



## FCAB UPDATE

*Week of April 4, 2002*

(Last update was February 28, 2002)

### MEETING SCHEDULE

**Stewardship Committee Meeting**  
Thursday, April 18, 2002, 6:30 p.m.

PEIC – Public Environmental  
 Information Center

**Fernald Citizens Advisory Board Meeting**  
Saturday, April 20, 2002, 8:30 a.m.

PEIC – Public Environmental  
 Information Center

### ATTACHMENTS

- Draft Minutes from the 03/16/02 FCAB Meeting
- 03/14/02 Stewardship Committee Meeting Summary
- Draft 04/20/02 Full Board Meeting Agenda
- Draft 04/18/02 Stewardship Committee Meeting Agenda
- Draft 4/11-13/02 SSAB Spring Chairs Meeting Agenda
- Letter to Jessie Roberson on Accelerated Clean-Up Schedule
- Recommendations on Master Plan for Public Use on the Fernald Environmental Management Project
- Report Summary & CAT Team Reports #25, #26, and #27
- Articles & News Clippings

### NEWS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

Reminder the SSAB Spring 2002 Chairs Meeting will be held April 11<sup>th</sup> –13<sup>th</sup> at the Westin Hotel in Cincinnati.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Please note that the phone number for The Perspectives Group has changed.

Please contact Doug Sarno or David Bidwell at The Perspectives Group  
 Phone: 513-648-6478 or 703-837-9269 Fax: 513-648-3629 or 703-837-9662

E-Mail: [djsarno@theperspectivesgroup.com](mailto:djsarno@theperspectivesgroup.com) or [dbidwell@theperspectivesgroup.com](mailto:dbidwell@theperspectivesgroup.com)

**000001**



**FULL BOARD MEETING**  
**Public Environmental Information Center**

**Saturday, March 16th**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

The Fernald Citizens Advisory Board met from 8:30 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. on Saturday, March 16, 2002, at the Public Information Center

**Members Present:**

Jim Bierer  
 Kathryn Brown  
 Sandy Butterfield  
 Marvin Clawson  
 Carol Connell (for French Bell)  
 Lisa Crawford  
 Lou Doll  
 Pam Dunn  
 Gene Jablonowski  
 Steve McCracken  
 Graham Mitchell  
 Robert Tabor  
 Gene Willeke

**Members Absent:**

Lisa Blair  
 Blain Burton  
 Steve DePoe  
 Jane Harper  
 Thomas Wagner

**Designated Federal Official:**

Gary Stegner

**The Perspectives Group Staff:**

Douglas Sarno  
 David Bidwell

**Fluor Fernald Staff:**

Sue Walpole

Approximately 15 spectators also attended the meeting, including members of the public and representatives from the Department of Energy and Fluor Fernald.

## Call to Order

### General Remarks and Announcements

Jim announced that a recent SSAB Chairs' conference call included several participants from DOE headquarters and focused on the Top-to-Bottom Review. During the call, DOE participants explained that the review addressed agency concerns that the money spent on environmental cleanup has not resulted in adequate risk reduction. The review resulted in \$800 million being set aside to help sites reduce risk and accelerate cleanup schedules. Roughly half this money has already been earmarked for the Hanford site. The SSAB chairs asked how sites could secure a portion of the remaining funding; however, no clear formula or criteria exist for the allocation of these funds. Lisa Crawford expressed concern that the \$800 million has not been allocated by Congress. Jim also reported that the SSAB Chairs discussed cuts to the Long-Term Stewardship program at Environmental Management (EM) and the possibility that some projects will be transferred to other departments. In addition, the Environmental Management Advisory Board has been restructured, is developing a new charter, and is seeking a new chairperson. Finally, Jim reported that funding for SSABs may be reduced and that Martha Crosland urged Boards to find ways to work effectively with less support. All of these issues will be discussed extensively at the April SSAB Chairs' meeting in Cincinnati.

Jim announced that he attended John Bradburn's retirement party on March 7. Jim asked members to send him suggestions for how the FCAB could show its appreciation for Bradburn's years of service at the site and support for the CAB.

Doug Sarno showed the group a report released recently by the National Safety Council. The report includes a section on the Fernald Citizens Task Force. Doug will try to obtain copies of the publication for members.

Steve McCracken reported that the site is preparing for the spring work season and that ongoing projects are going well. Steve stated that he expects a good year at the site, but he cautioned that the silos projects needs to make significant progress over the next two years for the new baseline to be successful.

Jack Craig offered to provide the Board with copies of a Hanford agreement that was signed by the State of Washington, DOE, and EPA. This document will provide guidance on how Hanford secured a large portion of the \$800 million recently set aside by DOE.

Jamie Jameson stated that, as a member of the management team, he has never felt better about Fernald. He announced that the management team is working with a human resources consultant to help them implement changes at the site over the next couple of months. Specifically, managers are receiving training on how to handle involuntary separations in a sensitive manner. Jamie acknowledged that change is not easy, but he stated that leadership at Fernald would not sacrifice quality or safety at the site and he lauded Fernald personnel for their commitment to quality and safety. Jamie urged the FCAB members to contact any member of the management team with questions and stated that he looks forward to continuing to work with the FCAB.

Carol Connel attended the meeting in place of French Bell. She announced that staff resources at ASTDR have been directed towards the Anthrax problems. She added that the agency's budget has been reduced for the next year. Carol distributed four copies of a recent health study to the FCAB and FRESH.

#### **Baseline for 2006 and Current Remediation Issues**

Dennis Carr explained that the site is focusing on risk reduction and accelerating the clean up schedule in order to secure part of the \$800 million set aside by DOE. A baseline schedule for reaching a 2006 closure date will be submitted to DOE Ohio on March 20. A revised baseline package will be submitted to DOE headquarters around April 1. On April 10, site managers will meet with Jessie Roberson to present an executive summary of the new baseline and funding profile. Dennis stated that he believes she will announce the final funding decision during a trip to the site in late April. Dennis stated that Hanford was able to present a partnership with the state and other stakeholders when it made its request for funds. He would like to see the same approach taken at Fernald and asked the FCAB to submit a letter of support that could be presented to Jessie Roberson at the April 10 meeting.

