

6-710.37

1079



MEMORANDUM

CHAIR
John S. Applegate

VICE CHAIR
James C. Bierer

MEMBERS
 Marvin W. Clawson
 Lisa Crawford
 Pamela Dunn
 Constance Fox, M.D.
 Darryl D. Huff
 Dan McElroy
 Robert G. Tabor
 Warren E. Strunk
 Dr. Thomas E. Wagner
 Dr. Gene E. Willeke

EX OFFICIO
 L. French Bell
 Jack Craig
 Gene Jablonowski
 Graham Mitchell

TO: Citizens Advisory Board Members

FROM: John S. Applegate

SUBJECT: 11/15/97 Meeting of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board

DATE: November 1, 1997

The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board will meet on Saturday, November 15, 1997, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton Cleves Highway, Harrison, OH.

The agenda will be as follows:

- 8:00 a.m. Breakfast (optional)
- 8:30 a.m. Call to Order
- 8:30-8:40 Opening Remarks
- 8:40-9:00 Committee Reports
- 9:00-9:15 Review of Site Tour
- 9:15-10:15 Prioritization and Long-Term Planning
- 10:15-10:30 Break
- 10:30-11:45 Overhead Cost Reduction
- 11:45-12:00 Public Comment
- 12:00 p.m. Adjourn
- Lunch (optional)

We look forward to seeing you at the meeting.

1



**FERNALD
CITIZENS
ADVISORY
BOARD**

Chair
John S. Applegate

Vice Chair
James C. Bierer

Members
Marvin W. Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Pamela Dunn
Constance Fox, M.D.
Darryl D. Huff
Dan McElroy
Warren E. Strunk
Robert G. Tabor
Dr. Thomas E. Wagner
Dr. Gene E. Willeke

Ex Officio
L. French Bell
Jack Craig
Gene Jablonowski
Graham Mitchell

Draft Minutes from the September 20, 1997 Meeting

The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board met from 10:05 a.m. until 1:12 p.m. on Saturday, September 20, 1997, at the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton-Cleves Highway, Harrison, Ohio. The meeting was advertised in local papers and open to the public.

Members Present:

John Applegate
French Bell
Jim Bierer
Marvin Clawson
Lisa Crawford
Constance Fox
Gene Jablonowski
Darryl Huff
Graham Mitchell
Robert Tabor
Thomas Rentschler

Members Absent:

Dan McElroy
Warren Strunk
Jack Craig
Pam Dunn
Thomas Wagner
Gene Willeke

Designated Federal Official Present: Ken Morgan

Staff Present: Tereza Marks
Crystal Sarno
Douglas Sarno

About 5 spectators also attended the meeting, including members of the public and representatives from DOE and Fluor Daniel Fernald.

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair James Bierer called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Announcements and New Business

Bierer introduced Jennifer Jones from the Center for Environmental Communication Studies at the University of Cincinnati. Jones asked the Citizens Advisory Board members that attended the pilot workshop for the National Dialogue held three weeks ago in Knoxville, Tennessee, to provide input for a report to DOE. The final workshop report will be completed on September 30, 1997. She expressed the opinion that Fernald's input to the report was important since communication between groups at Fernald was far ahead of other sites.

Doug Sarno asked if the Citizens Advisory Board should take action on the National Dialogue. Lisa Crawford stated that she thought the Citizens Advisory Board should encourage DOE to listen to feedback and reports from the National Dialogue. Some members of the Board were concerned that Secretary Pena's administration might not be receptive to information provided by the National Dialogue or that DOE might not wish to continue funding the program because the National Dialogue was initiated under the Grumbly/O'Leary leadership at DOE.

Bierer suggested that comments from the Citizens Advisory Board would add value to the National Dialogue. He would like the full Board to review the final report on the pilot workshop.

Bierer announced that the minutes from the July meeting would be in the next week's Friday mailing.

Graham Mitchell noted that the reinterment of Native American remains was a major issue at the pilot workshop for the National Dialogue. Many Native American remains are currently stored in universities and museums. Mitchell feels that DOE could provide land for these remains to be reburied, as was successfully done at Fernald. Sue Walpole commented that Fernald keeps track of reburial issues at DOE sites.

