

611

6-710.10¹¹

**FERNALD CITIZENS TASK FORCE WEEKLY MAILING OF UPCOMING
EVENTS AND MEETINGS, ALSO INCLUDES DRAFT MINUTES FROM
JANUARY 11, 1997 MEETING**

03/07/97

TASK FORCE TASK FORCE
15-14
ANNOUNCMEN



FRIDAY MAILING

3/7/97

INCLUDED IN THIS MAILING ARE:

- John Applegate memo re Budget and Schedule Issues
- Waste Management Committee Meeting Summary Report 2/5/97
- Transportation Committee Meeting Summary Report 2/5/97
- Memo re invitation to Phil Hamric party
- Letter to Tom Wagner: Response to FCTF Comments on Intermodal Transportation of Fernald Waste
- Fernald Community Reuse Organization (CRO) Meeting Announcement
- Newsclippings

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Please note the following upcoming meetings:

- WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE:** The Waste Management Committee will meet Wednesday, March 12, 1997, at 7:00 p.m. in the Uno Building.

Please Note!

- TASK FORCE MEETING:** There will be a full Task Force Meeting on Saturday, **March 15, 1997**, at 8:30 a.m. in the Alpha Building.

Change of meeting date!

- FRESH MEETING:** FRESH will hold a meeting on **Sunday, April 13, 1997**, (not on Thursday March 20, as originally scheduled) at Venice Presbyterian Church on Layhigh Road in Ross. All are welcome to attend!

QUESTIONS:

- Please call John at [redacted] or Doug at [redacted] with questions or concerns. You may also fax or e-mail us at:

John FAX: 281-3331 E-MAIL: john.applegate@law.uc.edu

Doug FAX: 648-3629 E-MAIL: [redacted] 000001

*CHAIR*

John S. Applegate

MEMBERS

James C. Bierer
 Marvin W. Clawson
 Lisa Crawford
 Pamela Dunn
 Constance Fox, M.D.
 Guy C. Guckenberger
 Darryl D. Huff
 Gloria J. McKinley
 Jerry Monahan
 Thomas B. Rentschler
 Robert G. Tabor
 Warren E. Strunk
 Dr. Thomas E. Wagner
 Dr. Gene E. Willeke

EX OFFICIO

L. French Bell
 J. Phillip Hamric
 Gene Jablonowski
 Graham Mitchell

Draft Minutes from the January 11, 1997 Meeting

The Fernald Citizens Task Force met from 8:40 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. on January 11, 1997, at the Alpha Building, 10967 Hamilton-Cleves Highway, Harrison, Ohio. The meeting was advertised in local papers and open to the public. Time was reserved for public input.

Members Present:

John Applegate
 French Bell
 Jim Bierer
 Marvin Clawson
 Lisa Crawford
 Pam Dunn
 J. Phillip Hamric
 Guy Guckenberger
 Gene Jablonowski
 Gloria McKinley
 Graham Mitchell
 Jerry Monahan
 Warren Strunk
 Robert Tabor
 Thomas Wagner
 Gene Willeke

Members Absent:

Constance Fox
 Darryl Huff
 Thomas Rentschler

Designated Federal Official Present:

Ken Morgan

Task Force Staff Present:

Deborah Dunstan
 Crystal Sarno
 Douglas Sarno

About 20 spectators also attended the meeting, including members of the public and representatives from DOE, Fluor-Daniel Fernald, and FRESH.

000002

1. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

Chair John Applegate called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

2. Announcements and New Business

The Minutes from September 28, 1996, and November 9, 1996, meetings of the Task Force were accepted and approved as presented.

Applegate outlined the three issues to be discussed at today's meeting: 1) update on vitrification, 2) site recycling protocol, and 3) the 1997 workplan (an action item for this meeting). While the new workplan is mostly a continuation of the 1996 plan, the Task Force will also look at site schedules and budget issues in the coming year.

He then welcomed Trish Thompson, who will replace Rick Maslin as Director of Public Affairs at Fluor Daniel Fernald.