Dennis reviewed a handout that outlined each remediation project, its status, and the strategy for the project to meet the 2006 baseline. He reported that the waste pits remedial action project is 42 percent complete, with more than 337,000 tons of waste processed and 54 unit trains sent to Envirocare. By April 1, the dryers will operate on a 24-hour, 7-day schedule, excluding time set aside for routine maintenance. Dennis also reported that Fernald has acquired 20 used rail cars and refurbished them to meet specifications for waste shipments. This brings the total number of train cars to 190 owned by the site. He explained that a 2200-pound fiberglass lid to one of the newly purchased rail cars had blown off during a recent windstorm. An improperly installed clamp sheared because it had been repeatedly striking against the car. Fernald had not

yet taken ownership of the cars and will replace the clamps on each one as well as inspect the clamps on the other train cars at the site. Marvin Clawson expressed concern regarding the grade of metal used for the clamp. Dennis reported that Fernald is conducting a destructive analysis on the clamps used on the rail cars, to ensure that similar metal fatigue problems will not occur.

The soil and disposal facility project is 30 percent complete. Dennis reported that more than 811,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil has been excavated and dispositioned. Cell 1 of the on-site disposal facility (OSDF) is completed, and cells 2 and 3 are 67 percent and 27 percent complete, respectively. To reach the 2006 closure goal, Fernald is adopting a self-perform approach to this project and is currently hiring a local workforce to conduct this work. This project will continue on its current schedule, rather than taking the two-year hiatus that was included in the original baseline.

Dennis reported that the decontamination and demolition project would accelerate by more than a year and a half in some areas. This acceleration is necessary to provide access to the contaminated soils beneath the structures. More MACTEC crews will be added to the site; these new personnel will be teamed with existing workers to help ensure safety. He stated that the lab building should be vacated by the end of the year, but acknowledged the various materials stored in the lab complicate this. Some services provided at the lab will be moved off-site or contracted to outside sources. This project area is currently 46 percent complete.

Dennis explained that the preliminary design for Silo 3 is expected in March and the final design should be submitted in July. He reported that the site continues to pursue disposal of untreated Silo 3 waste in IP2 bags. These bags would be sent to Envirocare by rail. Terry Hagen explained that the site is waiting for Envirocare to secure a NRC license change before pursuing a ROD amendment. Gene Willeke reported that he met with members of the silo project team, and reiterated his past concerns that non-treatment creates a low-probability, high-consequence inhalation risk. Dennis stated that the team is considering an aerosol additive that would reduce airborne risks from the waste and is working closely with a materials handling consultant. He also reported that the IP2 bags are tested extensively to ensure they will not tear. Doug added that the April public meeting at the site will be devoted to the silos projects.

The schedules for Silos 1 and 2 will be moved ahead by about 9 months, according to Dennis. To accomplish this, the project will be subdivided into construction packages that can be bid before the complete design is approved. Dennis reported that materials from these silos will be transferred to four holding tanks and mixed with inert material to

meet a 17 percent waste loading for transport using a weak concrete mixture. The site would like to ship the waste to Envirocare via steel containers in rail cars. These containers would be placed directly in the Envirocare cell. Envirocare is seeking a license change to increase its waste acceptance criteria for radon. Dennis reported that the fallback plan is to ship the wastes by truck to NTS.

Dennis reported that the aquifer restoration project is 57 percent complete. He stated that this project is progressing well and will not be affected by the 2006 acceleration. In response to a question by an FCAB member, Dennis reported that the levels of uranium removed from the water have been consistent with previous modeling. He added that two new contamination areas have been identified—west of the south access road and beneath the pilot plant drainage ditch.

Dennis reported that disposition of nuclear materials should be completed in 2002. Two waste streams still need to be removed from the site. These include 2000 containers (55-gallon drums) of enriched compounds, which were sent from the Hanford site to Fernald. The current plan for disposing of these wastes is to mix them with waste pit materials and send them to Envirocare. This would be expensive, so the site is looking into other options. These options include sending the wastes to NTS or returning them to Hanford. Graham Mitchell stated that assisting closure sites was part of the recent Hanford funding agreement.

Dennis also reviewed the scope of the Fluor contract and distributed an illustration of what the site will look like at site completion. Site completion is specifically defined in the Fluor contract, including what buildings will remain at the site. The remaining buildings will be associated with water treatment. As it nears the end of this contract, Fluor and DOE will evaluate whether additional structures can be removed. According to Dennis, there is little difference between site completion and site closure. By 2006, Fluor will have finished all of the work in its completion contract except removal of rail infrastructure, cleanup of those areas, and removal of the rubble from the silos treatment facility.

Dennis concluded his talk with a review of the proposed budget. The current budget for the site is \$300 million per year. To reach the 2006 baseline, the site is requesting a total budget of \$324 million for the next three years. Dennis explained that he would also propose an optimized budget of \$350 million for the next two years to reduce the risk associated with reaching the 2006 closure date. The additional funds would support early procurement for the silos project and make it easier to meet the 2006 baseline. Dennis

also explained that Silos 1 and 2 are the "critical path" to meet the new baseline. This means they must be completed on time, in order for other projects to be undertaken.

#### **Envirocare Plans for Silos Waste**

Ty Rogers of Envirocare provided the Board with information regarding disposal of silos materials in Envirocare's 11(e)2 embankment. An amendment request was submitted to NRC in mid-March to allow Envirocare to dispose of Silo 3 materials in unopened IP2 bags. Approval for Envirocare's last license change took two months, and NRC is already familiar with the changes being proposed in this amendment. Bags of Fernald waste would arrive at Envirocare by rail. These bags would be lifted out of the train car and placed directly on the floor of the cell. Workers would wear appropriate personal protection. No bags would be stacked. Spaces around the bags would be filled with sand, and they would then be covered with a clay layer and additional waste. The finished cell will contain 22 feet of waste and will be 30-40 feet high.

Steel containers containing waste from Silos 1 and 2 would also be placed directly on the cell floor. Envirocare is still working out specific details for managing radon, but Ty expressed confidence that this would not be a significant obstacle to obtaining a NRC amendment. This proposal will be submitted to NRC in the next couple of months.

