangler Reporting Services

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

600051

1 done.

2 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Tom.

3 Do we have anyone else wanting to
4 speak. Edwa Yocum.

5 MS. YOCUM: Edwa Yocum, Crosby
6 Township resident, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I live in Crosby Township, where
8 90 percent of the disposal cell will be in Hamilton
9 County. I support the alternative 3A. Also I have
10 other comments such as place at least a 300-foot
11 buffer zone around the entire disposal cell. Add a
12 10-foot chain link fence skirting the buffer zone,
13 so this would protect the trespassers.

14 No off-site waste for disposal at
15 Fernald. No long-term storage of off-site waste on
16 Fernald site.

17 Future ownership of Fernald site
18 should remain in the hands of the federal
19 government.

20 No characteristic hazardous waste
21 disposed in the cell, such as flammable, toxic, or
22 corrosive.

23 Groundwater should be remediated to
24 the drinking water standard of 20 parts per billion

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000052

1 or less.

2 We need real time monitoring.

3 Also continue to evaluate

4 technologies that would increase protection to
5 residents and community.

6 No dilution of waste to meet waste
7 acceptance criteria. Soils above 1030 to be
8 shipped off-site.

9 And I do support the US EPA's waiver
10 of siting criteria.

11 In conclusion, the Fernald site
12 beyond the disposal cell should become a wetland or
13 sanctuary, and I believe in the balance approach
14 for all DOE sites. Thank you.

15 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Edwa.
16 Anyone else care to offer -- Ann.

17 MS. SCHULTE: I'm Ann Schulte, I'm a
18 member of Ross Area Merchants Association and I am
19 also a resident of --

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear
21 you.

22 MS. SCHULTE: I'm Ann Schulte and I
23 am also a resident of Morgan Township and I am also
24 a member of Ross Area Merchants Association. I'm

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000053

1 opposed to the public storage unit for two reasons,
2 my main reason is because it's stored over an
3 aquifer. We're talking about drinking the water
4 for a vast number of people, and I feel this is a
5 risk that doesn't need to be taken. I think we
6 have looked at convenience over the health and
7 safety of the community.

8 Also the other concern I have is once
9 this cell has been approved, how do we have the
10 control of allowing outside storage or outside
11 contaminants to come into the storage unit?
12 There's a part of it that will say it's been at
13 Fernald before, at some point it can come back here
14 again, and I don't want to be a dump site for the
15 rest of the community. Thank you.

16 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Ann. Any
17 more comments tonight? Again be reminded that the
18 comment period is over on the 31st of May. Gary.

19 MR. STORER: I'm Gary Storer, Crosby
20 Township resident and trustee.

21 The northeast corner of the Fernald
22 site is a relatively uncontaminated zone, and my
23 idea is to locate the disposal cell -- if there has
24 to be one, I've got some thoughts about that in a

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000054

1 minute -- if there has to be a disposal cell, it
2 should be located over the production area. Waiver
3 should be -- we should seek a waiver to allow for
4 this to happen. The main reason I feel this way is
5 that could be usable, a usable strip from that
6 northeast corner south to Wiley Road, future use,
7 land uses for township use or residents or
8 whatever.

9 Over the production area there's
10 already recovery measures in place to either clean
11 up contamination that might leak into the aquifer,
12 so those recovery measures are already in place.
13 Even though the northeast corner has a layer of
14 clay, I believe the layer of clay serves the same
15 purpose as the recovery measures that are already
16 in place over the production area.

17 I'm opposed to the on-site disposal
18 cell. I would be willing to take a risk of
19 shipping this stuff off-site until we're told we
20 cannot do so. There are sites willing to take the
21 contaminated materials. I also do not agree with
22 the transportation risk that I've been told is
23 associated with transporting this contaminated
24 material off-site.

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000055

1 I also heard rumors, I haven't been
2 able to trace down the facts yet, about shifting
3 the disposal cell southward farther into Crosby
4 Township. I certainly would be opposed to this
5 also. I think if a disposal cell is also located
6 on-site, that security needs to be beefed up
7 on-site. I know the security officers no longer
8 carry arms, firearms. I think that would be a
9 necessity due to the recent hostilities that we've
10 all heard about in the news directed toward the
11 federal government.

12 Thank you for this opportunity to
13 express myself.

14 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Gary. I
15 think it's important to note that Tom did ask for
16 an extension of the comment period, and it's
17 something that we can't unilaterally do, Tom. We
18 will take it under advisement, and I would say the
19 chances are extremely good you will get your wish
20 on this, but I can't state it right now, but we
21 will get you a response to that very soon.

22 MS. CRAWFORD: Will you let us know
23 if they are going to indeed do that? That means we
24 don't have to spend Memorial Day writing these

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000056

1 things.

2 MR. STEGNER: Absolutely, we will
3 let you know.

4 MR. REISING: We will make a
5 decision within a couple of days.

6 MR. STEGNER: By your meeting this
7 week you should know.

8 MR. SARIC: Yeah, you can go ahead
9 and take your 30 days.

10 MR. STEGNER: Thank you, Jim. That
11 was pretty simple. There's your approval authority
12 right there.

13 MS. CRAWFORD: So we have until June
14 30th now?

15 MR. SARIC: That's right, 30 plus
16 one.

17 MR. STEGNER: So enjoy your weekend
18 everyone. Do we have anymore individuals wanting
19 to comment? Yes, sir.

20 MR. KALLILE: My name is Jim
21 Kallile, I'm with the Ohio Department of Health. I
22 would like to say that based upon our point of
23 view, we also endorse the alternative for building
24 an on-site disposal cell, and we believe when you

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000057

1 consider the risks and costs involved with
2 remediation of the entire site, we believe this is
3 the appropriate remedy.

4 MR. STEGNER: Thank you. Anyone
5 else right now?

6 Again, be reminded that now we have
7 until June 30th to get your comments in. And also
8 be reminded that the document, a form for comment
9 is included in the proposed plan summary which are
10 available in the back of the room. I thank you all
11 for coming tonight. We appreciate your input. It
12 is very valuable to us and all your comments will
13 be responded to in the responsiveness summary.

14 Thank you all very, very much. Be
15 careful going home.

16 - - -

17 PUBLIC MEETING CONCLUDED

18 - - -

19
20
21
22
23
24

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000058

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, LOIS A. ROELL, 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 (58) fifty-eight pages, and that the
foregoing transcript of proceedings is a complete
and accurate report of my said stenotypy notes.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: LOIS A. ROELL, RPR
AUGUST 12, 1997. NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF OHIO

Spangler Reporting Services

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

000059