Applegate mentioned that he will be attending the SSAB Chairs meeting on January 23, 1997, and asked that anyone with an issue they would like raised at this meeting to please let him know.

The 10-year plan has been considerably revised, and Applegate detailed some of the reasons for the changes. Al Alm is responding to upcoming budget pressures by finding ways to get Congress to commit steady resources to site cleanup. The original 10-year plan caused concern at some sites because it involved moving waste from certain sites to other sites. In response to this concern, Hanford developed the "National Dialogue" component of the plan, as they saw themselves as being the recipients of large amounts of waste. This dialogue was designed to give them some idea of what waste they might receive, and to allow them some input to that decision. This has developed into a broader idea of creating a National Dialogue of waste movement between sites; this is now in the planning phase. Applegate suggested that the Task Force should get involved when the Dialogue concept is more concrete, to ensure that Fernald's cleanup plans don't change without the Task Force knowing about it and having some input.

3. Committee Reports

Monitoring and Recycling Committee

Committee Chair Pam Dunn explained that the committee will review project-specific monitoring plans as they become available, but that they are still waiting for those plans. In addition, they now have responsibility for recycling issues.

Transportation Committee

Committee Chair Tom Wagner mentioned that CSX will be giving the committee three options for their planned rail trip, but will require the Task Force to pay. If the price is too high, the Task Force will not go. The Transportation Committee will meet again in late January, and will present recommendations to the Task Force at a later date.

Natural Resources Committee

Committee Chair Jim Bierer said that the committee has received a draft natural resource restoration plan from the Natural Resources Trustees, and will meet in January to discuss it. The committee is also waiting for the Trustees to create a resource restoration plan.

Waste Management Committee

Committee Chair Gene Willeke explained that the committee has spent a lot of time dealing with the silos issue, and will meet again in late January or early February. They hope to make a recommendation to the Task Force regarding Silo 3 at the March 1997 meeting.

Community Reuse Organization

Lisa Crawford reported that the Community Reuse Organization will have a facilitator assist them with strategic planning at their meeting on February 4, 1997. The resulting plan will be released at the end of February. Task Force members expressed the desire to have the CRO minutes included in the Friday mailing.

ATSDR

French Bell gave an update on the ATSDR/CDC Advisory Board. He explained that, while they have had numerous meetings, they are just getting fully organized. Doug Sarno asked that the Task Force receive ATSDR/CDC meeting minutes when they become available.

Membership Committee

John Applegate reported that two possible replacements for retiring Task Force member Jerry Monahan will be interviewed shortly.

It was suggested that the Task Force investigate creating its own web page, whether independently or as part of DOE's home page. Sarno will check into it and report back to the Task Force.

4. Update on Silos

Don Paine of Fluor Daniel Fernald addressed the leak from the vitrification pilot plant melter, which took place on December 26, 1996. He showed a video tape of the melter, highlighting the conditions both before and after the leak occurred.

After the video, Guy Guckenberger asked why the original design did not allow for these conditions. Paine explained that this was an experimental melter, with very difficult and "unfriendly" waste, and that the purpose of this melter was to learn what the problems were. Many of the "problems" had been anticipated, and Paine believes that, although this is a complicated mix, all of these problems are solvable. Fluor Daniel Fernald is going through an evaluation now using a safety review team, as well as a data analysis plan, a path forward team, and an incident team. Paine also mentioned that Fluor Daniel Fernald was two weeks away from completing the desired tests on this melter.

Where does this leave us now? The issue is not *can* vitrification work, but rather at what cost, and how long it will take. Fluor Daniel Fernald does not feel that there an alternative to vitrification at this moment. However, the Independent Review Team is meeting at the end of January to explore all possible options, including vitrification of all three silos, vitrification of only Silos 1 and 2 while solidifying Silo 3, or stabilization in some form for all three silos. The Independent Review Team has already issued the following Action Statements:

- 1) The current baseline does not support enough design activity to assure the continuity of resources necessary to capture the lessons learned from the Vitrification Pilot Plant. More resources must be devoted, including specialized outside consultation and design peer review, taking advantage of other vitrification projects.
- 2) It will be necessary to rebaseline the OU4 project to move waste retrieval design and process testing up to a higher priority. There is a great deal of uncertainty in this area, and confidence in the retrieval system is vital to the success of any remediation alternative.
- 3) The scheduling basis for OU4 activities relies on unrealistically optimistic assumptions. Realistic scheduling in all activities including design, regulatory processes, and construction is critical to project success.