#### **Status of Stewardship**

The Board discussed the definition of closure in Fluor's contract and noted that completion of the Fluor contract does not mean that DOE's obligation to the site is finished. Members of the Board stated that they would like to see DOE projections for funding beyond 2006 and that emphasizing the 2006-closure date sends the wrong message to Congress.

Steve McCracken reviewed the status of stewardship and DOE's post-closure obligations. According to Steve, many issues regarding stewardship have not been resolved, and DOE's Office of Environmental Management has not yet developed guidance or funding for it. He further acknowledged that the current Master Plan for Public Use must be continuously updated. Steve presented the following points of discussion:

- DOE is responsible for paying for monitoring and maintenance of the OSDF.
- DOE is responsible for implementing and maintaining institutional controls.
- DOE has some responsibilities for records management. Community desires need to be integrated with DOE obligations.
- While DOE will provide land for ecological restoration and public use, there have been no decisions regarding the provision of security or maintenance. If trails are part

of the Natural Resource Damage (NRD) settlement, then their construction would be legally required.

- Fencing the perimeter of the site is still undetermined. More discussion is needed regarding the kind of fence and how it would be maintained. A Board member suggested involving the Department of Interior in these discussions, and Gary Stegner reported that the National Park Service had been part of initial conversations.
- The extent to which DOE will be involved in providing information to the community has not been determined for the long-term.
- There are many unanswered questions regarding a multi-use education facility, including who would build it and who would maintain its operation. Funding for this facility will not be included in the NRD settlement.
- If restoration is part of the NRD settlement, DOE will be responsible for its stewardship. What is entailed in this stewardship has not been defined.

Pam Dunn explained that she read a report that said DOE headquarters would like to delegate stewardship responsibilities to other agencies. The group briefly discussed the definition of stewardship and the importance of not viewing site closure as an end point. Members agreed that it is important for the FCAB to determine what the community wants for stewardship and work with DOE to achieve this. Doug stated it was important to plan now for what will happen beyond 2006.

The CAB also asked Steve about the future of the CAB and public involvement at the site. Steve explained that the FCAB is not funded through a separate appropriation from headquarters. He stated that unless directed to do so, the site would not eliminate the Board. He further stated that he did not believe the Fernald cleanup could be successful without an SSAB. Gary added that the revised baseline includes funding for the CAB through 2006, with full funding through the next two years. Doug noted that the existing support contract expires after September, and that the CAB also has received good support from the Fluor public affairs office. Gary suggested a meeting be held with Doug and the FCAB leadership to discuss future support issues.

#### **Letter of Support for Cleanup Acceleration**

The CAB agreed to draft a letter that supports the concept of an accelerated cleanup schedule, but the letter will outline the Board's concerns as well. The letter will be addressed to Jessie Roberson and copied to the director of Ohio EPA and members of Congress. Key points to include in the letter are as follows:

1. Investing in the acceleration of the Fernald cleanup schedule will reduce risk.

2. DOE must make a commitment to long-term stewardship at the site and funding beyond 2006. The Board is concerned with a general lack of detail regarding the site after 2006.
3. DOE must make a commitment to fund activities at the Fernald site beyond 2006.
4. The acceleration of the schedule at Fernald must not compromise the thoroughness of the cleanup or safety.
5. The Board endorsed an accelerated schedule several years ago.
6. Meaningful public involvement should not be sacrificed in the name of acceleration.

A draft of the letter will be distributed to CAB members for comment. Jim Bierer will sign the final version.

#### **Master Plan for Public Use Comments**

Doug reported that at its last meeting, the Stewardship Committee reviewed the draft Master Plan for Public Use of the FEMP. He presented the Board with a draft comment letter, based on the Stewardship Committee discussion. The letter includes the following points:

5. Overall, the plan format is confusing and should be restructured.
6. A master plan for post-closure is especially important because the cleanup schedule has been accelerated to 2006.
7. The plan should include a process for making decisions regarding the construction and management of a multi-use education facility.
8. The plan should offer criteria for a successful ecological restoration and assign responsibility for achieving success.
9. The document should include plans for the movement, storage, and final location of the Cold War Garden.
10. The number of interpretive stations along the trails should not be included in the report without providing justification for that number. In addition, the plan should outline a process for developing these stations.
11. More information is needed regarding the proposed perimeter fence.
12. The plan should refer to the trails as "walking trails" rather than "hiking trails."
13. Fishing should be discouraged at the site, because it is not conducive to the non-recreational and educational future use of Fernald. Since it will be difficult to prevent all fishing, monitoring should be conducted to ensure fish are safe to consume.

14. The plan should include more information on how hunting will be permitted for management and research purposes. Opportunities for public input should be included.
15. The plan should include a timeline for design documents and address public involvement in final design for public use amenities.
16. The Board endorses recommendations made by the Ohio EPA in its comment letter.

The Board approved these comments. The letter will be submitted as soon as possible.

#### **SSAB Groundwater Final Statements**

The Board approved the statements developed at the February SSAB groundwater workshop in Augusta, Georgia. These statements will be signed at the SSAB Chairs meeting in April.

#### **Future of Fernald Workshop on Public Access to Site Records**

Doug stated that the Future of Fernald Workshop on Public Access to Site Records, held on March 13, was successful and attracted a number of stakeholders who had not attended previous meetings. A summary of the workshop will be prepared and mailed to the FCAB and Stewardship Committee members.

Doug explained that the next step for this project is to hold a design charrette regarding the proposed education facility. The purpose of the charrette is to develop conceptual designs that can be used to build support and estimate costs. Earlier in the day, Doug and David Bidwell met with the architects, Brenda and David Scheer, who will lead the charrette. They attended the workshop and are excited about the project. The Scheers will attend the April Stewardship Committee meeting, at which the members will develop a needs statement for the education facility. Doug explained that the Stewardship Committee has proposed holding the charrette on May 18, in place of the scheduled full Board meeting. All of the FCAB and Stewardship Committee members, plus another ten individuals, will be invited to attend the charrette. The architects will produce a draft report for the July 11 FCAB meeting and provide a final product by the end of August.

Doug also reported that David and he met with the librarian of the Harrison Branch of the Hamilton County Library. She attended the Future of Fernald Workshop. Doug stated that it is important to coordinate with people who provide information to the community. In addition, the new branch library building is a good model for the proposed education facility.