3. Committee Reports

Monitoring and Recycling Committee

Doug Sarno provided the update on behalf of Pam Dunn, Committee Chair. While the committee has not met since the last CAB meeting, it continues to track site monitoring activities.

Natural Resources Committee

Committee Chair Jim Bierer said that the Committee had requested and was granted an extension of the comment period on the Supplemental Environmental Projects. The period has been extended until October 3, 1997. The next meeting of the committee will be on September 23, 1997, to discuss the Supplemental Environmental Projects. A second meeting is planned to study the Natural Resource Monitoring Plan.

Transportation Committee

Sarno provided the update on behalf of Tom Wagner, Committee Chair. The committee is still committed to intermodal transport of wastes, but wastes will not be able to go through the North Las Vegas transfer station due to public objection.

Waste Management

Doug Sarno provided the update on behalf of Gene Willeke, Committee Chair. The committee has been very busy. Willeke has been instrumental in the consideration of microencapsulation as an alternative to cementation for Silo 3 wastes. The committee traveled to Brookhaven National Laboratory on July 16, 1997, to observe the microencapsulation technology. Microencapsulation appears to be a simple and clean process. Sarno feels that Fernald will be able to get bids on this process.

Crawford commented that the FRESH meeting on September 25, 1997, would include an hour and a half presentation on microencapsulation by experts from Envirocare and Brookhaven. She invited interested members of the Citizens Advisory Board to attend this meeting. Sarno explained that microencapsulation is not a new process but has not really been applied to hazardous wastes. Commercial equipment is readily available.

The Waste Management Committee met on September 16, 1997, to discuss the Silos decision and upcoming events. An RFP for Silo 3 is at DOE headquarters now and will then be released for public review. The committee will provide input into the RFP. There will be a Commerce Business Daily announcement for Silos 1 and 2 which the committee will also review. The committee will have a teleconference on Monday, September 22, 1997, to review the CBD. Sarno also pointed out that the committee will need to consider new plans to build interim storage for the Silos' wastes. There is no detailed information on plans for this now. While there are many advantages of such an approach, the committee is concerned that this may take away the incentive to clean up the silo wastes quickly.

Bierer notified the Citizens Advisory Board members that the DOE Community Meeting on October 14, 1997, will contain a tour of the on-site disposal cell.

Efficiency Committee

Bob Tabor, Committee Chair, announced that the Efficiency Committee had its initial meeting in July to outline the scope and direction of the committee. The next meeting is planned for September 27, 1997. DOE, EPA, OEPA and Fluor Daniel Fernald all attended the initial meeting. The committee will be looking at the distinction between remediation funds and overhead funds. They need to look at what is driving the funds and the justification for the expense. Bob Tabor distributed a letter to Jack Craig, commenting on the budget priorities for Fernald and the Ohio Field Office, for review by Board members.

In reviewing these priorities lists, the committee came to the conclusion that the remediation projects were in the correct order but that there were large numbers of overhead projects which would need to be completed before remediation could begin. The committee does not believe the 1995 recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Board.

Sarno asked for recommendations on changes to the letter presented to the group by Tabor. It was suggested that the phrase "This is too high" be punctuated by an exclamation point. It was also suggested that the letter go the Ohio Field Office and be that a copy be sent to Jack Craig. Rentschler proposed that a cover letter be provided to each person to whom the letter is sent to explain why they were receiving the letter. Crawford made a

motion that the letter be accepted with these changes. It was passed unanimously. The last sentence was amended to include the phrase "...this is an urgent matter."

Connie Fox wondered if the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board should be working with other CABs to set a priorities list. Sarno stated that it would probably come about as a result of the National Dialogue.

In order to appear to DOE as one voice, Bierer felt that better communication was necessary between the CABs and suggested a letter to the Chairs of other groups or a summary of activities be exchanged. Gene Jablonowski suggested a yearly meeting of the CABs.

Mitchell said that we should watch DOE headquarters very carefully since they were causing numerous delays. He reported that the Ohio Field Office still does not have a manager and the ARASA contract has still not been awarded. If the decision is not made by October 1, 1997, DOE will miss its deadline by three months. He said that DOE would also lose one million dollars if the Ohio Field Office contract with Envirocare is not signed by the deadline. Bob Tabor suggested that his committee send a letter to DOE. Crawford suggested that members visit headquarters.