Sarno explained that one question before the Task Force is whether other processes besides vitrification should be considered. While vitrification is a new process, we have done tests and therefore have some understanding of the process involved. He further explained that no other alternatives have been explored in detail, so many questions of cost, safety, etc. for those alternatives are unanswered. Vitrification was originally chosen based on issues of risk, cost, and schedule, but it now turns out that it takes longer than originally thought, and costs more. The Task Force needs to find out: 1) what are the real costs (including the impact of vitrification on other site projects, risk reductions, money and time), 2) how long will it really take, and 3) how reliable is it? Sarno reminded the Task Force that the Independent Review Team (IRT) is addressing all of these questions, and has been asked to look at other options such as cementation, as well as to evaluate health, safety, and economic impacts for these other options. They will also look at the regulatory impacts for each alternative. Lisa Crawford asked if someone at DOE is asking these questions (separate from the IRT) and suggested that all output and answers from that person be shared with the Task Force and Independent Review Team.

5. Site Recycling Protocol

The recycling of materials from OU3 was discussed. As outlined in the current ROD, materials from the production area that meet the waste acceptance criteria will go into onsite disposal, and materials which do not will go to NTS. Some materials from the clean side of the site, such as desks, trailers, and computers, can be recycled or reused via donations or resale. Those items with some surface contamination might be cleaned and reused, but the costs of cleaning the item versus the costs of recycling must be weighed. Completely contaminated items will be disposed of. The decisions on what items to clean and what items to dispose of will be based on schedule, local economic impact, institutional preference, local social preference, and protectiveness of the environment. The importance of each of these criteria must be weighed in relation to each other.

So that DOE might receive their input, the Task Force members were asked to individually rank the following criteria in order of importance:

- a) Net present value
- b) Total Undiscounted Cost
- c) Schedule Impacts
- d) Local Economic Impacts

- e) Institutional Preference
- f) Local Social Preference
- g) Protectiveness of the Environment

Secondly, the Task Force members were asked to rank, on a scale of 1 to 5, their preference for disposition alternatives, in relation to four of the above performance measures. The alternatives to be considered were:

- 1) On-Site Disposal Facility
- 2) On-Site Decontamination and Unrestricted Release
- 3) Vendor Facility Decontamination and Unrestricted Release
- 4) Metal Melt and Fabrication of Restricted Use Products (Recycle 2000)
- 5) Vendor-Operated FEMP Material Release Facility

The results of both exercises are attached. The survey information will feed into the February meeting of the Recycling Committee, and the results will be announced to the Task Force.

6. Site Schedule and Budget Update

DOE is in the process of developing the FY 1998 budget, and projections of the next five years will be available the first week of February. Jack Craig explained that there have been numerous budgets prepared, and that the 10-year cleanup plan assumes an unlimited budget to clean the site in 10 years. The current budget is \$259 million per year, which will allow cleanup of the site by 2008 (a 13-year plan). Assuming this flat line budget, it is essential to work hard to reduce landlord costs -- thereby getting more money for overall site cleanup.

Craig welcomed the Task Force's interest in reducing landlord costs, though he suggested that doing so would take a considerable amount of Task Force time. The Task Force will address that issue at its March meeting.

7. 1997 Workplan

The 1997 Workplan is a continuation of the 1996 Workplan, with the addition of "Cost and Schedule." Most of the March Task Force meeting will be spent discussing this issue. Applegate asked for a vote adoption of the Workplan, and it was accepted as presented.