**Relocated Public Environmental Information Center**

The Board reviewed the design for the relocated Public Environmental Information Center. The Center will be moved to a new trailer to be located just outside the gate for the Fernald site. The Administrative Record and other information would be moved to this trailer, but the site's technical library will be housed elsewhere. The new facility is likely to be open two days a week and other times by appointment.

**April Chairs Meeting**

Doug reminded the group that the annual SSAB Chairs meeting will be hosted by the FCAB, and is being held at the Westin Hotel in downtown Cincinnati on April 11 to 13. All FCAB members are invited to attend a Thursday evening reception, hosted by Fluor Fernald. Members were also urged to observe other sessions of the meeting. There will be a public comment session on Saturday. Each SSAB will have two official representatives at the meeting. Jim Bierer and Tom Wagner will represent Fernald.

Doug reported that each SSAB has been asked to provide a one-page summary of the three main issues being addressed at its site. The Board members agreed to issues to include in the Fernald submission: long-term stewardship (including records management), the silos projects, and the acceleration to 2006 closure.

**Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the March 16, 2002 meeting of the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board.

\_\_\_\_\_  
James Bierer, Chair Date  
Fernald Citizens Advisory Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Stegner Date  
Deputy Designated Federal Official



**Date:** March 14, 2002

**Topics:**

- Review of Master Plan for Public Use
- Public Access to Sites Records Feasibility Study

**Attendees**

**Fernald Citizens Advisory Board**

Jim Bierer  
Marvin Clawson  
Pam Dunn  
Bob Tabor

**FRESH**

Edwa Yocum

**The Perspectives Group**

Doug Sarno  
David Bidwell

**U.S. Department of Energy**

Ed Skintik  
Gary Stegner

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

Gene Jablonowski

**Ohio Environmental Protection Agency**

Donna Bohannon

**Fluor Fernald**

Larry Stebbins  
Ric Strobl  
Jeff Wagner  
Sue Walpole

**Others**

Jim Innis



# MEETING SUMMARY

## Review of Master Plan for Public Use

Doug opened the meeting, reviewed the agenda, and distributed a summary of the proposed action from the draft Master Plan for Public use of the Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP). The plan addresses public access and trails, and is closely aligned with the criteria previously recommended by the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board (FCAB). The document mentions a multi-use education facility (MUEF), but does not propose any specific actions regarding this facility. None of the Stewardship Committee members attended the public meeting for this plan, which was held on February 28, 2002. The group also reviewed comments on the plan submitted by the Ohio EPA.

The committee discussed a number of issues regarding the plan and agreed to present written comments to the FCAB for its approval. Issues and concerns to be included in the letter of comment are outlined below.

- Overall, the plan is too long and not well organized. It is still formatted like a NEPA document, which it is not.
- The plan identifies a restoration goal of creating "early stages" of a prairie. Jim Innis stated that an abrupt change from forest to prairie would result in undesired effects. The plan should address what will occur if restoration is unsuccessful and who is responsible, since the public use plan is based on successful restoration.
- More information is needed regarding fencing of the FEMP perimeter.
- The plan should clarify how hunting for wildlife management and research will be managed. The public should be provided information about any permitted hunting.
- Fishing should be discouraged because it contradicts the non-recreational goals of public use at the site. Committee members expressed concern about lengthy time spent at the site for fishing, increased litter, shoreline disturbances to access fishing spots, and soil disturbance to find bait. The group acknowledged, however, that it would be difficult to prevent all fishing, so the fish should be monitored to ensure they are safe to eat.
- The plan does not address the existing Cold War Garden, where it would be placed when the site is completed, and how it would be stored.
- The plan specifies that fewer than 20 interpretive stations will be placed along the trails. However, the plan does not justify this number or address a process for planning these stations.
- The plan uses both "hiking" and "walking" to describe the trails. The trails should be walking trails, because "hiking" implies a recreational use.

## MEETING SUMMARY (continued)

- The plan should include timelines for decisions and assure public access to final design documents. The FCAB and the broader public should be involved in all planning phases.
- The plan mentions the MUEF, but does not address a process for making decisions regarding that facility.
- Committee members felt that planning for trails and other public use amenities should be integrated into remediation. Gary Stegner stated that it may be better to wait until soil remediation is complete, so that trails can all be planned at one time.

The committee also briefly discussed the need to develop Congressional support for an on-site educational facility, because it might be most easily funded as a separate budget item. Doug suggested that the committee should be ready to seek support for an on-site educational facility by the end of summer. Jim Bierer stated that an education center could be a community asset for Ross.

### Public Access to Site Records Feasibility Study

A Future of Fernald workshop was held on March 13. This workshop was part of the Stewardship Committee's feasibility study of public access to site records. Doug stated that he was encouraged by the more than sixty people who attended the workshop. Several participants had not participated in earlier workshops. One of these new participants was the librarian for the Harrison Branch of the Hamilton County Public Library. Doug explained it is important to coordinate this project with existing information sources in the community.

Committee members believed all of the participants at the workshop were "on the same page." Doug stated that this was evidence that the FCAB and Stewardship Committee have been successful communicating issues to other community members.

According to committee members, workshop participants were supportive of building an education facility and wanted some kind of oversight for stewardship activities. Overall, the community wants to be actively involved in what happens with site records and wants this involvement to be perpetuated in future generations.

Doug reviewed next steps for the feasibility study. A summary of the workshop will be included in the next mailing. Pam asked that the summary also be sent electronically to members with email. A design charrette will be held in May, in order to develop preliminary concepts and cost estimates for a MUEF. The architects who will run the charrette, Brenda and David Scheer, attended the Future of Fernald workshop and are enthusiastic about helping to "tell the story" of Fernald. They will attend the April Stewardship Committee meeting, which will be

devoted to developing a "needs statement" for the an on-site educational facility. Doug proposed holding the charrette on Saturday, May 18, during the time reserved for the May FCAB meeting. Pam Dunn suggested the FCAB could meet on Thursday, May 16 if necessary. The total number of participants will be between twenty-five and thirty. Members of the FCAB and Stewardship Committee will be invited to attend the charrette, and Doug asked the members to propose additional invitees. Gene Jablonowski suggested that charrette participants be

provided with information prior to the charrette. The Scheers will draft a report of the charrette by July and produce a final product by the end of August. The final report for the feasibility study is due to DOE by the end of September.