Sarno commented that Fernald is unique in that many of the cleanup decisions have already been made, so now work can actually begin. He stated that we need to get DOE to focus in earnest on the cleanup work.

Fox suggested that we notify our Congressmen, and perhaps even the President, of the situation. Tom Rentschler expressed concern that the Citizens Advisory Board was no longer having an impact on DOE actions. He stated that he did not believe that he would be able to stay on the Board.

Sarno asked Mitchell to provide him with a list of the problems with DOE Headquarters and how each problem is impacting the site. Bob Tabor suggested that workers at the site be able to add additional problems to the list.

John Applegate suggested that a letter be drafted on these issues and sent to Secretary Pena and Assistant Secretary Alm. Many members thought other government officials should be made aware of the situation. Tabor suggested that the letter be followed up with phone calls and/or visits. Applegate said he would contact Alm.

It was suggested that the letter recall what the Board has achieved and what goals still need attention and that the letter be sent to Pena and Congress. The letter will indicate the fact that it was voted on unanimously and Applegate is signing on behalf of all members of the Citizens Advisory Board.

Rentschler suggested that the letter be issued to the media. Crawford said FRESH would do a follow up letter.

CRO Meeting

Daryl Huff discussed the events of the last Community Reuse Organization meeting. Several members have resigned, but CRO has appointed a few new members. CRO's grant has been approved and they have hired Kurt Paddock as a consultant to the group. He will officially begin on Wednesday, September 24, 1997, and will have his offices co-located with the Citizens Advisory Board in the Jamtek Building.

ATSDR

French Bell said that ATSDR was anticipating the release of the Public Health Assessment shortly. He suggested that the ATSDR do a follow-up letter to those of the Citizens Advisory Board addressing the effect of the delayed clean up on public health. He will also try to involve the Fernald Health Advisory Committee.

4. Membership Roundtable

Applegate explained that the issues in front of the Citizens Advisory Board have changed since the organization began. The issues have moved beyond the basics and have become more technical. For example, the decision by DOE to hold a monthly meeting is a move in the correct direction. Applegate noted that the decrease in citizen involvement in these meetings is not a result of disinterest, but rather an increase in the confidence which people have about the direction of activities at Fernald. He pointed out that the many members of the Citizens Advisory Board have been involved with the site since the beginning and are more familiar with the issues than people at DOE headquarters.

One of the first things the Citizens Advisory Board members should consider is their expectations of the Board. We must also make a clear path forward on replacing vacant spots on the Board. We need to decide how we are going to recruit new members.

Since the Citizens Advisory Board has more continuity than DOE headquarters, it needs to remind DOE of the Board's original goals. A copy of the original report should be sent to DOE headquarters and to the Ohio Field Office.

Citizens Advisory Board members need to decide how much time we want to spend per month attending meetings and working on the Board. Sarno provided handouts examining the range of time that could be spent per month. One evening a month was considered to be a minimum whereas three to four evenings/month was considered to be on the high end of the range.

Members of the Board agreed that the Citizens Advisory Board is likely to be around for a long time. Because of this, the following things must be done:

- 1) Monitor the progress of the group, both its accomplishments and obstacles
- 2) Remind DOE headquarters (and others) of the Citizens Advisory Board's goals
- 3) Keep the public informed of the Board's activities
- 4) Make a "report card" to determine how well the Citizens Advisory Board's recommendations are being met

With several openings on the Board, the Citizens Advisory Board must consider how to recruit new members. Ken Morgan noted that the spirit of the board is to represent the community as a whole, so all groups must be represented. He would like to see a member from the environmental community who is not already involved in the site. Many members felt that new members should be recruited from already involved groups, because it would be difficult to learn all the issues from scratch.

Sarno discussed the membership recruitment used in the past. He pointed out that this method provides more applicants than are needed and thus, the Citizens Advisory Board will have to turn qualified individuals down. This process could lead to the perception of the Board as exclusionary. He suggested that prospective members be approached by the Citizens Advisory Board ensuring that no one would be turned down.

