

**SUMMARY OF DOE PUBLIC WORKSHOP
SILO 3 PATH FORWARD
MAY 14, 1997**

On Wednesday, May 14, 1997 the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) held a public workshop from 7-9 p.m. at the Plantation in Harrison, Ohio. The purpose of the workshop was to inform and receive feedback from interested stakeholders about the path forward for remediating Silo 3 at the Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP).

Approximately 70 people attended the workshop including representatives from the following affiliations:

- | | |
|--|--|
| --DOE | --FRESH |
| --Fluor Daniel Fernald | --Fernald Citizens Task Force |
| --U.S. EPA | --Fernald Community Reuse Organization |
| --Ohio EPA | --Crosby Township Trustees |
| --Ohio Department of Health | --Foster Wheeler |
| --Local Congressional Delegation
(Rep. from Rob Portman's Office) | --Chem-Nuclear Systems |
| --Local Residents | --PRC Environmental Management Inc. |
| | --J. Page Distributing |

The workshop opened with brief remarks from DOE's Public Information Director, Gary Stegner. Stegner explained the purpose of the meeting and also informed the group about efforts DOE is making to build closer relationships and communicate with stakeholders associated with the Nevada Test Site. Stegner also explained this workshop is the first in a series of public involvement activities to be offered to interested stakeholders during the next few months to focus on the Silos Project path forward.

During the next part of the meeting, Terry Hagen, Fluor Daniel Fernald's Director of Strategic Planning, presented an overview of the proposed public involvement and decision-making process for the remediation of Silo 3. Hagen emphasized that DOE would like to work hand in hand with stakeholders to identify the best treatment technology/performance criteria and get them involved in the Silo 3 Request for Proposal. Hagen also explained we are using a similar approach to the feasibility study methodology. This process involves identifying and screening a universe of stabilization technologies focusing on implementability, effectiveness, and cost issues. After the alternatives are narrowed down to two or three, additional discussions and public workshops will focus on educating people in more detail about the selected technologies. This will allow a more detailed evaluation using the CERCLA "nine criteria".

Hagen then presented the Silo 3 Record of Decision modification process, proposing

233

that an Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) be used with enhanced public involvement opportunities. He explained that an ESD will document a technical basis for moving from vitrification (if an alternate technology is selected) and will identify treatment technology performance criteria. If the ROD modification process is necessary, interested stakeholders will be involved through identified public comment periods. DOE will respond in writing to all comments from stakeholders prior to finalization of an ESD. Hagen also explained that DOE has committed to public input on the draft Request for Proposal (RFP), which includes responding in writing to all public comments on the draft document prior to issuance of a final RFP. A short-term timeline for the Silo 3 path forward was presented at the workshop.

Don Paine, Fluor Daniel Fernald Silos Project Manager, spent the rest of the meeting explaining the content of the Silo 3 waste form and walked through several potential remediation technologies for Silo 3 waste including:

- Asphalt (Bitumen) Stabilization
- Cement Stabilization/Solidification
- Polymer (Micro) Encapsulation
- Vitrification
- Ceramics
- Ceramic Silicon Foam
- Macro Encapsulation
- Metal Matrix (Ceramet)
- Molten Metal Technology
- Thermal Setting (Epoxy) Resins
- Sulfur/Polymer Encapsulation
- Phoenix Ash Stabilization

Paine explained the technology process and screening factors used in the selection process including effectiveness, implementability, and cost. The advantages and disadvantages associated with each of the alternatives were pointed out to members of the public. At the end of the evening Paine identified the proposed technologies DOE would like to carry forward for detailed evaluation including:

- Cement Stabilization/Solidification
- Polymer (Micro) Encapsulation
- Sulfur/Polymer Encapsulation

The meeting concluded with several questions and comments from stakeholders. The following action items resulted from the meeting:

The next public workshop concerning the Silo 3 path forward will be held on June 16. Stakeholders expressed interest in wanting more detail about the proposed alternatives listed above (i.e. % of waste volume increases). They want to know both good and bad examples associated with each alternative.

Stakeholders requested more discussion/meetings about the ROD Amendment process.

Stakeholders requested information about where the \$600 million figure for vitrification came from (U.S. EPA referred to this figure in the workshop). Stakeholders also requested cost comparisons between the alternatives carried forward and vitrification.

Request for DOE and FDF to consider adding Phoenix Ash stabilization to the list of alternatives to be carried forward and discussed in more detail.

Most of this information will be discussed at the next Silos Project public workshop to be held on June 16, 1997.

A transcript from the workshop and the handouts from the meeting are available at DOE's Public Environmental Information Center (PEIC) located at 10845 Hamilton Cleves Highway; (513) 738-0164.