Bob Tabor reported that the union office at the site will sort and organize its files soon. These files likely contain materials that would be of interest to the community. Committee members expressed an interest in materials that document the early days of the union and production at the site. Bob will ask union leadership to keep an eye out for historical documents and photographs. Jim Innis suggested that the community equally would be interested in materials that document the history of Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety and Health (FRESH).

#### **Next Meeting Date**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. and the next Stewardship Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, April 18.

000014



## STEWARSHIP COMMITTEE MEETING PEIC

Thursday, April 18, 2002

### AGENDA

---

- 6:30 p.m.      Opening Remarks and Updates
- 6:45 p.m.      Planning for Design Charrette
- Review "How to Achieve Vision" and Criteria for Education Facility
  - Review March 13 Workshop Results
  - Answer Outstanding Questions
  - Develop Needs Statement
- 8:30 p.m.      Adjourn



**FULL BOARD MEETING**  
Public Environmental Information Center

Saturday, April 20, 2002

**DRAFT AGENDA**

---

8:30 a.m.	Call to Order
8:30 – 8:45 a.m.	Chair's Remarks and Ex Officio Announcements
8:45 – 9:00 a.m.	Results of Chairs Meeting
9:00 – 9:30 a.m.	Feedback and Update on 2006 Acceleration
9:30 – 10:30 a.m.	Silos Presentations and Discussion
10:30 – 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 – 11:15 a.m.	Silos FCAB next Steps
11:15 – 11:45 a.m.	Planning for Design Charrette
11:45 – 12:00 p.m.	Public Comment
12:00 p.m.	Adjourn

**SSAB SPRING 2002 CHAIRS MEETING**  
**Westin Hotel • Cincinnati, Ohio**  
**REVISED AGENDA, as of 4/1/02**

**THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 2002**

- 1:00 p.m.            Bus departs Westin Hotel for Fernald Tour
- 5:00 p.m.            Bus returns to Westin Hotel
- 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.    Reception Hosted by Fluor Fernald – Windows Ballroom

**FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2002 – Tyler-Davidson Room**

- 8:00 – 8:30 a.m.    Registration and Continental Breakfast
- 8:30 – 8:45 a.m.    Welcome and logistics, Jim Bierer, Fernald Chair
- 8:45 – 9:30 a.m.    Round Robin (5 minutes per site)  
                          - Top three issues per site
- 9:30 – 12:00 p.m.   Top to Bottom Review and 2003 Budget (Eugene Schmitt, DOE HQ)  
 (with break)        - Overview and latest developments  
                          - Administration of \$800 million fund  
                          - DOE plans for public participation and SSABs  
                          - Chairs Discussion
- 12:00 – 1:30 p.m.   Lunch – Windows Ballroom
- 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.    Status and Implications of Long Term Stewardship Strategic Plan  
 (Dave Geiser, DOE HQ)
- 3:00 – 3:20 p.m.    Review of Day, Identify Topics for Afternoon Breakouts and Saturday
- 3:20 – 3:45 p.m.    Public Comment
- 3:45 p.m.            Formal Meeting Adjourned for Day
- 3:45 – 5:00 p.m.    Informal Breakout Sessions  
                          - Alternatives to Incineration already identified  
                          - Other topics as identified by Chairs  
                          - (Federal Coordinators will also meet during this time)
- Dinner on your own

SSAB SPRING 2002 CHAIRS MEETING  
Westin Hotel • Cincinnati, Ohio  
REVISED AGENDA, as of 4/1/02  
Page 2

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 2002 – Tyler-Davidson Room

- 8:00 – 8:30 a.m. Continental Breakfast
- 8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Discussion and Signing of Ground Water Workshop Statements
- 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. Chairs Discussion  
- Report back from informal breakout groups, as needed  
- Report on upcoming incineration workshop (L. Gibson)  
- Topics as identified by Chairs
- 11:00 – 11:30 a.m. - Chairs Discussion  
- Meeting debrief  
- Future workshops and chairs meetings  
(next Chairs meeting is scheduled for Oak Ridge, October 14-15)
- 11:30 – 12:00 p.m. Public Comment
- 12:00 – 12:30 p.m. Closing Remarks
- 12:30 p.m. Meeting Adjourned



April 2, 2002

Jessie Hill Roberson  
Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20002

*Chair*  
James C. Bierer

*Vice Chair*  
Thomas E. Wagner

*Members*  
Lisa Blair  
M. Kathryn Brown  
Blain Burton  
Sandy Butterfield  
Marvin W. Clawson  
Lisa Crawford  
Stephen P. Depoe  
Louis Doll  
Pamela Dunn  
Jane Harper  
Robert G. Tabor  
Gene E. Willeke

*Ex Officio Members*  
L. French Bell  
Gene Jablonowski  
Stephen H. McCracken  
Graham Mitchell

*Support Staff*  
The Perspectives  
Group, Inc.

Dear Ms. Roberson:

Since we first recommended an accelerated cleanup schedule to DOE in 1995, the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board (FCAB) has been a strong supporter of a focussed and smart remediation approach that does not sacrifice quality or jeopardize safety. As such, we welcome the current attention of DOE Headquarters to finally achieving this vision.

In principle, the FCAB endorses the current initiative to accelerate cleanup towards a goal of closure by December 2006. Representatives of the site contractor and DOE have worked diligently to provide information to the FCAB and address our concerns as they have revised the baseline. We believe, if implemented properly, an accelerated schedule will benefit the community by reducing risks more quickly and allowing us to move forward with the planned future uses of the site. However, a number of very significant concerns remain regarding this accelerated cleanup schedule and management of the site after closure is achieved. Only if these issues are adequately addressed can we be fully supportive of the accelerated approach.