000007

**Fernald
Community
Reuse
Organization**

Meeting Announcement

You are invited to attend the Fernald Community Reuse Organization (CRO) meeting on:

Tuesday, March 4, 1997, 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Ross High School Media Center, 3425 Hamilton-Cleves Road, Ross, Ohio

Meeting Focus: Draft Strategic Plan

The draft strategic plan will be presented for discussion and review. Public comments will also be welcome as a part of the review process.

The CRO was formed to provide recommendations to the Department of Energy on social and economic development issues resulting from downsizing at the Fernald Environmental Management Project. For more information on the CRO, please call or write to:

Fernald Community Reuse Organization, P.O. Box 38, Ross, OH 45061
(513) 648-4168



MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 6, 1997

IN ATTENDANCE

Sandy Butterfield	<i>FRESH</i>	Tisha Patton	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>
Marvin Clawson	<i>Task Force</i>	David Rast	<i>DOE - FN</i>
Lisa Crawford	<i>Task Force</i>	Doug Sarno	<i>Task Force</i>
Lew Goidell	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>	Michael Smith	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>
Darryl Huff	<i>Task Force</i>	Tom Wagner	<i>Task Force</i>
Tom Ontko	<i>Ohio EPA</i>	Sue Walpole	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>
		Eric Woods	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Evaluated total traffic volumes on Route 128 versus expected increased truck traffic from the site.
- Based on this information, traffic volumes between Ross and Miamitown look equitable. The committee does not see any action needed at this point.
- Still awaiting costs from CSX for rail trip.
- Discussed response to Intermodal option for OU4 waste:
 - Committee is concerned that risks do not accurately reflect incremental risks from a whole site basis.
 - Need to be clear that Silo 3 was used only for illustration - did not mean to imply that Silo 3 cementation has been selected.
 - Question raised about change in DOE truck routes to avoid Oklahoma, could impact Fernald shipments.
- Nevada SSAB Concerns: Trucks at US-95/I-15 interchange and trucks going over Hoover Dam.
- DOE recently met with Nevada Field Office about options for creating better intermodal opportunities, specifically to a North Las Vegas facility. Could demonstrate feasibility of intermodal. Asked for detailed fact sheet. Committee supported idea in principal.
- Plant 1 pad is full of waste waiting to go to NTS.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE ~ CONT.

ACTION ITEMS

- Doug will call Earl Dixon at Nevada about coordinating with SSAB. Start dialog on specific issues.

ACTIONS FOR FDF/DOE:

- 1) Revisions of intermodal analysis
 - 2) Trial of intermodal at North Las Vegas facility
 - 3) Changes of truck route around Oklahoma
 - 4) Report traffic volume to DOE
- Next meeting in April timeframe to look at intermodal answers.



MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 5, 1997

IN ATTENDANCE

Nina Akgunduz	<i>US DOE</i>	Gloria McKinley	<i>Task Force</i>
Lisa Crawford	<i>Task Force</i>	Donald Paine	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>
Bob Heck	<i>Fluor Daniel Fernald</i>	Doug Sarno	<i>Task Force</i>
Gene Jablonowski	<i>Task Force</i>	Bob Tabor	<i>Task Force</i>
Kelly Kaletsky	<i>Ohio EPA</i>	Gene Willeke	<i>Task Force</i>

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Silo 3 material at Miami University for compound analysis - expect results next week.
- Two cementation experts added to IRT:
Della Roy, PhD - retired from Penn State
Earl McDaniel - retired from Oak Ridge
- Microencapsulation may be a good solution for Silo 3 - encases material in small polyethylene pellets, being developed out of Brookhaven Labs.
- We need a side-by-side comparison of materials in Silo 3 versus Silos 1 and 2.
- It was noted that skipping campaign 3 (Silo 3 material) left out a large piece of the puzzle. FDF said it was done because of foaming/sulfate problem.
- Requested DOE/FDF to prepare a decision rationale for why not vitrification for Silo 3 in a clear, easy to read format, so that the public can see it.
- Discussed at length the uncertainties and difficulties surrounding vitrification.

ACTION ITEMS

- Next Meeting: Scheduled for Wednesday, February 12, 1997.
- Will continue to monitor progress of IRT.