- The goal of reaching closure by 2006 must not compromise the thoroughness of the cleanup or jeopardize the safety of the community and site personnel. It is important that schedule and budget contingencies be recognized for this very complex and challenging work, and that safety and quality be the primary drivers of decision making, not speed.
- Site closure must not be portrayed as the end of DOE responsibilities at the site. Current budget projections make it appear as if DOE's costs will end in 2006, and this perception must be corrected. DOE must commit to long-term stewardship at the site and develop a detailed projection of funding requirements and a schedule of DOE's responsibilities in perpetuity. The Fernald community made an enormous sacrifice in supporting on-site disposal of waste and DOE must not walk away from its responsibilities to the long-term management of that waste and surrounding property at Fernald.
- Meaningful public involvement must not be sacrificed in the name of acceleration. Active stakeholder involvement has been the cornerstone of Fernald's success since 1993. An informed and involved public becomes more critical as the site deals with closure issues and the need to plan and implement long term stewardship.

These issues are extremely important to the FCAB and we would like to have initial feedback from DOE as to how they will be dealing with them in time for discussion at our next meeting on April 20. We appreciate the opportunity to provide this input and look forward to a continued dialogue as remediation of the Fernald site moves forward.

Sincerely,

Jim Bierer  
Chair

Cc: FCAB Members  
SSAB Chairs  
Jamie Jameson, Fluor Fernald  
Martha Crosland, DOE EM-21

000019



## REPORT SUMMARY

**Report Title:** Critical Analysis Team Reports #25, #26, and #27  
**Report Date:** February-March 2002  
**Summary Date:** April 3, 2002

The Critical Analysis Team (CAT) produced three reports in February and March 2002.

### CAT Report #25

This report focuses on the CAT review of the Silo 3 Conceptual Design package. Key technical issues of concern are identified:

- Design and construction of the Silo 3 side-wall opening including cutting of the wall and disposal of the wall sections.
- Pneumatic removal of Silo 3 solids, particularly concerning the configuration, operation, and maintenance of the pneumatic wand.
- Performance of the Dust Collectors.
- The Silo 3 Enclosure Building, including design, operation, and ultimate disposal of the facility.
- Loading of transport containers, including the interface between the loading device and containers, controlling contamination in the loading area, remote operation, and the process for disposing of failed containers or liners.

### CAT Report #26

This report identifies concerns that must be addressed to ensure success of a "fast-tracked" approach to the silos projects. In a fast-tracked approach, the design will be completed through a construction and procurement packages that will be bid and awarded as individual contracts.

- Projects should not conduct design activities without an "approved basis and requirements document." This document is not approved for Silo 3.
- Proceeding directly from conceptual design to final bid packages is risky, because it reduces opportunities for design reviews and shifts risk to vendors.
- A number of steps must be followed to credibly complete designs in the form of packages.
- A number of management mechanisms should be in place to avoid pitfalls posed by fast tracking.

To address these concerns, the CAT offered the following recommendations:

1. Fluor Fernald should revise the Engineering Execution Plan and the Project Execution Plan to support the current project direction.
2. The Silo 3 Design Basis and Requirements document should be approved.
3. The Silos project should assign an individual responsible for each bid package.
4. The Silos project should develop and implement management mechanisms to ensure design package integration and interface management (e.g. Interface Control Document, procedures, and memorandums of understanding).

**CAT Report #27**

This report is focused on a silos project status review conducted at the Jacob's facility in Oak Ridge in March 2002. One result of the Jacob's visit was a schedule of anticipated CAT activities in March and April. This report also includes CAT comments on the Silo 3 Conceptual Design Cost Estimate:

- The estimate does not include contingency or escalation. Rather, the estimate includes an 'allowance' that does not appear sufficient.
- The estimate does not specify costs for a number of activities, although the CAT recognizes that estimates for those activities may exist elsewhere.
- Some equipment cost estimates may be underestimated.
- The estimate does not reflect the current Silo 3 fast-track approach, so it is unclear how the estimate could be used as a Government Fair Cost Estimate. The lack of a detailed Work Breakdown Structure system may be the root cause of difficulties in tracking activities and expenses.
- The work schedule in the estimate (four ten-hour days per work week) may lead to unnecessary overtime costs.
- The CAT does not understand the need for or use of Nuclear Certified Instruments in this facility.

000021



4197  
4197

March 25, 2002

*Chair*  
James C. Bierer

*Vice Chair*  
Thomas E. Wagner

*Members*  
Lisa Blair  
M. Kathryn Brown  
Blain Burton  
Sandy Butterfield  
Marvin W. Clawson  
Lisa Crawford  
Stephen P. Depoe  
Louis Doll  
Pamela Dunn  
Jane Harper  
Robert G. Tabor  
Gene E. Willeke

*Ex Officio Members*  
L. French Bell  
Gene Jablonowski  
Stephen H. McCracken  
Graham Mitchell

*Support Staff*  
The Perspectives  
Group, Inc.

Gary Stegner  
United States Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 538705  
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8705

Dear Mr. McCracken:

Enclosed please find the Fernald Citizens Advisory Board (FCAB) Recommendations #2002-02, Comments on the Master Plan for Public Use at the Fernald Environmental Management Project.

The FCAB has a continuing strong interest in the long-term use of the Fernald site and issues related to long-term stewardship. We look forward to working with DOE as we plan and implement an exciting future at Fernald.

Sincerely,

James C. Bierer  
Chair

Enclosure  
cc: Martha Crosland, EM-11

000022



## RECOMMENDATION #2002-02

### COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN FOR PUBLIC USE ON THE FERNALD ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT

March 16, 2002

3 pages

Presented to: Gary Stegner, U.S. DOE, Fernald Site Office

Source of Recommendation:

- Full Board  
 Stewardship Committee

Type of Recommendation:

- Initial  
 Follow-on to Recommendation

Response Requested by: June 1, 2002, ongoing coordination also desired

The FCAB reviewed the master plan and held detailed discussions at its March 14, 2002 Stewardship Committee and March 16, 2002 full board meetings. Overall, the FCAB found that the draft Master Plan reflects previous input and discussions regarding the use of the Fernald site. However, there are a number of issues that require clarification and further elaboration. These are discussed below.

- The master plan is not clearly written or well organized. As it is no longer a NEPA document, we suggest the master plan be dramatically streamlined to clearly identify the components of the proposed action, placing the other alternatives in an appendix if needed. If this document is to truly serve as a Master Plan, it should be organized as such to clearly lay out all of the needed activities along with the details known to date and identify how the remaining details will be determined. A one page summary of public access decisions and appropriate timelines and tables of how those decisions will be implemented would greatly assist the reader and provide a better road map as the site moves toward closure.
- It is important to recognize the increased importance of this and similar documents in light of the acceleration of site activities toward a 2006 closure. In that light, we recommend that this report better recognize the critical need to integrate natural resource restoration and planning for future public use with remediation activities. The master plan must include a detailed timeline of key activities for the planning and implementation of the proposed restoration and public use actions showing how those will be integrated into remediation.
- The master plan defers discussion of the proposed Multi-Use Education Facility because too many questions remain unanswered. However, the document should outline next steps, DOE's participation, and a rough timeline for addressing these questions. Time is running out for adequate planning and funding of this facility as DOE's 2004 budget is already under development. A specific plan for this is needed in the very near future. Identification of how, when, by whom, and with what public input this plan will be developed must be included in the master plan.

000023

- There is an ongoing concern about the successful implementation of healthy ecosystems on site, in particular prairies and wetlands. It is clear that DOE will only be able to complete the early stages of this work prior to site closure, while successful implementation of the public uses on site require that these ecosystems thrive. DOE needs to more clearly identify its responsibility, the procedures for bringing this about, and the criteria that will be used to judge success. It is time that we identify the final site stewards and begin to integrate them into the planning and implementation of these many important activities. Specific plans for both the successful implementation of ecosystems and the identification of stewards need to be developed in the very near future. Identification of how, when, by whom, and with what public input this plan will be developed must be included in the master plan.
- The master plan does not address the final disposition of the Cold War Garden. Plans must be made to safely remove and store the garden while remediation is completed and then install it in a permanent location on site. Identification of how, when, by whom, and with what public input this plan will be developed must be included in the master plan.
- The master plan indicates that no more than twenty interpretive stations are proposed for the trails. The master plan should provide some guidance for how the content and design of these interpretive stations will be developed. The public should be involved in these decisions. Because there is no interpretive plan at this time, it is likely too early to determine the number of interpretive stations that are necessary or feasible. Without specific justification, we suggest that this number be dropped from the master plan. A specific plan for determining the number and type of signs will need to be developed prior to the end of remediation. Identification of how, when, by whom, and with what public input this plan will be developed must be included in the master plan.
- The master plan suggests that a perimeter fence will enclose the entire property. This is an idea that has not been addressed previously with the public. More detail is needed regarding the nature of this fencing and how it will fit in with the overall future use of the site (height, appearance, material, etc...). Detailed discussion and public involvement will be necessary for this activity.
- The document refers to trails as "hiking and walking" and this creates some confusion. All trails are ultimately for the same historical and educational purposes and are not meant to encourage hiking. We suggest dropping that "hiking" distinction.
- The master plan does not address fishing on the Fernald site. We do not believe that fishing is conducive to the non-recreational and educational future use of the site. We wish to see the final site configuration discourage the lengthy stays, picnicking, digging for worms, wading, off-trail hiking, and on-site staffing requirements that fishing would entail. At the same time, we recognize that preventing all fishing may be difficult and request that studies and monitoring be conducted to ensure that any fish caught in Fernald waters will be safe to consume. A specific plan for this will need to be developed prior to the end of remediation. Identification of how, when, by whom, and with what public input this plan will be developed must be included in the master plan.
- The master plan would prohibit hunting or trapping of any kind, except for wildlife management or research purposes. When hunting or trapping will occur for management or research purposes, information should be available for the public regarding the nature and extent of these activities. A specific plan for this will need to be developed prior to the end

of remediation. Identification of how, when, by whom, and with what public input this plan will be developed must be included in the master plan.

- In addition to the specific plans we identify above, it is clear that the majority of specific and important decisions regarding future use and access to the site will be determined within design documents. The Master Plan must identify each of these documents and provide a detailed timeline of their development and plans for public comment. Public input into those documents will be the most critical component of planning for the future use and long term stewardship of the Fernald site.

In addition to the above comments, the FCAB endorses the specific recommendations made by Ohio EPA in their March 14, 2002 letter of comment. The FCAB appreciates the opportunity to review this master plan and looks forward to continuing to work closely with DOE in planning and implementing all aspects of future use and long term stewardship at Fernald.

## Critical Analysis Team Report

### CAT Report #25

20 February 2002

The Critical Analysis Team (CAT) has completed a review of the Silo 3 Conceptual Design package and design review comments are documented in Attachment 1 of this report.

The CAT's review was based on the following Silos Project requests:

- "The objective of the (CAT's) Independent Review is to support a determination that the project has sufficient information to proceed to the next phase of the project."<sup>1</sup>
- "Enclosed for your (CAT) formal review in accordance with the referenced letter, are the following Silo 3 Project Conceptual Design documents and drawings."<sup>2</sup>
- "Any comments generated from review for this package will be considered in the development of the Remedial Design Package, which is expected to include no on-site treatment."<sup>2</sup>
- "To aid your review of this package, notation has been added to the Flow Diagrams, Piping & Instrumentation Drawings, and General Arrangement Drawings to illustrate the treatment part of the design, which may be deleted from further design effort."<sup>2</sup>

In performing this design review, the CAT has attempted to follow the above directions as closely as possible, particularly evaluating whether the project is prepared to proceed to the next phase.

Many of the CAT's comments addressing treatment apply to the design whether the treatment is deleted or not. Therefore, the CAT chose to include all comments on the design as they may prove of value to the ongoing design. However, because the treatment operation may be deleted, the CAT has identified specific treatment comments with an asterisk.

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter DOE-0062-02, Nina Akgunduz, Team Leader, Silos Project, the Independent Review of the Silos Project, dated 6 November 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Letter C:SP:2002-0004, Stephen M. Beckman, Contract Technical Representative, Formal Critical Analysis Team (CAT) Review of Silo 3 Project Conceptual Design Package, dated January 23, 2002.

000026

## Critical Analysis Team Report

### CAT Report #26

13 February 2002

The CAT was recently informed the Silos project will be pursuing a new approach to completion of design for Silos 1 and 2 and Silo 3 projects. This new approach is in part intended to support a new baseline for completing the silos project in calendar year 2006.