611

**SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW TEAM (IRT)
PUBLIC AVAILABILITY SESSION
February 12, 1997; 7:00 p.m. Alpha Building**

In support of the Silos Project, DOE and Fluor Daniel Fernald assembled an Independent technical team to offer advice and make recommendations concerning the treatment of the waste in Silos 1, 2, and 3. The team has been meeting monthly since November and each session has included representatives from FRESH and the Task Force. However, to give the general public the opportunity to meet the IRT on an informal basis, an Availability Session was offered. The nine-member IRT, plus two experts on stabilization, made up the panel. Others attending the meeting included reps from U.S. EPA, OEPA, Institute for Energy & Environmental Research (IEER), FRESH, Fernald Citizens Task Force, ATSDR, Rob Portman's Office, GCBCTC, FAT&LC, DOE and Fluor Daniel Fernald.

A call-in line had been publicized for those unable to attend the session. The Nevada Community Advisory Board contacted DOE and planned to participate via conference call. However, due to scheduling conflicts and the time difference, they had to cancel.

Gary Stegner opened the meeting and asked the 11-member panel to briefly introduce themselves. Gail Bingham from the IRT gave a status summary of the team's progress to date. Following are some of the comments/questions that were directed to the team.

- The charter of the IRT should be limited to technical issues.
- The approach the United States takes to classification of radiological waste is not rational. Waste form determination should be guided by what is best in terms of protectiveness not by current requirements.
- The OU4 Record of Decision provides that the Silo waste shall be disposed of as a vitrified waste form. A glass waste form for the Silo residues is best. Until and unless, Fluor Daniel Fernald/DOE demonstrate that it is not technically possible to vitrify the Silo residues, no other waste form should be considered.
- Expressed concern that the IRT does not currently have all the information necessary to make an assessment of the Silos Project. The IRT should be provided with all relevant data and take as long as necessary to make a recommendation.
- Expressed concern with respect to DOE/Fluor Daniel Fernald's understanding of the potential for Silo degradation and collapse especially with respect to the potential impact of waste removal activities.
- Has the IRT been provided with a copy of the FEMP Emergency Response Plan?
- Requested that in the event that the IRT concludes that there exists insufficient information to make a final recommendation at this time, that it will return when the information becomes available and make a recommendation at that time.
- Requested that whatever the outcome of the IRT recommendation and final direction, sufficient "additional expertise" be brought in to support the project and assure a success. Requested that the expertise be the best available and not be

000013

limited to Fluor Daniel Fernald or DOE.

- Interpreted the "ADS Tracking Report" provided to her by DOE as "claiming" that the IRT had attended a stakeholder meeting.
- Asked whether "privatization" of the project has been considered.
- Expressed concern that vitrification is being rejected based on technical difficulties associated with sulfates in the residues, yet sulfates present similar problems for cement stabilization.
- Expressed concern that the team needs more information and time to make a sound recommendation.
- Isn't there knowledge from other sites? Is there no coordination of lessons learned or sharing of information?
- Considers vitrification of Silo residues as a legally binding requirement. Does not understand why alternate forms are being considered.
- Considers the "March 1 deadline" for an IRT recommendation as an arbitrary Fluor Daniel Fernald requirement. Recommended that it should be "scrapped".
- Expressed concern that the IRT does not adequately understand the implications of waste volumes in considering a recommendation.
- Expressed concern regarding the dramatic increases in projected project costs.
- Expressed concern that we are not considering the impact of NTS not accepting a waste form other than what is currently agreed to.
- Expressed concern that no satisfactory explanation has been provided to the Stakeholders with respect to why Campaign 3 was omitted from the Pilot Plant test program.
- Asked the IRT if they had been provided with a copy of the Dose Reconstruction Report?
- Requested assurance that the report documenting this effort would be an IRT report not a Fluor Daniel Fernald report.
- Requested recommendations in the report not be limited to consensus issues. Dissenting opinions should also be included.
- FRESH requested a one-pager from each member of the IRT addressing their "feelings" on the "process, results," as an evaluation tool for them.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15. The IRT's next session will be February 25-28.

000014