The new approach consists of completing design through a number of construction and procurement packages that will be bid and awarded as individual contracts. This approach, known as "fast-tracking," carries with it both the possibility of acceleration and, if not managed properly, the risk of failure, delay and cost growth.

Following are issues that must be addressed in order to ensure success of the fast-tracked approach to silos projects.

**1) Projects should not conduct design activities without an approved basis and requirements document.** Currently, the Silo 3 basis and requirements document is not approved, placing the project at risk for the following pitfalls leading to an undisciplined design approach:

- Verbal work direction.
- Unilateral changes.
- Undocumented changes.
- Scope, schedule, and cost creep.
- Unauthorized work direction.
- Impulsive work direction.
- Inadequately reviewed, evaluated, and approved work direction.

**2) Proceeding directly from conceptual design to final bid packages is risky.** This approach reduces both the opportunity for, and the detail of, design reviews. It places a great burden on the importance of writing detailed, solid specifications. Also, this approach may attempt to inappropriately shift project risk to vendors.

**3) To credibly complete the designs in the form of packages, the projects must...**

- ...prepare individual baseline documents including cost estimate, schedule with interim measurable milestones, and scope of work.
- ...ensure that the Piping and Instrumentation Diagrams are complete and approved to support bid package development, construction and operation.

# Critical Analysis Team Report

## CAT Report #27

20 March 2002

The Critical Analysis Team (CAT) conducted a brief silos project status review at Jacob's facility in Oak Ridge in early March 2002. The CAT acknowledges and appreciates both Fluor Fernald (FF) and Jacobs cooperation and patience in supporting this review.

During the review, the CAT:

- Received status briefings on both Silo 3 and Silos 1 and 2 design efforts, including briefings utilizing Jacob's 3-D modeling design tool.
- Briefly reviewed and discussed comments with DOE, FF and Jacobs on the Silo 3 container and excavator draft specification.
- Discussed the CAT's Silo 3 Conceptual Design comments<sup>1</sup> with DOE, FF and Jacobs.
- In consultation with DOE, the CAT outlined its ongoing support activities for April and May.
- Reviewed the most recent Jacobs schedules and the draft FF rebaselined schedules.
- Reviewed the Silo 3 conceptual design cost estimate.

This report focuses on two items resulting from the CAT's Jacob's visit: (1) schedule for ongoing CAT activities (primarily design reviews); and (2) comments on the Silo 3.

### CAT Schedule

The CAT's anticipated activities in the months of April and May include:

- CAT representative attend silos 'topic of the month' public briefing (April 9<sup>th</sup>).
- Review for information Silo 3 Remedial Design Package (to be issued to the CAT March 18<sup>th</sup>).
- Review for information Silo 3 Equipment Sheets specification package (to be issued to the CAT April 30).
- Review for information Silo 3 cost estimate update (to be issued to the CAT second week of April).

---

<sup>1</sup> The comments discussed were those not identified by DOE for formal response.

- Review for information Silo 3 Buildings specification package (to be issued to the CAT April 15).
- Formal review and comment on Silo 1 and 2 Preliminary Design (to be issued to the CAT on April 15):
  - CAT meet in Richland to review and develop comments on preliminary design (April 22 through April 26).
  - CAT draft comments to be forwarded to DOE Fernald by April 26.
  - CAT meet with DOE, FF and Jacobs to review CAT comments (April 30 through May 3).
- CAT meet at Jacobs to participate in squad check on Silo 3 Mechanical specification package (May 13 through May 17).

### CAT Silo 3 Conceptual Design Cost Estimate Comments

The CAT does not expect the following comments to receive formal responses in the existing cost estimate. Rather, the CAT hopes these comments will be useful in supporting future estimate submittals throughout the silos project.

The cost estimate appears to be low for the following reasons:

- The estimate does not include contingency or escalation. Rather, the estimate includes an 'allowance' that does not appear sufficient for reasonable project contingency and escalation. Following is a table of rough estimates of allowances the CAT would assign to each construction activity:

Activity	Cost Estimate Allowance	CAT Allowance
00 Site/Demo/Site Improv.	0%	10%
01 Concrete	10%	17%
02 Structural Steel	10%	17%
03 Architectural	10%	17%
04 Equipment	0%	50%
05 Piping	5%	35%
06 Electrical	5%	50%
07 Instrumentation	5%	35%
08 Paint/Insulation	5%	10%
09 HVAC	5%	50%
10 Fire Protection	0%	10%

- The estimate does not include costs for the activities listed below. The CAT acknowledges that many of these activities may be included in the construction management, project management and waste management functions explicitly excluded from this estimate. Similarly, some of the

information might be found in the Appendices listed but not provided in the CAT's estimate package.

- Jacobs, FF and DOE activities during construction.
  - Removing contaminated dirt and importing clean-fill.
  - Construction acceptance testing.
  - Startup testing.
  - Turnover activities.
  - Operation Readiness Review activities.
  - Lost time due to weather.
  - Equipment such as dump trucks, compressors, small generators, welding machines, etc.
  - Equipment mock-up and testing.
- A spot check of equipment estimates indicates what appear to be underestimates of equipment costs. Examples include the vacuum wand system (\$12,750), Feeder system (\$10,230), Isokinetic sampling system (\$490), Conveyors (5 at @24,580 each) and Breathing air skid units (\$4,280 each). The project should ensure that these estimates are accurate.
  - The estimate is not currently organized to reflect the current Silo 3 approach. The design is being completed by specification package and the estimate is organized largely by discipline. It is unclear how this estimate might be used as a Government Fair Cost Estimate (GFCE) if it doesn't relate to the packages that will be released for bids.

The unique project approaches being pursued under the silos project make it difficult to track activities and expenses. A root cause of this appears to be the lack of a sufficiently detailed Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) system. The existing WBS does not provide the tracking, controlling and reporting functions necessary for sound project management. This not only confuses the CAT, but lead to a lack of discipline in ongoing project activities.

- The estimate assumes four ten hour days per work week. Depending on existing labor agreements, this may lead to unnecessary overtime costs (approximately 2hrs per day). The project should ensure the work schedule provides the most efficient, effective approach to complete the work.
- 07 Instrumentation page refers to Nuclear Certified Instruments. The CAT does not understand the need for or use of these instruments in this facility.